



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Consultation Report Annex A - Autumn 2021 Consultation Issues Tables

Book 6

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: JULY 2023

Application Document Ref: 6.1

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

Table A.1: Summary of Section 42 responses and consideration by topic.....	3
a. Need and Benefits	3
b. Development proposals.....	9
c. Forecasts.....	26
d. Economics and socio economics	32
e. Carbon and climate change	56
f. Traffic and transport	60
g. Noise and Vibration	79
h. Air quality.....	94
i. Landscape, townscape and visual resources	102
j. Ecology and nature conservation.....	119
k. Land use and recreation.....	133
l. Health and wellbeing	139
m. Major accidents and disasters.....	145
n. Law and order.....	148
o. Hazards	149
p. Existing infrastructure.....	150
q. Construction	151
r. Approach to EIA	156
s. Mitigation	157
t. Airspace and overflights	179
u. Water and flood risk	182
v. Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology.....	189
w. Sustainability assessment	191
x. Geology and ground conditions	192
y. Cumulative effects	195
z. Consultation.....	197
Table A.2: Summary of Section 47 responses and consideration by topic.....	208
a. Need and benefits	208
b. Development proposals.....	210

c.	Forecasts	216
d.	Economics and socio-economics	217
e.	Carbon and climate change	237
f.	Traffic and transport	246
g.	Noise and vibration	276
h.	Air quality	285
i.	Landscape, townscape and visual resources	289
j.	Ecology and nature conservation	299
k.	Land-use and recreation	304
l.	Health and well-being	311
m.	Major accidents and disasters	315
n.	Law and order	318
o.	Hazards	319
p.	Existing infrastructure	320
q.	Construction	325
r.	Approach to EIA	332
s.	Mitigation	333
t.	Airspace and overflights	342
u.	Water and flood risk	344
v.	Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology	349
w.	Sustainability assessment	351
x.	Geology and ground conditions	352
y.	Cumulative effects	353
z.	Consultation	354

Table A.1: Summary of Section 42 responses and consideration by topic
a. Need and Benefits

Theme: Need/benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Demand and forecasts	<p>Comments about the level of detail and evidence included in the need case, estimates of runway movements in the Baseline case that could affect impacts, and questions about airport capacity, particularly in relation to post-pandemic growth in demand. Questions were raised about whether 70 movements per hour is attainable. Requests made for publication of independent demand forecasts that address a range of scenarios with analysis of assumptions made.¹</p>	<p>The air traffic forecasts have been prepared jointly by GAL's in-house airline relations and marketing and research teams and ICF, one of the UK's foremost experts in air traffic forecasting.</p> <p>In preparing the forecasts, regard has been had to the importance of having a robust, realistic view of the level and characteristics of air traffic growth that would occur at Gatwick, whilst also ensuring that the environmental impacts of Gatwick's growth, some of which, such as noise, traffic and carbon, rely heavily on the forecasts, are not understated. This also accords with advice from the Planning Inspectorate to ensure that realistic 'worst case' environmental impacts are understood. For this reason, the forecasts are considered to represent a robust and realistic view of the level of air traffic growth.</p> <p>Hourly levels of movements in the baseline and northern runway cases (55 and 70 movements per hour respectively) have been informed by GAL's operational planning team. 55 movements per hour have been achieved at Gatwick since 2016. A movement rate of up to 70 movements per hour in dual runway operations is attainable. The number of hourly movements is dependent on the</p>	N

¹ Note: Comments in bold and shaded grey were also made by s47 respondents

Theme: Need/benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>mix of aircraft types (sizes) and the split between arrivals and departures. Busy day schedules have been prepared for the baseline and northern runway project cases and provided in Appendix 4.3.1 of ES Chapter 4: Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>Forecasts have also been prepared for sensitivity cases, including slower growth, slower fleet transition, Heathrow Runway 3 and development of London Luton Airport.</p>	
Use of northern runway	<p>Comments in support of the Project due to the advantages of developing an existing asset, improving efficiency, resilience, and safety, and increasing capacity. Objections raised around need and impacts. Concerns about passenger experience, safety, increased delays due to worse aircraft congestion, increased use of fossil fuels, and the consequences of operating without an emergency runway.</p>	<p>Comments in support noted.</p> <p>The Needs Case (Doc Ref. 7.2) prepared in support of the DCO application sets out the benefits, including how the project would enhance resilience.</p> <p>The proposed layout and configuration of the airfield has been subject to, and informed by, detailed simulation modelling, demonstrating how proposed changes, including to the reconfiguration of holds and taxiways, will improve operational performance of the airfield.</p> <p>The safety of the proposals, in respect of aircraft and aerodrome safety has been and will continue to be assessed by the CAA and will be subject to CAA approval.</p> <p>The effects of the Project on carbon emissions are considered in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N
Scale of expansion	<p>Suggestions that more evidence is required to justify the scale of the proposed expansion, particularly</p>	<p>Information supporting the need for the proposed development against forecast aviation demand in the UK and in London and the Southeast, including having</p>	N

Theme: Need/benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	considering Heathrow R3, surplus capacity at other airports e.g., Stansted, and the Government Net Zero commitment.	regard to possible development and growth at other airports, and taking into account Jet Zero, is provided in the Need Case.	
Making best use	Comments that the proposals are bringing a new runway into use rather than intensifying use of an existing one and are not compliant with government policy. Also, that routine use of the northern runway could result in intensification of use of the main runway, and this should be considered as part of the DCO.	<p>The Planning Statement (Doc Ref 7.1) appraises the Project against relevant national aviation and national and local planning policy. It is considered that the Project complies with existing national policy including the Government policy 'Beyond the Horizon - The Future of UK Aviation – making best use of existing runways (June 2018)' and the Government's 10-year Aviation Strategy 'Flightpath to the Future' (2022).</p> <p>The DCO seeks consent for the proposal to make best use of Gatwick Airport's existing runways and infrastructure which includes how the use of the existing main runway would change in dual runway operations.</p> <p>The Northern Runway cannot be used in its most efficient form in its current location. It therefore needs to be repositioned to make best use of the existing infrastructure. Whilst the main runway can handle more movements per hour, for the reasons set out in ES Appendix 4.3.1 Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3) this is dependent on several factors (e.g. aircraft types, numbers of arrivals and departures etc.) which means this is not an ideal solution.</p>	N
Benefits	Questions around scale of benefits attributed to the northern runway compared with those realised through growth on the main runway, including demand for airline slots and reduction in delays.	The Needs Case (Doc Ref. 7.2) prepared in support of the DCO sets out the benefits, including how the project would enhance resilience, improve operational performance and enable more slots to be released to airlines in response to airline demand compared to the future baseline (i.e. without the Project).	N

Theme: Need/benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments supporting the benefits of increased capacity, including business growth, improved economic resilience and stability, encouragement of tourism, and greater employment and inward investment. Also, that the Project will encourage greater industrial and commercial growth within the Gatwick Diamond area.	Noted – The Needs Case (Doc Ref. 7.2) prepared in support of the DCO sets out the benefits, including local, regional and national economic benefits, how the project would enhance resilience, improve operational performance. Further information is provided in other supporting documents such as the Economic Assessments prepared by Oxera and Oxford Economics.	N
	Comments supporting growth to ensure a profitable airport and associated benefits. Concerns that the Project prioritises profits for the owners and shareholders over economic benefits, safety and the environment.	Comments supporting growth are noted. Documents in support of the DCO provide full information to assess economic benefits and environmental impacts as well as safety.	N
Reduced emissions/taxi times	Comments suggesting increased landing capacity would result in reduced airborne holding and related CO2 emissions. Also, increased take-off capacity would improve on-time departures, reducing taxi times and leading to environmental and efficiency benefits as aircraft spend less time stationary with engines running. These improvements will help to mitigate against increased emissions from additional flights related to the Project.	It is anticipated that arrival spacing will be reduced because there will not be a need to have account of the departures in between. That means in any given period, the airport can accommodate more arrivals than at present. In today's operation the same number of aircraft would have to separate further and be airborne for longer. The additional NRP capacity will enable the airport to deal with more arrivals and they can land without the spacing capacity. More departures can also be sent out. There will be less of an impact from holding aircrafts because planes can depart and arrive at the same time with the northern runway.	N

Theme: Need/benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Airfield	<p>Comments suggesting a complex but less crowded airfield is easier for air traffic controllers to manage, meaning improved runway safety and utilisation. Other comments questioned the efficiency of the layout, suggesting it would be too complex and could lead to increased delays and impact on passenger service levels, with airlines potentially less willing to grow their operations at Gatwick.</p> <p>Questions were also raised about the safety of holding aircraft between runways and whether clearance distances would be sufficient and if not, whether they would lead to longer taxiing times.</p>	<p>The proposed layout and configuration of the airfield has been subject to, and informed by, detailed simulation modelling. Further information including how the project would affect performance of the airfield, such as aircraft taxi and holding times, is provided in the Note on Simulation Report provided at Annex 8 of ES Appendix 4.3.1 Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3). Further information is also provided in Annex 9 of ES Appendix 4.3.1 Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3) in response to questions about safety of holding aircraft between runway and clearance distances.</p>	N
Airspace	<p>Comments that the use of existing Standard Instrument Departure routes (SIDs) and Standard Arrival Routes (STARs) would mean no newly overflowed communities. With the modernisation of airspace due to be in operation before the Project, there should be no further airspace changes necessary to accommodate it. The timescales for the airspace</p>	<p>The Northern Runway Project is not dependent upon changes to the London Terminal Manoeuvring Area (LTMA) airspace. The related Gatwick Northern Runway Project Airspace Change Proposal (ACP-2019-81) makes clear that no changes to Standard Instrument Departures, Standard Arrivals or Instrument Approach Procedures are required. Dual runway operations would operate using existing, published procedures. (https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=205) Thus the air noise assessment assumes the routing of aircraft to and from the main runway and from the northern runway would remain as it is today.</p>	Y

Theme: Need/benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	modernisation process (FASI South) were mentioned, with suggestions that it should be considered as part of the Project so any impacts can be addressed.	<p>The Department for Transport / Civil Aviation Authority co-sponsored airspace modernisation programme (including the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation – South) is a distinct process from the Development Consent Order. The Gatwick FASI-S airspace change proposal (ACP-2018-60) will be managed through the regulatory process for airspace change as set out in the Civil Aviation Authority publication CAP 1616 as part of a coordinated and co-dependent multi-sponsor airspace change.</p> <p>The timeline for FASI-South - which is outside of Gatwick’s control - is adapting to programme and process changes and thus the Gatwick focused FASI-South project, which sits within the overarching programme, remains at an insufficiently mature stage to understand the potential changes in flight tracks and consequent noise impacts.</p>	

b. Development proposals

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Alternatives	Requests were made for more information on the alternatives considered and an opportunity to understand how the design and decision-making process was informed by environmental, physical and social constraints.	<p>A two-stage appraisal process was developed to identify the preferred proposals for supporting growth at Gatwick. Stage One considered the strategic growth options and Stage Two comprised the appraisal of key component parts and development of the Preferred Proposals.</p> <p>A number of key aviation documents together with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and development plan policies have informed the development of this process, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Aviation Policy Framework 2013 2. Airports Commission Appraisal Framework (April 2014) 3. The National Policy Statement for National Networks (December 2014) 4. The Airports National Policy Statement: New runway capacity and infrastructure at airports in the Southeast of England (June 2018) 5. Beyond the Horizon - The Future of UK Aviation: Making Best Use of Existing Runways (June 2018) 6. Flightpath to the Future - A Strategic Framework for the Aviation Sector (May 2022) 7. Jet Zero Strategy: Delivering net zero aviation by 2050 (July 2022) <p>The Airports Commission Appraisal Framework sets out the importance of taking an integrated approach to the development of growth options for airports which considers the full range of relevant factors. This includes economic, social, environmental and operational issues and the potential effects of aviation connectivity and infrastructure at a range of spatial levels.</p>	Y

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>It sets out a range of criteria headings to be considered when options are being assessed, covering strategic fit, economy, surface access, environment, people, cost, operational viability and deliverability.</p> <p>The Airports Commission guidance has been used to inform the development of a framework used for the Stage Two options appraisal process. The GAL options appraisal categories comprise operations, business case, deliverability, planning and consents, surface access, water, environment (including ecology, heritage, soils, visual), community (noise, air quality, health and socio-economics) and land and property.</p>	
	<p>Suggestions that instead of upgrading the northern runway, the Applicant should focus on recovering from the pandemic improving the existing infrastructure (i.e. renovating terminal buildings), increasing capacity through improvements to the main runway, and attracting additional airlines, particularly to reduce vulnerability if EasyJet decreases its presence.</p>	<p>Prior to the Covid pandemic, Gatwick experienced a sustained period of growth over the previous 10 years. There has been a strong start to recovery and there is confidence that passenger and airline demand at Gatwick will return to previous levels over the next four to five years and then continue to grow.</p> <p>GAL has developed a series of strategic growth options for how the airport could grow to meet this future national and Gatwick based demand. The scenarios considered and published in the 2019 Master Plan are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scenario 1: where Gatwick remains a single-runway operation using the existing Main Runway. 2. Scenario 2: where the existing Northern Runway is routinely used together with the Main Runway; and 3. Scenario 3: where GAL continues to safeguard land for an additional runway to the south. <p>Scenario 1 would see passenger throughput increase to approximately 57 to 61 mppa in 2032 through investments in terminal facilities, operational</p>	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>efficiency and resilience, improvements to surface access and car parking and provision of additional commercial facilities. However, year on year growth rates would decline as the runway constraints become increasingly binding. Most of the growth would be outside the current peak times and therefore the requirement for additional infrastructure would be relatively modest.</p> <p>Scenario 2 proposes that a strip of additional pavement be laid to the northern edge of the existing Northern Runway, to allow the corresponding adjustment of its centreline north of its current position. This would allow the dual operation of the Main Runway and Northern Runway together to achieve higher throughput overall.</p> <p>At the time of publishing the draft Master Plan this option was estimated to enable passenger throughput to increase to approximately 68 to 70 mppa by 2032. Within this scenario it was proposed that the airport would remain a two-terminal operation (with some requirement for reconfiguration and for new supporting facilities) and would not require changes to flight paths from the current arrangements.</p> <p>Scenario 3 proposes continued safeguarding of land for an additional runway to the south of the existing Main Runway. This scenario could accommodate a throughput of approximately 95 mppa and would require more significant changes to the airport and surrounding roads.</p> <p>Gatwick's draft Master Plan was published for consultation on 18 October 2018. The consultation ran for 12 weeks, closing on 10 January 2019. Over 5,000 consultation responses were received including detailed comments relating to the growth Scenarios.</p>	

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Having carefully considered the consultation feedback and the current and emerging national aviation policies, GAL published its final Master Plan in July 2019 which concluded that a 'do minimum' option (Scenario 1) would restrict future growth and Gatwick's ability to contribute to meeting future demand for increased aviation capacity. This option would not allow Gatwick to make best use of its existing runways, as only one runway would be operational at any time.</p> <p>The final Master Plan also confirmed that GAL was not actively pursuing Scenario 3 in light of the Government's support for the third runway at Heathrow but considers it to be in the national interest for land to continue to be safeguarded to allow for a new runway to be constructed to the south of the airport, if required in the future.</p> <p>GAL confirmed it would pursue a dual runway option (Scenario 2) which would deliver the following benefits:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting aviation need and demand: Contributing to meeting the Government's identified need for air passenger growth to 2050, meeting Gatwick's demand forecasts, and serving the air travel needs of Gatwick's population catchment in southern England, and more widely by virtue of excellent accessibility to rail services. Additional capacity: By bringing the Northern Runway into routine use, we would be able to make best use of this existing infrastructure, and unutilised capacity. Greater choice: Additional capacity would provide further opportunities for airline innovation and passenger choice to more destinations and support a variety of airline types of operation and pricing models. 	

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Operational resilience: Unlocking extra capacity would help us continue to provide good operational performance for passengers and airlines, and more flexibility and resilience. This would also add further resilience to the wider system of London airports. 5. Economic growth: The Northern Runway plans are forecast to deliver significant benefits, that would be delivered locally and sub-regionally, including jobs, increased economic activity and expenditure, supply chain opportunities, and opportunities for inward investment and supporting the delivery of projects within the Gatwick 'Diamond'. 6. Training and skills: Benefits for education and training in local colleges, including increased construction and operational apprenticeships. 7. Community support: Increased community funding contributions, including for community projects and community cohesion. 8. Similar noise footprint: The extra capacity would be balanced by the airport's noise footprint remaining broadly similar to today's levels. This is mainly because of the introduction of new, quieter aircraft technology which has already made a significant difference. 9. Enhanced noise insulation support: A new noise insulation scheme providing 3 tiers of support for affected local residents, covering a wider area than existing, and including support for extensive noise insulation measures. 10. Environmental effects: minimise and mitigate the environmental effects of the proposals, such as on noise, air quality, carbon and other impacts on the natural environment, and seek opportunities to enhance these aspects where possible. 11. Minimal disruption: The majority of construction activity would take place within the existing airport boundary, and highways boundary (M23 Spur and Airport Way) and would be subject to controls to 	

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>minimise temporary impacts and effects on private interests. The development would be phased so that disruption to our neighbours and passengers is minimised.</p> <p>Overall, it was considered that Scenario 2 offered the optimum approach to making best use of existing runways, increasing UK airport capacity, and delivering economic growth for the region.</p> <p>Alongside developing our proposal to bring the existing Northern Runway into routine use, GAL are ramping back up its capital investment programme. The recently published 2023 Capital Investment Programme forecasts investment of circa £1.65 billion over the next six years (2023 – 2029) which includes significant investment in the refurbishment of areas of the campus such as both the North and South departure lounges and gate rooms which have been highlighted by passengers as being tired and dated.</p>	
	Suggestions for new, alternative airports to be built or other airports expanded, particularly those outside of the Southeast.	The ANPS recognises that there are long-term capacity problems facing London and the Southeast including at Gatwick where the airport is operating at capacity at peak times. The ANPS is the Government's policy on the need for new airport capacity in the Southeast of England. It, along with other aviation policy, is supportive of all airports beyond Heathrow (including outside of the south-east) making best use of their existing runways.	N
Cost	The cost of the development and whether it would lead to higher charges dissuading passengers from using Gatwick was queried.	Current projections indicate that, even with the significant investment associated with the development, Gatwick airport charges would remain highly competitive when compared to other London and European airports.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Queries around how the Applicant would finance both Project and its commitments to sustainability.	The Project would be financed through a blend of debt, equity and airport charges. GAL's commitments to sustainability are set out in both its current Decade of Change documents (for the current airport up to 2030) and in the project Sustainability Statement (indicating additional measures associated with the Project).	N
	Concern that taxpayer money is being used to fund the proposals.	No taxpayer money would be used to finance this project.	N
Supporting infrastructure – detail	Suggestions that further design detail is required to explain the impacts of supporting infrastructure proposals. Requests made for a consolidated plan showing the full extent of the works.	Works plans defining separate works areas and Indicative Masterplans showing the full extent of the works (and defined by Land use) will be Included in the DCO submission.	N
	More information was requested about works to support the Baseline case, including their planning status and assessments of how the forecast demand would be served.	There are a number of 'baseline' projects which are currently in GAL's development programme, most of which were deferred as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. These do not form part of the Project. ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides information on these projects including their planning status.	N
Supporting infrastructure – hotels and offices	Inclusion of hotels and office space as associated development within the DCO was questioned, including whether plans for hotel and office	Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we refined and updated our assessments to further understand the additional office and hotel demand that would be generated by the Project, given the quantum of office and hotel proposals is directly driven by the Project and its components (e.g., by	Y

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>space are necessary given there is existing unused office space that could be utilised.</p>	<p>passenger numbers). The updated assessment also took into account changes to the future baseline position and changes in occupancy rates between 2019 and 2022. These updates were presented in the Summer 2022 Consultation and are the basis of the DCO Application.</p> <p>A full explanation on the role of the hotel and office proposals as Associated Development is provided in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1). This was also presented as part of the Planning ‘Group A’ Topic Working Group #3 on 23rd November 2022.</p> <p>In summary and in line with PINS Guidance (April 2023):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relationship and proportionately to the Principal Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hotel occupation has a direct relationship to the airport’s operation by providing accommodation for visitors and users to the airport. the demand for hotel bedrooms is driven by passenger demand. - The proposed office space is for airport-related use, driven by the residual airport-related office demand taking account of the conversion (loss) of Destinations Place; existing vacant office space at the airport; and displacement of non-airport related tenanted space to an off-airport location. - Both hotels and office provisions are typical land uses associated to and found commonly at airports. ▪ Subordinate to the Principal Development – the provision of hotel and office space is subordinate to the Principal Development and not an aim in itself. ▪ Cost and Revenue – the delivery of new hotels or offices is not necessary as a source of additional revenue for the Applicant. 	

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests made to avoid displacement of airport-related parking to locations further from terminals or outside the Airport boundary as a result of providing new office/hotel floorspace.	<p>Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the approach to and proposals for car parking was re-examined and a revised approach to car parking provision adopted to better support initiatives for sustainable travel and avoid encouraging more car use by over-providing parking.</p> <p>Updated proposals were presented at the Summer 2022 Consultation, including removal of the proposals to use of Pentagon Field for car parking and a reduction in the number of spaces proposed.</p> <p>The proposals provide for a range of additional parking proposals both close to terminals and elsewhere within the airport, both to replace spaces that will be lost and to meet forecast demand. Further information is described in ES Chapter 5 and the Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>There are no plans to provide parking outside the airport boundary.</p>	Y
	The delivery of supporting infrastructure before surface access improvements and the runway was also questioned.	<p>The phasing of infrastructure delivery is complex, particularly since GAL challenged themselves to keep the development within the existing footprint and is therefore re-purposing existing space rather than developing additional land.</p> <p>Much of the supporting infrastructure that is being delivered ahead of the runway is facilities that are displaced by other airfield infrastructure. As an example, several existing car parks are lost, and the phasing of their replacement aims to ensure space provision remains aligned with passenger demand and has no negative impact on our local community. Car parking plans and phasing were updated following consultation feedback in 2021 and 2022.</p>	Y

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Ancillary infrastructure such as motor transport and waste re-cycling facilities must be relocated ahead of the start of construction of additional aircraft stands and a new taxiway. Hotel and office accommodation would be phased to meet passenger demand and the needs of airport businesses for space. Proposals for both were reviewed following consultation feedback in 2022 and included in the 2022 consultation. Updated indicative phasing is described in ES Chapter 5 (Doc Ref. 5.3) and the Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3).	
Supporting infrastructure – CARE facility	Requests were made for more information on the technology and flue height of the CARE facility as well as the selection process for its potential locations and its impacts. Suggestions were also made for alternative locations and for retaining the existing facility.	<p>The existing CARE facility would need to be demolished as the area it is in would be repurposed to provide new remote stands. The CARE facility would process food waste for energy (heat), as does the current facility, although to provide for growth associated with the Project it would need to process a larger volume of food waste and would therefore be larger in scale.</p> <p>There would be two biomass boilers (one pre-existing to provide for the relocated 650 kw plus an additional 450 kv to provide for growth). There would be a materials recovery facility (MRF) to allow sorting of waste. A storage area would be provided for baled waste for collection by external suppliers from both landside and airside operations.</p> <p>The building would occupy an area of approximately 17,550 m². The main building would be up to 22 metres in height with a biomass boiler flue that would be up to 48 metres above ground level (diameter of 0.47 metres) and there would be elements up to 5 metres below ground level.</p>	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>An options appraisal for the location of the CARE Facility was undertaken to consider its feasibility and potential impacts. The following key requirements influenced the development of the options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Operations – all options would need to be designed to allow for efficient operation of the facility itself and the airport, including considerations of waste flows and vehicle routing; 2. Capacity – all options would need to provide for a waste capacity that meets the demands of 75.6 mppa by 2038 (80.2 mppa by 2047); 3. Design – all options are to be designed to ‘tie in’ and be in keeping with the design of the existing airport, drive innovation, support delivery of Gatwick Airport’s Sustainability Policy and Second Decade of Change (June 2021) and align with the Governments Waste Management Strategy (October 2018). <p>Two options were identified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Option 1 (Flying Pan site) proposes a CARE facility relocated to an area known as the Flying Pan Site (north of cargo). The site is currently utilised for surface block car parking; 2. Option 2 (Long Stay Car Park North) proposes a CARE facility relocated to the northwest zone of the airport. The site is currently utilised as airport car parking. <p>While Option 1 scored marginally better in terms of the business case, surface access and environment criteria, both options performed well overall, and were taken forward as part of the consultation on the Project in Autumn 2021.</p>	

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, Option 1 has been selected. Respondents preferred its central location, noting the shorter journey from the central terminal areas where the bulk of the waste originates and its relative remoteness from the airport boundary.	
Supporting infrastructure – car parking	Inclusion of lighting and columns in the heights of decked car parks was queried.	Lighting is required to all decked car parks, for navigation, safety and accessibility purposes. On the top deck, lighting columns are required to provide area lighting, to aid identification of cars and to promote a safe environment for all users. The lighting strategy recommends the use of lanterns with precise optical controls to efficiently contain light within the task area, to minimise visibility of the light source from afar and to avoid upward light and light obstruction effects.	N
Airport boundary	Differences between the Airport boundary shown in the Project proposals compared with the boundary shown in local plans were highlighted. More clarity requested about the boundary and the land being used.	The Gatwick Estate includes 634 hectares whereas the application site covers some 814 hectares and includes additional biodiversity areas, sites for acquisition (e.g., Brook Farm) so will extend beyond the current airport boundary.	N
Gatwick Stream	Further information requested about the phasing of Gatwick Stream works.	The floodplain compensation area that was previously proposed on the Gatwick Stream has been removed from the Project. Updates to the guidelines for the consideration of climate change published by the Environment Agency in July 2022 mean that it is no longer required.	N
Main runway supporting infrastructure	Queries raised about the amount of proposed supporting infrastructure needed to serve growth on the main	There are a range of ‘baseline’ projects which are currently in the development programme, but which do not form part of the Project for the purpose of the application for a DCO. These notably include improvements	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	runway compared with the amount needed for the Project.	to both terminals, expansion of the Gatwick railway station, an additional multi-storey car park in North Terminal, automation of and alterations to existing car parks, and an extension to Pier 6 to provide more aircraft stands and gates.	
Airfield	Questions raised about whether an increase to 70 movements per hour is attainable and the accuracy of the impact assessments based on this number.	Hourly levels of movements in the baseline and northern runway cases (55 and 70 movements per hour respectively) have been informed by GAL's operational planning team. A movement rate of up to 70 movements per hour in dual runway operations is attainable.	N
	Comments that the proposed reconfigured Juliet Taxiway should be verified by the CAA as being in line with industry best practice.	The CAA have not raised any concerns about the proposed safety, design or concept of operation on Juliet taxiway. Further information is provided in Annex 9 of ES Appendix 4.3.1:Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3). However, following consultation, GAL have amended the design to extend Code E capability from Taxiway Uniform all the way through to Taxiway Quebec. This avoids the risk that Taxiway Lima becomes a single point of failure for the independent movement of Code E aircraft.	Y
	The proposals for stands were accepted for both the Baseline and Project cases, however there were questions about the operational feasibility of Pier 7, including around passenger access.	A total of 12 options were evaluated as part of the pier appraisal process, with Pier 7 performing the best overall. It was the only option with no score lower than "feasible" against any of the criteria and its location, adjacent to the proposed Taxiway Lima extension provides the greatest free flow of aircraft on the taxiway system, avoiding the risk of delays caused by congestion associated with the vast majority of the other options.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Pier 7 will support passenger growth associated with the dual runway operations and will serve both North and South Terminals. It is proposed that passengers will reach the Pier using autonomous vehicles with stations for boarding and disembarkation from these vehicles being provided at each Terminal. The vehicles will operate on a shuttle basis, allowing passengers to make their own way to the Pier and from there to their gate. The Pier will consist of a ground floor plus two levels (arrivals and departures), including departure gate areas, together with some commercial facilities at the first-floor level.</p>	
	<p>The need for a replacement control tower was queried and questions were raised about the need for a new public safety zone.</p>	<p>The emergency or standby control tower, located south of the existing hangar 7 and to the west of the motor transport facility, was Gatwick's control tower from 1958 until 1984 when it was replaced by the current 'stalk mounted' tower. The building continues to operate as a 'standby' tower if for any reason the main tower is inoperable (for example during maintenance activities). The building also houses multiple IT equipment rooms, training facilities, office and staff welfare accommodation.</p> <p>This tower would be converted from a landside to an airside operation with a new bus stop and walking route for staff access. GAL expect this facility to be replaced by a "virtual tower", example of which are already being operated by Heathrow for their standby facility and London City for their primary operation. Gatwick's virtual tower would be located within an existing building at the airport and the equipment rooms and office facilities would also be relocated to existing buildings.</p> <p>Public safety zones are calculated in a standardised way and the Project will accord with these requirements.</p>	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments were made about the suitability of the proposed air traffic management tools for a mixed mode runway.	During implementation, the air traffic management tools would be upgraded where required to support the use of the mixed mode runway concept, as would be agreed with the Regulator in accordance with relevant regulations.	N
Spoil locations	Questions raised about the consideration of alternatives to Pentagon Field for spoil. Suggestions that all spoil remain on site and be used for bunding purposes.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Appendix 3.3.1: Options Appraisal Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3) explains the reasonable alternatives considered by GAL during the optioneering and Project design process. This included the consideration of options for the airfield and highways construction compounds.</p> <p>The amount of spoil to be generated is more than that can be used for bunding purposes. There is no possibility for the all the excess material is used for bunding. The excess material will be sent off site including Pentagon Field, which was identified through the alternative assessment process as a suitable spoil receptor site. Further detail is provided in the Spoil Strategy, contained in ES Appendix 5.3.1: Buildability Report (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N
Parking	Comments suggested that the proposed passenger car parking provision was not consistent with sustainable travel. The use of Pentagon Field for decked parking was not supported, with on-airport parking preferred. Queries were raised about the loss of car parking due to Pier 7 and requests were made for a detailed Parking Strategy.	<p>Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the approach to car parking was re-examined and a revised approach to car parking provision adopted to better support initiatives for sustainable travel and avoid encouraging more car use by over-providing parking.</p> <p>Updated proposals were presented at the Summer 2022 Consultation, (including removal of the use of Pentagon Field for car parking) and a reduction in the number of spaces proposed.</p>	Y

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns about the potential increase in unauthorised parking, including on local roads.	<p>Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the approach to car parking was re-examined and a revised approach to car parking provision adopted to better support initiatives for sustainable travel and avoid encouraging more car use by over-providing parking.</p> <p>Updated proposals were presented at the Summer 2022 Consultation, and a reduction in the number of spaces proposed.</p> <p>No changes are proposed that would allow additional capacity for an increase in unauthorised parking. In response to comments from local planning authorities the provision of on-airport parking does not allow for the re-provision of unauthorised off-airport parking reduced as a result of enforcement activity.</p>	Y
Baseline developments	More information was requested about works to support the Baseline case, including their planning status and assessments of how the forecast demand would be served.	There are a number of 'baseline' projects which are currently in GAL's development programme, most of which were deferred as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. These do not form part of the Project. ES Chapter 4 - Existing Site and Operation - provides information on these projects including their planning status. None of these are required to enable the increase in aircraft movements or passengers forecast in the Baseline Case.	N
R2 Safeguarded Area	Comments made that the large area of land safeguarded for R2 creates uncertainty and restricts potential development from taking place, including housing. Requests a legally binding commitment not to build R2.	<p>In the light of Government support for the third runway at Heathrow, GAL confirmed it was not actively pursuing R2 in the Gatwick Masterplan July 2019, but nevertheless considers it to be in the national interest for land to continue to be safeguarded to allow for a new runway to be constructed to the south of the airport if required in the future.</p> <p>This position has not changed in terms of Gatwick's desire to continue to safeguard R2 land. Safeguarding of R2 is a policy requirement under the</p>	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		CBC Local Plan (Policy GAT 2) and GAL made further representations to the Reg 19 Local Plan consultation that continue to support the provision of policy safeguards for R2 land.	

c. Forecasts

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Validity of forecasts	Requests were made for more information to support forecasts and evidence the need case.	<p>The DfT assumes that in 2030 the London airports would have an annual capacity of 200 million passengers, which is just 19 million above the annual throughput in 2019. Heathrow and Gatwick are already assumed 'full', whilst Luton is now operating at its planning limit. By 2030 an additional 39 million passengers are forecast in the London market which will be in excess of the current available capacity. This indicates significant need for additional airport capacity in London and Southeast to meet consumer demand for flying in the long term.</p> <p>Whilst there is inherent uncertainty in predicting long term aviation growth, the forecasts presented have been prepared jointly by GAL's in-house airline relations and marketing and research teams and ICF, one of the UK's foremost experts in air traffic forecasting.</p> <p>In preparing the forecasts, regard has been had to the importance of having a robust and realistic view of the level and characteristics of air traffic growth that would occur at Gatwick, whilst also ensuring that the environmental impacts of Gatwick's growth, some of which, such as noise, traffic and carbon, rely heavily on the forecasts, are not understated.</p>	N
Expansion of other London airports	Comments made that the forecasts should consider potential expansion at other London airports over the study period.	An important factor that would affect the level of air traffic at Gatwick in the future is whether a third runway is brought forward at Heathrow Airport (Heathrow R3). National policy, as set out in the Airports National Policy Statement (NPS) (Department for Transport, 2018), supports the construction of Heathrow R3. When the NPS was published it was expected that Heathrow R3 would be provided by 2030.	N

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Following the designation of the NPS, Heathrow Airport Holdings Ltd (HAHL) – the owner and operator of Heathrow and the promoters of Heathrow R3 - commenced work on the extensive and detailed studies that would be required to support a Development Consent Order application to seek formal consent for Heathrow R3. However, as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, HAHL suspended its work in 2020. HAHL has not provided any timeframe for recommencing its process for seeking development consent and there is no indication that work will be recommencing in the short term. Even if HAHL does restart work it is considered unlikely that Heathrow R3 could be operational much before the mid-late 2030s as a result of the delays to their consenting process, which would be expected to consequently delay their anticipated opening date (originally scheduled for 2030).</p> <p>There is therefore significant uncertainty surrounding when, and if, a third runway will now be developed at Heathrow. Due to this uncertainty, the forecasts prepared in support of the Northern Runway Project are based on a 'no Heathrow R3' scenario. This approach is considered robust as it provides a realistic worst-case assessment of the environmental impacts of the Project. However, as Heathrow R3 remains Government policy, a separate sensitivity test has been undertaken to consider the potential for cumulative effects with a proposed expansion of Heathrow Airport through the provision of a third runway in the event it was to come forward (see ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships (Doc Ref: 5.1)).</p> <p>Consideration has also been given to the effects that development currently being planned at London Luton Airport would have on Gatwick's traffic forecasts. However, estimates of any impact on Gatwick prior to 2037 are considered relatively minor given the limited overlap in catchments between the two airports and the lack of capacity in the wider London market until the early-mid 2030s.</p>	

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Fleet mix	<p>The fleet mix sensitivity case forecasts were considered robust by some, with others suggesting different growth trajectories, including with growth at other airports, should be considered.</p> <p>More information was requested about the assessment methodology and the fleet mixes used in the Slower Transition Case. Others highlighted differences between the fleet mixes used in forecast data book and in some assessments. It was suggested that the impact of the pandemic on aircraft orders made the fleet mix used in the Central Case optimistic.</p>	<p>Fleet mix assumptions have been made to provide input to the noise and environmental analysis capturing ongoing fleet modernisation programs amongst Gatwick’s airlines. Next generation aircraft include those currently entering service and benefiting from the latest engine technologies.</p> <p>In 2019 just over 12% of movements were operated by next generation aircraft with this share forecast to steadily increase. Over the forecast period the next generation share is forecast to steadily increase approaching 60% in 2029 and we expect virtually all current generation aircraft to be phased out by 2038.</p> <p>In the short-medium term known fleet and airline plans have been captured within the underlying fleet assumptions. Beyond this, fleet assumptions have been supported by broader industry trends including retirement rates/ages as well as order books and other aircraft types expected to enter service.</p> <p>Beyond the mid-2030s there is the potential for future generation aircraft types to enter service (e.g., neo and MAX replacements) as well as other modes of propulsion (e.g., electric, hydrogen).</p> <p>The ‘Slow Fleet Transition’ sensitivity case assumes that the rate of transition of Gatwick’s airline fleet is slower than in the core forecasts. The purpose of this sensitivity test is to understand how noise, air quality and carbon impacts could be greater if the turnover of aircraft types to next generation aircraft is slower than expected in the core forecasts.</p> <p>In the Slow Fleet Transition Baseline case the next generation share is assumed to reach 50% in 2032 compared to 80% in the baseline core case, whilst by 2038 the next generation share of nearly 100% in the core forecasts</p>	N

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>is assumed to decline to 82% in the Slow Fleet Transition case. Similar changes are assumed in the slow fleet transition NRP case.</p> <p>Recent trends saw Gatwick's next generations share peak at over 25% in 2021. However, this was driven by airlines favouring the use of next generation fleets during the COVID-19 pandemic. Pre COVID-19, Gatwick's share of next generation aircraft had reached 12%, whilst recent trends show that in 2022 next generation aircraft are likely to make up around 20% of movements.</p> <p>During COVID-19, many airlines delayed aircraft deliveries whilst the manufacturers also slowed down production rates to adjust for these reduced levels of demand. By 2047 it is unlikely that current generation aircraft will be operating in significant numbers, so for 2047 the Slow Fleet Transition sensitivity has assumed a noisier mix of next generation aircraft. Typically, some noisier and often slightly larger aircraft are assumed to substitute for a share of the next generation fleet types assumed in the core forecasts.</p> <p>The fleet mixes have been assumed within other assessments including busy day schedules, noise, carbon and other topics.</p>	
Capacity	The assessment of capacity across the airfield, including presentation of the baseline as a capacity constrained forecast, was queried. More information about the relationship between the hourly increase in capacity and how this relates to the	GAL has engaged in Topic Working Groups where further information has been shared on the derivation of the forecasts including busy day schedules and annual forecasts. Further information is provided in ES Appendix 4.3.1 Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	annual demand forecasts was also requested.		
Future demand	<p>More information was requested to support forecasts of future demand (for both baseline and NRP cases) in order for them to be validated.</p> <p>Other comments suggested that post-pandemic growth forecasts were optimistic and that the assessments should also consider the growing numbers of people reducing aircraft use to reduce individual carbon footprints.</p>	<p>GAL has engaged in Topic Working Groups where further information has been shared on the derivation of the forecasts that have been prepared by GAL and ICF. Further information is provided in ES Appendix 4.3.1 Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3)).</p> <p>The Forecast Data Book provides further information supporting the recovery profile from COVID. The assumed speed of recovery is comparable to other industry forecasts for example IATA, ACI and Eurocontrol.</p>	N
Methodology	More clarity about the methodology used to create forecasts was requested, including whether account was taken of the cost of carbon, future abatement measures, and whether demand forecasts are consistent with the Government's Jet Zero assumptions.	<p>Further clarity about the methodology used to prepare the air traffic forecasts is provided in ES Appendix 4.3.1 Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>UK Department for Transport (DfT) and more recently UK Jet Zero aviation forecasts have been used to support the long-term growth trajectory for the London market.</p>	N
Baseline case	Comments suggested the Baseline case forecasts may be too high and questioned whether the infrastructure could cope with the increases. Others	In the Baseline Case, (i.e. without the Northern Runway Project), it is estimated that Gatwick will be able to handle approximately 326,000 commercial ATMs in 2047, reflecting an increase of around 10% compared to the 2019 throughput. This increase in movements will be achieved through	N

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	suggested the 2016-2019 growth rate was a reflection of capacity constraints and an important factor in forecast growth in the baseline case. Some also queried the seasonality assumptions.	<p>better year-round slot utilisation and further capacity release, whilst up-gauging (the use of larger aircraft) and load factor growth will also support higher passenger volumes of around 67mppa. These trends include the impact of changes in the market mix at Gatwick, for example growth in long haul markets (larger aircraft types and less seasonal operations) and reductions in seasonal charter air traffic.</p> <p>The increase in runway utilisation during off peak periods will result in annual air traffic profiles flattening as demand spreads to the less utilised periods of the year, although some seasonality would remain. In 2047, busy month commercial ATMs are forecast to be 6% higher than the annual average compared to 17% in 2019 and 23% in 2014.</p> <p>Further information is provided in ES Appendix 4.3.1 Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	
Development case	Comments suggested the Development Case forecasts could be too high and further information was required to support them, although cargo forecasts were not considered unreasonable. Requests were made for the daily profile of demand relative to the use of runways.	<p>The growth under the Northern Runway is driven by the new incremental runway capacity offered by the Northern Runway as well as a combination of larger aircraft and other factors. The increase in cargo volumes being forecast reflects the additional belly capacity of additional long-haul services assumed in the forecasts.</p> <p>Daily profiles – hourly slot usage has been provided as part of the Topic Working Groups.</p>	N

d. Economics and socio economics

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Economic assessment – study areas	Differences in study area boundaries for the PEIR and Economic Impact Report were highlighted as making comparisons difficult. It was also suggested that the Local Study Area should align more closely with the Northern West Sussex FEMA and that some community facilities were missing from the study area.	Different study area geographies are used within the assessment to reflect the different types of socio-economic impacts being assessed. Explanations are given in detail in the ES Chapter 17 Socio Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) paragraphs 17.4.10 and 17.4.11. In summary, following feedback the Northern West Sussex FEMA has been included within the study areas. In addition, the boundary of the Local Study Area (LSA) has been amended to include more settlements in proximity to the Airport, and the Five Authorities have been renamed to Six Authorities to include Croydon. It should be also noted that following feedback, data is also provided at a local authority level. Finally, both the ES Assessment as presented in ES Chapter 17: Socio Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the Economic Impact Report: Local Impact Assessment prepared by Oxera (as is presented in ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact (Doc Ref. 5.3)) have considered the same study area as appropriate.	Y
Economic assessment – data	Comments suggested that up to date government guidance input would significantly increase the net present value of emissions and affect the Project’s overall benefit-cost profile, meaning an updated assessment should be provided.	In the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we published our Economic Impact Assessment which considered the economic effects of the Project. In September 2021, after our Economic Impact Assessment was completed, the Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy updated the carbon values it uses to appraise policy proposals. While the carbon values used in our Economic Impact Assessment were up to date at the time of its preparation, the assessment has been updated to reflect the latest carbon values as a part of the planned update to the EIA for the DCO submission.	Y

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concern was expressed about use of baseline data sources and a lack of data available on the number of businesses with trade related to the airport that would see an uplift with the Project.	<p>Given the uncertainty regarding the long-term impact of the COVID-19 pandemic as well as the lack of post-pandemic data, the EIA relies on 2019 as a reference year for the future state of the economy for inputs to the analysis other than traffic forecasts.</p> <p>The number of businesses with trade related to the airport is not included in the scope of the assessment. However, we estimate the impact of the Project on local businesses as the indirect and induced employment and value-add impacts.</p>	N
	Others noted that inclusion of a pandemic year (2019-2020) in the data was inconsistent with the general approach. It was also suggested that alternative scenarios should be included that consider impacts of the pandemic beyond 2021 and 2022 and include unemployment rates and the effects of the government furlough scheme.	Our assessment has not factored in the impact of the pandemic to the extent that there is no evidence available that these impacts would be long-lasting. For example, there is no evidence currently available to suggest the furlough scheme would impact employment in 2029, which corresponds to the Project opening. The baseline employment statistics provided by Cambridge Econometrics do however factor in any long-lasting effect of the pandemic on the local employment baseline by 2047.	Y
	Concerns that the assessment is based on out-of-date information affecting the validity of the cost-benefit analysis. Queries raised about assumptions, particularly around the long-term impact of the pandemic on passenger demand, and whether the economic benefits	Given the uncertainty regarding the long-term impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as the lack of post-pandemic data, the EIA relies on the latest data available using 2019 as a reference year for the future state of the economy for inputs to the analysis. Economic impact estimates for a scenario that assumes slower / lower passenger growth, for example as a result of COVID-19, at Gatwick are also provided. This sensitivity aims to show the effect of lower levels of demand on economic impacts. The traffic forecasts	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	had been successfully demonstrated.	for this slow growth sensitivity are provided by ICF. Oxera uses these ICF forecasts as inputs to the sensitivity analysis.	
Economic assessment - methodology	The Economic Assessment was considered comprehensive and technically robust, but comments highlighted that there may be areas where demand forecast may have been under or overstated (e.g., due to a slower than anticipated recovery from the pandemic and optimistic forecasts), which would affect net economic benefits. Other comments suggested the ability of other airports to meet some of the projected growth has not been accounted for and could also have a material impact on benefits.	Economic impact estimates for a scenario that assumes slower / lower passenger growth at Gatwick are also provided. This sensitivity aims to show the effect of lower levels of demand on economic impacts. The traffic forecasts for this slow growth sensitivity are provided by ICF. Oxera uses these ICF forecasts as inputs to the sensitivity analysis. The impact expansion schemes at other airports could have on the benefits arising from the Project are discussed qualitatively.	Y
	Sensitivity testing of the economic assumptions using Experian forecasts was requested to better align with the local authority evidence base. It was also suggested that there is a need for more focused assessment of the socio-economic impacts based upon the six local authorities in closest proximity to the airport.	ICF, CE, Experian and Oxera's forecasts have informed the assessment considering all the macro-economic externalities. In particular, the Housing and Population Report (as presented in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3)) discusses the impacts on housing and population based on Experian employment forecasts. Full consideration of Experian employment forecasts is set out in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) Sections 3.0 and 5.0. Specifically, it is noted that Experian (March	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		2022) forecasts are significantly higher than comparable Cambridge Econometrics (March 2022) forecasts (see ES Appendix 17.9.3 Table 3.2.4). However, a full review of levels of employment underpinning current local plans in the study area has been conducted (ES Appendix 17.9.3 , para 3.2.11-3.2.51) which has found that the aggregate level of employment growth which currently underpins local plans is substantially lower than the Experian March 2022 forecast and is more in line with the Cambridge Econometrics Forecast, despite the fact that many of these plans refer to Experian in their evidence base.	
	Comments suggested that the socio-economic analysis underplays the labour supply shortage, particularly in the construction industry.	<p>ES Appendix 17.9.1 Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides a detailed analysis of the construction employment expected to be generated by the Project. This includes quantum and origin/commuting data while the potential housing effects are analysed in ES Appendix 17.9.3 (Doc Ref. 5.3). This data has informed the assessment in the ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) in Section 17.9.</p> <p>In addition, ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) (Doc Ref. 5.3) presents opportunities for regional and local construction enterprises and measures to facilitate the construction supply chain opportunities that will arise during the key construction period of the Project.</p> <p>The precise definition of the workforce required to construct the Project will be supplemented as the detailed design progresses and following appointment of the Tier 1 contractors. GAL considers that the ESBS would provide the framework necessary to avoid adverse construction labour supply effects. An integral part of this would be the establishment of an employment</p>	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		and skills delivery model, shaped in partnership with the Construction Industry Training Board and the Civil Engineering Contractors Association. This would reflect the construction industry-endorsed National Skills Academy for Construction (NSAfC). A key, underpinning objective of the NSAfC concept is the opportunity this provides for NSAfC hubs to work collectively to share intelligence around workforce demand and facilitate the movement of labour across projects. This would operate in concert with the wider ESBS employment and skills initiatives that would support the opening up of new and different talent pools to supplement the available workforce, include reaching into communities facing multiple barriers to gaining and sustaining work.	
	It was suggested that the assessment also include air fare savings, airline costs, fuel efficiency, average fares and air fare elasticities, airline shadow costs, airport (GAL) revenues, benefits and losses from changes in travel times, and a tourism deficit.	<p>The national impact assessment already presented changes in air fares, airline costs, average shadow costs, air fare elasticities and airports' revenues. An additional table with the input for 2019 baseline fares has been added.</p> <p>Net benefits from changes in travel times on the surface access network has not been estimated as it would not be proportionate to do so given these benefits are likely to be marginal based on the limited expected passenger diversion from other airports. In addition, following consultation feedback, we no longer quantify any impacts from improvements in taxi times as a result of the Project as these are marginal and are likely to not be realised due to airline scheduling.</p> <p>Assumptions about fuel efficiencies relate to the forecasts which were provided by ICF and are an input to the national impact assessment. Therefore, these are not discussed in the economic assessment report.</p>	Y

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		There is an expanded discussion on tourism effects in the update to the national impact report. However, the assessment doesn't quantify the welfare impacts associated with tourism due to limited evidence available. The local impact assessment includes a section discussing local tourism impacts.	
	Other suggestions were for inclusion of the definition of 'adversely affected', compensation details, and disaggregation of sources of consumer benefits and producer costs.	<p>The national EIA splits the net benefits to consumer and provider's benefits and costs and provides a breakdown of the consumer benefits by passenger type (leisure vs business)</p> <p>The definition of the assessment in terms of magnitude and significance is set out in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) at Section 17.4. Based on the findings of the Socio-Economics Assessment as presented in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1), there are no adverse effects that would require mitigation.</p>	N
	Comments that estimate of increased Air Passenger Duty receipts do not reflect the Project's net impact on government revenues as the project may also result in reduced tax take in other areas of the economy, so government revenue benefits should be removed.	The national impact assessment already accounts for the fact that the increase in Air Passenger Duty receipts will be offset by a reduction in consumers' taxable spending elsewhere in the economy, as passengers buying tickets would have less disposable income.	N
Local Economic Assessment	Comments suggested there is uncertainty around the catalytic impact estimates. Requests were made for further information on the causal relationship between air traffic and	<p>Following consultation feedback, updates were provided in the Summer 2022 Consultation describing progress as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have refreshed our socio-economic and economic study areas to look at the Labour Market Area and the Six Authorities Area comprising 	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	employment, and for an assessment of the relative value of the jobs lost and gained to those people experiencing the change.	<p>the County areas of East Sussex, West Sussex, Surrey, Kent and Brighton and Hove alongside London Borough of Croydon, together with a Local Study Area that encompasses all neighbouring communities around Gatwick. These study areas form the basis of both the socio-economic and economic assessments which will support the Project's DCO Application, and which will assess the potential effects of the Project on receptors in these areas. In addition, the socio-economic impacts are assessed within the Northern West Sussex FEMA. Following feedback, all employment data is also presented in a local authority level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We are undertaking more detailed analysis on the construction employment expected to be generated by the Project, including the likely quantum, skills and origins of the construction workforce (as presented in ES Appendix 17.9.1 Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note (Doc Ref. 5.3). We are also considering the trade and skills required by the construction workforce as presented in ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 17.9.1 Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note (Doc Ref. 5.3). ▪ We are assessing the potential impacts of the temporary construction workforce on housing need, specifically the need for short-term temporary accommodation, based on anticipated accommodation types and tenures required by the Project workforce as set out in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3). ▪ We are assessing a variety of econometric forecasts (including CE and Experian) to understand and test the impact of the Project, including long-lasting effect (if any) of the COVID-19 pandemic on local employment. 	
	The rationale for assumptions around increased labour supply were queried including regarding the relative scale of employment creation compared with the availability or otherwise of labour within the study areas.		
	Requests made that a more complete economic narrative for the inclusion of imperfectly competitive market benefits should be provided along with supplementary economic modelling to substantiate the multiplier results.		
	Requests made for each local authority jobs figure to be further divided into direct, indirect and catalytic jobs.		

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We are assessing the impacts of the operational employment (ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) at Section 17.9 for the relevant labour supply for each study area and assessment period. Data is also presented at a local authority level in ES Appendix 17.6.1 Socio-Economic Data Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3). ▪ The estimation of net impacts, including labour supply impacts, have been scoped out of the assessment due to the difficulty in robustly estimating those effects. Net impacts are discussed only qualitatively. ▪ Input-output modelling (indirect and now induced) has been revised to adjust multipliers which are reported. Moreover, potential overlaps with other impacts are removed. ▪ Employment at LAD level (split by job type) is now provided. ▪ The narrative on the inclusion of imperfectly competitive market benefits has been expanded to illustrate the channels through which this type of impact would be realised. 	
Economic assessment – monetised environmental impacts	<p>Comments that the approach taken to carbon appears robust but that revised government carbon values are available.</p> <p>Also, that the air quality effects have a very large range. Suggestions that carbon value should include non-CO2 impacts and emissions from inbound flights.</p>	<p>In our Autumn 2021 Consultation, we published our Economic Impact Assessment which considered the economic effects of the Project. In September 2021, and after our Economic Impact Assessment was completed, the Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy updated the carbon values it uses to appraise policy proposals. Whilst the carbon values used in our Economic Impact Assessment were up to date at the time of its preparation, we will be updating the assessment to reflect the latest carbon values as a part of the planned update to the EIA as part of the DCO submission.</p> <p>Ranges in air quality costs represent uncertainty and different health impacts accounted for in the damage cost values published by DEFRA and DfT.</p>	Y

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Due to the scientific uncertainty around the magnitude of the non-CO2 effects, a qualitative assessment of these impacts has been added in line with guidance from the Department for Transport (TAG).</p> <p>In the context of a UK appraisal, it is considered appropriate to only include emissions from outbound flights to be consistent with the emissions accounting methodology in the UK carbon budget (see Climate Change Committee (2020), 'The Sixth Carbon Budget – Methodology Report', December, pp. 257-259; BEIS (2020), '2018 UK Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Final figures', 4 February, p. 25.) This is in line with DfT's modelling in the context of the Jet Zero strategy (see DfT (2022), 'Jet Zero: modelling framework', March, p. 39)</p>	
Economic assessment - trade and foreign investment	Comments made that the impact of the Project on trade and foreign direct investment should be included in the assessment as its omission is likely to result in an underestimate of benefits.	We agree the omission of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) results in an underestimate of the benefits arising from the Project. The updated EIA consequently provides a quantification of the trade benefits arising from the Project. However, due to concerns over double counting with other benefits we do not include trade benefits in the net present value (NPV) of the Project. FDI effects are discussed qualitatively as it is difficult to robustly estimate the additional welfare benefits associated with FDI flows without double-counting with trade benefits.	Y
Employment and labour market	Greater clarity was sought on the number, type, quality, and location of jobs created by the Project. More information was requested to understand the link between current labour supply, new jobs and local economic benefits. Comments	The Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) (see ES Appendix 17.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) aims to maximise the opportunities that the Project presents for creating sustainable jobs, skills development, career progression and potential for business growth and increased productivity through the construction and operational phases. The activation of the ESBS would be described within an Implementation Plan. This would describe how Gatwick would deliver the ESBS, setting out clear objectives, actions,	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>suggested that some types of jobs could create employment shortages for other local businesses or in construction of new developments. Others said more could be done to maximise employment and economic benefits for the areas surrounding Gatwick and that the direct economic benefits do not outweigh the impacts.</p>	<p>milestones, outputs and projected impacts; the key partners and stakeholders Gatwick would work with and how; and governance, monitoring and reporting arrangements. Representatives with an excellent knowledge of employment, skills and business needs, opportunities and infrastructure are already working closely with us in an advisory capacity.</p> <p>Further work will be done to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Refresh the socio-economic and economic study areas to look at the Labour Market Area and the five County areas of East Sussex, West Sussex, Surrey, Kent and Brighton and Hove, together with a Local Study Area that encompasses all neighbouring communities around Gatwick. These study areas form the basis of both the socio-economic and economic assessments which will support the Project's DCO application, and which will assess the potential effects of the Project on receptors in these areas. ▪ More detailed analysis will be undertaken on the construction employment expected to be generated by the Project, including the likely quantum, skills and origins of the construction workforce. We will look at the trade and skills required by the workforce to assess and understand the impacts on the existing labour market. ▪ We will assess the potential impacts of the temporary construction workforce on housing need, specifically the need for short-term temporary accommodation, based on anticipated accommodation types and tenures required by the Project workforce. 	
	<p>Support for proposals to rebuild the airport's business and bring economic benefits, whilst minimising any potential impacts on the community and environment.</p>		
	<p>Comments made that further assessment is required to understand potential burdens on local authorities and their communities due to the labour requirements of the Project and that GAL should contribute to mitigating them.</p>		

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>Suggestions that the fall in aviation jobs due to automation (baggage handling/air control etc) would reduce the potential for job creation and should be included along with the employment impacts on the UK tourism industry due to increasing outbound trips. Also, that there is a risk of the local community becoming reliant on the single employer.</p>	<p>The ESBS will have at its heart, the promotion of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DE&I). One of the four core objectives of the ESBS would be to ‘Cultivate and promote the conditions whereby people from all backgrounds can reach their full potential and share in the benefits of a healthy economy’ and one of the two underpinning cross-cutting themes would be ‘The promotion of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and breaking down barriers that prevent social mobility’.</p> <p>Gatwick proposes a number of approaches that would make this happen. Examples include: effective employment brokerage, which reaches into communities facing multiple barriers to gaining and sustaining employment, particularly within localities exhibiting high levels of multiple deprivation; working with community-based organisations to ensure that customised or wraparound support is provided to address particular needs; and we will implement Gatwick’s existing Diversity, Equity and Inclusion policy to use our strategic position to help influence the industry we work in, which includes our supply chain.</p>	
	<p>Comments made around the potential decrease in supply of higher skilled workers in the area as some may choose to move due to increases in noise and air pollution.</p>		
	<p>Comments that the proposals may benefit larger corporations rather than local businesses.</p>		

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that Gatwick and its supply chain should introduce a diversity initiative to ensure those traditionally excluded from work can have access to employment.		
Jobs	Concerns about the reliability of the assessment of additional jobs generated by the Project and the value they would create. Also, the lack of jobs created at a national level is inconsistent with the levelling up agenda.	<p>The direct ('on-site') additional operational jobs have been estimated by the ICF forecast. Moreover, Oxera has estimated the indirect, induced and catalytic employment figures based on an approach explained in ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>Growth in onsite jobs has been forecast to increase at a rate moderated compared to that of the annual growth in traffic (passengers / ATMs). This growth in jobs is at a rate less than half of passengers. For example, under the NR forecast passenger demand is forecast to increase 87% versus the baseline whilst onsite jobs are forecast to increase under 40%.</p>	N
	Comments that there may not be a need for increased jobs as there are already high levels of employment rates both locally and nationally and unfilled posts at the airport.	Additional employment opportunities will support further the local economies of the hosting authorities as well as of those falling within the LMA and the Six Authorities. These will also help decreasing unemployment, providing a wider range of jobs that match the skills of the current labour and through the ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3), there will be opportunities to train and specialise workforce to facilitate the new jobs.	N
	Concern raised that the workload of existing airport staff would increase and queries around whether the airport	Additional roles would be created in order to support increased operational activity resulting from the Project.	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	would be able to successfully manage increased working with local businesses. Suggestions for more flexible working for airport workers.	<p>ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) would facilitate additional resource to support increased working with local businesses.</p> <p>The suggestion for more flexible working for airport workers is noted.</p>	
	<p>Support expressed for proposals for training and up-skilling the local workforce. Comments made around the need for new training courses and apprenticeships to upskill the adult and younger population. It was suggested that the offer to share workforce requirements with LEPs, FE, HE and schools should be extended to include other local skills partnerships and that job creation in green industries should be supported. Suggestions that local Project construction workers should be re-skilled for jobs in airport operations and management.</p>	<p>We are developing our Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS). The ESBS aims to maximise the opportunities that the Project presents for creating sustainable jobs, skills development, career progression and potential for business growth and increased productivity through the construction and operational phases. The activation of the ESBS will be set out within an Implementation Plan. This would describe how Gatwick would deliver the ESBS, setting out clear objectives, actions, milestones, outputs and outcomes. It will also set out the key partners and stakeholders Gatwick would work with and how. A suite of interlocking initiatives would be required to maximise employment and skills outcomes. These would include employment outreach and brokerage and a range of skills provision and actions to open up routes to work experience and careers. This would include apprenticeships and graduate recruitment opportunities. Gatwick would work with the Gatwick Family of on-site businesses to open up work and upskilling opportunities for a wide demographic – from school leavers to adult returners.</p> <p>Gatwick would work with the Gatwick Family to share workforce requirements with a full range of organisations and partnerships involved in predicting skills and workforce needs and planning associated provision. That process of sharing and predicting skills needs alongside other proposed activities around opening up Gatwick’s innovation pipeline would maximise opportunities to collaborate to drive up green enterprise and jobs.</p>	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The incorporation of employment brokerage into skills and employment activities would facilitate opportunities for changes in career direction as well as support for movement between employers.	
Skills and training	Requests were made for more information in the OESBS on the proposed scholarships model as well as how training opportunities and supply chain engagement would be achieved. Comments also sought more information on how GAL would work with local authorities and local businesses to attract indirect and catalytic employment.	<p>We are engaging with stakeholders and piloting and testing actions and ways of working in order to inform the initiatives that will be included in the Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) Implementation Plan. This includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Working with the Construction Industry Training Board and the Civil Engineering Contractors Association to scope a National Skills Academy for construction to enable us and our contractors to connect with job seekers, skills providers, potential supply chain contractors and other infrastructure projects to manage labour demand. 2. Trialling delivery of our Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) project work with schools at the airport to maximise the motivational potential of this unique environment, rather than conducting it entirely in schools. 3. Delivering trial recruitment campaigns alongside the Department for Work and Pensions, Jobcentre Plus, education and skills providers and individual local authority-based employment brokers around volume recruitment. These have involved the full range of businesses across the airport campus. The significant uplift in passenger numbers and associated recruitment demand across the airport for Summer 2022 has provided an ideal opportunity to develop relationships that we can continue to build on into the future. 4. Developing processes that would clarify for small and medium sized businesses, the requirements for winning and delivering contracts on-airport and establishing a process for local businesses to be able to register their interest in supplying goods and services. 	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>5. Developing relationships to enable us to contribute insight and support to shaping the planned Crawley Institute of Technology and Crawley Innovation Centre as well as adding value to the innovation development network. We are also scoping mechanisms for engaging individual businesses with Gatwick’s innovation pipeline.</p> <p>6. Commissioning research into how leading domestic and international airports are successfully working collaboratively with organisations across their surrounding region, to promote themselves and attract investment. This has informed the proposed regional investment and promotion activity strand of the ESBS.</p> <p>We are developing proposals for steering and governance arrangements for the delivery of the ESBS which will include external partners. Representatives with an excellent knowledge of employment, skills and business needs, opportunities and infrastructure are already working closely with us in an advisory capacity.</p> <p>These include the Construction Industry Training Board, the Civil Engineering Contractors Association, the Chair of the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership and Managing Director of the Chichester College Group and the Chief Executive of Gatwick Diamond Business.</p> <p>Core to Gatwick’s proposed delivery methodology across employment and skills actions would be to establish a relationship with a consortium of delivery agencies, with each playing to their strengths. We are also looking to identify key delivery partners, identifying the organisations that we would work with, how this could be structured and the key measures and outputs that will be required.</p>	

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Gatwick will explore, in collaboration with education, employment and skills experts, a range of options for driving up social mobility. Gatwick envisages that this could include the introduction of scholarships. Further detail will be included within the Implementation Plan, which will describe the activation of the ESBS.	
	Comments that the construction company delivering the project should have to commit to apprenticeships, training, and work placements. And that a skills and recruitment strategy should be introduced.	A delivery model for construction recruitment and skills development would be shaped in close collaboration with the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) and the Civil Engineering Contractors Association (CECA). Building on established good practice and what works, the model would reflect the tried and tested National Skills Academy for Construction (NSAfC), which was developed by the CITB and endorsed by the construction industry. As part of this, the requirement for delivery of Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) (refer to ES Appendix 17.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3) construction employment and skills outcomes will be made clear to Tier 1 contractors and down the supply chain. The performance indicators and outcomes will reflect the suite of outcomes set out in the NSAfC model. As such, they will include work placements, skills and apprenticeship provision.	N
Visitor and business economy	The opportunity for growth around international visitor economy, working with local partners and national sector bodies was highlighted as a key priority for local partners and lacking in the assessment. Comments queried the assumption that business trips would be created and suggested a	The ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) (ESBS) recognises that the Project constitutes a significant opportunity to promote future domestic and international trade and investment opportunities for the local, labour market and wider six authorities' area. The ESBS Implementation Plan would describe how, in order to maximise this opportunity, GAL would collaborate with partners to define a clear regional 'identity', emphasising economic and business strengths and opportunities, showcasing the area for inward investors and contributing to efforts to retain business and economically active communities within the	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	more cautious approach be taken to business travel assumptions, particularly in light of increased use of virtual meetings.	region. Additionally, the ESBS would envisage working with partners to develop a visitor generation strategy and set of associated targeted projects. These would consolidate and underpin the ongoing strategic direction of the Gateway Gatwick Partnership, promoting regional tourism.	
Green Business	Suggestions that the focus should be on 'green business/industry', including promoting green apprenticeships and training, as the sector has greater potential for secure, long-term employment.	Noted. Gatwick would work with the Gatwick Family to share workforce requirements with a full range of organisations and partnerships involved in predicting skills and workforce needs and planning associated provision. That process of sharing and predicting skills needs as a business collective, alongside other proposed activities around opening up Gatwick's innovation pipeline would maximise opportunities to collaborate to drive up green enterprise, jobs and skills. This would be explored further in the Employment, Skills and Business Strategy Implementation Plan.	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Gatwick should follow other global airports focusing on green issues, prioritising these before considering expansion to become a world leader in sustainability.	<p>GAL is committed to playing its part in the transition to Net Zero. In 2017, Gatwick became the first carbon neutral London airport, and its Second Decade of Change sustainability policy commits it to ambitious decarbonisation targets at the airport in addition to measures designed to help reduce carbon emissions related to surface access and aviation.</p> <p>Gatwick has a target to reduce GAL Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions to reach net zero by 2030. Scope 1 emissions are from sources directly controlled by Gatwick such as fuel burnt for heating and used in vehicles, and refrigerants. Scope 2 emissions are those associated with electricity consumed by Gatwick.</p> <p>As part of the DCO application, Carbon Action Plan is submitted at ES Appendix 5.4.2 Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) describing the commitments that GAL makes to reduce the carbon emissions within its control in four main areas – airport buildings and ground operations; construction; surface access; and aviation.</p>	N
Local communities	Comments made around the impact of compulsory purchase on businesses and communities losing facilities as well as families losing homes.	<p>Gatwick though the development of the project will ensure that a reasonable and proportionate approach is taken to land acquisition, ensuring that all land required is justified.</p> <p>Land and rights affected or acquired by the Project are being sought by agreement, where voluntary agreements are not reached the Project will pay compensation to affected parties in line with the Compensation Code. No homes are included within the Project proposals for acquisition.</p>	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns around the effect on local economic activity due to traffic along the A22 corridor and suggestions that the cumulative impacts of known planning permissions in neighbouring local authorities should be considered.	<p>The models which inform our assessment cover a wide area, including the A22 corridor. The models for future years all include estimates of population and employment growth, by using factors from the TEMPro database as indicated in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance. The assessment is therefore inherently cumulative.</p> <p>Nevertheless, we have also considered a cumulative effects assessment which specifically includes proposed development at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and west of Ifield, in response to stakeholder requests to test the possible cumulative effects of these schemes which are close to the Airport.</p> <p>Model assumptions have been adopted with regard to DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) including with respect to growth assumptions.</p>	Y
Housing – assessment	Comments made that the methodology used in the housing study is overly simplistic and excludes analysis of key issues, such as market signals, affordable housing, constraints on housing supply, cumulative effects of other developments, and the rate of housing delivery in the local area. There were also concerns that it did not take account of the type and quality of employment being generated and how this translates into the need for different types of housing. Also, that the assessment of the population and	<p>The ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) adopts the same approach (using PopGroup) as applied in Strategic Housing Market Assessments which are typically prepared for the purposes of plan-making. It adopts demographic-led, housing-led and employment-led scenarios which are appropriate for the purposes of assessing housing and labour market impacts for EIA purposes (as described in Section 1 of the ES Appendix 17.9.3).</p> <p>The analysis in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) has been updated to include some additional information requested, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of the amount of affordable housing likely to be required, including how this compares with recent delivery of affordable housing, 	Y

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	housing effects have been based on different study areas, which do not allow for sufficient understanding of the housing and community impacts.	<p>local evidence of affordable need, local plan policies for affordable housing and pipeline supply. This also takes into account the profile of operational employment generated by the Project.</p> <p>2. Undertaking more detailed analysis of the potential housing demand associated with construction employment, including looking at capacity within the private rented sector and other forms of short-term/temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Further clarification has been included for the geography used in the PHR. For the key elements of the report, figures are given for the study area as well the constituent Housing Market Areas and individual Local Authorities for information purposes (these are appended to the report).</p>	
	It was suggested that contributions were needed from GAL towards the delivery of the wider link road to mitigate the impacts of the Project and support the provision of affordable housing at West of Ifield and other sites.	<p>A contribution towards the link road would only be justified if the assessment demonstrates significant effects arising from the Project which require mitigation to the degree that a link road is required.</p> <p>Our assessment considers a core scenario without development west of Ifield (as it is not sufficiently certain to be included bearing in mind the guidance in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance) and a cumulative scenario which includes development west of Ifield). The assessments indicate that the link road is not required in order to mitigate the effects of the Project.</p>	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests made for housing trajectory modelling to be undertaken to assess housing growth with jobs growth and using the most up to date data. Similar concerns were expressed in relation to understanding hotel bed space/visitor accommodation capacity for workers coming from further afield.	<p>At each iteration of ES Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) the most up-to-date housing trajectories available at the time of drafting the report were used. This will continue to be updated in future versions of the report.</p> <p>The job growth figures used in ES Appendix 17.9.3 (sourced from Cambridge Econometrics) have been adopted to align with the base date used in the wider Socio-Economic Chapter for consistency.</p> <p>Additional information has been included in ES Appendix 17.9.3 to assess the potential housing demand associated with non-home-based construction workers, including looking at capacity within the private rented sector and other forms of short-term/temporary accommodation.</p>	N
	Further evidence was requested to demonstrate that the Project will not impact negatively on the delivery of housing in the local area (as a result of construction workers being taken from housing schemes).	The timescales of each cumulative scheme have been considered in respect of overlapping the various phases of proposed development. The PEIR cumulative assessment has not identified any issues on this respect.	N
Property values	Comments made that the effect on residential and commercial property values should be considered in the assessment, as recommended in the PINS scoping opinion. Also, that homeowners be compensated for	<p>National Planning Practice Guidance advises that in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of neighbouring property could not be a material planning consideration.</p> <p>GAL recognises that the Project could give rise to effects on property prices (both negative and positive). In respect of any loss in value of property, Part 1</p>	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>any impact that the Project would have on property prices.</p>	<p>of The Land Compensation Act 1973 (LCA) makes statutory provision for payment of compensation to qualifying property owners of properties that are depreciated in value as a result of the physical effects – noise, smoke, fumes etc– of the use of development works such as an airport expansion. Therefore, if there were to be any negative effects on property prices, the provisions of the LCA would apply and provide for payment of compensation to fully cover any loss in value.</p> <p>Furthermore, the National Planning Practice Guidance advises that in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of neighbouring property could not be a material planning consideration.</p> <p>The PINS scoping opinion (para. 4.10.3) requested that consideration be given to any likely significant effects of the Project on property values due to increased frequencies of flights. The issue of flightpath changes and their likely impacts are considered within ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1), together with the proposed mitigation measures to address the assessed impacts on residential properties. This identifies the potential for some moderate significant adverse effects in a number of locations close to the airport but concludes that the proposed Noise Insulation Scheme will mitigate and avoid any significant effects in relation to nearly all receptors. It does, however, acknowledge that to the west of the western end of the northern runway, there are approximately 40 properties on Ifield Road and near Russ Hill that have been identified as experiencing larger increases in noise (above 3 dB) which even with the Noise Insulation scheme may still experience residual moderate significant adverse effects.</p>	

<p>Tourist Attractions</p>	<p>Comments that the tranquillity of tourist attractions including Hever Castle, Penshurst Place, Chartwell and Knowle Park could be affected, with impacts on their ability to contribute to the local economy and job market.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the landscape and communities within the flight corridor over the High Weald AONB east of Gatwick Airport and south of Edenbridge would experience an increase in overflights of between approximately 15% and 20% to the existing future baseline of more than 200 flights a day, by the year 2032. In the area of the AONB that fans out and curves to the south and west from Hever to Crowborough, where there are currently between 100 and 200 flights a day, the increase is also anticipated to range from 15% to 20% of flights. Examples of people living within or using the AONB in these locations include visitors to Hever Castle and the Ashdown Forest. People generally experience a relatively high level of tranquillity in nationally designated landscapes of high scenic quality. These receptors are likely to be of high or very high sensitivity to change.</p> <p>Overflying aircraft at less than 7,000 feet above local ground level currently form a regular visible or audible feature that forms a slightly discordant aspect when experiencing the landscape. The special qualities that people living within and visiting the High Weald AONB experience, including distant scenic views and the landscapes relative tranquillity and dark skies, whilst affected to some extent as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft, would still be positive qualities that would be perceived.</p> <p>The largest increase in overflights is anticipated to be in areas that currently experience the greatest number of overflights, where relative tranquillity is slightly lower. An increase of up to 20% in the number of aircraft following the same flight paths may be discernible to some residents or observers or barely perceptible as an increase to others. The magnitude of change would be negligible leading to minor adverse effects on the perception of tranquillity during the day and at night, which is not significant. Some people within the AONB may be unable to perceive the increase in the number of aircraft and would therefore experience no discernible effect to the level of tranquillity.</p> <p>Although these impacts are not assessed from a socio-economics perspective, it is not likely that they will create issues to the operations and the quantum of tourists visiting these areas.</p>	<p>N</p>
----------------------------	--	--	----------

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Employment land	Comments made that the assessment should include the land supply implications of the identified growth and include evidence detailing the employment land needs that would arise as a result of job growth associated with the Project.	<p>GAL has assessed the land supply implications associated with identified growth – consideration has been given to the existing total employment land as well as the total projected pipeline across the FEMA (sourced from evidence-based reports published by the LPAs within the FEMAs).</p> <p>Consideration has been given to the LPA's assessment of their own economic growth potential and whether the LPA has a current and forecast surplus or shortfall in space. The assessment of total quantum of future airport-related space, across the FEMAs, has entailed a review of a break-down of commercial space by type and location across the FEMAs). By necessity this needs to draw down data from the most recent evidence available from the relevant local authorities, so it is difficult to arrive at a consistent baseline position.</p> <p>The analysis does not assess suitability or deliverability of the land identified by local authorities – i.e., where space should be located. It may be that some of the land proves not to be deliverable or that there is a requirement for additional space for flexibility. Some forecasts of land requirement may be out of date. Equally, new sources of land supply may have emerged in the period since some Council's produced their annual monitoring or evidence-based reports on which we have relied for the analysis below. As Local Plans are prepared over the coming five years it will be for local authorities to consider the requirements of the Airport and of the wider economy as part of maintaining a portfolio of land for employment (in line with NPPF para 82).</p>	N

e. Carbon and climate change

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Carbon assessment	Suggestions that assessment should include inbound and outbound flight emissions, the cumulative impacts of other airport expansion projects, airspace modernisation, the carbon implications of the highway improvements, and use of sustainable aviation fuel.	<p>Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the assessment methodology and scope. Specifically, see paragraph 16.4.16 for reasoning behind limiting the assessment to outward flights only.</p> <p>Section 16.10 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) for reporting on cumulative effects.</p> <p>The assessment of impact for the NRP DCO Application has been carried out in line with the current policy framework and best practice guidance for assessments in the UK, including Jet Zero and Decarbonising Transport.</p>	N
	Consideration of how the released capacity on the main runway might further increase carbon emissions was also requested for inclusion in the assessment.	<p>Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the assessment methodology.</p> <p>The assessment of impact for the NRP DCO Application has been carried out in line with the current policy framework and best practice guidance for assessments in the UK, including the Jet Zero Strategy. Jet Zero analysis uses updated airport capacity assumptions consistent with the latest known expansion plans at airports in the UK (see paragraph 16.10.7 in the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1)).</p>	N
	Comments made that all types of greenhouse gases which have the potential to contribute to a likely significant effect on climate should be assessed along with non-greenhouse gases.	Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the reasoning behind exclusion of non-CO ₂ impacts/radiative forcing from the assessment.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Carbon reduction targets	<p>Concerns raised about increased greenhouse gas emissions in light of national carbon reduction targets and local authority climate change action plans. Queries raised about how GAL would encourage airport partners to reduce emissions.</p> <p>Comments made that offsetting is not compatible with net zero and that new technologies to reduce carbon in aviation are unproven.</p>	<p>Section 16.12 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out a summary of the assessment effects and in paragraph 16.12.3 describes that the overall impacts arising from the Project are not so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets, including Carbon Budgets.</p> <p>The assessment of impact for the NRP DCO Application has been carried out in line with the current policy framework and best practice guidance for assessments in the UK, including Jet Zero. It is noted that the Jet Zero Strategy does not define a pathway and explicitly notes that there are various routes to achieve the Net Zero target for the sector. GAL is aware that Jet Zero Strategy provides the opportunity for UK Government to review progress against targets and to introduce further/additional mechanisms in order to ensure the sector achieves the 2050 target.</p> <p>The ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) and the Project's mitigation approach has been developed alongside and in light of the environmental assessment work. The Carbon Action Plan seeks to reduce GAL-controlled emissions as much as possible by 2030 and remove any residual emissions to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030 for Scopes 1 and 2, before committing to 'zero emissions' for GAL direct Scope 1 and 2 emissions from 2040 onwards (i.e. no carbon removals required). Gatwick is committed to the CAP and its outcomes through the terms of the DCO.</p>	N
Consultation materials	<p>Comments made that more information about mitigation should be available and that the Carbon and Climate Change Action Plan,</p>	<p>Section 16.8 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the related mitigation measures adopted as part of the Project.</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	The Third Climate Change Adaptation Report, the Sustainability Statement, and the Landscape and Environmental Management Plan should be included in the consultation.	<p>The subsequent Summer 2022 Consultation explained the role and function of the Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)).</p> <p>A Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3), Sustainability Statement (Appendix D to the Planning Statement, (Doc Ref. 7.1)) and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) form part of the DCO Application.</p>	
Take-off emissions	Comments that emissions could be increased due to the shorter northern runway requiring fully loaded aircraft to use a more aggressive take-off profile and querying whether this has been modelled.	<p>ES Appendix 16.9.4 Assessment of Aviation Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Doc Ref. 5.3) addresses this issue. Landing and take-off profiles are not expected to change as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The assessment of impact for the NRP DCO Application has been carried out in line with the current policy framework and best practice guidance for assessments in the UK, including the Jet Zero Strategy.</p>	N
Climate change	Comments made that the case for expansion has not been made on environmental grounds when there is a climate change emergency. Also, that climate change is linked to biodiversity loss and damage to landscapes which have national and international protection.	<p>The assessment of impact has been carried out in line with the current policy framework and best practice guidance for assessments in the UK, including Jet Zero. The Government confirms in its Jet Zero Strategy that it can achieve Jet Zero without needing to intervene directly to limit aviation growth.</p> <p>Section 16.8 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the relevant mitigation measures adopted as part of the Project.</p> <p>The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) provides commitments across three of the GHG assessment topics: construction, surface access and aviation. The extent to which emissions can be mitigated, and the measures by which this mitigation will be achieved, has informed the assessment of significance within the ES.</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		ES Appendix 15.9.1: In-Combination Climate Change Impact (ICCI) Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) (see Table 1.1.1) considers the impacts of hotter and wetter conditions and drier/drought conditions on biodiversity, ecology, conservation and landscape as a result of a changing climate from increased greenhouse gas emissions.	
	Comments that economic gain should not occur at the expense of the local and global environment.	Noted.	N

f. Traffic and transport

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Buses and coaches	Concerns raised about the absence of improvements to bus and coach station facilities and the reliance on operators to react to demand.	<p>Potential service improvements have been analysed for both the local bus network and the wider coach network, with the results presented in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4) and ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1). Gatwick Airport is already served by a network of services, but GAL has explored how that network could be strengthened. The Project proposals include new and enhanced regional coach services to target areas that currently have a low public transport mode share but generate significant numbers of trips to and from the airport. These areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sevenoaks and the Medway Towns ▪ East Grinstead and Uckfield ▪ Tunbridge Wells (via East Grinstead) ▪ Horsham and Worthing ▪ Bexley and outer east London <p>GAL would extend the funding of local bus services in line with increases to its Sustainable Transport Fund where these show benefits for local journeys, in particular by Gatwick Airport staff. Areas of focus include support for early morning, late evening and weekend journeys to match different shift patterns.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposals follow the approach already taken by GAL to support public transport services through its Sustainable Transport Fund, which would be extended in accordance with our Surface Access Commitments for the Project. 	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Local roads	Comments made that impacts on the local road network, which is already congested, would need to be mitigated, including in relation to cargo traffic. Concerns raised about limited improvements proposed and limited capacity, along with suggestions that improvements to local junctions should only be undertaken to accommodate local traffic where there is evidence of need.	<p>GAL has undertaken a full assessment of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models are explained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4) and its associated annexes and include all airport-related traffic associated with the Project (including cargo traffic), together with non-airport or 'background' traffic. They cover not just the roads around the Airport but a wide area of southeast England. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. We have considered the results of the modelling in detail to ensure that we have identified all locations where mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>The approach supports the assignment of the majority of airport-related travel to the strategic road network, largely avoiding the local network and mitigating the potential for impacts on local junctions. The Surface Access Commitments for the Project (set out in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3)) allow for potential support to further works where there is evidence of an impact from the Project, rather than as a result of non-airport background traffic growth.</p>	N
	More detail was sought around the access arrangements to Horley Business Park, with requests for assurance that it will be maintained at all times from the South Terminal roundabout access road.	The proposals for the development of Horley Business Park do not yet have sufficient certainty for them to be included in our modelling as a committed (or definite) scheme in the scenarios with or without the Project. This is in accordance with the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance. It will be for the promoters of that development to produce access proposals for South Terminal Roundabout or any other location noting that the development proposal has been put forward without regard to the Northern Runway Project being in place.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The cumulative effects assessment presented in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships (Doc Ref 5.1) includes Horley Business Park as a possible future development.	
	Requests for a focus on improvements to the local community, with particular reference to investment in local infrastructure beyond Crawley to towns like Horley.	<p>The highway proposals which form part of the Project include additional infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists, to encourage the use of active travel modes by Gatwick Airport staff and to provide improved facilities for all users in the area.</p> <p>GAL has undertaken a full assessment of the expected effects of the Project on the performance of the local road network and has identified all locations where mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>Investment in local infrastructure, where it is not required to mitigate the effects of the Project, is a matter for the local highway authorities working in conjunction with the relevant local Councils.</p> <p>Improvements to public transport services connecting local communities beyond Crawley and Horley are included in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3).</p>	N
Motorways	Concerns raised around the lack of resilience in the motorway network. Comments made that the M23 is approaching capacity and recent improvements were only designed to cope with background growth rather than additional airport passengers.	<p>GAL has been engaging closely with National Highways throughout the preparation of the DCO application.</p> <p>GAL has undertaken a full assessment of the impacts of the Project on the strategic road network using the strategic highway model and taking account of GAL's commitments to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concern also about the capacity of the M25 and any proposal for smart motorway design.	<p>The models include the t highway proposals for the M23 Spur, Airport Way and the A23 London Road which form part of the Project.</p> <p>The assessment demonstrates that the highway works will provide sufficient capacity for both background traffic and traffic associated with the Airport, including traffic associated with the Project.</p> <p>The assessment also identifies any other locations that may require mitigation to address the effects of the Project and GAL has not identified a need for mitigation elsewhere on the M23 or M25.</p> <p>It is noted that the M23 Smart Motorway Project included improvements along the M23 Spur to Gatwick Airport and the highway works proposed for the Project build on these improvements.</p>	
	Suggestions to minimise land take, particularly in relation to the M23 Spur at Junction 9A. Other suggestions to increase the land take to ensure that the full benefits of the proposed development are realised.	The highway designs have sought to optimise the amount of land required, allowing sufficient space to meet both capacity needs and the required highway design standards but without taking land that would otherwise not be necessary for the completed scheme or its construction. All proposals relating to the permanent or temporary access to land have been discussed with the relevant land interests.	N
Construction traffic	Further information was sought around the assumptions made about the volume and timing of construction traffic impacts as well as construction traffic routes. Requests made for consultation in advance of any road closures,	The DCO Application includes an Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref 5.3)) and related documents which set out the proposed approach to construction activities, in particular those which affect the volume and timing of construction-related vehicle movements.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	diversions or alternative access arrangements as well as hours of working and the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	<p>The assessment includes consideration of conditions during the busiest summer months in the construction period, combining summer levels of Airport activity (including activity with the Project, where appropriate) with the expected amount of construction traffic at those times.</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan identifies likely traffic management arrangements and routes for construction vehicles, and it is expected that these will need to be agreed with the relevant planning and highway authorities.</p> <p>The proposals for construction methodology and associated traffic management will be refined during the detailed design stages, in consultation with the relevant authorities. The current indicative proposals have been shared with the local highway authorities, planning authorities and National Highways through the consultation and engagement process for the Project.</p>	
Public transport connections to Kent	Comments made that the Project should include proposals for improving public transport connections to Kent.	<p>GAL has limited influence and control over the many transport providers and other agencies for which access to the airport is only one of many considerations.</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3) contains a commitment to providing additional regional coach services to Kent. GAL proposes to work with operators to introduce a new route between the Airport and Chatham, via Sevenoaks and Maidstone, even without the Project, and expects to commit to supporting enhanced frequency on this route with the Project. GAL would also work with operators to deliver a new coach or regional express bus route between the Airport and Royal Tunbridge Wells, via Uckfield.</p>	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Transport assessment – other developments	Concern that the impact of other developments (e.g. West of Ifield, Gatwick Green, and Horley Business Park) was not included in the traffic and transport assessment, while other comments queried the inclusion of projects that are not fully-funded or going through the planning process (e.g. Croydon Area Remodelling Scheme, Lower Thames Crossing).	<p>GAL has reviewed the Uncertainty Log for the transport modelling, which is a long list of potential developments and schemes in the area covered by the models, identifying how certain each is to come forward. This approach is set out in the DfT’s Transport Appraisal Guidance and allows GAL to identify which schemes and developments should be included in the core modelling scenarios. The list of developments and classification of certainty has been produced based on information received from, and discussions with, local planning authorities, local highway authorities, National Highways and Network Rail.</p> <p>The Croydon Area Remodelling Scheme is now excluded from our core modelling scenarios given its level of certainty. The Lower Thames Crossing remains one of the schemes included in the core modelling on advice from National Highways and in consultation with the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>Developments at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and West of Ifield are excluded from the core modelling scenarios as their delivery is not yet sufficiently certain. These developments are included as part of the cumulative effects assessment set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships (Doc Ref 5.1).</p>	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Transport assessment – sustainable transport	<p>Concerns around future sustainable transport mode share and how targets would be met if schemes fail to materialise. Suggestions that additional mode share scenarios should be tested to understand mitigation needs and sensitivity testing undertaken.</p>	<p>The commitments contained in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3) (the SAC) are being committed to as part of the DCO Application. As part of the SAC, the Project is committed to achieving a certain level of sustainable transport mode share for air passengers and staff. The SAC also sets out the measures which Gal expects to be required to deliver those mode shares. The SAC also includes an approach to monitoring surface access outcomes to determine whether the mode shares are achieved and if they are not, a process to add to or alter the interventions if necessary.</p> <p>The assessment is based on the committed mode shares in the SAC and the associated measures to achieve them.</p>	Y
Transport assessment – modelling and study area	<p>Concern that the study area for the Transport Assessment is assumed to be the same as for the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p>	<p>The strategic modelling in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4) forms the basis for identifying locations which may experience impacts as a result of the Project. The area covered by the strategic model is extensive and includes much of southeast England.</p> <p>The lower thresholds for identifying traffic and transport effects in EIA terms include changes in traffic flow of greater than 30% as a result of the Project, or a forecast change of 2% in the V/C ratio at a junction, which represents a very small change. Changes less than this are not likely to be perceptible in practice and are not likely to occur beyond the extensive boundary of the strategic highway model.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concern that the VISSIM corridor model is concentrated to the East/South of the airport with limited extent to the North/West. Suggestions that additional junctions should be included: A23/Massetts Road; A23/Victoria Road; A217/Tesco roundabout; and A217/Hookwood Roundabout.	The VISSIM model is focused on those junctions that require mitigation, as evidenced by the strategic modelling in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4).	N
	Comments made that further consideration be given to key routes such as the A24, A29, A264 and A272, and rural routes as well as the Felbridge junction of the A22. Suggestions that J6 of the M25 be included in the Area of Detailed Modelling.	The strategic highway model includes these routes and junctions. ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4) do not report performance at every route and junction but deals only with those where changes resulting from the Project exceed certain thresholds; nevertheless, that information is drawn from a review of the performance of the whole of the Area of Detailed Modelling. The routes and junctions referred to all fall within the Area of Detailed Modelling, including M25 Jn6.	N
	Concerns raised that only a small proportion of South London has been included in the 'Detailed Modelling Area' and the full impacts have not been assessed.	The extent of the assessment study area has been informed by the strategic modelling work that has been undertaken and the coverage of the strategic highway model. This is described in more detail in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment and its associated annexes (Doc Ref 7.4). Transport for London has been consulted on the modelling work that has been undertaken and has recognised the limited extent of additional traffic generated as a result of the Project.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments made that IEMA guidelines are not considered appropriate for defining the Transport Assessment study area. Also, that National Trip End Model (NTEM) will not be representative of the likely scale of growth in the area.	<p>The extent of the assessment study area has been informed by the strategic modelling work that has been undertaken and the coverage of the strategic highway model. This is described in more detail in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment and its associated annexes (Doc Ref 7.4).</p> <p>Forecasts within the models are based on information from NTEM and from the TEMPro software which allows estimates of future growth in background traffic to be made, in line with the guidance contained in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance.</p>	N
Transport assessment – data	Comments made that most of the surveys used are from 2016 and data should be updated to account for current travel patterns, including changes related to Brexit and the pandemic. Needs and benefit assessments should also reflect changes to travelling habits and working arrangements.	<p>The transport modelling is based on data originally collected in 2016 during a period where the transport network was operating in a relatively stable condition. During the period of 2018 to 2019, prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, the introduction of the Smart Motorways Scheme between Junctions 8 and 10 on the M23, and disruption to train services through 2018 and 2019, led to a period of variability in access to the airport. 2016 was considered the most stable pre-pandemic period on which to base the modelling.</p> <p>Analysis of the changes in traffic flows at key locations adjacent to Gatwick Airport and on the strategic road network suggests that weekday daily traffic volumes in June 2022 were below the equivalent for 2016, indicating that traffic levels had not yet recovered to pre-pandemic levels. Slower recovery was indicated on the local road network. The analysis also suggested this was consistent across the day for a typical weekday, with peak hour traffic volumes tending to be lower than 2016 equivalents. By comparison, the assumptions used to produce the future baseline model scenarios imply general traffic growth between the 2016 base year and 2022 of around +6%.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		From this analysis, the 2016 base for modelling is considered to be robust and appropriate for assessing the effects of the Project.	
Car parking	Concerns about the overall increase in car parking, including the impact on traffic, carbon emissions, increased land take, and sustainable travel mode share of the increased ratio of parking provision for passengers.	<p>The approach to car parking was re-examined after the Autumn 2021 Consultation and a revised approach to car parking provision has been adopted to better support initiatives for sustainable travel and avoid encouraging more car use by over-providing parking.</p> <p>The DCO application proposals no longer include the use of Pentagon Field for car parking, and provide for a total of around 8,900 car parking spaces, of which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 7,780 spaces would be required to replace those that need to be relocated due to the construction of the Project; and ▪ 1,100 new spaces would be needed for growth. <p>It is important to note that GAL has not developed the highway works proposals to encourage people to drive to the airport. ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3) demonstrates GAL's commitment to increasing the proportion of trips made by public transport and other sustainable transport modes as part of the Project. The highway improvements are necessary to ensure the efficient and safe movement of airport and non-airport traffic both of which are expected to grow in volume over the next 25 years. Accordingly, the Project provides necessary capacity for growth, ensures the smooth flow of traffic between Crawley and Horley, and would deliver improved connections between the M23 motorway and Gatwick Airport.</p>	Y
	Comments suggested parking charges should be increased.	Charges for parking and for drop-off and pick-up activity are already in place at the Airport. GAL anticipates that it will need to increase charges for	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Others suggested reducing fees for short-term and pick-up and drop-off.	parking and forecourt access as part of measures to support achieving the mode shares that are committed to in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3). The Project has assumed a level of charging for the purposes of modelling and assessment, but GAL will retain flexibility on the scale of pricing so that it can vary charges to respond to seasonal changes and changing travel patterns over time, as it progresses towards the committed mode shares.	
	Queries raised about how the lack of increase in staff parking was achieved and suggestions for park and ride facilities.	<p>In order to achieve the mode shares to which the Project is committing under the commitments for staff travel set out in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3), GAL will introduce measures to discourage journeys to work by single-occupancy car.</p> <p>As explained in the SAC, GAL aspires to go beyond the committed mode share targets contained with the DCO application. These are not committed to under the SAC but will be developed in future ASAS action plans and targets by GAL.</p> <p>GAL will maintain those incentives and measures which are already in place for staff travel as part of its current ASAS and would continue to enhance these to make it easier for staff to choose sustainable modes. This includes initiatives linked to staff parking, discounts on public transport and incentives that specifically support cycling and the use of zero or low emission vehicles for journeys to work. GAL's approach to encouraging more use of sustainable modes will also consider the availability and location of staff parking and GAL's aim is to minimise circumstances where single occupancy car use is the default choice.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Sustainable transport and modal split	<p>More information requested about how passengers and staff will be encouraged to use sustainable transport, particularly when the proposed mitigation is focused on providing for vehicles. Suggestions that sustainable transport measures to support the wider region should be included and that use of electric vehicles encouraged. Comments that staff car-pooling is difficult to accommodate due to shift times.</p> <p>Clarification requested around the mitigation measures that would be applied should the take up of sustainable travel modes not reach 60% by 2030. Suggestions that mode share targets should reflect an aspiration for no further growth in highway trips.</p> <p>Support for measures promoting sustainable access by cycle and requests for more cycle lane and secure cycle parking as well as cycle hire/purchase schemes.</p>	<p>Under the Northern Runway Project, GAL is committing to a number of additional surface access commitments as set out in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3). This includes a commitment to achieve a minimum of 55% of air passenger journeys to be made by public transport and a minimum of 55% of airport staff journeys to work to be made by public transport, shared travel (a journey made by private car containing more than one person) and active modes (walking and cycling), three years after the opening of the new runway.</p> <p>As explained in the SAC, GAL aspires to go beyond the committed mode shares set out in the SAC and has identified aspirational longer-term mode share targets that will be developed in future ASAS action plans and targets. These will build on initiatives and plans that GAL already has in place, or that GAL is preparing to do even if the Project were not to proceed.</p> <p>It is important to note that GAL has not developed the highway works proposals which form part of the Project in order to encourage people to drive to the airport. The SAC demonstrates GAL's commitment to increasing the proportion of trips made by public transport and other sustainable transport modes. The highway improvements are necessary to ensure the efficient and safe movement of airport and non-airport traffic both of which are expected to grow in volume over the next 25 years. Accordingly, the Project provides necessary capacity for growth, ensures the smooth flow of traffic between Crawley and Horley and would deliver improved connections between the M23 motorway and the airport.</p> <p>The Project proposals also include improvements to walking and cycling routes in the design of highway improvements. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing access to existing routes during construction, when temporary closures may be required to ensure safety 	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing additional routes to improve connectivity, for example a new route between Longbridge Roundabout and North Terminal and improved access from Horley to South Terminal <p>GAL will also be investing in infrastructure on-airport to support more cycling to work for airport employees and in initiatives to promote cycling and walking to both staff and passengers.</p>	
Road improvements - timing	Comments that the road improvements required for the project should not be phased for delivery after the runway opening.	The strategic and local highway models have been used to test the operation of the highway network in the year that dual runway operations commence and three years afterwards. These indicate that the existing network will perform acceptably when the runway opens, but that proposed highway works which form part of the Project will need to be in place to support the proposed growth in demand estimated within three years of the commencement of dual runway operations whilst also allowing for background traffic.	N
Highway modelling	Concerns raised that modelling is still evolving so impacts, including on locations other than those identified, cannot be fully understood.	<p>Extensive and comprehensive modelling work has been undertaken as part of preparing the assessment for the DCO application, including updating the models from those used to present the PEIR in the Autumn 2021 Consultation. The Project Team has engaged extensively with National Highways and with other stakeholders in the process of developing and refining the models, to discuss both the technical aspects of the models and the emerging outcomes.</p> <p>The assessment presented with the DCO application identifies where impacts may occur as a result of the Project based on the latest model suite.</p>	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests made for further information on junctions forecast to operate over 80% vehicle to capacity ratio and on the impact of the Project on the SRN.	GAL has reviewed the threshold criteria used to identify the scale of impact that the Project may have at a particular location. The screening of impacts from the modelling now includes junctions forecast to operate over 80% volume to capacity ratio, where in the PEIR this threshold was set at 85%.	Y
	Questions also raised about modelling of the Longbridge Roundabout junction during construction and whether local housing growth has been considered.	<p>Longbridge Roundabout is contained in both the strategic and local highway model. The Project proposes to upgrade Longbridge Roundabout to improve the capacity of this junction and reduce queueing that occurs in the future baseline.</p> <p>The operation of Longbridge Roundabout has been tested in the strategic and local highway models in both future baseline and with Project scenarios. GAL has also undertaken an assessment of the performance of the highway network during the construction of the highway works which form part of the Project. That assessment includes indicative traffic management arrangements of the form that could be in place during the busiest summer months of this construction period, when overall traffic flows are likely to be at their highest. The detail of the traffic management arrangements will be finalised with National Highways and local highway authorities during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The models for future years, with or without the Project, include allowance for population and employment growth through the application of growth factors derived from the TEMPro database, in line with guidance in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance. This includes the effect of local housing growth in the surrounding districts.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>Comments made that the model calibration and validation are not compliant with the DfT's TAG and that there are inconsistencies with modelled traffic flows from Local Plans which require review. Also, that there is an inconsistency in the comparison of the staff efficiency assumed between the 'Future Base' and 'With Project' scenarios which has not been substantiated. The congestion threshold used to identify problem areas was also considered to use unduly generous impact criteria.</p>	<p>A detailed calibration and validation exercise has been undertaken on the updated models that have been used for the DCO application. The calibration and validation information has been shared with stakeholders, including National Highways and the local highway authorities.</p> <p>The threshold for identifying junctions that may need to be considered for possible impacts arising from the Project has been lowered, meaning that more junctions fall under consideration than was the case in the PEIR (Autumn 2021 Consultation).</p> <p>Inconsistencies exist with Local Plan models due to the very different extents of the models and the distribution of traffic across a much wider area, consistent with the approach adopted for the Project and discussed with the DfT, National Highways and local highway authorities.</p>	Y

<p>Highway design</p>	<p>Comments made around designs needing to allow for future growth and facilitate active travel. Concerns were raised about maintaining a safe and reliable SRN during proposed South Terminal and Longbridge roundabout works. Others considered the proposed works at North Terminal roundabout unacceptable.</p> <p>Changes to the North and South Terminal roundabouts to provide grade separation and changes to the Longbridge Roundabout were supported. More detail was also requested around the Longbridge roundabout widening, including its timing, access, compound location, and PRow diversion.</p>	<p>Following feedback on the options presented in the Autumn 2021 Consultation, GAL made several changes to the highway works proposed as part of the Project which were subsequently consulted on through the Summer 2022 Consultation. This included changes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The number of lanes on the M23 Spur ▪ The layout of South Terminal roundabout and the new flyover ▪ The layout of Airport Way including the new merges and diverges ▪ The retention of North Terminal roundabout with altered arrangements to connect this into the remainder of the works, and a revised grade-separation design ▪ The number of lanes on A23 London Road ▪ The layout of Longbridge roundabout ▪ The layout of A23 Brighton Road ▪ The integration of additional active travel measures at Longbridge Roundabout and associated with the A23 London Road <p>The DCO application includes ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref 5.3) and ES Appendix 5.3.1: Buildability Report (Doc Ref 5.3) which provide more detail on the proposed sequencing and temporary arrangements for construction.</p>	<p>Y</p>
	<p>Comments made around driver safety - and the need for a safety impact assessment - due to new views because of vegetation clearance associated with the three roundabouts.</p>	<p>The highway proposals which form part of the Project have been the subject of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit which has been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities, alongside ongoing discussions with officers from those authorities which have helped to refine the design.</p>	<p>Y</p>
	<p>Further information was requested on permanent and temporary land take for highway works.</p>	<p>The plans submitted with the DCO application contain the extents of the proposed highway works, the limits of deviation allowing for construction and the proposed allowances for temporary and permanent land take. These have been shared with local authorities and impacts on individual landowners have been shared with each party affected.</p>	<p>N</p>

		The Land Plans detail the land affected, as well as the rights sought within the various plots included within the DCO application.	
Railway modelling and assessment	Comments made that modelling should extend beyond its current focus on peak to understand potential crowding issues. Also, that a luggage load factor should be included.	<p>The DCO application railway modelling provides information on the levels of crowding expected in each hour of the day, across a typical summer weekday.</p> <p>The analysis does not include a specific luggage load factor when considering how busy rail services to and from Gatwick Airport station may be with or without the Project. It is assumed that passengers will not put luggage on seats, but will use overhead racks, luggage racks or available floor space in vestibules. However, where the assessment indicates that all seated capacity may be occupied by passengers, the take-up of available standing space is also assessed. If there is a substantial proportion of standing capacity likely to be occupied by passengers, further consideration is given to the additional effect of luggage.</p>	Y
	Suggestions that the assessment should be updated to take into account of the prospect of no further capacity investment on the Brighton Main Line. in advance of the Project. Comments also made that the approach to assessing rail crowding does not show whether the Project impacts on rail networks in terms of capacity.	<p>The assumptions made about future rail services within the modelling have been reviewed and re-confirmed with Network Rail as part of refining the models for the DCO application. This includes removing schemes from the Future Baseline that do not have confirmed funding (notably the Croydon Area Remodelling Scheme).</p> <p>The assessment of crowding on rail services considers the impacts on available seated and standing capacity as a result of the Project and is set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4).</p>	Y

	<p>Queries raised about whether the assessment considers possible delays to the electrification of the North Downs Line and improved rail connections with Kent. Questions were also raised around whether sensitivity testing has been carried out to consider the impact on rail of growth in London and the South and housebuilding in the area.</p>	<p>The assumptions made about future rail services within the modelling have been reviewed and re-confirmed with Network Rail as part of refining the models for the DCO application. They are set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment and its Annexes (Doc Ref 7.4). The assessment does not include electrification of the North Downs Line nor additional rail services to and from Kent.</p> <p>The models include assumptions about population and employment growth through the use of TEMPPro factors, as indicated in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance. The models therefore include the implications of housebuilding in London and the Southeast.</p>	N
Railway and station capacity	<p>Concerns raised about the lack of resilience in the rail network, particularly with Brighton Main Line approaching capacity, the lack of proposed improvements to the railway station, and the ability to meet mode share targets.</p>	<p>Gatwick Airport railway station is currently undergoing a significant upgrade, being delivered by Network Rail and which will be complete in 2023. This will provide additional capacity for passenger movements, regardless of the Project.</p> <p>An assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on crowding on rail services, which indicates that although some trains will get busier, there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate both airport and non-airport related passengers without the need to provide additional services at peak or other times of day. The assessment is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4).</p>	N
	<p>Suggestions that the Project could help improve rail links between West Kent and Gatwick, alleviating pressure on the road networks. It was also suggested that direct services between Tonbridge and Gatwick be reinstated, and other cross-country links established. Comments made around the impact</p>	<p>GAL has discussed the possibilities of direct rail services to Kent with Network Rail and it is clear that such services should not be considered to come forward as part of the assessment. GAL has therefore identified enhancements to the regional coach network which would provide additional coach connections between Kent and Gatwick Airport, and these are contained within the modelling for the Project.</p> <p>Irrespective of the Project, GAL continues to support any proposals brought forward that would show a positive business case for direct rail services</p>	N

	<p>of maintenance requirements on the ability to meet aspirations for earlier services.</p>	<p>between Gatwick Airport and Kent and will continue to support any work by Network Rail on potential opportunities. GAL will also continue to work with operators and Network Rail to try to secure increased numbers of train services both earlier in the morning and later in the evening. However, for the purpose of the Project and the DCO application, the modelling does not assume that these services are in place, and therefore they are not relied upon in the outputs presented in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4).</p>	
	<p>Comments made around the need for delivery of passenger capacity throughout the day to achieve modal split targets. Queries raised about whether this would undermine access to the rail tracks for routine maintenance.</p>	<p>The modelling indicates that the mode shares which form part of the Surface Access Commitments can be achieved without the need for an increase in the number of rail services to and from Gatwick Airport. Nevertheless, GAL will continue to engage with Network Rail to understand additional opportunities and any impact that rail infrastructure maintenance may have on service provision.</p>	<p>N</p>

g. Noise and Vibration

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Air noise	Comments suggested that the proposals should include a policy of 'sharing the benefits' of any aircraft noise reduction and this should be reflected in the assessments.	A noise envelope is proposed to set limits on noise from future operations at the airport. Noise limits are proposed for two periods, the latter noise contour areas are smaller. The area of the Leq day and night contours would not exceed these limits, and the noise envelope would provide certainty to the community that noise levels would be limited and would reduce in the future so as to share the benefits of new technologies with the community. ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides details of the Noise Envelope. ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope (Doc Ref 5.3) provides a report on the further engagement undertaken in relation to the Noise Envelope, including material on sharing the benefits, including presentations given in June 2022.	N
	Concerns raised about the increase in aircraft movements resulting in more frequent disturbance events for communities and sensitive receptors under flight paths and a lack of respite from runway alternation.	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides a full assessment of the noise impacts expected from the increased numbers of flights, following the appropriate methodology. For the vast majority of people currently affected by aircraft noise, the increases will be small in the day and very small at night. A number of mitigation measures have been included within the Project. The Northern Runway would not be used routinely at night between 2300 and 0600 hours. For those most affected a Noise Insulation Scheme is proposed. A physiological sleep disturbance study has been undertaken which concludes that even in the area of greatest noise increase beyond the west end of the Northern Runway there would be no more than one additional 'awakening' per summer night per person as a result of the Project, in the population in that area overall. An 'awakening' in this study means a change of sleep state, not waking up, and an average healthy person awakens about 20 times a night for various reasons not connected with noise. See ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments highlighted the impact of aircraft noise in quieter rural areas as more intrusive, particularly early in the morning and late at night, with potential to affect physical and mental wellbeing.	It is recognised that aircraft noise may be more easily heard in areas of quieter background noise. However, there are areas of low background noise in urban areas (away from main roads) as well as in rural areas, and the noise assessment follows the recommended guidance on assessing aircraft noise levels.	N
Noise assessment – study area	More detail was requested around how the study area was defined. Additional locations were suggested for assessment and/or inclusion in the new inner or outer zones. Concerns raised about the lack of consideration of impacts on communities to the east of the airport.	<p>The study area for noise and vibration effects includes all receptors that may experience potential adverse impacts, i.e. the area where noise increases or decreases could occur above the threshold levels used to assess effects. For example, for some air noise metrics, this area extends more than 20 km from the airport and overflights are considered beyond this. Whereas for ground noise, the nearest receptors around the airport have been assessed, as at greater distances, the impacts would be lower. This approach has ensured that the most critical receptors have been considered.</p> <p>For road traffic noise the modelled study area includes all roads in the strategic transport model where traffic flows could be changed by the Project. For the operational phase the study area includes the 3D modelling of roads undertaken within a 600m buffer of new Highways works in accordance with DMRB. Road links outside of the modelled study area have been assessed using a comparison of traffic flows within the entire strategic road network model (over 8,000 links), to identify whether or not any significant changes in noise could be identified due to the Project.</p>	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Noise assessment - data and methodology	Requests made for inclusion of a full description of the methods used in the assessment.	The methods used in the noise assessment are described in Section 14.9.4 of the ES and: ES Appendix 14.9.1: Construction Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3), ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3), ES Appendix 14.9.3: Ground Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3), ES Appendix 14.9.4: Road Traffic Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3), ES Appendix 14.9.5: Air Noise Envelope Background (Doc Ref 5.3) and ES Appendix 14.9.6: Ground Noise Baseline Report (Doc Ref 5.3).	N
	Suggestions for inclusion of sensitivity testing around different growth rate scenarios to provide a better understanding of future noise impacts on local communities. Other areas suggested for inclusion in the assessment included consideration of buildings used by vulnerable groups and assessment of private amenity spaces. Inclusion of monitoring proposals was also requested.	The ATM forecasts used for the modelling of noise in the future are based on estimates of how the fleet will transition based on assumptions around airlines' fleet procurement programmes and business models. The 'central case' used in the noise assessment is based on what is considered to be the most likely rate of fleet transition. However, there is uncertainty around this, particularly following the global COVID-19 pandemic and the financial impact of this on the airlines. Therefore, noise modelling has also been carried out for a 'slower transition fleet' based on ATM forecasts in which the rate of fleet transition is delayed by about five years and which would result in higher noise levels than the central case for the same periods. A sensitivity analysis was carried out that concluded 2032 would be the year of greatest noise impacts (see ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) Section 14.7). More detail has been provided on the changes to be expected at a selection of specific locations that represent communities most affected (see ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration Section 14.4 and Figure 14.9.1) (Doc Ref. 5.1). In addition to assessing impacts on residential properties, and the additional specific locations, air noise has been modelled and assessed at schools, hospitals,	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		community buildings and places of worship with full results in ES Appendix 14.9.4 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
	More information was requested about how noise impacts on people within the South Downs National Park were assessed. Also, that the Tranquillity Study should refer to users of the National Park and Public Right of Way Network and that the noise impact on residences in the noise impact areas should be considered and mitigation proposed to reduce impacts.	Overflight analysis for landscape and visual assessment has been included up to 35 miles from the airport (see ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration , Sections 14.9 and 14.11.16) (Doc Ref. 5.1). Section 14.9 of ES Chapter 14 assesses overflight impacts on residential and other receptors. The extent of the tranquillity study area has been determined through an appropriate methodology (to accommodate specific criteria in CAP1616 Appendix B para B30) and incorporated into baseline data for nationally designated landscapes and character areas. The assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) is based on four representative locations. The increase in overflying aircraft at less than 7,000 ft would range from 6% to 16% which equates to between 0.2 and 1.8 aircraft a day. Approximately half of the aircraft which currently overfly the SDNP are non-Gatwick.	N
	Requests made for further information about the assumed use of SIDs in the Baseline and With Development cases.	A shift of 8% of westerly Gatwick departures onto the currently little used WIZ (Route 9) SID has been applied for the 2032 baseline as this is expected to accommodate baseline growth by 2032. The assumed SID usage is provided in ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3). The Project is not expected to result in redistribution of flights across SIDs.	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration																																																																									
Topic	Summary of comments	Response									Change																																																														
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">DAY</th> <th colspan="9">Departure Route</th> </tr> <tr> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>5</th> <th>6</th> <th>7</th> <th>8</th> <th>9</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td>26</td> <td>08S</td> <td>08</td> <td>26</td> <td>08</td> <td>08</td> <td>26</td> <td>26</td> <td>26</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>SAM</td> <td>FD</td> <td>KEN</td> <td>LAM</td> <td>CLN</td> <td>DTY</td> <td>BOG</td> <td>SFD</td> <td>WIZ</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2019 Baseline (ERCD Report 2002)</td> <td>22%</td> <td>9%</td> <td>8%</td> <td>27%</td> <td>8%</td> <td>2%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2032 Baseline</td> <td>23%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>8%</td> <td>2%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2032 NRP</td> <td>23%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>7%</td> <td>23%</td> <td>8%</td> <td>2%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>0%</td> <td>8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DAY	Departure Route									1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		26	08S	08	26	08	08	26	26	26		SAM	FD	KEN	LAM	CLN	DTY	BOG	SFD	WIZ	2019 Baseline (ERCD Report 2002)	22%	9%	8%	27%	8%	2%	23%	0%	0%	2032 Baseline	23%	7%	7%	23%	8%	2%	20%	0%	8%	2032 NRP	23%	7%	7%	23%	8%	2%	20%	0%	8%		
DAY	Departure Route																																																																								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9																																																																
	26	08S	08	26	08	08	26	26	26																																																																
	SAM	FD	KEN	LAM	CLN	DTY	BOG	SFD	WIZ																																																																
2019 Baseline (ERCD Report 2002)	22%	9%	8%	27%	8%	2%	23%	0%	0%																																																																
2032 Baseline	23%	7%	7%	23%	8%	2%	20%	0%	8%																																																																
2032 NRP	23%	7%	7%	23%	8%	2%	20%	0%	8%																																																																
	Concerns raised that consideration of health effects of noise are based on a limited study concerning self-reported annoyance.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes additional supporting literature to that presented at PEIR in the Autumn 2021 Consultation.								N																																																															
	Suggestions that updated data for air noise modelling should be used, Gatwick Airport Noise and Track Keeping (NTK) data be included and more information provided about future fleet mix scenarios.	<p>The air noise baseline for 2019 has been modelled by the CAA's Environmental Research and Consultancy Department (ERCD) using their ANCON noise model, which is validated each year based on noise and flight track data collected by the Gatwick Noise and Track Keeping (NTK) system. In recent years, 32 locations have been used with typically eight in use at any one time. In April 2019, the system was upgraded to improve functionality and ease of access for the public online. The NTK data are used by GAL to respond to complaints, and to engage with the public over noise and track performance.</p> <p>Air noise has been modelled using the CAA's ANCON v2.4 model, as used to produce Gatwick's noise exposure contours annually, and validated for Gatwick on an annual basis. Air traffic has been modelled for four operational forecast years - 2029, 2032, 2038 and 2047 for the base case (do-minimum) and with Project noise modelling to allow comparisons between with and without Project cases in these years.</p>							N																																																																

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>The basis of these models is the 2019 ANCON model. For current aircraft types, ANCON uses source noise levels, climb rates and dispersion within Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) based on those measured in the Gatwick Noise and Track Keeping (NTK). Noise emission levels from future aircraft types have been taken from the CAA's latest estimates and reported in the noise assessment, along with all other relevant input data.</p> <p>The noise modelling of all future cases (i.e. 2029, 2032, 2038 and 2047) is based on forecasts of air traffic movements and fleets expected to operate, so is unavoidably approximate albeit based on best available information at this stage. At the current time, as the aviation industry has been impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic, there is some uncertainty as to how airlines will invest in new quieter aircraft in the future. To address this uncertainty a range of future fleets have been considered in the air noise modelling. The 'central case' fleet represents the transition envisaged from current generation to next generation, quieter, aircraft. The 'slower transition fleet' case represents a delayed transition leading to higher noise levels in the future, in both the future baseline and Project cases (see ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration Section 14.5) (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	
	Comments made that the population metric used downplays the impact of the Project on rural areas.	Consistent metrics are essential to allow decision makers to compare impacts across airports and proposals elsewhere. In practice the noise changes from the Project are small and that is the key factor that determines relatively small impacts from the Project, not the groupings of numbers of people.	N
	The presentation of overflights in a 3.6x3.6km grid was not considered to be of sufficient resolution for analysis.	The resolution of the overflight analysis has been reduced to 1km for the ES as explained in ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3) and reflected in the various overflight maps provided for in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1).	Y

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that assessment should use a daytime LOAEL of 48dB LAeq 16 hr, a night-time LOAEL of 40dB LAeq 8 hr. Also, recommendations that SOAEL for the night period is set at level that is lower than 55 dB LAeq 8 hr and consideration given to a night-time SOAEL based on an N60 contour in addition to one based on LAeq 8 hr.	LOAELs and SOAELs for air, ground, traffic and construction noise are based on national guidance including government guidance that takes account of WHO guidance since the Noise Policy Statement for England was published in 2010 (for more details, see Section 14.4 in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1)).	N
Noise envelope	Concerns raised that GAL has pre-judged the noise envelope without input from stakeholders or the local community, as required by CAP 1129.	<p>The Applicant sought local technical input from local authorities on the noise and vibration assessment for the Project through the Noise Topic Working Groups. Discussions have helped refine many areas of the assessment and ensure local circumstances are understood. These are summarised in ES Appendix 14.3.2: Summary of PEIR and Updated PEIR Responses – Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref 5.3).</p> <p>Further stakeholder engagement was undertaken on the developing proposals for the Noise Envelope following the Autumn 2021 Consultation. In addition, the Applicant formed a Noise Envelope Group to seek further views on the noise envelope and guide development of the final proposal for the DCO. Terms of reference were produced, and two sub-groups were established; the Local sub-group and the Aviation sub-group, to facilitate discussions with local communities, local authorities, and aviation stakeholders. A total of 12 meetings were held between 26 May and 11 October 2022. These were structured around four themes drawn from consultation feedback and the CAP1129 guidance. See ES Appendix 14.9.8: The Noise Envelope Group Output Report (Doc Ref 5.3) which provides a summary of the group’s work and ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report</p>	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		on Engagement on the Noise Envelope (Doc Ref 5.3) which provides minutes of meeting, papers presented and key documents submitted.	
	Comments that the proposed noise envelopes do not challenge Gatwick to reduce noise impacts. Concerns raised that they are based on the modelling of a slower transition fleet and based on the peak noise year, meaning the noise envelope should be reviewed and reduced over time and that any noise reduction resulting from new technologies should benefit residents rather than enabling more flights. Others notes that there has already been both an increase in passengers and air traffic at Gatwick, and a decrease in noise.	<p>GAL is proposing a noise envelope that sets limits in terms of the areas of the daytime LOAEL contour Leq, 16-hour day 51 dB, and the night-time LOAEL contour Leq, 8-hour night 45 dB.</p> <p>The LOAEL contours have been chosen because they represent the lowest level of observable adverse effects during the day and night and can be modelled with reasonable accuracy so as to provide forecasts of future performance. The limiting Leq, 16-hour day and Leq, 8-hour night contour areas are proposed with reference to the forecast noise impacts reported in the ES, taking account of operating and other measures to limit noise.</p> <p>A contour which fixes the maximum noise footprint of the airport would limit the throughput of the airport unless quieter planes can be encouraged to operate. It would incentivise the airport to encourage airlines to use the quietest aircraft and quietest operating procedures, whilst allowing growth to occur within a clear noise limit. It would also provide local communities with certainty on future noise levels. The Noise Envelope provides a review process to ensure the envelope remains current. See ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>GAL would operate flights from the northern runway using procedures designed to minimise noise impacts, compliant with established noise abatement procedures and in line with the commitments of the Noise Action Plan. The Noise Action Plan lays out a series of actions to manage and reduce noise which equally apply to flights using the northern runway. GAL would continue to work</p>	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		with stakeholders to develop ways to minimise noise for all operations at the airport.	
	Suggestions that the noise envelope should consider the impact of noise disturbance from increased overflights, account for average noise contours at various dB levels, and include the enforcement procedure for breaches.	The Noise Envelope is proposed to meet the policy requirements and follow CAA guidance. It will also include enforcement procedures. See ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Suggestions for use of a noise envelope regardless of the Project.		
Flight paths	Comments that confirmation of noise impacts requires more detail on future flight paths. Also, that departure profiles, weather, fleet mix, numbers of movements and their routings should all be provided. Comments made that the increased use of WIZAD/Route 9 departure route has not been explained.	<p>The air noise assessment assumes the routing of aircraft to and from the main runway and from the northern runway would remain as it is today. This is because the Project can operate using these routes without need for an airspace change process. When the likely outcome of the FASI-South airspace is known then the noise impacts of that change will be assessed as part of that process, following the relevant guidance.</p> <p>The accuracy of the assessment depends primarily on forecasts in terms of the number and types of aircraft that will operate in the future. Estimations of the noise emissions of future aircraft types are also important. These have been made by the CAA based on the latest information and clearly show the extent to which newer aircraft types are quieter than their older equivalents. ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides details.</p>	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Changes in the climate could affect aircraft performance and hence climb rates which could alter noise levels on the ground. However, such effects are likely to be small.</p> <p>Changes in the climate could affect wind speeds and direction and hence runway modal split. The results of modelling runway modal splits from 50% to 90% westerly show variations in contour areas of 3% for daytime Leq, 16-hour 51 dB contours and 2% for night-time Leq, 8-hour 45 dB contours. The variation in contour populations is 22% for daytime Leq, 16-hour 51 dB contours and 5% for night-time Leq, 8-hour 45 dB contours. It is not known to what extent climate change could affect runway modal split, but this analysis suggests that it is not likely to have major changes in the noise impacts of the Project.</p> <p>Changes in weather could affect the propagation of noise from airborne aircraft to the ground, and hence noise levels at receptors. Modelling an increase in summer temperature of 4 degrees Celsius (with a corresponding reduction in relative humidity of 8%) showed noise levels within 1 dB compared to current weather conditions, so these effects are likely to be insignificant.</p> <p>A shift of 8% of traffic onto the WIZAD (Route 9) westerly standard instrument departure route (on which aircraft departing west turn south between Crawley and Horsham) is required to help accommodate increased air traffic growth in the London area to the north, that is expected to have occurred in the baseline situation by 2032.</p>	

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Questions raised about what would happen if the airspace modernisation programme were to change the conclusions in the ES.	The air noise assessment assumes the routing of aircraft to and from the main runway and from the northern runway would remain as it is today. This is because the Project can operate using these routes without need for an airspace change process. When the likely outcome of the FASI-South airspace is known then the noise impacts of that change will be assessed as part of that process, following the relevant guidance.	N
Road noise	Comments made around the increase in road noise associated with the 2032 base case, with suggestions for use of 'whisper' tarmac' and a 40mph speed limit on the M23 spur and A23 between the South Terminal Junction and Longbridge Roundabout.	<p>Measures have been designed into the Project to reduce the potential for impacts from traffic noise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alignment changes through optioneering of the road scheme design. 2. 1 metre noise barrier along the North Terminal roundabout flyover elevated section (facing Riverside Garden Park). 3. 1 metre noise barrier along the South Terminal roundabout flyover elevated section, north side. 4. Traffic management and speed reductions including a 40mph speed limit on the M23 London Road. <p>A low noise surface was also considered as an additional form of mitigation. However, the lack of noise performance of low noise surfaces at the relatively low design speeds in the relevant areas, together with potential maintenance concerns, led to the decision that this would not be a suitable and effective form of noise mitigation. ES Appendix 14.9.4: Road Traffic Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides details.</p>	N
	It was noted that construction and operational traffic noise modelling as well as the significance for sensitive receptors should be agreed with National Highways.	The road traffic noise assessment follows National Highways Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Volume 11, Section 3, Part 7 (LA111 – Noise and Vibration, Revision 2) (National Highways et al., 2020) published by National Highways (formerly Highways England) that sets out requirements for the assessment and reporting of noise and vibration impacts for highways schemes.	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		National Highways was consulted on details of the noise assessment and mitigation options in the summer of 2022; and did not object to the noise modelling and assessment methods.	
Night flights	Comments suggested a ban or limit on flights between 23.00 and 0.700 to allow respite for residents. Others suggested a ban on flights from the northern runway between 23:00 and 06:00 unless the main runway is closed for repair.	Current night restrictions would continue to cap aircraft numbers in the 23:30-06:00 hours period on the main and northern runways. The northern runway would only be used for departures and not routinely between 2300 and 0600 hours, unless the main runway is closed for example for repair.	N
Noise insulation scheme	More information was requested about the homeowners assisted moving scheme and noise insulation scheme, particularly around eligibility and whether there is a monetary cap or closing date. Support was expressed for the two-stage noise contours to decide mitigation zones.	Further details of the homeowners assisted moving scheme and the noise insulation scheme have been developed, including with consultation from Local Authorities in the Noise Topic Working Group, including monetary limits for the various ranges of noise within the two-tier insulation scheme. The schemes are summarised in Section 14.8 of the ES with detail in ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme (Doc Ref 5.3).	Y
	Comments suggested the noise insulation scheme should also include works to prevent solar gain and look at measures to actively cool affected properties. Also, that monitoring for the effectiveness of	The Inner Zone scheme of the Noise Insulation Scheme includes blinds and acoustic ventilators to all noise sensitive rooms. The Outer Zone scheme also includes acoustic ventilators to noise sensitive rooms, allowing windows to remain closed with ventilation. Acoustic ventilators draw fresh air into the room. GAL has carried out a review of the current scheme that included a survey of households that have taken up the scheme. The outcomes of that review have	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	the noise insulation scheme should be included.	informed the scheme proposed for the Project. The suggestion for monitoring of the new scheme will be considered following its launch.	
Vibration	Concern that the proposals could result in increased vibration and affect the structural integrity of properties.	<p>Vibration effects during construction have been assessed and reported section 14.9 of the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The construction methods have been reviewed and the main source of potentially significant levels of ground vibration identified is sheet piling. Bored piling will also be used. It creates lower levels of vibration. It is anticipated that sheet piling will be carried out by vibratory techniques, rather than methods requiring piles being impacted. Vibration from this form of vibratory piling may be at levels that are perceptible on occasions but are not likely to give rise to adverse comment and not at levels likely to cause structural damage. Details are provided in ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N
Construction	Concerns raised about the impact on residents at Horley Gardens Estate of noise and vibration associated with construction of surface access improvements and flood mitigation measures. Suggestions made that there should not be any night working for road improvements.	<p>Construction noise has been assessed based on current design of the works, making a series of worst-case approximations where necessary. Noise levels have been predicted for 29 stages of construction at 170 locations across the airfield and highway areas. Works required at night, such as those near the runway and taxiways, and main roadways, will give rise to the greatest noise impacts, and have been minimised. The likely programme of day and night works has been analysed to make sure that cumulative noise from potentially overlapping works have been modelled and assessed. ES Appendix 14.9.1: Construction Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3) gives details.</p> <p>On the south side of Horley night works are likely to be required to build the some of the highway structures including bridges and road widening. The amount</p>	N

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>of night work has been minimised and mitigation has been included to minimise noise disturbance and the likely extent and duration of night noise impacts is described in the Section 9 of Chapter of the ES.</p> <p>Noise mitigation will be secured through the Section 61 application process whereby the local authorities will vet the contractor's proposed methods of working to ensure the Best Practicable Means to minimise noise and vibration are adopted.</p> <p>The noise insulation scheme is described in the CoCP and will be developed as the Project progresses, as the construction methods are refined, the Section 61 process is progressed, and the contractor develops details of the scheme. Noise insulation would then be offered to all properties predicted where it has not been possible to reduce construction noise at source.</p>	
Community	<p>Comments suggesting Gatwick Noise Management Board is not independent and suggestions that the noise metrics are flawed. Requests raised for more information on how combined effects would be addressed.</p>	<p>The Noise Management Board (NMB) is a unique body, bringing together representatives from all stakeholders in the management and mitigation of aircraft noise. The membership of the board comprises representatives from various aspects of the aviation industry the Department for Transport, elected representatives of the people and a number of local community noise action groups.</p> <p>The choice of noise metrics for the draft Noise Envelope for consultation was explained in Appendix 14.9.5 of the PEIR. During consultation in summer 2022 other noise metrics were discussed and this has been taken into account, along with government policy and guidance in developing the Noise Envelope submitted in support of the DCO Application.</p>	Y

Theme: Noise and Vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The assessment of combined noise effects has been updated since the PEIR and is presented in Section 14.11 of the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
	It was suggested that opportunities to improve the health and quality of life of noise-affected communities should be explored and that monitoring should be proposed, and communities involved in the design of mitigation measures.	The assessment in ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) takes a wider determinants of health approach, which includes considering opportunities to improve the health and quality of life of communities. This includes though the provision and quality of new areas of open space, as well as through the employment and training opportunities of the Project. The Noise Insulation Scheme includes specific measures that respond to noise related quality of life issues, and noise monitoring will be undertaken.	N
	Comments that the approach to quiet areas was not supported and consultation should be used to identify new quiet areas.	There are no 'Quiet Areas' designated within Local Plans or Neighbourhood Development Plans as Local Green Spaces. No areas identified as Quiet Areas through implementation of the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006 have been identified within the study area that could be affected by the Project.	N

h. Air quality

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Damage Cost Assessment	Comments around the damage cost assessment, which was considered limited and providing too great a range of cost. Concerns raised about how the Impact Pathway Assessment has been carried out. Suggestions that further work is required to obtain a robust social cost figure to inform mitigation measures and development of an Air Quality Mitigation Strategy.	<p>The Sussex Guidance has been given due regard in commitments made to mitigation of air quality impacts in Section 13.9 of Chapter 13. However, the specific damage cost calculation requirements from the Sussex Guidance have not been applied because there is no requirement or justification for doing so under the ANPS and NNNPS.</p> <p>It is recognised that the Sussex Guidance requires an assessment of transport emissions associated with the Project. The air quality assessment for the ES has included all routes likely to be used by construction traffic around the airport, and any roads affected during operation. Pollutant concentrations have been predicted at discrete receptors in the AQMAs and the wider study area. Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology and have been agreed at air quality Topic Working Group meetings.</p> <p>The air quality assessment has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project. The Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p> <p>The underlying rationale of the Sussex Guidance is to seek the mitigation of NO_x and PM_{2.5}. Actions to improve air quality in the future are included in the ES Appendix 5.3.8: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref 5.3) and ES Appendix 5.3.7: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3). The assessment in Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice.</p> <p>This approach is considered consistent with the principles and guidance set out in the Sussex Guidance; following the requirements for EIA and NPSs; and</p>	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		provides detailed commitments for suitable mitigation to be secured through the DCO.	
Data and modelling	Concern that the modelling data is not complete, and apportionment data missing from the PEIR, making analysis difficult. Also, that the omission of ammonia modelling means reasonable scientific doubt remains over the conclusions for both the PEIR and HRA.	<p>Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3), and have been agreed at Air Quality Topic Working Group meetings with the Local Authorities. A summary of consultation and engagement is provided in Section 4 of Chapter 13: Air Quality of the ES (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Modelling data is complete, and the ES has included a source apportionment of predicted pollutant emissions for the main sources, such as aircraft in the air, aircraft on ground, airport activities, car parks, airport related and non-airport related road traffic. Predicted pollutant concentrations have been presented in tabular format in the ES, Appendix 13.9.1: Air Quality Results Tables and Figures. The results of the emissions inventories for each year are provided in ES, Appendix 13.9.1: Air Quality Results Tables and Figures.</p> <p>Ammonia has been included in the assessment of ecological impacts. The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues are presented and discussed in Chapter 13 of the ES and corresponding appendices.</p>	Y
	Comments that the fleet mixes used in the air quality assessment appear to be different from those presented in the Forecast Data Book. Also, that the metrics used to look at aircraft emissions performance have not been included in the PEIR.	<p>The air quality assessment has been based on estimates of how the aircraft fleet will transition over time, based on those in the ES Forecast Data Book. In addition, a sensitivity test for a slower fleet transition case has been undertaken for all modelled future scenarios.</p> <p>Details of aircraft emissions performance metrics have been provided in ES Appendix 13.4.1 Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	Y

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Details of the sensitivity tests undertaken are included in ES Appendix 13.9.2: Sensitivity Tests (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
	Concerns raised that the PEIR model significantly overestimates the background level in the base year compared to previous modelling work.	This comment was addressed during an air quality Topic Working Group meeting, summarised in Section 13.4 in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1). This has been considered in the air quality assessment methodology in relation to backgrounds, included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3). Details of the model verification are included in ES Appendix 13.6.1: Air Quality Data and Model Verification (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that receptor points for which concentrations and source apportionment have been modelled in the past are not included and the exact locations of ecological receptors modelled is unclear.	ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes model outputs at discrete sensitive receptors within both the 11 km by 10 km domain and wider study area outside of this domain. The assessment includes receptors requested by Reigate and Banstead Borough Council. Details of the receptors included in the assessment including are provided in Section 13.5 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1). All receptors, including ecological receptors are presented in ES Appendix 13.6.2: Air Quality Receptors and corresponding figures (Doc Ref. 5.3). Predicted pollutant concentrations have been presented in tabular format in the ES Appendix 13.9.1: Air Quality Results Tables and Figures (Doc Ref. 5.3).	Y

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that the air quality model will need to be revisited following the traffic models being re-run and that predictions for 2047 should be included in the ES. Also, that the assessment should address the surface access and air quality impacts of the scheme -especially in relation to forecast increases in traffic on roads.	The air quality assessment for the ES includes a breakdown of airport and non-airport related road vehicles for all years including 2047. The data are based on the traffic modelling for the ES which includes the management of traffic through the Surface Access Commitments (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments) (Doc Ref. 5.3). The results of the emissions inventories for each year are provided in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1). No modelling of 2047 is required as no significant effects are predicted in earlier years and emission factors and backgrounds are expected to continue to improve in future years therefore no new significant effects would occur in 2047 (as detailed in Section 13.10 in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1)).	Y
	The significance of air quality issues and the impacts for the A22 and the Ashdown Forest Special Conservation Area and Special Protection Area was highlighted. Suggestions made that several SSSIs should be included in the air quality assessment (i.e., Glover's Wood; House Copse; Hedgecourt and Buchan Hill Ponds).	The wider study area for the assessment includes all roads within the 11 km by 10 km domain with the additional traffic extent defined by changes in traffic flows screened using the IAQM/EPUK criteria to identify areas for detailed modelling. Discrete receptors (human and ecological) within and outside of the 11 km by 10 km domain have been assessed. Ecological receptors include statutory designations such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Protection Areas (SPAs). Glovers Wood and Buchan Hill Ponds ecological sites are included in the assessment. House Copse and Hedge Court are not included in the assessment due to their distance from the affected road network.	N
	Suggestions made around the calculation of nitrogen deposition and the need to consider the impact of holding patterns.	An assessment of nitrogen deposition has been undertaken for comparison against the relevant critical load for all sensitive ecological receptors identified in the ES assessment. Where the change in nitrogen deposition is less than 1% of the site's lower critical load, then no significant effects would be anticipated. The assessment of nitrogen deposition includes contributions from both NO _x and NH ₃ emissions.	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>For ecological sites, where changes are greater than 1% of the critical level/ lower critical load, the assessment of effects have been considered in Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1) to determine significance.</p> <p>The air quality assessment calculates operational impacts from the airport that arise as a result of emissions from aircraft which have been assessed for the landing and take-off (LTO) cycle up to 3,000 ft (approximately 915 metres) in height as defined by the ICAO. Beyond that height effects to air quality would be negligible. Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	
	Concerns raised that the dispersion model setup and methodology applied for the model verification includes elements which could lead to unreliable modelling results for the baseline and future years, both with and without the Project.	The model verification was revised following the PEIR to take account all feedback during consultation and engagement. The key points of feedback were all addressed and the model verification for the ES is improved compared with the PEIR, with fewer zones and improved correlation between modelled and monitored results. The results of model verification were presented at the air quality topic working group in November 2022, and the results and processes were agreed. Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3). Topic working group meetings are summarised in Section 13.4 in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) of the ES. The results presented in the ES are reliable and follow best practice.	N
	Suggestions that a detailed review of the air quality assessment should be undertaken as rectifying the omissions will change the results.	The dispersion model setup and model verification were reviewed following the PEIR to take account all feedback during consultation and engagement. The key points of feedback were all addressed for the ES and the model verification is improved compared with the PEIR. All recommendations and clarifications have been addressed during the air quality topic working group meetings and details of how these have been considered in the ES are provided in ES Chapter 13:	Y

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1). Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Guidance	Suggestions that consideration should be given to WHO guidance, recommending that annual average nitrogen dioxide concentration should reduce from 40 µg/m³ to 10 µg/m³.	<p>The World Health Organisation (WHO) global air quality guidelines are not part of current UK legislation or policy. The thresholds used to assess schemes remain as presented in Table 13.2.1 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1), in accordance with current legislation and policy standards. The assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13 details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice. Actions to improve air quality in the future are included in the ES at Appendix 5.3.8: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) and at Appendix 5.3.7: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>The ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) assessment has regard to the WHO air quality guidelines as one evidence source informing the qualitative professional judgement as the likely significant effects of the Project changes on public health. This follows IEMA 2022 guidance and good practice. Other evidence sources, including national regulations and planning policy, are also relevant and are applied in reaching a balanced and evidence-based conclusion.</p>	N
Government policy	Comments that the 2038 future baseline does not consider any emission reductions, which is not consistent with the Government's UK Clean Air Strategy 2019 or net-zero targets.	Road traffic emissions were calculated using the factors from the Defra Emission Factor Toolkit (EFT) v11. EFT v11 contains basic vehicle split composition data up to 2050 and this would be used to reflect the ongoing improvements in emissions from vehicles in line with the government's commitment to transition to zero emission cars and the banning of petrol and diesel vehicle sales in 2035.	Y

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Throughout the assessment reasonable worst-case assumptions have been made to address the uncertainties providing a robust approach. Further details are provided in Chapter 13 of the ES (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Effects	Comments that the bulk of assumed overall air quality improvements comes from reductions in non-airport sources of pollution and reductions in airport related road traffic pollution, while emissions from the airport itself increase.	The air quality impacts depend on proximity to the source type and total emissions at a given location. The ES has included a source apportionment of predicted pollutant emissions for the main sources, such as aircraft in the air, aircraft on ground, airport activities, car parks, airport related and non-airport related road traffic. Predicted pollutant concentrations have been presented in tabular format in the ES Appendix 13.9.1: Air Quality Results Tables and Figures (Doc Ref. 5.3). The results of the emissions inventories for each year are provided in ES Appendix 13.9.1: Air Quality Results Tables and Figures (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Concern that there is no consideration of the potential health impacts from ultrafine particles as they have been excluded from the assessment.	It is not possible to practically model these impacts although ultrafine particles are included within the fine particulate matter (PM _{2.5}) fraction which is modelled and mitigated where necessary. Ultrafine particulate matter (UFP), also known as PM _{0.1} , as it is less than 0.1µm has been taken into consideration in the health assessment in ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1). In addition to monitoring key pollutants, GAL commits to participating in national aviation industry body UFP studies, including those reviewing how monitoring could be undertaken, as described in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1).	Y
	It was noted that the highest increases in NO ₂ concentrations occur at Ifield wood and the receptors located along the A264 and A24. Suggestions that specific	The results have been updated in the ES and have been presented in tabular format in the Appendix 13.9.1: Air Quality Results Tables and Figures (Doc Ref. 5.3). The assessment in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice. Actions to improve air quality in the future are included in ES Appendix 5.4.2:	Y

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	incentives be developed to increase the level of sustainable transport for these areas.	Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) and at ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
	Concern that workers commuting from outside the local area would lead to an increase in air pollution.	<p>The air quality assessment for the ES has included all routes likely to be used by construction traffic around the airport, and any roads affected during operation.</p> <p>The air quality assessment has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project and the Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p> <p>The transport figures in Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1) include future growth assumptions agreed with the local planning authorities. Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N
Mitigation and enhancement	Comments that the table of mitigation and enhancement measures contains no enhancement measures for air quality.	The assessment in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) describes mitigation and enhancement measures proposed to reduce and control impacts on air quality arising from the Project.	Y
Monitoring	Suggestions that dust monitoring should be installed at the start of the project to establish a baseline and run throughout the duration of the works to ensure dust management plans are working.	The commitment to provide suitable construction dust monitoring is outlined in ES Appendix 13.8.1: Construction Period Mitigation (Doc Ref. 5.3) and included in the ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 5.1). The commitment is secured by the DCO includes monitoring at least three months prior, and during the construction period. Construction mitigation measures (including any monitoring recommended) would follow best practice IAQM guidance and would be implemented through the CoCP.	Y

i. Landscape, townscape and visual resources

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Consultation materials	<p>Suggestions that full CGIs would be more helpful than wireline montage images. Also, that a high resolution, accurate, computer-generated 3D model of the site and the proposals could be developed.</p> <p>Comments that key viewpoints suggested by stakeholders during scoping have been excluded and requests made for viewpoints from PRow 362a and from PRow 360 at the footbridge when it crosses the railway.</p>	<p>Further candidate representative viewpoints have been agreed through subsequent engagement with stakeholders, after the close of the Autumn 2021 Consultation. A selection of these have been taken forward through the assessment within the ES including locations on PRow 362a and PRow 360 on the railway footbridge. (See Section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1)). Viewpoints with no intervisibility have been identified in ES Appendix 8.6.2 Additional Candidate Viewpoint Photography (Doc Ref. 5.3) for reference.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) incorporates appropriate photomontages for a DCO application of representative viewpoint locations, see ES Figures 8.9.1 to 8.9.128 (Doc Ref. 5.2). Wireline photomontages based on accurate 3D models of key buildings and infrastructure have been prepared as Type 3 illustrations in accordance with Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals (Landscape Institute, 2019). CGIs would not necessarily comply with LI guidance.</p>	Y
Light	<p>More information was requested around the lighting effects on Meadowcroft House during construction and operation.</p>	<p>Construction</p> <p>Occupiers of the office building at Meadowcroft House on the southern edge of Horley would lie immediately adjacent to the contractor compound for the South Terminal roundabout improvements. Trees and hedgerows along the northern boundary of the compound would be retained and protected during the construction phase to ensure a screen is maintained to minimise any visual effects. In combination with mature boundary vegetation within the grounds of the property, views during summer when trees are in leaf would be largely screened. During the winter near filtered views south of the</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>compound, taller infrastructure and activities would be prominent as discordant additions to views, in place of the horse paddocks. Lighting would also be visible in winter against a backdrop of existing lighting columns at the South Terminal roundabout. Occupiers of the property are receptors of low sensitivity to a medium magnitude of change resulting in a minor adverse level of effect during the day and at night, which would not be significant.</p> <p>Operation Receptors would continue to gain filtered views through boundary vegetation of the contractor compound for the South Terminal roundabout up to approximately 2033, when it is anticipated that it would be removed and grazed paddocks would be reinstated. The A23 roundabout and flyover would continue to be visible at a higher level beyond, including moving traffic. New lighting would be visible in place of existing columns on the A23 and against the backdrop of lighting at the airport. People at their place of work are receptors of low sensitivity and would experience a medium magnitude of change resulting in a minor adverse effect, during the day and at night, for the short-term construction activities, reducing to a low magnitude of change and a minor adverse effect in the long term, which would not be significant.</p>	
	Comments made around lack of assessment of light pollution and dark skies, particularly in relation to South Downs National Park. Comments that the Project will worsen light pollution, particularly from aircraft.	The ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes an assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) based on four representative locations, see section 8.9. The increase in overflying aircraft at less than 7000 ft would range from 6% to 16% which equates to between 0.2 and 1.8 aircraft a day. Most aircraft which currently overfly the SDNP are non-Gatwick.	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Any increase in lighting at Gatwick Airport would not affect the SDNP. The only possible effect that could be experienced is due to visible lights on overflying aircraft. The increase in aircraft numbers is defined above. The only detectable night time cumulative effects would be as a result of other non-Gatwick overflying aircraft or other consented or planned development within the SDNP or its setting. Any change to the level of lighting at Gatwick Airport will not be relevant to cumulative night time effects on the SDNP.	
Assessment area	Comments that a lack of regard was had to the Surrey Hills AONB boundary review.	Following engagement with the Surrey Hills AONB unit regarding the progress of the boundary review process, they confirmed that the evidence gathering in 2022 was complete and Natural England consultants are considering Evaluation Areas and Candidate Areas. Natural England will then launch the statutory and public consultation on the proposed extensions which is expected to run in 2023. Any assessment of predicted effects on the landscape, views or perception of tranquillity on the basis of land that may or may not be included in the AONB, would seem premature.	N
	Suggestions that the assessment should include the visual impact of the 18,000m ² Gatwick Stream Flood compensation area, which appears to excavate the ground level by 3m.	There is no Gatwick Stream flood compensation area proposed as part of the Project. Section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes an assessment of the construction phase and operational effects on landscape character and visual amenity as a result of the proposed River Mole flood compensation area. Landscape mitigation measures and the creation of a new area of public open space associated with this land east of Museum Field and at Brook Farm is included in this section of the ES and illustrated and described in ES Appendix 8.8.1: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>Comments that the LTVIA does not identify landscape character or visual receptor groups of nationally designated landscapes. Suggestions that a conclusion be provided as to whether the identified effects would affect the special qualities of designated landscapes.</p>	<p>Special qualities of the nationally designated landscapes are considered throughout the ES. The assessment of effects on High Weald AONB includes special qualities and landscape character. The Project Site is located within the wider setting of the High Weald AONB and therefore contributes, to a limited extent, to the function of a more highly valued landscape. However, due to the largely urban character of Gatwick Airport, the contribution that this land makes to a nationally designated landscape of high scenic quality is not significant.</p> <p>The LTVIA within ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) ES describes the special qualities and other qualities of the High Weald AONB and the objectives relevant to the designation in addition to the landscape character areas of Mid Sussex District which coincide with the AONB designation. This forms the basis for the LTVIA.</p> <p>Special qualities of the nationally designated landscape and how they relate to the perception of tranquillity are an experiential quality, as defined in relevant guidance. There is a significant overlap with landscape character and therefore it is considered that effects on tranquillity are appropriately represented.</p> <p>No significant impacts have been identified within section 8.9 of the ES for the special qualities of the High Weald AONB or views from it as a result of the Gatwick NRP and no significant effects on the perception of tranquillity within the AONB as a result of an increase in overflying aircraft.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overflights	Suggestions that the effect of additional overflights needs to be considered and concerns raised that overflying aircraft would have a defining effect on levels of tranquillity within the South Downs National Park.	<p>The extent of the tranquillity study area has been determined through an appropriate methodology (to accommodate specific criteria in CAP1616 Appendix B para B30) and incorporated into baseline data for nationally designated landscapes and character areas.</p> <p>The assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) is based on four representative locations. The increase in overflying aircraft at less than 7,000 ft would range from 6% to 16% which equates to between 0.2 and 1.8 aircraft a day. Approximately half of the aircraft which currently overfly the SDNP are non-Gatwick. The effects are considered to be minor adverse, which is not significant.</p>	N
Mitigation and enhancement	Comments suggested a lack of imagination around mitigation and enhancement, with only limited planting and no landscaping to screen development in the short term. A review of mitigation proposals was requested, including looking at measures outside of the local area.	<p>While no mitigation measures have been included for land outside of the DCO boundary, new areas of public open space outside Gatwick Airport (but within the DCO boundary) forms part of the development proposals, including landscape mitigation measures.</p> <p>Other elements of the landscape mitigation package which forms part of the Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ vegetation retention strategy to ensure the maximum extent of green infrastructure is retained within the Project site boundary; ▪ earthworks cut and fill balance to retain and reuse the maximum volume of spoil within the Project site boundary; ▪ planting proposals appropriate to the Gatwick location and to the future climate change scenario; ▪ enhancement of green infrastructure through management proposals; 	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ preparation of an Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides an overarching vision and long-term objectives for the Project; and ▪ preparation of a Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3) to provide design quality control without being too restrictive for future design stages development. Guidance will reflect national and local design strategies and legislation. <p>Detailed landscape proposals will be agreed in consultation with the relevant authorities should the DCO be granted.</p> <p>It is anticipated that landscape planting as part of the mitigation proposals will be established within 12 months of the completion of the various elements of the Project.</p>	
	More information was requested about how mitigation will be reviewed to reflect the Heathrow expansion and airspace modernisation programme.	<p>The air noise assessment assumes the routing of aircraft to and from the main runway and from the northern runway would remain as it is today. This is because the Project can operate using these routes without need for an airspace change process.</p> <p>When the likely outcome of the FASI-South airspace is known then the noise impacts of that change will be assessed as part of that process, following the relevant guidance.</p>	N
	Concerns raised that the proposed environmental area is small in comparison to the overall size of the airport and inadequate to mitigate the proposals. Also, concerns that	<p>The environmental mitigation areas will deliver a net increase in the area of open space at Gatwick Airport and are embedded within the Project as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Areas for proposed environmental mitigation included within the Project are:</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	mitigation would not be implemented.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approximately 0.79 hectares of land immediately to the west of the London to Brighton railway line, north of the current A23. This area is currently used as staff car parking and is proposed to provide replacement open space/habitat for the Project. ▪ Approximately 0.64 hectares of land immediately to the west of the London to Brighton railway line, south of the current A23. This area is currently used as staff car parking and is proposed to provide replacement open space/habitat for the Project. ▪ Approximately 0.52 hectares of land to the northeast of Longbridge Roundabout. This would comprise landscape and ecological mitigation planting and a pedestrian footbridge (of approximately 25 metres) across the river Mole. The land on the west bank of the river Mole would offset the loss of recreational public open space in Riverside Garden Park and Church Meadows. ▪ Approximately 17 hectares of land to the west of the River Mole including the area of Museum Field. This area adjoins the current Gatwick Biodiversity Area that runs along the river corridor. The primary purpose for the inclusion of this area is for ecological habitat creation and flood compensation. For Museum field, an access road of approximately 5 metres width is proposed with a 6-metre-high landscaped bund around the southern and eastern perimeter. There would be a new pond of up to 500 m² and the provision of up to 100 bat boxes. ▪ The River Mole diversion would provide opportunities for ecological mitigation in this area. ▪ Two areas of hedgerow are proposed to the south and eastern parts of the airfield to provide habitat connectivity as follows: ▪ Along Perimeter Road East the existing leylandii hedge would be replaced by a species rich hedgerow (approximately 125 metres). 	

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Along Crawler's Brook there is a 5-6m wide amenity grass verge. A short scrub hedge would be grown to provide a green corridor that links Crawler's Wood and habitat suitable for bats to the west of Gatwick (approximately 750 metres). The detail of the planting would take into account aerodrome safeguarding so as not to infringe obstacle limits or create attractants to wildlife. A 15-metre-wide belt of trees is proposed to be planted on the eastern edge of Pentagon Field, adjacent to the Balcombe Road and further planting added to the northern edge and within the field to the south of Pentagon Field. 	
Assessment methodology	Comments suggesting a methodology should be provided for production of supporting visualisations. Queries raised about the methodology for production of the zone of theoretical visibility, including whether it has been clipped at 5km. Concerns raised around the 5km study area, particularly that it does not account for the open land between Tandridge and the airport.	<p>As a matter of best practice, the photomontages have been prepared based on the Technical Guidance Note 06/19: Visual Representation of Development Proposals (Landscape Institute, 2019). Specific methodology is contained within ES Appendix 8.4.1: Landscape Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3)</p> <p>Following feedback received during the Autumn 2021 Consultation, ZTVs have been generated which extend beyond a 15-kilometre radius from the Project site boundary to identify the potential for intervisibility between development at Gatwick Airport, the surrounding landscape and the visual receptors within it, see ES Figure 8.4.2 (Doc Ref. 5.2).</p> <p>Viewpoint photography at Leith Hill located approximately 11.3 kilometres from the Project site within the Surrey Hills AONB was undertaken to demonstrate the nature of very distant views from surrounding high land, of which Leith Hill is the highest in the southeast of England, see ES Figure 8.4.37 (Doc Ref. 5.2). The limited visibility of development at Gatwick Airport in the existing view and the likely barely perceptible change in view as a</p>	Y

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>result of the addition of the proposed development, together with the outcome of the assessment of visual receptors within the 5-kilometre radius, has informed the extent of the 5-kilometre radius study area as the main focus for the assessment within the ES.</p> <p>The ZTV indicates that the vast majority of land that may be potentially intervisible with development at Gatwick Airport lies within the 5-kilometre radius area. This has defined an appropriate study area to capture the relevant landscape, townscape and visual receptors that are likely to be affected by the Project and to ensure that all likely significant effects have been identified.</p>	
	Requests for explanation of the reason for character areas within the High Weald AONB being scoped out of the assessment.	<p>The LTVIA within ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) describes the special qualities and other qualities of the High Weald AONB and the objectives relevant to the designation in addition to the landscape character areas of Mid Sussex District which coincide with the AONB designation. This forms the basis for the LTVIA.</p> <p>Special qualities of the nationally designated landscape are considered throughout chapter 8 of the ES and how they relate to the perception of tranquillity as an experiential quality, as defined in relevant guidance. There is a significant overlap with landscape character and therefore it is considered that effects on tranquillity are appropriately represented.</p> <p>No significant impacts have been identified within Section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) for the special qualities of the High Weald AONB or views from it as a result of the Gatwick NRP and no significant effects on the perception of tranquillity within the AONB as a result of an increase in overflying aircraft.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the methodology does not provide criteria for magnitude of change, or a description of the significance levels applied to judgements made in the LTVIA regarding tranquillity.	<p>The LTVIA methodology at ES Appendix 8.4.1 : Landscape, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3) has been expanded to include greater detail for assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity.</p> <p>Definitions and criteria for landscape and visual receptor sensitivity, magnitude of change and significance of effect are included and are used consistently throughout the LTVIA in ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	Y
	Concern about accuracy of the PEIR in relation to an incorrect distance given between allocation for Gatwick Green and the DCO boundary. Also, that the Gatwick Green has not been assessed as a cumulative scheme.	The cumulative development is defined within Section 8.11 of the ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) as 0km from the DCO boundary, east of Balcombe Road. Specific reference to the Gatwick Green commercial development has been added to the description of cumulative landscape and visual effects within ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).	Y
Effects	Comments that the environmental benefits do not outweigh the environmental costs.	<p>The environmental mitigation areas will deliver a significant net increase in public open space at Gatwick and are included as part of the Project.</p> <p>Areas for proposed environmental mitigation included within the Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approximately 0.79 hectares of land immediately to the west of the London to Brighton railway line, north of the current A23. ▪ Approximately 0.64 hectares of land immediately to the west of the London to Brighton railway line, south of the current A23. ▪ Approximately 0.52 hectares of land to the northeast of Longbridge Roundabout. 	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approximately 17 hectares of land to the west of the River Mole including the area of Museum Field. ▪ The River Mole diversion would provide opportunities for ecological mitigation in this area. ▪ Two areas of hedgerow are proposed to the south and eastern parts of the airfield. ▪ A 15-metre-wide belt of trees is proposed to be planted on the eastern edge of Pentagon Field, adjacent to the Balcombe Road and further planting added to the northern edge and within the field to the south of Pentagon Field. 	
	Concerns raised that the PEIR downplays the value of the landscape surrounding the airport and the townscape environment of Horley and Crawley. Also, that the surface access improvements would cause significant visual impacts extend beyond the operational airport boundary.	<p>The LTVIA within ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out baseline information from published district wide landscape and townscape character assessments and the High Weald AONB Management Plan. These assessments have informed judgements regarding the relative value of these receptors in Section 8.6 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The implementation of the surface access improvements will require removal of mature vegetation which will initially result in a change in view for visual receptors, mainly in close proximity to the road corridor including some locations outside of Gatwick Airport.</p> <p>Reinstatement of vegetation removed as a result of the A23/M23 spur improvements will form part of the mitigation proposals within the Project, see outline ES Appendix 8.8.1: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Additional environmental areas will also form part of the Project to compensate for any loss of landscape/habitat and provide extensive areas of replacement public open space.	
	Suggestions made that more consideration be given to the skyline landscape.	32 representative viewpoint locations throughout the study area for the Project have informed the assessment of effects on visual receptors within the LTVIA at ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1). Panoramic photographs and photomontages illustrate the range of views that are available, including skylines and horizons and how the proposed development would interact with existing landscape character and development.	N
	Comments that due to the airspace modernisation programme, it is not possible to conclude that in 2032 there would be a reduction in the area of landscape and townscape affected by aircraft noise.	<p>The air noise assessment assumes the routing of aircraft to and from the main runway and from the northern runway would remain as it is today. This is because the Project can operate using these routes without need for an airspace change process. When the likely outcome of the FASI-South airspace is known then the noise impacts of that change will be assessed as part of that process, following the relevant guidance.</p> <p>The assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity within nationally designated landscapes is included in Chapter 8 of the ES. Notwithstanding the potential 20% increase in the number of flights at less than 7,000 feet above ground level by 2032, in terms of noise emission levels, the future baseline would include changes in the aircraft fleet to quieter types therefore whilst numbers of overflights would increase this adverse effect on the perception of tranquillity would be partially offset by some reduction in potential noise levels. It is predicted that in 2032 there would be a reduction in the area of landscape and townscape affected by aircraft noise and,</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		therefore, the number of residents affected living in the affected area, which supports the assessment of minor adverse effects within the study area.	
	Comments that there is limited information on how green infrastructure could make a positive and innovative contribution to the Project.	An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan is included in ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3). The report outlines the various soft landscape Zones, elements and habitats which will be created as part of this proposal and puts forward the necessary actions and ecological strategy required for their ongoing maintenance and management.	N
	Comments that land take for car parking from Crawley Local Plan's Gatwick Green site could be unnecessary if public transport was better utilised.	No parking associated with the Project is proposed on the Gatwick Green site.	N
Flight paths	Concerns raised about the lack of information about how the cumulative impact of flight paths will be accounted for, including in relation to airspace modernisation.	The air noise assessment assumes the routing of aircraft to and from the main runway and from the northern runway would remain as it is today. This is because the Project can operate using these routes without need for an airspace change process. When the likely outcome of the FASI-South airspace is known then the noise impacts of that change will be assessed as part of that process, following the relevant guidance.	N
Protected landscape	Concerns raised about the impact on the Kent Downs AONB due to overflying, particularly regarding tranquillity, air quality, and dark night skies. Suggestions that the assessment should also include Chartwell, Knole Park and Toys Hill.	Section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8 includes an assessment of the effects on the perception of tranquillity within the Kent Downs AONB. Small areas of the landscape on the southern edge of the AONB between the settlements of Merstham and Westerham and south of Sevenoaks are generally overflowed by between 1 and 10 Gatwick flights a day with smaller areas overflowed by between 10 and 50 flights a day. People living within or	Y

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		using the landscape of the Kent Downs AONB are anticipated to generally experience an increase in overflights of between 5 and 10%. People visiting the popular National Trust property at Knole Park are anticipated to experience a 13% increase in overflying aircraft, which is 1.8 flights a day, which is not considered to be significant.	
	Comments that more consideration should be given to the importance of the South Downs, including the Project's impact on the special qualities of the National Park. Suggestions that the assessment should also include reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment 2020.	<p>Relevant national, county and district landscape character assessments were reviewed for the ES. Reference to the South Downs Integrated Landscape Character Assessment 2020 is included in the assessment.</p> <p>The key landscape characteristics of the relevant landscape types/character areas and special qualities of the South Downs National Park have been considered and assessed.</p> <p>The special qualities experienced by people living within and visiting the nationally designated landscapes within the study area include distant scenic views and relative tranquillity and dark skies. Whilst these special qualities would be affected to some extent as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft, they would still be positive qualities that would be perceived.</p> <p>The assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity within the South Downs National Park (SDNP) is based on four representative locations. The increase in overflying aircraft at less than 7,000 ft would range from 6% to 16% which equates to between 0.2 and 1.8 aircraft a day. Approximately half of the aircraft which currently overfly the SDNP are non-Gatwick. The effects are considered to be minor adverse, which is not significant.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that tranquillity of the High Weald AONB will be affected by increased road traffic and associated noise and air quality problems.	The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues are presented and discussed in Chapter 13: Air Quality of the ES and corresponding air quality appendices. The air quality assessment included all designated ecological sites within the wider study area, defined as all roads within the 10 x 11 km domain with the additional traffic extent defined by changes in traffic flows screened using the IAQM/EPUK criteria. The changes in traffic flow at High Weald AONB were not greater than the screening criteria, therefore the High Weald AONB is not included within the wider study area for air quality.	N
	Comments about the impact on the Sussex Low Weald.	Assessment of the effects of the Project on the character of the Low Weald are included throughout sections 8.9 and 8.11 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Support for the minimum 15m buffer around ancient woodland. Suggestions that compensatory broad leaved woodland planting should be proposed to reduce the long-term impact of woodland loss.	Native woodland species mixes are proposed as part of the mitigation and enhancement strategy for the Project. Details of locations of planting, species mixes and management techniques are included in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan at ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3). Overall, there will be a net increase in woodland habitats within and around Gatwick Airport as a result of the Project.	NA
Heritage	Concerns raised about impacts on listed buildings and historical burial grounds, with suggestions some had been omitted from the assessment, e.g. Church of St Bartholomew. Suggestions that a mitigation strategy be developed.	All appropriate data sources have been examined as part of the assessment. These sources are identified in Appendix 7.6.1 Historic Environment Baseline Report of the ES (Doc Ref. 5.3) and include the National Heritage List for England (NHLE) and the Historic Environment Records for West Sussex and Surrey. No omissions have been identified with regard to listed buildings or historical burial grounds. The assessment of impacts and effects	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>is presented in Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Strategies for further archaeological investigations and historic building recording have been agreed with the appropriate stakeholders and are set out in ES Appendices 8.6.1 and 8.6.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	
	<p>Comments that air noise may impact on tranquillity of the setting of designated heritage assets and that methodology for measuring this should be agreed. Concerns raised that the noise from additional aircraft may result in a negative impact on the enjoyment of the historic landscape.</p>	<p>The assessment of the impact of air noise on the setting of designated heritage assets has been undertaken in accordance with the appropriate guidance as advised in the Airports National Policy Statement and is presented within Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1). This methodology for this assessment was agreed with Historic England.</p>	N
	<p>Suggestion that new non-designated assets should be included in the assessment.</p>	<p>The assessment of impacts on non-designated heritage assets is presented within Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1). No 'new' non-designated heritage assets have been identified by the Project team or by any stakeholder during the consultation process.</p>	N
	<p>Suggestions that the assumption of low archaeological value in areas within the operational airport and car parks need to be further explored.</p>	<p>Available borehole and geotechnical information, and other relevant information, has been reviewed as part of an examination of potential archaeological truncation within the airport; the results are presented within ES Appendix 7.6.1 Historic Environment Baseline Report (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 7.6.4 Geotechnical Data Reviewed for Mapping of Archaeological Potential (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestion that a detailed archaeological study of the relevant part of the Wealden landscape be undertaken to understand and mitigate harm to undesignated archaeological assets.	Impacts on buried archaeological remains are limited to a few small areas of land therefore it would not be proportionate to undertake a detailed archaeological study of this part of the Weald. Strategies for further archaeological investigations and historic building recording have been agreed with the appropriate stakeholders and are set out in ES Appendices 8.6.1 and 8.6.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that Thunderfield Castle Scheduled Monument could be directly affected by the changes to the local road network and may require mitigation.	Changes to the local road network would not result in any harm to the significance of Thunderfield Castle. This issue has been discussed with Historic England and it is agreed that no mitigation is required.	N
	Request for more details on the effects of the Longbridge roundabout works on the Church Road Conservation Area.	The assessment of impacts on above ground heritage assets, including the Church Road (Horley) Conservation Area, as a result of changes within their setting is presented within Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Suggestions that a Historic Area Appraisal of the airport be undertaken to address gaps in the assessment.	Available borehole and geotechnical information, and other relevant information, has been reviewed as part of an examination of potential archaeological truncation within the airport; the results are presented within ES Appendix 7.6.1 Historic Environment Baseline Report (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 7.6.4 Geotechnical Data Reviewed for Mapping of Archaeological Potential (Doc Ref. 5.3). A request was made through the appropriate Topic Working Group (TWG) for clarity on what is meant by 'a Historic Area Appraisal of the Airport', but no responses were received.	N

j. Ecology and nature conservation

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Ecology	Comments that wildlife is likely to be disturbed by aircraft noise and air pollution and questioning the benefit of the proposed ecological area close to northern runway. Support for the proposals as long as no trees are cut down.	<p>The potential for impacts from changes in noise and air quality have been considered within the assessment process and are reported in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1). The conclusion of this work is that there were no noise sensitive ecology receptors (any wildlife present are already adapted to a high noise environment). The impact of changes in air quality found no significant effects on any receptor.</p> <p>The ecological areas to be included within the Project build on those already within the airport to increase the areas currently managed for biodiversity value.</p> <p>Works to enable various elements of the Project will require the loss of some trees. However, this will be kept to a minimum and will be mitigated through the creation of new woodland, as far as is practicable accounting for aircraft safeguarding constraints.</p>	N
	Suggestions for projects such as living walls to assist in air quality and temperature management, as well as alleviate the visual impact of the Project.	Whilst green walls do not form a specific element of the Project at this stage of the design process, a Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref 7.3) has been prepared as part of the DCO to provide design quality control without being too restrictive for future design stages development. Green walls could form part of the detail design solution. Guidance reflects national and local design strategies and legislation.	N
Assessment	Comments that the Zone of Influence (Zoi) should be fully justified and that there is a need for surveys, particularly of bats, covering more of the surrounding area. Comments that no	<p>The Zoi was defined only after detailed investigation. Two study areas – for designated sites and species – were used to determine its extent.</p> <p>The initial search area for European designated sites (including SACs, SPAs and Ramsar sites) covered the area within 20 km of the Project site</p>	Y

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>justification for survey areas has been provided (other than for bats). Suggestions that surveys of surrounding area should be undertaken. Also, that ammonia has not been included in the assessment.</p>	<p>boundary. This buffer was extended for SACs designated for bats and for SACs/SPAs which are sensitive to changes in air quality from vehicle emissions and located within 200 m of major roads.</p> <p>An initial area within 5 km of the Project site was searched for other sites (SSSIs, National Nature Reserves (NNRs), Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) and locally-designated sites) to allow for effects arising from works at the Project site and effects arising from changes to surface access arrangements. A 5 km buffer search area is considered appropriate since this recognises that effects due to surface access arrangements may occur at some distance from the Project site.</p> <p>For protected and notable species, records of protected or otherwise notable species were requested from the local records centres for an area extending 2 km from of the Project site boundary, except for otters and bats where a larger 10 km search area was used.</p> <p>The survey area for the majority of ecology surveys was within the Project site boundary, which extended slightly beyond the current Project site boundary. However, it is recognised that effects on ecological receptors can occur beyond such limits, especially for mobile species such as bats and birds. Barriers to dispersal have been considered in survey designs, for example where great crested newt (GCN) ponds have been discounted due to them being separated from the Project site by major roads. Additional surveys were undertaken as knowledge of the survey area was gained during the earlier surveys and as the Project design evolved.</p> <p>The survey area included the major watercourses that flow through the Project site to identify any potential sign of otters or water voles, including 500 metres both upstream and downstream, where access permitted.</p>	

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>The study areas for both designated sites and species have been used to determine the Zone of Influence (Zol) for the assessment of effects. This means that the Zol has also adapted and responded as survey/modelling data were collected. The Zol for the Project was also determined based on the Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland (CIEEM, 2019) combined with that adopted in previous studies in relation to expansion at Gatwick, work undertaken by the Airports' Commission in respect of a second runway.</p> <p>Following consultation, modelling of aerial emissions from both construction and operational traffic has been updated to include ammonia (NH₃).</p>	
	Suggestions that an in-combination assessment on the Ashdown Forest be conducted.	Such an assessment has been undertaken and is reported in ES Appendix 9.9.1 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Concerns raised regarding the use of 2016 data for Surrey and suggesting the updated Site of Nature Conservation (SNCI) list should be used as not all SNCIs and Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) within the 5km buffer have been considered.	SNCIs and BOAs are included as locally designated sites within the assessment (see Table 9.6.1 in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1). All background data from relevant local records centres have been updated prior to submission of the ES, including with respect to BOAs within the 5km buffer.	N
	Comments that the third runway at Heathrow is not included within the cumulative assessment for ecology and suggestions that the worst-case scenario should include it.	Due to the uncertainty associated with Heathrow's third runway, it has not been included in the main cumulative assessment. However, a separate qualitative assessment is included about potential cumulative effects, should the Heathrow third runway project come forward during the timescale for this	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Project. This is provided in the ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
Bats	Comments that areas surrounding Gatwick Stream and the River Mole appear important connective habitats for bats and providing resilience for foraging and commuting is a priority for Barbastelle and Bechstein's Bats.	<p>Advanced survey techniques identified that Museum Field (and surrounding area), the adjacent River Mole corridor (NWZ) and Brockley Wood were used as core foraging areas for a number of Bechstein's bats with the River Mole Corridor identified as being of regional importance for foraging and commuting Bechstein's bats. Riverside Garden Park was also identified as an important foraging and commuting area and Bechstein's bats were recorded flying over the runway in the west of the Project site.</p> <p>During bat activity surveys, barbastelle bats were recorded in the southern section of Brockley Wood, in woodland to the west of the fire training ground and near Perimeter Road South, in the south of the Project Site.</p> <p>Construction works in these areas would impact on bats foraging and commuting through habitat loss and disturbance. The diversion of the River Mole and the airfield satellite contractor compound would reduce habitat suitability and connectivity to the south of Brockley Wood. However, mitigation measures to protect the wood and maintain a 15-metre buffer along it would ensure bats could continue to commute into the wider landscape, including to the south. The completion of the River Mole diversion anticipated in 2025 would result in high value habitat establishing. Further damp and dry grassland habitat would be created resulting in an enhancement to the habitat availability south of Brockley Wood.</p> <p>The Museum Field flood compensation area would be constructed within the existing field and would not disturb the boundary woodland and trees, other than a small channel connecting it to the east. Therefore, the habitats utilised</p>	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>by bats in this area would be retained, reducing any impact construction works would have on the Bechstein's bat or barbastelle populations.</p> <p>Through the construction and operation of alterations to Taxiway Juliet and the associated spur, there is a greater risk of bat mortality due to collision with aeroplanes and associated turbulence. However, the new spur would not be in constant use and aeroplanes using it would not be travelling at speed, therefore increased exposure to the risk of collision would be intermittent and not constant.</p> <p>The mitigation and enhancement measures to the west of Brockley Wood that is anticipated to be completed between 2025 and 2028 would significantly improve the value of this habitat for bats by improving connectivity between roosting and foraging areas. This would be particularly beneficial for the Bechstein's bat populations to the west of the Project site. Although there would be a temporary, long-term loss until new planting has established, and therefore this would not result in direct mitigation during the construction period of the Project, in the long-term this would enhance the overall value of habitats and habitat connectivity and would therefore have a beneficial impact on the Bechstein's bat and Barbastelle populations.</p> <p>The activities associated with the construction of new and replacement car parks, the reconfiguration of airport facilities and noise mitigation features early in the Project would be likely to have a negligible adverse impact on Bechstein's bats or Barbastelle through the removal of small areas of broadleaved trees, hedgerows and scrub which do not provide a core foraging resource. Both species were recorded along the southern boundary of the Project site and a Bechstein's bat roost was also recorded in Crawler's Wood. The construction activities associated with the Project in the south of site would predominantly affect urban habitats and would result in a small</p>	

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>loss of broadleaved trees and scrub within them which are of limited value as foraging or commuting habitat. The potential impact on Bechstein's bats and barbastelles would be negligible.</p> <p>Bechstein's bats have been recorded foraging and roosting in Upper Pickett's Wood, Lower Pickett's Wood, Horleyland Wood and the surrounding landscape, where high activity levels from other bat species were also recorded. Works within this area that have potential to impact habitats suitable for bats include the construction of a foul water pipeline through a small area of woodland and the deposition of spoil within Pentagon Field. Both activities would be subject to the measures in the CoCP to protect retained adjacent habitats and would be designed to minimise the loss of higher value habitat. This would include the measures to protect the boundary woodland around Pentagon Field and route the pipeline where it would have least impact, such as by avoiding tree loss where practicable. The overall impact on the habitat resource would therefore be negligible.</p>	
	<p>Suggestions that the Project should be assessed at a landscape scale, with a master planning approach taken to design.</p>	<p>A Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref 7.3) has been prepared as part of the DCO to provide design quality control without being too restrictive for future design stages development. Guidance reflects national and local design strategies and legislation.</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan, ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3) outlines the various soft landscape zones, elements and habitats which will be created as part of this proposal and puts forward the necessary actions and ecological strategy required for their ongoing maintenance and management.</p>	Y

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The OLEMP includes a Landscape Master Plan defining the key existing and proposed green and blue infrastructure within and around the airport and how this will integrate development, public open space and ecological habitats with the landscape and townscape context.	
	Requests made for more information on lighting principles and for a lighting plan demonstrating the presence of dark corridors and indicating how bats will be able to utilise the landscape. Further information requested on bat activity around the Longbridge and South Terminal roundabout construction.	<p>The existing woodland narrows at the north-western end of the works area north of the A23 where it lies parallel to the Gatwick Stream and then the River Mole. The woodland along the southern side of the streams would be predominantly removed along this section but the Project has been designed to ensure a strip of the existing scrub and some woodland along the streams would be retained to maintain connectivity between woody habitats and a dark corridor.</p> <p>The majority of the woodland to the north of the new road alignment for improvements to the North Terminal roundabout would be retained. This would ensure a substantial amount of the existing woodland remains within Riverside Garden Park and that the area along the Gatwick Stream, where the highest levels of bat activity were recorded, would be least affected. However, where the woodland narrows towards the western end, some of the vegetation to the south of the stream would be lost except for the existing bankside scrub. The mature trees to the north of the stream would be retained and in combination with the scrub on the south bank, a dark commuting and foraging route would be retained for bats.</p> <p>Surveys completed in the area around the Longbridge roundabout improvement works, including crossing point work, found that the habitat around the River Mole corridor has the highest levels of bat activity The Project has been designed to retain, so far as practicable, vegetation along both the River Mole and the Gatwick Stream to maintain their existing value</p>	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>as a foraging resource and commuting route. The retained vegetation would also seek to maintain a dark corridor.</p> <p>Riverside Garden Park was identified as an occasional foraging and commuting area for Bechstein's bat. The majority of the habitats in the park would be retained with the exception of a narrow strip where it borders the A23 road to the south which would be lost to the North Terminal roundabout improvements. The home range of the bat was found to also include habitats in the west of the Project site along the River Mole. The Project has been designed to retain as much woodland as practicable, particularly along the River Mole to ensure a dark, well vegetated corridor would be retained. However, there would be a small loss of woodland from both banks of the River Mole where it enters and exits culverts/bridges beneath the A23 London Road and A23 Brighton Road.</p>	
		<p>A lighting strategy has been developed for the project which recommends that the Institute of Lighting Professionals 'Guidance Note GN08: Lighting and Bats' is considered in the development of the lighting design. Reference is made to the preference for warm-white light sources with reduced blue light component and to avoid flicker effects. It also identifies that special measures should be considered to avoid light spill onto Gatwick Stream. Which may comprise one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Warm white colour (e.g., 2,700K) with minimised blue light (wavelengths <500nm). ▪ Luminaire photometry selected to minimise back-spill towards the stream. ▪ Lower luminaire mounting heights to limit spill light beyond the highway. 	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of cowls and/or beam shaping devices on the luminaires to reduce light spill towards the stream. ▪ Part night dimming. ▪ Physical mitigation in the form of solid fencing. <p>Consultation has taken place with Surrey and West Sussex Local Authority Highways Departments. While their standard LED street lighting provision is in the 3,000K-4,000K range, they will permit lower colour temperature lighting to be used in situations where special environmental protection is required – such as the A23 near Gatwick Stream/Longbridge Roundabout</p> <p>The central lighting management system operated by the local authorities has adopted a switching regime in other locations which allows for part night dimming to make allowance for wildlife habitats and the same management is recommended here.</p>	
	Comments that Barbastelle and Bechstein's bats should be listed as Annex II species due to their rarity and therefore their classification as a County level of importance is not accurate.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Bechstein's and Barbastelle considered as of National Level importance in the ES (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	Y
Badgers	Lack of detail on the proposals to create a new artificial badger sett (no location or design detail), plus PEIR does not recognise the impact the closure of a badger sett would have on a badger social group.	The final location and design details for any artificial setts are to be determined during pre-construction surveys. The impact of the closure of a sett on badgers is considered in Section 9.9 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	The badger survey did not include any camera monitoring of setts, and the classification of setts only used field signs.	The use of field sign to identify the usage and status of badger setts is considered standard practice. Where field sign is clear and setts are visibly active, the use of camera monitoring is not considered necessary.	N
Mitigation	Concerns raised that mitigation will not be in place in some areas until the end of the construction period. Comments that mitigation, compensation, and enhancement measures should not be limited to within the airport boundary. Also, that more detail is needed on these to determine the significance of impacts.	The mitigation measures designed into the Project would ensure that high value habitats would be avoided as far as practicable and that any localised impacts on habitats for protected species, such as nesting birds, grass snake and GCN would be avoided. Where any mitigation habitat creation is due to take place later within the Project programme or such habitat would take time to establish, this is acknowledged within the ES and the significance determined accordingly.	N
	Suggestions that the mitigation measures for enhanced green spaces should be put in place without the Project.	GAL already has a programme of ecological enhancement as part of their Decade of Change that is out with and independent to the NRP.	N
Biodiversity	Suggestions that a voluntary Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) approach should be adopted as good practice and that significantly more biodiversity enhancement is needed than currently proposed if the Project is to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG.	Update provided at Summer 2022 Consultation: Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the Environment Act was granted Royal Assent (in November 2021). The Act sets out the requirement for all development, including NSIPs, to deliver quantifiable BNG. However, the application of BNG to the NSIP regime (and therefore to the Project's DCO application) is subject to further consultation and secondary legislation, the detail and timing of which is still to be confirmed. The Project's proposed approach to BNG is being discussed with key stakeholders. We will ensure	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		that the DCO application includes a high-quality approach to mitigating ecological effects and enhancing biodiversity, whilst meeting all legal and policy requirements.	
	Concerns raised about increased greenhouse gas emissions affecting biodiversity.	ES Appendix 15.9.1: In-Combination Climate Change Impact (ICCI) Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) (see Table 1.1.1) considers the impacts of hotter and wetter conditions and drier/drought conditions on biodiversity, ecology, conservation and landscape as a result of a changing climate from increased greenhouse gas emissions.	N
	Comments that the proposals should include a strategy for biodiversity monitoring covering the condition of key habitats and population monitoring of key species.	Monitoring for bats, badgers, GCN and reptiles would be carried out during the construction period, after species have been translocated and new habitats created. Monitoring for breeding birds, otters and badgers would be carried out prior to and during construction. A River Condition Assessment will be undertaken at three intervals following the creation of the river diversion.	N
	Concerns raised that the use of Pentagon Field as a Biodiversity Opportunity Area would be lost due to the Project.	Both Gatwick Woods BOA and the River Mole BOA fall partially within the Project boundary. The parts of the Gatwick Woods BOA affected by the Project include the western extent of a narrow strip of broadleaved plantation woodland that would be lost as part of the surface access improvements and the temporary disturbance to agricultural land at Pentagon Field whilst it was used for spoil deposition. There would also be the potential for the degradation of adjoining habitats which are considered in the assessment of effects on semi-natural broadleaved woodland, ancient woodland and	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Horleyland Wood LWS and all found to be not significant for the habitats within the BOA.</p> <p>Upon completion of the works at Pentagon Field, new tree planting would be undertaken along the eastern boundary resulting in increased woodland within the BOA. This would contribute towards the BOA's targets to create more woodland and creating ecological enhancements. The overall impact due to the very small loss of woodland from surface access improvements and the creation of a larger area of new woodland, that would also contribute to ecological networks, would be low resulting in an overall minor beneficial effect to a receptor of county value and would not be significant.</p>	
Habitats	Comments that wetland habitats and habitats associated with the River Mole and Gatwick stream should be included in the ES as they provide connective habitats through the landscape.	The importance of both water courses as strategic connective habitat is recognised within the Ecology Strategy for the Project, set out in the LEMP.	N
	Concerns raised about the impact of the proposals on sensitive habitats around the airport due to noise and air pollution.	The Project has been developed to avoid designated sites, areas of woodland and other ecologically sensitive habitats wherever practicable. The potential impact of changes to air quality and noise on sensitive receptors is included in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Suggestions that measure to address severance should be implemented as early as possible. Also, that where there is a loss of breeding bird and bat habitat,	<p>Noted.</p> <p>As much planting as possible will be undertaken early in the construction programme including within the new biodiversity area at Brook Farm. New design of habitat to be created takes account of potential effects to both</p>	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	new tree, shrub and grassland planting should be provided as a priority.	breeding birds and bats as far as is practicable while also considering aircraft safeguarding.	
	Concerns raised about the impact on bird habitats due to measures to deter birds from the area to avoid bird strikes.	Previous work on bird strike risks and management has been taken into consideration during the design process, including in the chosen locations and specification of new landscape planting. No new works to existing habitats deter birds to are proposed within the Project.	N
Woodland	Concerns raised about impacts on the Horleyland Wood and Lower Picketts Wood areas of ancient woodland. Suggestions that mitigation measures including buffering are required to ensure their protection.	<p>Four areas of ancient woodland are present immediately adjacent to the Project site boundary: Horleyland Wood; Lower Picketts Wood; Brockley Wood and a section of woodland along the north west side of the River Mole.</p> <p>A further two areas are located within 120m to the northeast; The Roughs and Bridges Wood and one area (Huntsgreen Wood) is located 75 metres south of the Project boundary. The potential impacts from contamination from pollution events and the measures to protect Horleyland Wood, The Roughs and Bridges Wood are described in Section 9.9 in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1) and would also be relevant to Lower Picketts Wood to the east which is located 70m south of Pentagon Field.</p> <p>The mitigation measures designed into the Project would ensure a 70-metre buffer comprising broadleaved plantation woodland was retained and protected along the boundary of the ancient woodland. This would remove the risk of soil compaction within the root protection zone of trees within Lower Picketts Wood and would intercept airborne dust before it reached the ancient woodland. Dust suppression methods would also be used to reduce</p>	Y

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>airborne dust in the first instance and reduce the likelihood of it reaching the ancient woodland.</p> <p>Construction works associated with creating the diversion of the River Mole corridor would be undertaken in proximity (approximately 30m) to Brockley Wood, resulting in the loss of some of the habitats to the south of it, comprising marshy grassland and semi-natural broadleaved woodland. However, species-rich grassland would be reinstated upon completion of the diversion works. The loss of a strip of semi-natural broadleaved woodland that connects to the ancient woodland would result in a small reduction in the overall habitat resource in the vicinity but would not reduce connectivity due to the airfield already creating a barrier to further areas of woodland to the south.</p> <p>A minimum 15 metre buffer would be provided around this area which would include a 10-metre strip of semi-natural broadleaved woodland to ensure it was protected from accidental damage. The security fencing would be at least 15 metres from the woodland edge, thereby ensuring there could be no access by personnel and machinery and that no materials would be stored within or adjacent to it. This would also ensure root protection areas were protected.</p>	

k. Land use and recreation

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Public open space	Concerns raised that widening the M23 would harm Riverside Gardens Park, removing a mature tree line and associated habitat. Requests for reassurance that mitigation measures will be targeted at communities or groups impacted by the loss and that replacement open space will be easily and equally accessible to current users of the park.	<p>The effects of the Project on areas of open space are assessed in the ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1). The areas of public open space permanently affected include approximately 1.03 ha of land within the area of Riverside Garden Park and approximately 0.13 ha of Church Meadow that both form part of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Riverside Green Chain designated open space.</p> <p>The following areas of replacement open space would be created as part of the Project close to the areas of open space affected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An area of approximately 1.43 ha currently located within an area of current area of Car Park B to the north and south of the A23. A new pedestrian walkway would be provided to connect the existing area of Riverside Garden Park to the area of replacement open space. This would be connected to Riverside Garden Park by the provision of a new pedestrian walkway. ▪ An area of approximately 0.52 ha of land to the west of Church Meadow, located to the west of the River Mole on land currently used as grazing land. This area of replacement space would be linked to the existing area of Church Meadow through the provision of a new pedestrian bridge over the River Mole. 	N
	Concerns raised that replacement public open space will not be immediately adjacent to areas removed. Requests for mitigation measures to be targeted at communities or groups impacted by the loss.	The effects of the Project on areas of open space are assessed in the ES Chapter 19: Agriculture and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1). The areas of open space permanently affected include approximately 1.03 ha of land within the area of Riverside Garden Park and approximately 0.13 ha of Church Meadows that both form part of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Riverside Green Chain.	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>The following areas of replacement open space would be created as part of the Project close to the areas of the open space affected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An area of approximately 1.43 ha currently located within an area of current area of Car Park B to the north and south of the A23. A new pedestrian walkway would be provided to connect the existing area of Riverside Garden Park to the area of replacement open space. This would be connected to Riverside Garden Park by the provision of a new pedestrian walkway. An area of approximately 0.52 ha of land to the west of Church Meadow, located to the west of the River Mole on land currently used as grazing land. This area of replacement space would be linked to the existing area of Church Meadow through the provision of a new pedestrian bridge over the River Mole. 	
	Requests for more detail about the impact on the use of parks and open spaces of nearby construction compounds.	<p>The temporary effects on open space in Riverside Garden Park and Church Meadows are assessed in Section 19.9 of ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>GAL understands that parks and open spaces are essential amenities for the local community and is committed to reducing any negative impact during construction.</p> <p>To achieve this, GAL will take measures defined in the ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 5.3) to ensure that the use of nearby parks and open spaces are minimally affected. These measures include:</p>	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Designing the construction compounds to minimise their footprint: We will ensure that the compounds are designed to take up as little space as practicable while still meeting the construction project's needs. 2. Implementing strict noise and dust control measures: We will implement strict noise and dust control measures to minimise any disruption to nearby parks and open spaces. 3. Maintaining clear communication with the local community: We will communicate clearly with the local community about the construction schedule and potential disruptions. This will allow park users to plan their activities accordingly and minimize inconvenience. 	
	Requests for more detail on the impacts on public open space at St Bartholomew's Church and the former Horley Anderson Centre and Playing Fields.	<p>The effects of the Project on areas of open space are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1). Approximately 0.13 ha of Church Meadows would be permanently lost as a result of the Project.</p> <p>An area of approximately 0.52 ha of replacement open space would be provided to the west of Church Meadows, located to the west of the River Mole on land currently used as grazing land. This area of replacement space would be linked to the existing area of Church Meadow through the provision of a new pedestrian bridge over the River Mole.</p>	N
Public rights of way	Requests for more detail on changes to Public Rights of Way and footpaths on Balcombe Road, including proposed route changes, timing, statutory notification procedures that would be	<p>The effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are assessed in Section 19.9 of ES Chapter 19: Agriculture and Recreation (Doc Ref 5.1).</p> <p>A Public Rights of Way Strategy is provided in ES Appendix 19.8.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3). It includes measures to reduce impacts on users of PRow during the construction period, as far as practicable.</p>	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	undertaken, the type of surfaces being proposed, the proposed widths of the altered footpaths, the type of fencing proposed and safety. Comments that an Outline Public Rights of Way Strategy should be provided to show how impacts on public users will be kept to a minimum during construction.		
Signage	Comments that there is inadequate signage for existing footpaths, that the paths to Horley are dangerous, as they are overgrown and have poor lighting, and that footpaths around Charlwood have been severed.	Proposals for the management of the PRoW affected by the scheme, including the potential requirement for lighting are provided in ES Appendix 19.8.2: Public Rights of Way Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
Assessment	Queries around the inclusion of only three neighbouring local authorities and the correct local, regional and national policies have been used. Comments that the chapter is confusing. Comments that previous questions from local authorities have not been addressed.	The DEFRA farm holding statistical dataset was updated in 2021 since the PEIR for the Project was published. The most recent data is included in ES Chapter 19: Agriculture and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1) and reflects current local authority boundaries. This data provides the context to the type of agricultural land use present in the vicinity of the Project.	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Access	Requests for more technical detail on access arrangements for the construction compound at Bayhorne Farm and for further detailed engagement with local authorities.	There would be no access to the construction compound along Bayhorne Lane where the main entrance to the Bayhorne farmhouse and buildings is located.	N
Replacement land	Suggestions that any loss of countryside must be replaced within the same local authority. Comments that the land at Brook Farm that would be integrated into the project boundary be planted with trees.	Native woodland species mixes are proposed as part of the mitigation and enhancement strategy for the Project. Details of locations of planting, species mixes and management techniques are included in ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3). Overall, there will be a net increase in woodland habitats within and around Gatwick Airport as a result of the Project. Brook Farm safeguarding precludes mass planting of trees close to runway. Areas of replacement open space are proposed to be located on areas of land located as close as possible to the areas of permanent loss which are within Car Park B immediately to the south of Riverside Garden Park and to the north of Longbridge Roundabout at Dairy Farm, to the west of Church Meadow area of urban open space.	N
Compulsory purchase	Comments that there is a lack of CPO mapping, and it is not clear what land is affected.	The NRP boundary has been available throughout the various stages of consultation and will continue to be refined until DCO application.	N
Land take	Concerns about the effect of land take on local landowners, particularly those whose land provides employment for local residents.	GAL has actively engaged with those with an interest in the land and worked to ensure that a reasonable and proportionate approach has been taken to land acquisition, ensuring that all land required is justified.	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more detail about land take associated with the M23 spur road east of Junction 9a, particularly from land forming part of Dovenby Hall.	The Book of Reference and Land Plans submitted as part of the DCO application identify the land required by or affected by the proposals. The effect of the Project on agricultural land is assessed in the ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Cycle routes	Comments that there is potential to enhance the quality of NCR21 and that generally improving cycling around the airport should be considered.	The potential effects on and enhancement of the NCR21 will be considered in the light of emerging highway design and local authority initiatives. As well as active travel proposals associated with the Project, which include new connections and enhanced access, particularly to and from Horley, improvements to NCR21 within the boundary of the airport are being brought forward under the current Airport Surface Access Strategy for completion in advance of the Northern Runway Project.	N
	Comments that the current cycle paths are insufficient, the airport is inaccessible by bike, and that current cycle parking and storage spaces are not easily located. Doubts also raised over the feasibility of staff and passengers with luggage cycling to the airport.	Our proposals for the Project have been modified since the Autumn 2021 consultation to include improved active travel infrastructure and crossings at Longbridge Roundabout and on the A23 London Road, together with links between Longbridge Roundabout and North Terminal, Balcombe Road and South Terminal and Riverside Garden Park and South Terminal. Connections in the wider area are a matter for the local planning and highway authorities to provide, as they consider appropriate. Gatwick is accessible by bicycle and sits along the National Cycle Route 21. A small but significant proportion of staff cycle and walk to work on the airport and GAL's Surface Access Commitments provided in ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3) support an increase in active travel.	Y

I. Health and wellbeing

Theme: Health and wellbeing			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Vulnerable groups	Questions around whether vulnerable groups and those within the protected characteristics have been considered. Requests for greater understanding of the impact of noise and air quality on care home residents and schools within the study area and the extent to which mitigation would reduce them.	<p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the relevant vulnerable groups for each health issue and considers how they may be affected. There is an overlap between vulnerable groups relevant to health and some protected characteristics.</p> <p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing is informed by the air quality and noise assessments that include vulnerable community receptors, such as schools and care homes. Appropriate mitigation is set out within those assessments. The Air Quality Assessment in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes model outputs at discrete sensitive receptors within both the 11 km by 10 km domain and wider study area outside of this domain. Sensitive receptors include residential properties, schools, hospitals and care homes. The assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice.</p>	N
	Concern for the health of children, the elderly and those with specific health conditions as a result of the smell of jet fuel and the presence of dirt falling from aircraft.	Vulnerable groups, including children, older people and those with poor health are discussed in the ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref 5.1), the scope of which was agreed through the planning process as set out in the EIA Scoping Opinion in ES Appendix 6.2.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3). Records of odour complaints were obtained from GAL's air quality team and local authorities for the last 5 years and a qualitative assessment has been included in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Assessment	Concerns raised about the assessment of impacts on local primary health care, acute services and emergency responders from additional passenger	The potential impact on health care was assessed as part of the PEIR and has been updated in the ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1), informed by additional data.	N

Theme: Health and wellbeing			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	movements. Also, that up-to-date data needs to be used.		
	Comments that an Equalities Assessment should be undertaken. Suggestions that the WHO guideline value should be used for nitrogen dioxide.	The Health and Wellbeing assessment in ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) has regard to the WHO air quality guidelines as one evidence source informing the qualitative professional judgement as the likely significant effects of the Project changes on public health. This follows IEMA 2022 guidance and good practice. Other evidence sources, including national regulations and planning policy, are also relevant and are applied in reaching a balanced and evidence-based conclusion.	N
	Comments that a more detailed assessment is required to understand the effects of construction traffic and noise on the health and wellbeing of residents near to the airport.	Both air and surface noise directly attributable to the Project were assessed in the PIER and have been further assessed in the ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) assessment. The assessment is informed by ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1), which assesses noise from the construction works and road traffic and describes the proposed mitigation.	N
	Comments that some relevant local authority planning policies have not been considered.	Additional local planning policies have been referenced in the ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) assessment. A proportionate approach is taken in not duplicating all policies described in other parts of the ES. It is noted that there are many direct and indirect policy links relevant to the wider determinants of health. The Planning Statement (Doc Ref 7.1) contains a full assessment of the Project against relevant local planning policies.	N

Theme: Health and wellbeing			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised that communities most likely to be affected by noise in the early construction phase are not listed.	The ES noise assessment (ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration) (Doc Ref. 5.1) assesses all relevant locations for construction noise, with the assessment informed by worst case receptors. The ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) assessment is informed by those results and takes a population-based approach. The assessment of noise impacts therefore considers all areas of potential noise impact appropriately.	N
Healthcare and emergency services	Requests for more information about the impact of additional passengers on local accident and emergency departments. Comments that mitigation be proposed to reduce any impact on emergency services and local healthcare facilities.	The ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) assessment considers the implications for ambulance services and A&E departments. The assessment notes that the level of demand is not solely a function of passenger throughput, as onsite first aid and paramedic triage at the Airport reduces the need for ambulance call-outs and inappropriate A&E use. The assessment explains how onsite paramedic provision would be scaled and demand forecast information made available to support routine NHS service planning.	N
	Comments around the potential impact on emergency services of more road collisions due the highway improvements.	The potential risk of road traffic incidents is addressed through design and is assessed as part of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) is informed by such modelling and considers the implications for road safety at a population level. Whilst accident rates are in part a function of total vehicle numbers, there are not expected to be significant healthcare service implications. Indeed, the highway improvement design supports reduced accident risk.	N
	Concerns raised about the additional demand on services as a result of the potential for an increase in the number of unaccompanied children arriving at Gatwick.	The impact of unaccompanied children has been considered, but not scoped into the ES. This is a complex issue that is not just a function of passenger numbers but reflects migration, asylum seeking, and border control polices internationally. As the drivers do not relate to the Project change, significant population level effects are unlikely.	N

Theme: Health and wellbeing			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	Requests for more information on measures that will be implemented to mitigate the effects of noise during construction and operation.	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides a detailed assessment of construction and road traffic noise in Section 14.9 including mitigation measures described in Section 14.8.	N
	Comments that mitigation to reduce sleep disturbance is required for airport activities other than night flights (eg noise due to more passengers using the road network).	Both air and surface noise directly attributable to the Project were assessed in the PEIR and have been further assessed in the ES. ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) assesses noise from the construction works and road traffic and describes the proposed mitigation.	N
Cumulative effects	Comments that the effects on health (including mental health) of combined and cumulative effects (air quality, noise and light) should be addressed.	The combined and cumulative effects are reported in the ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1), as well as in ES Chapter 20 on Cumulative Effects (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Improvements	Comments that opportunities to improve the health and quality of life of affected be explored and that monitoring is proposed. Also, suggestions to explore opportunities to enhance/improve provision for active travel and physical activity.	Opportunities to improve health and quality of life have been iteratively explored through the design, including through how new active travel and outdoor spaces are created or improved. Employment and training opportunities have also been explored, as have steps to collaborate with the Integrated Care Board to improve access to healthcare for Airport workers. Such benefits, and proportionate monitoring where appropriate, are discussed in the ES Chapter 18 on Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Monitoring	Comments that health-specific monitoring should be included in the ES and that a Monitoring Strategy should be an embedded mitigation measure.	Noted. Monitoring should be proportionate and is included where appropriate. The Project takes a joined-up approach to monitoring and therefore monitoring relevant to health is spread across the ES. The most appropriate	N

Theme: Health and wellbeing			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		methods for monitoring often relate to determinants of health, such as air quality or noise levels, rather than to population health outcomes.	
Employment	Comments that a clear strategy and action plan to address barriers to employment within the local population be developed.	<p>The health and wellbeing benefits of being in good-quality, long-term employment are recognised, as are the disbenefits associated with unemployment. Notwithstanding that there would be a need for a nuanced approach that would enable GAL to focus the Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) investments and actions in locations and in ways that would deliver greatest impact.</p> <p>It is expected that the ESBS employment and skills activities would be delivered primarily within the Local Authorities located closest to the Airport (being careful to focus on areas exhibiting the highest levels of deprivation and where social mobility is low), whilst business-focused initiatives would be delivered across the wider Six Authorities Area. GAL would particularly welcome the potential to address very localised circumstances and priorities (including pockets of deprivation and attendant characteristics) that would be highlighted through the baseline analysis that AECOM recommends that local authorities conduct, described in 3.226 of the Statutory Consultation Socio-Economics Response. Specific support would be provided customised to effectively tackle barriers to employment. Details will be outlined within the ESBS Implementation Plan.</p> <p>One of the four core objectives of the ESBS is to ‘Cultivate and promote the conditions whereby people from all backgrounds can reach their full potential and share in the benefits of a healthy economy’ and one of the two underpinning cross-cutting themes is ‘The promotion of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion and breaking down barriers that prevent social mobility’. GAL proposes a number of approaches that would make this happen. Examples</p>	N

Theme: Health and wellbeing			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		include effective employment brokerage, which reaches into communities facing multiple barriers to gaining and sustaining employment, particularly within localities exhibiting high levels of multiple deprivation; working with community-based organisations to ensure that customised or wraparound support is provided to address particular needs; and introducing specific initiatives which could include scholarships to support disadvantaged young people into learning and careers.	

m. Major accidents and disasters

Theme: Major accidents and disasters			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Safety	Concerns about the closer proximity of the runways potentially leading to an increase in emergency manoeuvres.	<p>The existing northern runway would be adjusted to reposition the centreline 12 metres further north to ensure a separation distance of 210 metres between it and the main runway. This distance is required to meet European Aviation Safety Agency standards for closely spaced parallel runways.</p> <p>Controlled dependency between the two runways would ensure safe aircraft operations. An arrival from the main runway would slow or stop short of the Northern Runway and cross it only after a departure on the Northern Runway has completed.</p> <p>Several existing taxiways would require amendment and realignment in order to accommodate the altered northern runway, to provide sufficient room for the safe manoeuvre of aircraft associated with both runways and to accommodate increased aircraft numbers. Redundant areas of hardstanding would be removed.</p> <p>Existing emergency policies are sufficient for managing operations and mitigating risks. More details of the Gatwick Emergency Orders are available in Annex 3 of ES Appendix 5.3.4: Major Accidents and Disasters (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N
	Concerns raised around the potential for terror attacks.	<p>There is always a risk of terrorism. The risk is not considered to be higher with the project compared with existing airport operations. There are extensive mitigation and contingency measures in place to manage the risk. All security measures will be confidential and cannot be detailed. The issue will be scoped out of further assessment. Information of which terrorism mitigation and management measures currently apply at Gatwick is available in Annex 3 of ES Appendix 5.3.4: Major Accidents and Disasters (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N

Theme: Major accidents and disasters			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The Project would be designed and operated in line with the Guidance on policing at airports (National Policing Improvement Agency, 2011) as is the case with the existing airport.	
Gatwick Fire and Rescue Service	More information requested about Gatwick Fire and Rescue Service operations. Concerns raised that fire stations close to Gatwick could be called on more frequently for Gatwick 'domestic' incidents.	On completion of the project, Gatwick Fire and Rescue Service will still operate a domestic fire appliance. Gatwick's airport fire category will remain the same.	N
Emergency services	Requests for further information about potential for increased demand for humanitarian support, acute hospitals/local authorities and rest centres.	The demand for humanitarian support in response to a major incident would be dependent upon the nature of the event. The Project will increase passenger numbers and total aircraft movements (the latter of which is expected to increase by around 20% above the 2019 level by 2038). However, it would not introduce fundamentally new or "bigger" hazards and therefore, within the frequency with which major events occur, would not be expected to result in higher demands and pressures on acute hospitals/local authorities and rest centres.	N
Public Safety Zones	Comments that a new public safety zone will be required for the northern runway with consideration required of the types of land use potentially affected.	Public safety zones (PSZs) comprise an outer boundary which is Public Safety Controlled Zone (PSCZ) and an inner, higher risk zone, which is the Public Safety Restricted Zone (PSRZ). The length of the PSCZ for an aerodrome with greater than 45,000 commercial ATMs per year has been set at 1,500 metres from the landing threshold. The PSRZ has been set at 500 metres from the landing threshold (this is irrespective of ATM numbers). The width of the PSRZ at the landing threshold is 75 metres either side of the runway centre line. The width of the PSCZ at the landing threshold is 140 metres either side of the runway centre line. This standardized shape has replaced the previous risk-	N

Theme: Major accidents and disasters			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		based model profile. The ES will provide detail on the PSZ for the Northern Runway.	
Emergency runway	Requests for more details about emergency aircraft measures when the northern runway is out of operation.	Should circumstances arise where an aircraft could not use the runway(s) at Gatwick, for whatever reason, it would be diverted to an alternative airport. This action is consistent with standard airport operating procedure and governed by the CAA.	N

n. Law and order

Theme: Law and order			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Gatwick Police Station	Comments that Gatwick Police Station is nearing the end of its useable life and will not be fit for purpose with the proposed growth. Suggestions for construction of a new, larger, police station in conjunction with the Project.	A major upgrade of the current Police Station is included in Gatwick's 2023 Capital Investment Programme. This would include addressing some of the current challenges that the changing nature of policing the airport has created since its construction, for example, the need for a fit for purpose armoury.	N
Policing	Comments that growth will lead to higher incidents of crime/disorder and a greater risk of terrorism requiring additional police and police accommodation. Comments that additional traffic will increase demand for roads policing officers, vehicles, support, additional Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras and support systems, additional speed cameras and other appropriate traffic management systems.	<p>ES Appendix 5.3.4: Major Accidents and Disasters (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides an assessment of risks associated with the Project in respect of potential major accidents and disasters. Table 5.1.2 of ES Appendix 5.3.4: Major Accidents and Disasters (Doc Ref. 5.3) considers the issues of terrorism and malicious biological and chemical attacks (including sabotage and vandalism).</p> <p>The Project's implementation and the on-going operation of the airport post-implementation would not be expected to increase the prevalence of terrorist incidents and malicious biological and chemical attacks. The response to any incidents or known potential threats would be controlled through existing security arrangements at Gatwick Airport, co-ordinated with the relevant external security bodies (e.g., Centre for the protection of National Infrastructure and the Department of Transport).</p>	Y

o. Hazards

Theme: Hazards			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Location	Comments that the development is within the consultation zones of two Major Accident sites.	Advice provided by the HSE was that the development is within the consultation zones of two major accident hazard sites, i) Gatwick Airport storage and hydrant company (Shell Oil) - HSE ref 3692, and ii) Esso Petroleum - HSE ref 3694. Analysis of potential major accidents and disasters – addressed in the Safety and Environmental Risk Assessment – noted that these facilities are designated as Upper Tier COMAH (Control of Major Accident Hazards) sites and as such are highly regulated with established safe systems of work. The Project would not affect the current regulation nor result in significant increases in risk levels. No intolerable risks or significant effects have been identified.	Y
CARE facility	Concerns raised that the Option 1 location for the CARE facility is within a Major Accident consultation zone.	ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered (Doc Ref. 5.1) explains the reasonable alternatives considered by GAL during the optioneering and Project design process. In respect of the CARE facility, the location of the CARE facility within a Major Accidents consultation zone was considered as part of the assessment of Option 1 (Option K1). This is explained in Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its supporting ES Appendix 3.3.1: Options Appraisal Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3).	Y

p. Existing infrastructure

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Gas networks	Comments that protective provisions to minimise potential impact on integrity of gas distribution apparatus should be agreed in advance.	As part of the construction process, GAL will be implementing protective provisions and relocating utilities in accordance with ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref. 5.3). GAL will engage with utility suppliers to ensure that all measures are carried out effectively and efficiently.	N
Rail	Comments that a number of rail related legal and commercial agreements will need to be entered into with Network Rail and that existing rights will need to be retained.	GAL has initiated engagement with Network Rail and its legal and commercial teams in advance of the DCO submission and will continue those discussions with a view to agreeing the necessary rights and provisions.	Y

q. Construction

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Phasing and plan	Requests for more details around construction phasing and the duration of the construction.	The construction phasing and sequencing is explained within a number of DCO Application documents. In particular, the ES: Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report: Parts A and B (Doc Ref. 5.3) gives detailed information around construction sequencing and the duration of the construction. A series of illustrative phasing plans are included within the Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3).	N
	Support for the proposals for managing construction impacts, including proposals to minimise effects on local communities/highway users. Comments welcoming measures to manage dust and plans for community engagement before works commence on site. Others requesting more communication with local businesses and residents about the proposed works.	Noted. The measures for managing construction impacts, including proposals to minimise effect on local communities/highway users are identified in ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3).	N
	Concerns about the proposal to work 24 hours a day, seven days a week for the first five years.	It is not intended to work 24 hours a day, seven days a week for the first five years. The information on working hours is given in ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3).	N
Construction compounds	Concerns raised about impacts on access to Horley Business Park due to the surface access satellite contractor compound.	Access to Horley Business Park is not included within the highway design proposals as it is not a committed scheme at this stage.	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more detail around how the locations of construction compounds have been determined and full assessment of their impacts, particularly on sensitive receptors.	ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Appendix 3.3.1: Options Appraisal Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3) explains the reasonable alternatives considered by GAL during the optioneering and Project design process. This included the consideration of options for the airfield and highways construction compounds.	N
	The need for a surface access contractor compound on the greenfield land north of the A23 Spur rather than on brownfield land elsewhere was queried.	<p>ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Appendix 3.3.1: Options Appraisal Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3) explains the reasonable alternatives considered by GAL during the optioneering and Project design process. This included the consideration of options for the airfield and highways construction compounds.</p> <p>Alternative options for the surface access contractor compound location were accessed considering factors such as proximity to the construction site, availability of utilities and infrastructure, and impact on local communities and the environment. It was determined that locating the compound on land north of the A23 Spur was the optimum solution.</p> <p>This location provides better access to the site and allows for safer transportation of materials and equipment whilst minimising disruption to local communities. Additionally, measures will be taken to mitigate any potential impact on the surrounding environment. GAL will reinstate the land after completion of the works.</p>	N
Construction workforce	Comments that increased demand for construction workers could impact on the delivery of new housing and also result in increased labour costs.	ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) assesses the cumulative effects upon the socio-economic receptors that are likely to occur during the Project's construction within the local study area.	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Overall, it can be expected that the construction activity generated by the cumulative schemes is likely to overlap with the different construction periods of the Project. To some degree this would increase the construction activity taking place within the local study area. However, labour supply issues are not anticipated due to the general scale and mobility of the construction workforce.</p> <p>In addition, it should be noted that according to Construction Industrial Training Board (CITB) and Construction Skills Network (CSN), the 'Construction Industry Outlook to 2027' forecasts that the infrastructure construction workforce (which currently comprises 10% of South East's construction workforce) will be reduced by -1.5% per annum in the South East but in contrast, housing construction workforce is forecast to increase by 3.6% per annum to 2027.</p> <p>As such, impacts on housing delivery associated with the Project's construction are not likely as these schemes by their nature may require construction workforce comprising different skills and trades compared to the profile of workers likely to be demanded by the Project that relates to infrastructure construction workforce. For similar reasons, the labour costs of these schemes are not anticipated to be impacted by the Project.</p>	
	Comments that construction workers are likely to use their own transport rather than public transport and this should be assessed in the transport strategy.	An Outline Construction Worker Travel Plan (contained in Annex 2 to ES Appendix 5.3.2 CoCP (Doc Ref. 5.3)) relating to the different phases of delivering both airport and highway infrastructure has been submitted as part of the DCO application. The schedule for completing each component of the Project means that the number of construction workers would vary over time. The Construction Travel Plan will take account of peaks in activity but also encourage sustainable travel throughout the construction phase. This would	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>include measures already available to employees working at Gatwick Airport such as discounts on public transport.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) includes consideration of construction phases including assumptions regarding construction worker access and peak impacts. The Project proposals allow for a conservative approach to workforce mode share, and this has been assessed accordingly.</p>	
Construction Management Plan	Requests for local authority input into the Construction Management Plan, with queries raised about timings and construction routes.	The proposed construction approach, sequencing and impacts, construction methodology and programme was discussed with local authorities at topic working groups on 27/09/2022, 01/11/2022 and 31/01/2023.	N
	Concerns raised regarding the disruption and environmental impacts of construction activities.	The Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 5.1) ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3) sets out information and measures taken to reduce the disruption and environmental impacts of construction activities.	N
	Suggestions that new, sustainable and carbon efficient methods are used for construction.	As a part of our construction process, we will be identifying and utilising sustainable and carbon-efficient methods in accordance with ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3) and ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3). These guidelines provide clear direction on how to reduce carbon emissions and promote sustainable practices throughout the construction process.	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Construction - rail	Suggestions to reduce construction HGVs by exploring creation of a rail head in the sidings to south of the station into which bulk aggregate materials could be delivered.	This has been considered but is not practical. The Project does not propose to construct a rail head for the delivery of construction materials and removal of spoil.	N

r. Approach to EIA

Theme: Approach to EIA			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Environment Act 2021	Comments that the ES needs to take account of new environmental targets for air quality, biodiversity, water and waste, the requirement for NSIP schemes to include biodiversity net gain measures and the role of Local Nature Recovery Partnerships.	The Environment Act 2021 is referred to throughout the ES and all relevant targets taken into account where applicable in the ES.	N

s. Mitigation

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Outline Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (OESBS)	Comments that the OESBS should be delivered regardless of the Project. Also, that more detail is needed on initiatives, targets, objectives and implementation processes.	<p>Gatwick is developing two, parallel Employment, Skills and Business strategies (ESBS). The first will set out a ten-year trajectory, running alongside the Gatwick Decade of Change. The other is specific to the Project – actions that will only be delivered if Gatwick is able to proceed with the expansion plans. Some strands are common to both, but the differentiating factor is scale and volume, which would increase if Gatwick receives approval for the Project, facilitated by the investment that would follow.</p> <p>An update was provided at the Summer 2022 Consultation:</p> <p>We are developing our ESBS for the Project. The ESBS aims to maximise the opportunities that the Project presents for creating sustainable jobs, skills development, career progression and potential for business growth and increased productivity through the construction and operational phases. An attendant ESBS Implementation Plan will be developed in consultation with external stakeholders after DCO submission. It will describe how we would deliver the ESBS, setting out clear objectives, actions, milestones, outputs and outcomes.</p>	N
	Suggestions that the OESBS should include the opportunity for growth around the international visitor economy, which is a strategic priority for local partners.	<p>Local tourism impacts are included in the catalytic footprint of the project as part of the economic impact assessment.</p> <p>The draft Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) recognises that the Project constitutes a significant opportunity to promote future domestic and international trade and investment opportunities for the local, labour market and wider Six authorities' area. The ESBS Implementation Plan would describe how, in order to maximise this opportunity, GAL would collaborate with partners to define a clear regional 'identity', emphasising economic and business strengths</p>	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		and opportunities, showcasing the area for inward investors and contributing to efforts to retain business and economically active communities within the region. Additionally, the ESBS would envisage working with partners to develop a visitor generation strategy and set of associated targeted projects. These would consolidate and underpin the ongoing strategic direction of the Gateway Gatwick Partnership, promoting regional tourism.	
	Proposal to maximise the use of small local businesses is welcomed for boosting the local economy and reducing travel distances.	Noted.	N
Public Rights of Way	Comments that opportunities to improve the local PRoW network should be explored, including the possible upgrade of the Sussex Border Path to a bridleway. Also, that there should be a formal route between Sussex Border Path and the Museum Field area.	<p>The effects of the Project on the Sussex Border Path are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The Public Rights of Way Management Strategy (ES Appendix 19.8.1 – Doc Ref. 5.3) contains the proposed management measures for the Sussex Border Path during the construction and operation of the Project.</p> <p>There would be pedestrian link created as part of the Project from the existing permissive path that links from the Sussex Border path into the Museum Field area.</p>	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Air quality	Comments that there should be a greater commitment towards mitigation/enhancement measures for air quality to reflect the increase in airport emissions associated with the Project. Requests for more detail around provision of operational mitigation that reflects the damage cost.	The assessment in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1.) details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice and will reduce impacts, even at locations where the current legislated standards are not predicted to be exceeded.	Y
	Suggestions that monitoring of ultrafine particles (UFPs) in the vicinity of the airport should be funded as part of the Project.	Ultrafine particulate matter (UFP) has been taken into consideration in the health assessment ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref.5.1). A commitment to engage with UK wide airport UFP monitoring studies has been included in the assessment in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1).	Y
Carbon emissions	Suggestions that the Project should include an emissions reduction plan setting out a trajectory to net zero. Where the agreed emissions reduction trajectory is not met, it should be a condition of that operations are reduced until back in line with commitments.	A Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) is submitted as part of the NRP. It includes a commitment to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030 for Scopes 1 and 2. The CAP is based on a series of outcomes, proposed to be legally committed to by Gatwick through the DCO. As explained in the CAP, GAL will continue to publish its third-party independently verified carbon footprint and review progress against the carbon targets every five years, in line with UK carbon budgets and Jet Zero targets. As part of this, GAL expects that the Local Authorities and other stakeholders will review the progress reports and would the right of appeal to the Secretary of State if there are concerns about the level of progress being made relative to the targets, or the updates to the targets themselves.	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Socio-economics	Queries raised about how economic outcomes associated with the Project will be monitored.	The monitoring, recording and evaluation framework will be designed and implemented in order to measure progress and achievement of outcomes committed through the Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) as set down in ES Appendix 17.8.1: Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref 5.3).	N
	Requests for financial contribution to local authorities for provision of community infrastructure, transport and affordable housing.	The Application is accompanied by draft Heads of Terms to the s106 (set out in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1)). The DCO and s106 will be developed alongside the LPAs during the course of the Pre-Examination and Examination stages, alongside the Statements of Common Ground process. The s106 will secure a key list of mitigation requirements.	Y
	Suggestions that business disruption could be mitigated with provision of high-quality walking and cycling superhighways in the Gatwick/ Manor Royal area.	<p>The findings of the Traffic and Transport, Noise and Vibration and Air Quality assessments (together with other topics) have been considered cumulatively to identify the level of impact to the surrounding business and residents during construction and operation. Based on the evidence the impacts to businesses across the various assessment periods have been assessed either minor adverse or moderate adverse.</p> <p>The highway works proposals include enhancements to the walking and cycling infrastructure in the areas of Longbridge Roundabout, Riverside Garden Park, North Terminal and South Terminal, including connections between them.</p>	N
Community Fund	Suggestions that the baseline funding for community initiatives (annual lump sum currently c. £230k) should be calculated using a parameter such as passenger numbers or number of air traffic movements. Comments that a	The Application is accompanied by draft Heads of Terms to the s106 (set out in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1)). The DCO and s106 will be developed alongside the LAs during the course of the Pre-Examination and Examination stages, alongside the Statements of Common Ground process.	Y

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	special community fund be created for Charlwood and Hookwood to recognise that their proximity to the airport.	The s106 will secure a key list of mitigation requirements and will include GAL's commitments to community funding in acknowledgement of current commitments in the May 2022 Section 106 Agreement which expires in December 2024 and the mitigation required by the NRP.	
Construction	Requests for more detail around mitigation of construction traffic impacts.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) has considered the construction periods as part of the assessment of the effects of the Project. This includes the impacts of construction materials and workforce traffic movements. The mitigation measures for construction traffic are described in Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Comments that more detail around management, monitoring and mitigation of impacts should be included in the draft code of practice offered as part of the Construction Noise Mitigation appendix.	Details of construction noise mitigation, monitoring and management are included in ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that mitigation measures need to be agreed for impacts on business and commuters using the strategic road network.	The modelling that we have used for the assessment has allowed us to identify the likely effects of the Project on road users. The assessment includes consideration of the effects on driver delay across the network, by considering the operation of junctions within the road network. The assessment indicates that in the majority of cases, the effects of the Project would be negligible or minor adverse. Locations where a moderate adverse effect has been identified have been investigated in further detail to determine whether mitigation is required.	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The approach to highway mitigation takes account of future growth in non-airport traffic including business and commuter trips along the highway networks serving the airport. The proposed highway mitigation provides journey time and safety benefits on the affected parts of the strategic road network compared to the Future Baseline.	
Light pollution	Comments that mitigation measures to combat light pollution on the South Downs National Park (SDNP) should be included.	Any increase in lighting at Gatwick Airport would not affect the South Downs National Park (SDNP). The only possible effect that could be experienced is due to visible lights on overflying aircraft. The increase in aircraft numbers is defined above. The only detectable night time cumulative effects would be as a result of other Gatwick overflying aircraft or other consented or planned development within the SDNP or its setting. Any change to the level of lighting at Gatwick Airport will not be relevant to cumulative night time effects on the SDNP.	N
Emissions	Comments that mitigation measures proposed for aircraft emissions are reliant on new technologies but there is no assessment of those technologies and that the PINS scoping response requires these to be “demonstrably secured”.	<p>An update was included in the Summer 2022 Consultation:</p> <p>To a large extent, emissions from aircraft are outside our control but Gatwick has strongly supported the Government’s commitment to net zero aviation and undertaken to play our part in enabling this to become a practical reality as soon as possible. Responses to our Autumn 2021 Consultation, however, included concerns that our plans for growth at Gatwick were inconsistent with a net zero future.</p> <p>The compatibility of forecast aviation growth with carbon commitments is addressed in the Government’s Jet Zero consultation and has been elaborated in further technical documents published this year by the Government which provide more background.</p>	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>The Jet Zero consultation provides four different trajectories or scenarios through which aviation forecasts can be met at the same time as achieving net zero by 2050. These involve different combinations of increased aircraft and operational efficiency, the development of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF), the development of zero emission flights through electric or hydrogen powered flight and the use of carbon trading markets or greenhouse gas removal technologies. The Government is investing in the development of each mitigation option but the Jet Zero consultation makes clear that its focus is on achieving net zero, while being flexible over the precise pathway to achieve it. To ensure that net zero is achieved, the Government will closely monitor the carbon trajectory of aviation and intervene to ensure that its absolute commitment is met.</p> <p>Whilst some may doubt the success of initiatives such as SAF or increased aircraft efficiency, it is important to recognise that the carbon and aviation forecasts set out above are the Government’s forecasts. Even more importantly, the Government has a binding legal duty to meet its climate change commitments and will be obliged to monitor and take further measures to ensure their successful delivery.</p> <p>The implications of this are profound. In order for the trajectory to net zero to be met, Government will need to actively review progress and take such action as is necessary. It cannot be known at this stage what, if any, further action may be necessary and so, for the purposes of Gatwick’s NRP DCO application, it is appropriate to assess the environmental implications of our full forecast growth – particularly as those forecasts are compatible with the forecasts that have informed the Government’s Jet Zero consultation.</p> <p>The Gatwick Airport Conditions of Use contain a NOx emissions charge and a carbon charge to incentivise airlines to use more sustainable and cleaner fleets. The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref.</p>	

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		5.3)) sets out outcomes that GAL is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources, including aviation emissions. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the CAP.	
	Suggestions that engine efficiency standards in aircraft serving the airport could be mandated as part of the Project. Also, that airlines could be required to meet minimum load factors and set a higher than industry standard for use of sustainable aviation fuel.	The Gatwick Airport Conditions of Use contain a NOx emissions charge and a carbon charge to incentivise airlines to use more sustainable and cleaner fleets. The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2) (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources, including aviation emissions. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the CAP, some of which relate to Sustainable Aviation Fuel.	N
	Comments that mitigation be provided for any additional social and environmental impacts, including on health and well-being, air quality and carbon reduction targets.	The Mitigation Route Map sets out what mitigation is required by the NPR based on a topic-by-topic theme and based on the environmental assessment that have been carried out as part of the Environmental Statement.	N
Night flights	Support for use of the northern runway to be limited to the period 06:00 – 23:00 hours.	Noted.	N
Aircraft noise	Comments that the Project should mitigate any increase in aircraft noise levels or noise distribution pattern. Also, requests for a review of the thresholds of qualifying grants for mitigation and compensation.	The Project does not require any change to flight paths, so we do not expect communities with no noise at present to be exposed to aircraft noise. GAL has considered the thresholds for noise mitigation carefully and proposed to offer noise insulation at levels below the DfT guidance, i.e. making the scheme more generous than others. The two-zone scheme also provides a higher level of mitigation to these worst affected which GAL feels is appropriate. We welcome	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		views on the details of this scheme and will work with stakeholders to develop those details including through discussions at the Noise Topic Group.	
	Comments that the noise envelope and insulation scheme should be extended further east and that the outer zone should align fully with the outer extent of the 51dB noise contour. Requests for closer engagement with local communities on design of noise mitigation measures.	<p>An update was provided at the Summer 2022 Consultation:</p> <p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we have been progressing work with the noise and vibration impact assessment, including construction and ground noise modelling and mitigation, developing the noise insulation scheme, and working with local authorities to address noise-related responses to the consultation.</p> <p>We formed a Noise Envelope Group with the aim of engaging with stakeholders to further explore the Noise Envelope proposal set out in the Autumn 2021 Consultation. The first meeting of this Group took place in May 2022. The Group met 13 times in 2022 and focused discussions on the themes identified in the consultation feedback to support the creation of a feasible, clearly defined, measurable and enforceable noise envelope proposal.</p> <p>The engagement structure was based upon the existing Noise Management Board (NMB), in particular utilising the memberships of the NMB Community Forum (NCF) and NMB Delivery Groups (NDG) to form sub-groups. Input will also be sought from airlines, air traffic control, Airport Coordination Ltd, the DfT, Environmental Health Practitioners for Local Authorities, and other industry experts and specialists as appropriate.</p>	N
	Requests for more information about the homeowners assisted moving scheme and noise insulation scheme. Also, suggestions for triple glazing.	In order to offer homeowners the option to move from the areas most affected by the highest noise levels, home owners within the Leq, 16-hour 66 dB noise contour with the Project in operation would be offered a package to assist them in moving. The details are set out in ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>The current Gatwick NIS is based on a future Leq, 16-hour 60 dB contour forecast in 2014, with 15 km extensions from under the runway centrelines, and adjusted to accommodate various residential areas. There are about 2,000 homes within this area of which about 1,120 have taken up the scheme (November 2022). Within this zone residents are entitled to £4,300 towards acoustic glazing and doors. Under the existing Noise Action Plan commitments, GAL has recently reviewed the scheme which resulted in an enhanced offer within the same zone.</p> <p>An enhanced NIS would be introduced for the Project to replace the current scheme and to address expected increases in air noise, and to offer additional mitigation for the housing already worst affected by noise, comprising an Inner Zone and an Outer Zone.</p> <p>The new Inner Zone would offer the highest level of noise insulation sufficient to avoid noise impacts indoors due to levels above the SOAEL (Leq, 16 hour 63 dB and Leq, 8-hour 55 dB). Residential properties within the Inner Zone would be offered noise insulation in the form of replacement acoustic glazing or internal secondary glazing to all windows, acoustic ventilators and blinds to noise sensitive rooms (bedrooms, sitting rooms, dining rooms and studies), and replacement doors to noise sensitive rooms if necessary. Additionally, the offer would include acoustic upgrading of bedroom ceilings where practicable if they are found to be allowing more noise intrusion than the closed acoustic glazing provided. Overall properties in this new Inner Zone would receive a significantly improved level of noise mitigation. A new NIS Outer Zone would be created for homes within the forecast Leq, 16-hour 54 dB daytime noise contour in 2032. This noise level was chosen in view of the Government consultation document Aviation 2050 (Department for Transport, 2018b) and best practice at UK airports.</p>	

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>This zone would be extended where necessary (e.g., along the extended runway centreline to the west) to ensure it includes all properties within the current scheme. Approximately 3,300 homes are predicted to be within this zone (and outside the Inner Zone). In this zone noise levels are modelled below SOAEL and residents would be offered acoustic ventilators to noise sensitive rooms. This would allow windows to remain closed with ventilation, which, with modern double-glazed windows, would increase the sound attenuation of the window by more than 10 dB. For properties with older single glazed windows with poor acoustic performance, double glazed windows would be offered to noise sensitive rooms in addition to ventilators to ensure equivalent levels of protection.</p> <p>A schools NIS is proposed for all schools with noise sensitive teaching spaces within the forecast 2032 Leq, 16-hour 51 dB noise contour. Where schools are concerned that aircraft noise could be affecting teaching, each classroom area would be surveyed to assess the effects of all types of noise including local road traffic. If noise insulation measures, such as improved glazing and acoustic air ventilation to reduce aircraft noise, would be practicable to implement, and would significantly improve the overall teaching conditions, then GAL would work with the school to deliver a suitable noise insulation package.</p>	
Surface Access Strategy	Comments that mode share targets will not be met, so the proposed surface access mitigation is not appropriate, too focused on vehicles rather than sustainable modes, and not aligned with local authority plans for reducing transport carbon emissions. Comments	As part of the DCO application we are setting out our Surface Access Commitments (SACs) (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) . As part of the SACs, we are committing to achieving a certain level of sustainable transport mode share for air passengers and staff. We are also setting out the measures which we expect to be required to deliver those mode shares. We also include an approach to monitoring surface access	Y

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	that any adverse traffic and surface access impacts (forecasting, transport assessment methodology, modal shift) should be mitigated.	<p>outcomes to determine whether the mode shares are achieved and if they are not, a process to add to or alter the interventions if necessary.</p> <p>The SACs will, in due course, inform a future ASAS which will describe in more detail the approach to securing, funding and delivering the interventions that are needed to achieve the committed mode shares.</p> <p>Our assessment is based on the committed mode shares in the SACs and the associated measures to achieve them. In discussion with stakeholders, we have also undertaken sensitivity tests to assist in understanding the implications of both a higher and a lower sustainable mode share being achieved.</p> <p>It is important to note that we have not developed our highway mitigation to encourage people to drive to the airport. Our SACs demonstrate our commitment to increasing the proportion of trips made by public transport and other sustainable transport modes. The highway improvements are necessary to ensure the efficient and safe movement of airport and non-airport traffic both of which are expected to grow in volume over the next 25 years. Accordingly, we have made sure that our proposals provide necessary capacity for growth, ensure the smooth flow of traffic between Crawley and Horley and deliver improved connections between the M23 motorway and the Airport.</p>	
Health and wellbeing	Requests for more detail around mitigation measures to prevent an increase in detrimental health outcomes for residents. Comments that health specific monitoring should be included and a Monitoring Strategy embedded in mitigation.	The ES includes additional mitigation detail across its assessments that promote improved health outcomes and improved health protection. These measures are taken into account by ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) (which is based on the residual effect conclusions of those input assessments), and as appropriate and proportionate sets out further mitigation measures. Monitoring should be proportionate and is included where appropriate. The Project takes a joined-up approach to monitoring and therefore monitoring	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		relevant to health is spread across the ES. The most appropriate methods for monitoring often relate to determinants of health, such as air quality or noise levels, rather than to population health outcomes. For example, ES Chapter 14 describes the mitigation measures for air noise, including the Noise Insulation Scheme.	
	Comments suggesting GAL should commit to limiting the airport to a two-runway operation and to agreeing a voluntary cap on passenger throughput.	In light of the Government's support for the third runway at Heathrow, GAL confirmed it was not actively pursuing R2 in the Gatwick Master Plan, July 2019, but considers it to be in the national interest for land to continue to be safeguarded to allow for a new runway to be constructed to the south of the airport, if required in the future. As part of the control measures to limit the likely environmental effects to those assessed in the Environmental Statement, GAL is proposing a cap on annual air transport movements.	N
	Comments that any additional social and environmental impacts, including on health and well-being, air quality and carbon reduction targets should be mitigated. Also, suggestions for opportunities to improve the health and quality of life of local communities adversely affected by noise should be explored and monitoring included.	The Mitigation Route Map at ES Appendix 5.2.3: Mitigation Route Map (Doc Ref. 5.3) sets out what mitigation is required by the NPR based on a topic-by-topic theme and based on the environmental assessment that have been carried out as part of the Environmental Statement.	N
Homes and local infrastructure	Comments that any increase in the need for new homes and supporting infrastructure due to the additional workforce should be mitigated.	ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note (Doc Ref. 5.3) sets out the quantum of the construction workforce anticipated aligned with the Buildability Report as set out in ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report (Doc Ref. 5.3) This data has then been	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that mitigation is inadequate to address impacts and should include affordable housing as well as contribute to local infrastructure.	<p>considered by the ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) to assess the potential impact of this temporary workforce in the relevant housing market areas. Section 17.9 of ES Chapter 17.9; Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) also assesses the potential change in the availability of housing (temporary accommodation, assumed to relate to the demand for private rented accommodation) relating to the introduction of this temporary construction workforce in the LSA, FEMA and LMA.</p> <p>As discussed within ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) the gravity model considers those non-home-based construction workers who would require temporary accommodation within the relevant study areas (see also ES Appendix 17.6.1 Socio-Economic Data Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3), Table 3.1.1 Scenario 1). In reality, to reduce the need for locally based accommodation a Travel Plan (as part of the Code of Construction Practice ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 5.3)) will be developed to encourage workers to travel from their permanent place of residence to work through initiatives such as subsidised travel. However, in order to test the maximum housing impact, for the purposes of this part of the assessment, Scenario 1 has been considered which assumes that 80% of workers will be home-based (ie permanently resident), and a maximum of 20% will be non-home-based (NHB) (i.e., requiring temporary accommodation). The details of these figures are presented in ES Appendix 17.6.1 Socio-Economic Data Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3) Table 3.1.1 Scenario 1 and ES Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) Table 6.1.1.</p>	
Road noise	Suggestions that road noise impacts on residences in the NIAs should be	Noted. This was considered in consultation with National Highways.	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	mitigated. Others supporting the proposed insulation and acoustic barrier measures.		
	Comments that agreements for maintenance of highway noise mitigations are needed.	Noted.	N
Woodland	Suggestions for compensatory broad leaved woodland planting in advance to reduce the long-term impact of woodland loss.	<p>Native woodland species mixes are proposed as part of the mitigation and enhancement strategy for the Project to compensate for any loss of woodland to provide appropriate green infrastructure for the Project. Details of locations of planting, species mixes and management techniques are included in ES Appendix 8.8.1: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>Overall, there will be a net increase in woodland habitats within and around Gatwick Airport as a result of the Project.</p>	N
Biodiversity	Comments that mitigation proposals are currently unclear and lack the required level of detail to assess whether they are sufficient. Also, that more should be done to enhance biodiversity including beyond the site boundary and that biodiversity net gain should be addressed. Suggestions that Biodiversity Opportunity Areas should inform ecological and mitigation plans.	<p>Update provided at Summer 2022 Consultation:</p> <p>Responses to the Autumn 2021 Consultation raised matters relating to a number of different issues with respect to ecology. This included, among others, how the NRP would address Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), various survey efforts and how zones of influence had been defined, consultation with stakeholders, mitigation design and approach to Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA).</p> <p>Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the Environment Act was granted Royal Assent (in November 2021). The Act sets out the requirement for all development, including NSIPs, to deliver quantifiable BNG. However, the</p>	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>application of BNG to the NSIP regime (and therefore to the Project's DCO application) is subject to further consultation and secondary legislation, the detail and timing of which is still to be confirmed. The Project's proposed approach to BNG is being discussed with key stakeholders. We will ensure that the DCO application includes a high-quality approach to mitigating ecological effects and enhancing biodiversity, whilst meeting all legal and policy requirements.</p> <p>The zone of influence (ZoI) for the project was agreed with Natural England during consultation and was defined by considering where impacts could potentially occur. Where this was outside of the project boundary (such as for bats), appropriate survey work was completed in those areas. As the project has evolved, the ZoI has changed and, therefore, requirements for further surveys have arisen to ensure that any potential impacts are identified. To that end, we are undertaking further survey work, where necessary, during 2022.</p> <p>We have progressed further consultation via a Biodiversity Working Group comprising stakeholders such as the Wildlife Trusts, Natural England and other interest groups. This has helped to ensure that their views are taken into consideration with respect to habitat design and associated mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation design has been developed as the project evolves especially with respect to the highways design. Areas of new habitat creation include the new open space within Car Park B, Museum Field and land to the south of Church Meadows. Details are set out in ES Appendix 8.8.1: Outline Landscape and Ecology Masterplan (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	
Tranquillity	More information requested to understand mitigation measures to reduce effects on the tranquillity of	The special qualities experienced by people living within and visiting the nationally designated landscapes within the study area include distant scenic views and relative tranquillity and dark skies. Whilst these special qualities would	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	designated landscapes. Comments that options for monitoring should also be included.	<p>be affected to some extent as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft, they would still be positive qualities that would be perceived.</p> <p>No significant impacts have been identified within section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) for the special qualities of AONB's or national parks, views from them as a result of the Gatwick NRP and no significant effects on the perception of tranquillity as a result of an increase in overflying aircraft.</p> <p>In terms of noise emission levels, the future baseline would include changes in the aircraft fleet to quieter types therefore whilst numbers of overflights would increase this adverse effect on the perception of tranquillity would be partially offset by some reduction in potential noise levels. It is predicted that in 2032 there would be a reduction in the area of landscape and townscape affected by aircraft noise and, therefore, the number of residents affected living in the affected area.</p>	
Woodland impacts	Concerns raised about impacts on the Horleyland Wood and Lower Picketts Wood areas of ancient woodland. Suggestions that mitigation measures including buffering are required to ensure their protection.	<p>Four areas of ancient woodland are present immediately adjacent to the Project site boundary: Horleyland Wood; Lower Picketts Wood; Brockley Wood and a section of woodland along the northwest side of the River Mole.</p> <p>A further two areas are located within 120m to the northeast; The Roughs and Bridges Wood and one area, Huntsgreen Wood, is located 75 metres south of the Project boundary. The potential impacts from contamination from pollution events and the measures to protect Horleyland Wood, The Roughs and Bridges Wood are described in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1) Section 9.9 and would also be relevant to Lower Picketts Wood to the east which is located 70m south of Pentagon Field.</p>	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>The mitigation measures designed into the Project would ensure a 70-metre buffer comprising broadleaved plantation woodland was retained and protected along the boundary of the ancient woodland. This would remove the risk of soil compaction within the root protection zone of trees within Lower Picketts Wood and would intercept airborne dust before it reached the ancient woodland. Dust suppression methods would also be used to reduce airborne dust in the first instance and reduce the likelihood of it reaching the ancient woodland.</p> <p>Construction works associated with creating the diversion of the River Mole corridor would be undertaken in proximity (approximately 30m) to Brockley Wood, resulting in the loss of some of the habitats to the south of it, comprising marshy grassland and semi-natural broadleaved woodland. However, species-rich grassland would be reinstated upon completion of the diversion works. The loss of a strip of semi-natural broadleaved woodland that connects to the ancient woodland would result in a small reduction in the overall habitat resource in the vicinity but would not reduce connectivity due to the airfield already creating a barrier to further areas of woodland to the south.</p> <p>A minimum 15-metre buffer would be provided around this area which would include a 10-metre strip of semi-natural broadleaved woodland to ensure it was protected from accidental damage. The security fencing would be at least 15 metres from the woodland edge, thereby ensuring there could be no access by personnel and machinery and that no materials would be stored within or adjacent to it. This would also ensure root protection areas were protected.</p>	
River Mole and Gatwick Stream	Comments that improvements to the downstream section of the River Mole should be included in the mitigation proposals. Suggestions that the Project provides an opportunity to	<p>Update provided at the Summer 2022 Consultation:</p> <p>We have also engaged further with the Environment Agency, to review options for reducing the effects of extending the existing runway culvert on the River</p>	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	enhance degraded floodplain habitat of the Mole and Gatwick Stream and improve resilience of these watercourses.	Mole and making improvements to benefit the river upstream and downstream of the airport.	
Water quality	Comments that mitigation is needed for impacts on water quality from road run off e.g., attenuation ponds and downstream defenders.	<p>The Autumn 2021 Consultation explained how the existing airport drains to local watercourses via balancing ponds and attenuation lagoons, and that a flood risk mitigation strategy would be required to meet planning requirements and to ensure no increase in the risk of off-site flooding due to the Project. We also identified a series of interventions (for example new flood compensation areas) which would store water in flood conditions. The sizing of the interventions was based on detailed computer modelling of flood events using climate change allowances published by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>In July 2021, the Environment Agency updated its climate change allowance guidance for peak river flows so that it was specific to the river catchment where development was taking place.</p> <p>This had the effect of reducing the required climate change allowance on the River Mole catchment for the 1% (1 in 100) Annual Exceedance Probability event from 35% to 20%. It was too late to take this change into account in the modelling reported in the PEIR, however, we have since reviewed the flood risk strategy to update it in accordance with the reduction in required allowances. We have also completed further detailed modelling of the airport drainage network, water storage and pollution treatment infrastructure. This modelling has demonstrated that some of the proposed flood compensation areas can be reduced in size, and two can be removed entirely, with no increase in off-site flood risk.</p>	Y

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>This has resulted in the following changes to the infrastructure required from that discussed in the PEIR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Museum Field and Car Park X flood compensation areas (FCAs) would be reduced in size. ▪ The proposed flood compensation area to the south of Crawley Sewage Treatment Works, and the small area to the east of Museum Field are no longer required. ▪ Surface water drainage Pond A and the extension to Dog Kennel Pond are no longer required. ▪ A small treatment works to clean de-icer contaminated runoff is now proposed to the east of the Crawley Sewage Treatment works as part of an overall strategy to reduce flood risk on the airport and improve water quality. <p>We have also engaged further with the Environment Agency, to review options for reducing the effects of extending the existing runway culvert on the River Mole and making improvements to benefit the river upstream and downstream of the airport. A metal grid would now be installed over the newly culverted section of the River Mole to allow daylight to reach the water surface and we would install a fish pass on the weir at the entrance to the culvert on the south side of the airport to improve fish passage upstream.</p>	
Sustainable transport	Suggestions for a significant increase in the amount of public transport proposed as part of the Project. Measures to improve public transport and increase more sustainable transport are all supported, including use of zero	<p>GAL actively engages with relevant stakeholders to highlight the priorities for sustainable access to Gatwick, to explore opportunities for improvements and discuss how new provision can be supported financially or in other ways.</p> <p>For the DCO application GAL has identified measures to enhance regional coach services and continue to support enhancements to local bus services which we are pursuing with operators even without the Project. The Decade of</p>	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	emissions vehicles where cars are the only option.	Change includes a commitment to increase the proportion of journeys to and from the airport by sustainable modes or by zero or ultra-low emission vehicles. GAL is introducing more on-airport facilities to support the use of electric vehicles and further initiatives are proposed as part of the Carbon Action Plan (see ES Appendix 5.4.2 Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) for the Project.	
	Suggestions that use of electric vehicles is encouraged and a non-profit electric vehicle bus scheme is established.	Noted.	N
R2	Suggestions that GAL should commit to not pursuing proposals for a second runway.	In light of the Government's support for the third runway at Heathrow, GAL confirmed it was not actively pursuing R2 in the Gatwick Master Plan, July 2019, but considers it to be in the national interest for land to continue to be safeguarded to allow for a new runway to be constructed to the south of the airport, if required in the future.	N
	Comments that the proposed mitigation is limited compared to R2 and that GAL should be contributing towards social and community infrastructure within the study area.	The R2 project is a very different and larger project than the NRP. Consequently, the mitigation for NRP will be different. The Mitigation Route Map (see ES Appendix 5.2.3: Mitigation Route Map (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out what mitigation is required by the NPR based on a topic-by-topic theme and based on the environmental assessment that have been carried out as part of the Environmental Statement.	N
Communities	Requests for greater focus on supporting local residents impacted by the Project, whether through	A greater focus on supporting local residents impacted by the Project will be undertaken post DCO Examination once it has been confirmed and it has been identified those that benefit from compensation or are subject to compulsory acquisition. All statutory notices regarding compensation and compulsory	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	compensation or compulsory purchase orders.	acquisition will be served in accordance with the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, Land Compensation Act 1973 and Planning Act 2008. The statutory notices will provide contact details for Gatwick Airport Limited to discuss these statutory notices in further detail if required.	

t. Airspace and overflights

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overflights	Comments that rural communities will experience greater levels of disruption due to the frequency of overflying.	The assessment of noise impacts in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) is in line with current guidance and policies and lays out mitigation in accordance with that guidance in section 14.8. Careful consideration has been given to compliance with available guidance and to policy and to exceed the minimum requirements where practicable, such as the outer zone of the aircraft noise insulation scheme. These measures will be further discussed in the Noise Topic Group in consultation with local authority environmental health officers to ensure they are well defined for the DCO application.	N
	Concerns raised that the impacts of more aircraft on flight paths over the Surrey AONB are downplayed in the PEIR.	<p>Relevant national, county and district landscape character assessments were reviewed. Particular attention has been paid in ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resource (Doc Ref. 5.1) to the key landscape characteristics of the relevant landscape types/character areas and special qualities of the High Weald AONB, Surrey Hills AONB, Kent Downs AONB and South Downs National Park. Valued landscape resources have been identified at national and local levels.</p> <p>Large areas of the Surrey Hills AONB are overflowed by Gatwick aircraft and aircraft from other airports. A broad area of the designated landscape south of the settlements of Godalming to Haslemere is overflowed by 1 to 10 flights a day and an area east of Godalming to Dorking is generally overflowed by 1 to 10 or 11 to 50 flights a day. Some of these areas and communities would experience no increase in aircraft whilst others are anticipated to experience an increase of between 1 and 5 flights a day. A small area of the AONB is overflowed by 100 to 200 flights a day. In this location an increase in the future baseline situation of between 15 and 20% of flights is anticipated to occur. These areas include popular and distinctive locations and local communities. People of high sensitivity using open rural spaces in the AONB such as Leith Hill and at Witley</p>	N

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		and Milford Commons would experience a negligible magnitude of change and no more than minor adverse effects, which would not be significant.	
	Comments that property values will be affected by the increase in frequency of overflights.	GAL recognises that the Project could give rise to effects on property prices (both negative and positive). In respect of any loss in value of property, Part 1 of The Land Compensation Act 1973 (LCA) makes statutory provision for payment of compensation to qualifying property owners of properties that are depreciated in value as a result of the physical effects – noise, smoke, fumes etc.– of the use of development works such as an airport expansion. Therefore, if there were to be any negative effects on property prices, the provisions of the LCA would apply and provide for payment of compensation to fully cover any loss in value. Furthermore, the National Planning Practice Guidance advises that in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests such as the impact of a development on the value of neighbouring property could not be a material planning consideration.	N
	Concerns raised about the overflight mapping, including its accuracy and reliability, the level of detail included, and the approach adopted. Queries raised about the reasons for no departure overflights being shown in East Sussex.	Table 14.7.1 of the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) gives the numbers of aircraft forecast with and without the project, day and night, in the different assessment periods used to assess noise and overflight impacts. Air noise has been modelled in all areas where noise levels exceed the threshold noise levels used in the assessment, as presented in the various noise contour figures. The methodology and resolution of the overflight analysis has been improved to reduce the mapping grid size from 3.2 to 1km in the ES.	N
Airspace changes	More information requested about the relationship between the Project and the airspace modernisation programme. Queries raised about the intention to utilise Route 9 (WIZAD)	The air noise assessment assumes the routing of aircraft to and from the main runway and from the northern runway would remain as it is today. This is because the Project can operate using these routes without need for an airspace change process.	N

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	to meet increased Air Traffic Movements and how these interact with the changes to airspace.	<p>A shift of 8% of traffic onto the WIZAD (Route 9) westerly standard instrument departure route (on which aircraft departing west turn south between Crawley and Horsham) is required to help accommodate increased air traffic growth in the London area to the north, that is expected to have occurred in the baseline situation by 2032.</p> <p>When the likely outcome of the FASI-South airspace is known then the noise impacts of that change will be assessed as part of that process, following the relevant guidance.</p>	

u. Water and flood risk

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Flood Risk Assessment	Comments that updated climate change allowances data should be used. Also, that the higher central climate change allowances are used as the minimum against which to assess the development as it contains essential infrastructure.	The assessment of flood risk impacts reported in ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3) follows Environment Agency guidance on climate change allowances which is based on UKCP18, therefore the Higher Central allowance has been adopted for fluvial flood risk.	Y
	Comments that the Project should be considered as sensitive to flood risk as it proposed essential infrastructure which should remain operational in time of flood.	The Project is considered to be essential infrastructure as stated in the FRA. The airport is at risk of flooding under the existing and with-project scenarios. The Flood Resilience Statement sets out how Gatwick would respond to a flood event to ensure the safety of passengers and staff.	N
Flood mitigation	Comments suggesting coordination of the Project and West of Ifield flood mitigation strategies.	The cumulative impact assessment included within Section 11.11 of ES Chapter 11: Water Environment (Doc Ref 5.1) considers the synergy between both developments. The West of Ifield development would be expected to provide its own mitigation to ensure no increase in flood risk to other parties.	N
	Suggestions that a Flood Threat Plan should form part of the proposals for mitigation and management of flooding.	A Flood Resilience Statement (referred to previously as a Flood Threat Plan in the PEIR) has been developed that sets out how Gatwick would respond to a flood event and ensure the safety of passengers and staff.	N
	Comments that a Management Plan for maintenance of the flood mitigation measures should be provided.	Maintenance plans for the flood mitigation measures would be produced as part of the detailed design for the Project.	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that the mitigation proposals should adopt an adaptive approach to allow for predicted shifts due to climate change.	The proposed scheme includes mitigation for potential effects including an allowance for climate change based on Environment Agency guidance to meet national planning policy for the design life of the project. Furthermore, sensitivity analysis has been undertaken to understand the implications of more extreme climate change scenarios.	N
	Comments that the full fluvial and pluvial flood risk mitigation strategy is needed.	The mitigation strategy is set out in the FRA and considers the interaction of the Project with all sources of flood risk.	N
	Comments that the capacity of the floodplain should be maintained throughout construction. Requests made for a Construction Flood Management Plan.	<p>The approach to the construction of the floodplain compensation areas will be set out in the Flood Compensation Delivery Plan that would be developed to support post-DCO consenting requirements as a DCO Requirement.</p> <p>The floodplain compensation areas and syphons will be constructed in advance of loss of floodplain as a result of the proposed scheme to ensure no net increase in flood risk offsite during construction.</p>	N
Surface water	<p>Concerns raised that run-off and associated contamination could increase due to surface access works, potential encroachment upon floodplains, and the increase in hard surfacing.</p> <p>Requests for more information about the additional storage proposed under Car Park Y, the modelling of de-icer use, and</p>	<p>The highways improvements surface water drainage strategy, see ES Appendix 11.9.6 Annex 1 (Doc Ref 5.3) includes a number of measures to intercept, store, attenuate and treat runoff from the carriageway prior to discharge to receiving watercourses. These measures include SuDS elements such as ponds and swales combined with tanks and oversized pipes.</p> <p>Floodplain encroachment is mitigated through the provision of two floodplain compensation areas on the River Mole at Museum Field and Crawler's Brook at Car Park X and the provision of syphons in the north-west noise mitigation feature and airfield taxiways.</p>	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>minimisation of road run off on the River Mole and its tributaries.</p>	<p>A small treatment works to clean de-icer contaminated runoff is now proposed to the east of the Crawley Sewage Treatment works as part of an overall strategy to reduce flood risk on the airport and improve water quality.</p> <p>We have also engaged further with the Environment Agency, to review options for reducing the effects of extending the existing runway culvert on the River Mole and making improvements to benefit the river upstream and downstream of the airport. A metal grid would now be installed over the newly culverted section of the River Mole to allow daylight to reach the water surface.</p> <p>To enhance aquatic ecology, we would install a fish pass on the weir at the entrance to the culvert on the south side of the airport to improve fish passage upstream and a weir would be installed on the upstream inlet to the culvert to concentrate flows during low flow periods to aid fish passage.</p> <p>These mitigation and enhancement measures are summarised in ES Chapter 11: Water Environment (Doc Ref 5.1) Section 11.8.</p>	
Burstow Stream	<p>Comments that the proposal includes modifications to attenuation ponds, drains and outfalls to the Burstow Stream which could impact on its geomorphology.</p>	<p>The Burstow Stream is not directly affected by the Project.</p> <p>A tributary of the Burstow Stream: Haroldslea Stream is crossed by the A23 where the Project would widen the carriageway to the east of the south terminal roundabout. These works will necessitate the short extension of an existing culvert, but this is not considered to produce environmentally significant effects as reported in the ES and has been raised with the LLFA who has not raised any concerns.</p>	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		An existing outfall to the Haroldslea Stream will be retained by the Project and the highways drainage strategy indicates there would be no change to runoff flows at that outfall.	
Gatwick Stream and River Mole	Comments that the proposed works will increase the flood risk particularly along the Gatwick Stream and River Mole until the mitigation measures are in place. Concerns raised about the delivery of mitigation measures late in the project timescales.	<p>The Project would not increase flood risk on the Gatwick Stream and River Mole through the provision of two floodplain compensation areas on the River Mole at Museum Field and Crawler's Brook at Car Park X combined with other measures on the airfield and highways drainage mitigation.</p> <p>The delivery of the floodplain compensation mitigation would be addressed by the Flood Compensation Strategy that would be developed to support post-DCO consenting requirements as a DCO Requirement.</p>	N
	Concerns raised about release of untreated de-icer and other pollutants into the River Mole and woodland.	<p>A small treatment works to clean de-icer contaminated runoff is now proposed to the east of the Crawley Sewage Treatment works as part of an overall strategy to reduce flood risk on the airport and improve water quality.</p> <p>We have also engaged further with the Environment Agency, to review options for reducing the effects of extending the existing runway culvert on the River Mole and making improvements to benefit the river upstream and downstream of the airport. A metal grid would now be installed over the newly culverted section of the River Mole to allow daylight to reach the water surface and we would install a fish pass on the weir at the entrance to the culvert on the south side of the airport to improve fish passage upstream.</p>	Y
Foul water	Comments that the Project should not impact on expansion of Crawley Sewage Treatment Works. Comments that any	Thames Water will complete an assessment of the impact of an increase in passenger numbers as a result of the Project on water treatment capacity at Crawley and Horley STW. GAL has engaged with Thames Water (including	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	changes to plans for the expansion of Crawley Sewage Treatment Works or for the continuation of the Trade Effluent Consent need to be advised to the EA at the earliest opportunity.	by providing ES Appendix 11.9.7 Wastewater Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3)) to allow Thames Water to assess the impacts to the receiving STW in line with their statutory duties The Environment Agency will be informed of the outcome of these discussions.	
	Comments that an increase in passengers could exceed the capacity of the Horley Sewage Treatment Works, with requests for more detail about sewage and wastewater capacity.	Thames Water will complete an assessment of the impact of an increase in passenger numbers as a result of the Project on water treatment capacity at Crawley and Horley STW. GAL has engaged with Thames Water (including by providing ES Appendix 11.9.7 Wastewater Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3)) to allow Thames Water to assess the impacts to the receiving STW in line with their statutory duties The Environment Agency will be informed of the outcome of these discussions.	N
Water efficiency	Comments that, due to serious water stress in the area, all possible water efficiency measures should be clearly identified and implemented as part of the Project. Suggestions that more ambitious water efficiency measures are needed, including retrofitting of existing buildings. Comments that there is need for water neutrality in the Southern Water Sussex North supply area.	Gatwick Airport is supplied water by Sutton and East Surrey Water whose sources of water are outside the Southern Water Sussex North supply zone. Ongoing consultation with SESW has not indicated any impediments to their ability to meet the Project's water demand. Separately the Project, Gatwick is progressing its Decade of Change strategy which aims to reduce water use at the airport by 50% from 2019 levels by 2030.	Y

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Drainage and alleviation ponds	<p>Comments that alternative measures may be required for two proposed alleviation ponds. The site at Longbridge roundabout is waterlogged for most of the year and the pond proposed in Church Meadows is in an Area of High Archaeological Potential. Questions raised around how the capacity of Dog Kennel Pond would be increased as it already floods.</p> <p>Queries raised around how the additional water that appears to be draining to the north of the site will be collected.</p>	<p>The comments received on the waterlogging at Church Meadows were noted and consequently since the PEIR the highway drainage strategy for Longbridge roundabout has been revised to replace one of the attenuation ponds previously proposed at Church Meadows that would drain to the River Mole with oversized pipes, see Annex 1 in ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3).</p> <p>The works within the airport would result in an increase in impermeable area and consequently would increase the volume of runoff to receiving watercourses. To ensure no increase in flood risk to other parties the Project includes new attenuation and storage of runoff within the existing airfield surface water drainage network, which includes the tank beneath Car Park Y, further details are provided in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3).</p>	Y
	<p>Requests for more detail on the likely effect of polluted water that exceeds Environment Agency permits being released into the wider environment and that detailed mitigation measures are proposed to address such events.</p>	<p>The Project would not increase the risk of pollution to receiving watercourses.</p> <p>While the Project would increase air traffic movements and therefore potentially an increase in the use of de-icer in winter months, it includes as mitigation a storage tank beneath Car Park Y and a new treatment works to increase the storage capacity of the long-term storage lagoons and therefore reduce the risk of de-icer contaminated runoff reaching the watercourses.</p>	N
	<p>Requests for more information on discharge rates and where the water will go from the Highway Drainage strategy.</p>	<p>The drainage strategy for the highways improvements is included in Annex 1 in ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3).</p>	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The highways improvements would result in an increase in impermeable area. To ensure this does not increase flood risk to other parties the runoff would be attenuated and stored in a variety of features such as ponds/basins, swales and tanks etc to ensure no increase in the rate of runoff to receiving watercourses.	
Modelling of groundwater movements	Requests for more information about changes to groundwater movements as a result of proposed alterations to the land surface heights. Also, queries around whether changes to groundwater movements have been fully integrated in the hydrology model.	<p>ES Chapter 11: Water Environment (Doc Ref 5.1) includes an assessment of the potential impacts of the Project on groundwater resources and concludes there would be no significant effects, this is supported by ES Appendix 11.9.5: Groundwater Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3). These have been informed by a limited ground investigation undertaken in 2022-3.</p> <p>The groundwater ES assessment has been based on a conceptual site model which did not identify and environmentally significant effects as a result of the Project.</p>	Y

v. Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology

Theme: Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Culverts	<p>Comments that the Environment Agency has a no culverting policy and strongly recommends that no culverts are adopted. Suggestions to instead use clear span bridges and reroute the River Mole around the west of the airport boundary.</p> <p>Comments that the 45m culvert extension under the runway is a significant negative ecological pressure to the River Mole which the proposed mitigations will not adequately mitigate. Requests for other mitigations to be provided.</p>	<p>We have engaged further with the Environment Agency, to review options for reducing the effects of extending the existing runway culvert on the River Mole and making improvements to benefit the river upstream and downstream of the airport. A metal grid would now be installed over the newly culverted section of the River Mole to allow daylight to reach the water surface and we would install a fish pass on the weir at the entrance to the culvert on the south side of the airport to improve fish passage upstream.</p>	N
	<p>Comments that the Water Environment Regulations Assessment does not refer to the culvert extension under the northern runway.</p>	<p>This is included generically within culverts as activities. This will be clarified further in the ES.</p>	N
Flood compensation areas	<p>Comments that the Car Park X and Museum Fields flood compensation area proposals are at risk of sediment accretion which should be designed out.</p>	<p>The ES does not identify any potentially significant impacts on sediment transport as a result of the Project. Gatwick has additionally committed to undertake future sediment monitoring of the river Mole at the connection of the Museum Field FCA.</p> <p>The monitoring of sediment accumulation in the new Car Park Y tank would be managed through regular monitoring by Gatwick to determine the need for future intervention to maintain capacity as they would with their exiting airfield drainage network.</p>	N

Theme: Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
River Habitat Survey	Comments made that a River Habitat Survey should be conducted for the sections affected by diversion/flood storage/culverting works.	A River Corridor Survey has been undertaken and is reported in ES Appendix 9.9.2 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

w. Sustainability assessment

Theme: Sustainability assessment			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Assessment	Requests made that a Sustainability Assessment should be prepared and shared in advance of the DCO submission.	A Sustainability Statement is being prepared and will inform the ES (refer to Planning Statement Appendix D – Sustainability Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1)). It will only be finalised at the time the DCO is submitted.	Y
	Requests that cumulative effects are re-assessed based on updated information and having rectified errors and omissions identified in relation to strategic-scale development sites in Horsham District and within the search radius.	The list of 'other developments' for the purposes of the cumulative effects assessment has been updated and reviewed by the LPAs during the preparation of the ES.	Y
Search area	Queries raised about limiting the search radius to 8km. Comments made that it is not considered wide enough, particularly given the significant strategic-scale development likely to come forward.	The list of other developments for the purposes of the cumulative effects assessment has used a search area of 10km plus two areas to the west and east that extend outwards from the 10km area (around 5km each) to reflect the Lowest Observable Effect Levels (LOAEL) contours for noise.	N

x. Geology and ground conditions

Theme: Geology and ground conditions			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Leaching	Concerns raised about potential for run-off from construction areas to soils and subsequent leaching into groundwater.	<p>Construction activities which involve breaking the ground surface increase the potential for existing contaminants in the soil and perched groundwater to be mobilised and migrate through the soil as a result of leaching (from exposure to rainfall) and from the creation of pathways to aquifers at depth (e.g. piling). There is also the potential for contaminants to occur in the soil during construction as a result of spillages or leakages.</p> <p>A review of desk study data and observations from a site walkover identified several potential areas of concern (PAOC) within the Project site (for details, see ES Chapter 10: Geology and Ground Conditions (Doc Ref. 5.1), Section 10.9). The PAOC represent potential sources of contamination from existing and historic land uses on the Project site and off-site. Where previous site investigations have been undertaken in areas to be affected by the Project, the results have been reviewed to identify where samples of soil, groundwater and leachate exceeded relevant screening criteria. The proposed development areas within the Project site have been overlain with the PAOC to identify:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. development areas that include PAOC; 2. the level of existing information available for these PAOCs; and 3. the potential for pollutant linkages to be active based on the existing information. <p>A staged approach is proposed as part of the mitigation strategy to identify the most appropriate course of action for each development area and to target areas where further investigation is required.</p>	N

Theme: Geology and ground conditions			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Further ground investigations are proposed for each of the areas identified and these are to be secured under the DCO. The scope of the investigations would be agreed with the Environment Agency and Crawley Borough Council prior to their commencement. The results of the further investigations/further assessment would determine remediation requirements (if any). In the case that remediation is required, a remediation strategy, again to be secured under the DCO, would be prepared and implemented to ensure the area is suitable for its proposed use. The scope of the remediation strategy would be agreed with the Environment Agency and Crawley Borough Council prior to its implementation. Validation works would also be secured under the DCO and would be undertaken on completion of the remediation and a verification report prepared for regulatory sign off.</p> <p>For development areas that do not fall within a PAOC (and where no buildings are proposed), a discovery strategy, likely to be secured under the DCO, would be implemented whereby procedures are in place for construction staff to follow in the event that currently unknown contamination is encountered during construction activities.</p> <p>Measures to minimise the potential for spillages and leakages of fuels and chemicals would be implemented through the CoCP. These measures would form part of a pollution prevention plan.</p>	
Soil	Comments that the loss of soil function would represent a low magnitude of impact.	Impacts and mitigation in terms of soil loss and handling during construction are presented in ES Chapter 10: Geology and Ground Conditions (Doc Ref. 5.1), Sections 10.8 and 10.9, where relevant to non-agricultural soils.	N

Theme: Geology and ground conditions			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Effects on agricultural soils are addressed within ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
	Comments supporting early installation of drainage in the construction process to manage the run-off during construction. Also, that the drainage network would limit the impact on surface water bodies as well as pollution to the soil. Suggestions that this element of the proposal could be developed with mitigation measures preventing harm to land and groundwater quality.	<p>The junction improvement works would be accompanied by the installation of drainage early in the construction process ensuring that surface water runoff would be suitably managed during construction. During this phase, impacts of the Project on surface water quality may still arise from runoff from construction areas and also as a result of contaminants in soils or perched groundwater migrating to surface waters.</p> <p>A number of mitigation measures are embedded into the Project and drainage measures would be provided commensurate with each phase of development, comprising, for example, carrier drains, filter drains, ditches and attenuation ponds, along with flow control arrangements to limit discharges to watercourses.</p> <p>The installation of interceptors and appropriate pollution control measures as part of the design of the Project's surface water drainage and pollution control system and would control the magnitude of impact on surface watercourses to ensure that there would be no change compared to existing operations. The level of effect would be no change, which would not be significant.</p>	N
Minerals and waste	Comments that information about mineral safeguarding sites will be updated in Surrey County Council's new Local Plan.	The consultation exercise completed by Surrey County Council for their emerging Minerals and Waste Local Plan Surrey is considered within Section 6.3 of the Mineral Resource Assessment presented at ES Appendix 10.9.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

y. Cumulative effects

Theme: Cumulative effects			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
National Policy Statement	Suggestions that the DCO process be delayed until the review of the National Policy Statement for National Networks (road, rail) is completed, allowing for use of updated forecasts and a more accurate assessment of cumulative impacts.	The Project will be reviewed against the relevant policy statements at the time of submission.	N
Heathrow expansion	Comments that greater consideration be given to the Heathrow expansion and that the approach to keeping it under review in relation to the Project is explained.	Due to the uncertainty associated with Heathrow's third runway, it has not been included in the main cumulative assessment. However, a separate qualitative assessment is included about potential cumulative effects, should the Heathrow third runway project come forward during the timescale for this Project. This is, is provided in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships (Doc Ref. 51).	N
Assessment area	Requests for more information to explain the rationale for the 5km boundary.	<p>The PEIR established a 5km radius study area for the LTVIA based on the results of the ZTV and field surveys undertaken. Following feedback received during consultation, ZTVs have been generated which extend beyond a 15-kilometre radius from the Project site boundary to identify the potential for intervisibility between development at Gatwick, the surrounding landscape and the visual receptors within it.</p> <p>Viewpoint photography at Leith Hill located approximately 11.3 kilometres from the Project site within the Surrey Hills AONB was undertaken to demonstrate the nature of very distant views from surrounding high land, of which Leith Hill is the highest in the southeast of England. The limited visibility of development at Gatwick in the existing view and the likely barely perceptible change in view as a result of the addition of the proposed</p>	Y

Theme: Cumulative effects			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>development, together with the outcome of the assessment of visual receptors within the 5-kilometre radius, has informed the extent of the 5-kilometre radius study area as the main focus for the assessment within the ES.</p> <p>The ZTV indicates that the vast majority of land that may be potentially intervisible with development at Gatwick Airport lies within the 5-kilometre radius area. This has defined an appropriate study area to capture the relevant landscape, townscape and visual receptors that are likely to be affected by the Project and to ensure that all likely significant effects have been identified.</p>	
	Suggestions that all strategic development sites should be included in the assessment of cumulative effects.	The list of 'other developments' for the purposes of the cumulative effects assessment has been reviewed for the ES using the approach set out in PINS Advice Note 17, including advice on tiers.	N
Socio-economic effects	Comments that greater consideration be given to the temporary impacts on the housing market and economy during the construction phase, particularly the effect on the supply of the construction workforce.	Following this comment, additional information has been included in the PHR to assess the potential housing demand associated with non-home-based construction workers, including looking at capacity within the private rented sector and other forms of short-term/temporary accommodation.	N

z. Consultation

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments expressed support for the consultation process, welcomed the opportunity to contribute, and said the consultation was well-run and important. Support for the communication and promotion of the consultation and the length of time to respond. Others suggested the consultation was not well publicised.	Noted. The consultation was promoted extensively using newspaper and digital advertising, social media, press releases, and through the MPO visits.	N
	Concern that the outcome of the consultation has been predetermined and that Gatwick is consulting only because it is required by law and that the questionnaire is biased in Gatwick's favour.	While the Planning Act 2008 requires consultation, the Applicant views gathering feedback as critical to developing the Project proposals. All feedback responses have been taken into account. This is demonstrated and reported in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1).	N
Consultation materials	Comments that the details provided about the project were easily accessible and widely available.	<p>The Applicant approached consultation with a commitment to ensuring consultees were given the opportunity to understand and provide feedback on the proposals. A range of engagement techniques were used, materials were available in different formats and with content at an appropriate level.</p> <p>The questionnaire was designed to gather information on the Project generally and on specific topics. Answers were not required for every question and in addition, feedback could be submitted in other ways, including by letter or email.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for larger consultation maps and diagrams that clearly show the impacts on local areas.	Noted.	N
	Concerns about the complexity and volume of information provided for the consultation. Also, that the consultation questionnaire was too long and would deter respondents from completing it.	The Applicant approached consultation with a commitment to ensuring consultees were given the opportunity to understand and provide feedback on the proposals. A range of engagement techniques were used, materials were available in different formats and with content at an appropriate level. The questionnaire was designed to gather information on the project generally and on specific topics. Answers were not required for every question and in addition, feedback could be submitted in other ways, including by letter or email.	N
Consultation report	Requests for publication of the draft Consultation Report in advance of the DCO submission.	The Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) has been finalised as part of the DCO Application to explain the consultation and engagement undertaken through the scheme development and pre-application stages.	N
Notice of consultation	Comments that insufficient notice of the start of the consultation period made it difficult for local authorities to collaborate and plan resources.	Consultation was announced and the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) published on 25 August 2021, two weeks prior to the start of the Autumn 2021 Consultation. The consultation then ran for 12 weeks, closing on 1 December 2021, a total of 14 weeks after it was announced.	N
Telephone surgeries	Comments that there was limited or no 'Ask the expert' availability, which may have limited the ability of stakeholders to comprehend and understand the scheme information, including the likely significant	Throughout the consultation period, telephone surgeries - advertised as 'call the expert' sessions - of 2.5 hours each were held to allow members of the public to speak to technical experts about the Project. Individuals could book 20-minute slots to discuss four topic areas: i) transport; ii) air quality and climate change; iii) noise; and iv) general issues. Bookings could be	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	effects presented in the preliminary environmental information report.	<p>made through the website, by calling the Project hotline, by email, or via the MPO.</p> <p>The telephone surgeries took place at a variety of times and days of the week to help maximise opportunities for people to participate. A total of 34 sessions were allocated, with three more added as a result of requests (two on general briefings and one on air quality). A total of 37 people booked telephone surgery slots during the consultation period.</p> <p>Stakeholders were offered virtual briefings on the Project which included an opportunity to ask questions of the project team. A total of 360 stakeholders attended a virtual briefing during the consultation period.</p>	
Mobile Project Office (MPO)	<p>Comments that MPO locations provided limited coverage, particularly in the most-affected communities, and that its hours were restricted to working hours only.</p> <p>Concerns that the MPO did not offer the opportunity to speak to GAL representatives.</p>	<p>Throughout the consultation, the staffed MPO visited 36 locations in local communities to encourage consultation participation and to distribute materials for people to take away at no cost. Visitors to the MPO were also able to submit completed hard copy questionnaires and book 'call the expert' sessions.</p> <p>The MPO was stocked with hard copies of the Consultation Summary Document and Consultation Questionnaire, with USB drives containing the consultation documents also available. Around 425 Consultation Summary Documents and Questionnaires along with 220 USBs were distributed from the MPO.</p> <p>The aim of the MPO was to provide as many opportunities as possible for people to access the consultation. The visits were planned for prominent locations and timed to coincide with periods where people would ordinarily</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>be in the area. Location choices were also made to ensure safe and legal operation in light of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Details of dates and times for the MPO visits were published in advance in the SoCC and on the Project website.</p>	
Consultation zones	Comments that residents and businesses affected by Route 9 (WIZAD) are located in the Outer Consultation Zone which means they were not made aware of this Consultation.	<p>A number of different methods of advertising were used to publicise the consultation to ensure as many people as possible knew about it across the inner and outer consultation zones. Methods include newspaper advertising (in four local papers), social media, and radio and digital advertising.</p> <p>The Autumn 2021 Consultation advertising activity – both statutory and the wider advertising campaign - covered the outer consultation zone as well as the inner. The MPO also visited a total of 36 locations across the region with 19 in the outer consultation zone.</p> <p>To further raise awareness of the consultation among local communities, the activity outlined above was augmented by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ issuing press releases to attract media coverage and raise awareness of the consultation at publication of the SoCC on 25 August 2021 and at the start of the consultation on 9 September 2021, along with regular topic-specific media releases throughout the consultation period; ▪ promotion of the consultation on the Project website and social media channels from 25 August 2021 to the end of the consultation period; ▪ a multi-channel advertising campaign that ran from 25 August to 1 December 2021; and ▪ a poster distribution to 110 hard to reach groups and 260 community venues across the region as part of a consultation pack. 	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Planning Performance Agreement	Comments that negotiations around the Planning Performance Agreement have been slow to materialise placing increased financial burdens on the Councils.	<p>Throughout the DCO process the Applicant has made the offer of funding to local authorities to cover the cost of their time during pre-application process. A PPA between the ten GOG authorities was signed in November 2022 with retrospective effect for the engagement carried out and the associated costs incurred. Discussions on a second PPA are ongoing to cover subsequent engagement, which would bring the total support offered to the local authorities to approximately £330,000 (of which approximately £190,000 has already been paid).</p> <p>This is in addition to the £90,000 the local authorities received under the NSIP Innovation Fund.</p>	Y
Hard to reach engagement	<p>Requests for details of how hard-to-reach groups have been engaged in the consultation process.</p> <p>Comments that engagement with hard-to-reach groups is considered inadequate.</p>	<p>During development of the SoCC, the Applicant sought advice from the local authorities about hard-to-reach groups in their areas. Some local authorities provided information, which was used to guide further desktop research, with a total of 110 organisations identified. Prior to the Autumn 2021 Consultation, interviews were sought with all organisations to understand their preferred ways of engagement in advance of the consultation to allow time to adapt the approach for these groups.</p> <p>Each group was also contacted prior to the start of the consultation to advise them of the consultation dates, request information about the consultation be shared with their members and offer virtual briefing sessions. Follow-up contact was made during the consultation period after consultation packs including a poster and short information leaflet were posted to all groups.</p> <p>The Consultation Summary Document and Questionnaire were also available in alternative formats and languages on request.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Consultation with local planning authorities	<p>Concerns raised about the lack of engagement with local authorities prior to the commencement of the consultation. Comments that there was little opportunity to discuss technical methodology or options and alternatives for the proposal in advance of the consultation.</p> <p>Comments that recording of online meetings were not made available.</p> <p>Comments that the format and content of the Topic Working Groups (TWGs) made it difficult for meaningful discussion of the issues. Also, that copies of the information shared at TWGs were not made available either before or after the sessions, some of which were rushed.</p>	<p>The Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out full details of local engagement, including with local authorities from 2019, both before/after and as part of the formal consultation process.</p> <p>The format and way in which the TWGs took place was continually reviewed and feedback from the local authorities was sought at regular intervals, to take feedback into account in the subsequent round of TWGs. This process is explained in further detail in Section 3.4 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p> <p>The Engagement Protocol set out the processes and timings of sharing information before and after each TWG, which was followed by GAL. This included meeting agendas, slides, notes and recordings. A copy of the Protocol is contained in an Appendix to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) Recordings of all TWGs held from 2022 onwards were made available to local authority attendees online.</p>	Y
Engagement with landowners	<p>Concerns raised about consultation with neighbours around the potential impact of the Project, including its construction, on their properties.</p> <p>Comments that responses to requests for more information were slow.</p>	<p>Land referencers were appointed by the Applicant in March 2019 to complete a diligent enquiry process prior to and throughout the statutory consultation to identify relevant persons with an interest in land. The following process was undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowners and other interested parties were identified initially through data and documents requested from and provided by HM Land Registry. These data and documents were refreshed at regular intervals to ensure the information held is accurate. Unregistered areas of land were also periodically checked to ensure the land 	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>remained unregistered. Further interested parties were identified through utility data requested from and provided by Atkins and council data requested from and provided by Surrey County Council and West Sussex County Council. The data obtained through the process listed above is refreshed within 6 months of the submission of the application to ensure the data listed in the Book of Reference & Land Plans is current and accurate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land Interest Questionnaires ("LIQs"), provided in Appendix B.19, were issued to all interests identified through the requests and searches listed above. These questionnaires sought to confirm the contact details of the affected parties and also to ask for details of any other parties who may hold an interest in the land. Where new interested parties were revealed, these parties were also issued with a LIQ to confirm the details provided. This confirmation process was ongoing throughout all stages of consultation. ▪ Where LIQs were not responded to, further reminder letters were issued, emails were sent and/or phone calls and site visits were conducted to request completion of the LIQ(s) where appropriate. ▪ Where landowners and other interested parties remained unknown, site notices, provided in Appendix B.20, were erected where possible in suitable visible locations and were replaced at regular intervals (for example on gateways or nearby telegraph poles). Where a number of unknown interests were located within the same vicinity, a single site notice was erected. ▪ Confirmation schedules, provided in Appendix B.21, were served on all landowners and other interested parties identified through the 	

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		actions taken listed above within 6 months of the submission of the application to ensure the data listed in the Book of Reference & Land Plans is current and accurate. These schedules sought to confirm that the information received previously remains current and accurate. Any updated information received would result in an update to the information held.	
Hard copy documents	<p>Comments that the lack of hard copy documentation in all local authority libraries was unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Also comments that it was unclear how members of the community, businesses and other consultees would be able to attain printed copies of the consultation material.</p>	<p>There were a number of ways for members of the public and stakeholders to access Project documents in hard copy, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attending one of the 18 public buildings in the local community where the SoCC was placed from 25 August 2021, the full suite of documentation was available from 9 September 2021, and Consultation Summary Documents and Questionnaires were available to take away. The deposit point locations were published in the SoCC, online, in newspaper adverts, and in a newsletter distributed to over 102,000 local homes and businesses surrounding the Airport. Stocks of documents were checked and replenished monthly. ▪ Calling the consultation freephone line (which was included in adverts, the SoCC, and the consultation newsletter, in addition to online) to request copies of documents. The project team posted around 132 Consultation Summary Documents and Questionnaires to members of the public who contacted us via the freephone line and email address. A small number of additional requests were made for specific technical documents or chapters, and these were also provided free of charge. ▪ Visiting the MPO at one of 36 local community visits (published in the SoCC, adverts, the consultation newsletter, and online). Hard copies 	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		of the Consultation Summary Document and Questionnaire were available to take away (free of charge) from the MPO, along with USBs containing all consultation documents. Around 425 Consultation Summary Documents and Questionnaires and 220 USBs were distributed from the MPO. MPO team members were also able to take and fulfil requests for hard copies of other consultation documents, however no such requests were received.	
Virtual consultation	<p>Comments that the information was considered to be inaccessible to all consultees (e.g. those with physical impairments or requiring the use of easy readers) and that there too much content on the virtual exhibition boards.</p> <p>Comments that the virtual exhibition was particularly helpful in helping them to make a considered judgement on the proposals.</p> <p>Suggestions that the virtual consultation should comply with the accessibility principles of Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG).</p>	<p>The Applicant approached consultation with a commitment to ensuring consultees were given the opportunity to understand and provide feedback on the proposals. A range of engagement techniques were used, materials were available in different formats and with content at an appropriate level, and the consultation was widely publicised.</p> <p>Although all consultation materials were available on the Project consultation web pages - along with an interactive virtual exhibition, 3D model of the proposals, videos, and an interactive non-technical summary of the preliminary environmental information report - a range of alternative ways to help local communities understand and provide feedback on the Project proposals were provided, including hard copy documents (in deposit points, at the MPO or on request from the Project email or hotline) and USBs loaded with the materials available free of charge.</p> <p>While some virtual exhibition boards had a high volume of text, the majority of the had around 25% text. All of the text in large font sizes, has reasonable line spacing and was not obstructed by other content.</p> <p>For community members without broadband/computer access or who were unable to travel to view hard copies of the documents, the Applicant offered</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>loans (on request) of tablets loaded with all consultation documents. Alternative format materials were also available on request. There were no requests for tablet loans or alternative format documents.</p> <p>Since 2017, the Gatwick Airport website (including the Project pages) has included the not-for-profit Recite Me accessibility toolbar to improve digital inclusivity by allowing visitors to customise content and consume it in ways that work best for them.</p>	
Compliance with Planning Act 2008, s47	<p>Questions raised about how the consultation meets the requirements of the section as the SoCC does not include a list of the newspapers in which it would be advertised. Also, that there is no evidence of newspaper adverts.</p>	<p>In line with Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008, the SoCC was made available to the public from 25 August 2021. It was published on the Gatwick Airport website on 25 August 2021 and was also made available on the same day in hard copy at 18 public buildings in the vicinity of the land required for the Project. The website address and details of the deposit points were also included in adverts (see Appendix B.5 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1)) in the following local newspapers, selected for their circulation, readership, and geographic coverage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crawley Observer (Wednesday 25 August); ▪ Surrey Mirror (Thursday 26 August); ▪ West Sussex County Times (Thursday 26 August); and ▪ Kent and Sussex Courier (Friday 27 August). <p>On Thursday 9 September 2021, just over two weeks after the SoCC was published, the consultation period began. As required by s48 of the Planning Act 2008, the consultation was advertised in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crawley and Horley Observer (Wednesday 8 and 15 September) ▪ Surrey Mirror (Thursday 9 and 16 September) ▪ West Sussex County Times (Thursday 9 and 16 September) 	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kent and Sussex Courier (Friday 10 and 17 September) ▪ The Times (Thursday 9 September) ▪ London Gazette (Thursday 9 September) <p>The s48 notice was also published on the Gatwick Future Plans web page. Copies of the adverts are available in Appendix B.6 in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>	

Table A.2: Summary of Section 47 responses and consideration by topic
a. Need and benefits

Theme: Need/benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Cost	Support for the proposals as cost effective compared to building a new runway and as a way of reducing the need for expensive, potentially unsafe night-time runway repairs. Others suggested the proposal was unnecessary and a waste of money.	The Northern Runway proposals are a cost-effective way to provide additional runway capacity in the London system to satisfy the forecast demand for aviation, given that much of the airfield infrastructure, including the Northern Runway, already exists. The Northern Runway is already used as a standby runway when repairs are required to the main runway, and this arrangement will continue in the future.	N
Capacity	Comments that there is no need for the Project due to surplus capacity at Gatwick (with the South Terminal closed and major airlines moving operations elsewhere) and at other London airports.	The Project would provide capacity to meet forecast increases in passenger demand in the medium and long terms. This need arises irrespective of potential growth being planned at other London airports. The need for the Project is explained in the supporting Need Case document.	N
	Comments that the majority of Gatwick's trips are for leisure, which does not merit increased capacity.	Existing and emerging government policy supporting the development of aviation recognises the benefits and importance of air travel for tourism and visiting friends and relatives (as well as benefits to business).	N
	Comments that there is no need for increased cargo capacity as Heathrow is the main cargo hub.	Gatwick does not currently have cargo only freight operators and it is not part of Gatwick's case to attract such operators. Cargo is, however, carried in the belly-holds of passenger aircraft as part of many airlines' operating models and this provides efficient use of resources and important business benefits to supporting trade and investment in addition to cargo operations at other UK ports and airports.	N

Theme: Need/benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that the government 'levelling up' agenda could reduce flight demand in the Southeast.	Forecasts prepared in support of the Project are based on forecast growth in London and Southeast. Also, Government forecasts do not suggest any significant reallocation of demand growth away from the Southeast. Government forecasts clearly demonstrate the lack of available airport capacity in the London market. It is these London airports that lack capacity compared to other airports around the UK where they are not constrained. London needs to remain a top-tier global city that can attract investment, tourism and business for the benefit of the whole country which is why meeting passenger demand at London airports is important.	N
Benefits	Comments that the economic benefits would be outweighed by environmental impacts, including the Project's contribution to climate change, noise, traffic, and pressure on housing and infrastructure.	Comment noted – the DCO application provides full information on the economic and other benefits of the project and its environmental and other impacts to allow informed decision to be made on the DCO. The Planning Statement concludes on the planning balance that has been carried out by GAL.	N
	Support for the potential for connections to new destinations, more frequent flights for leisure, and greater choice.	Noted.	N
	Comments that balance is needed between airports to encourage more competitive pricing for consumers, more competition between airports, and reducing capacity pressure at Heathrow.	Noted.	N

b. Development proposals

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Suggestions that the land proposed for the northern runway could instead be used to provide sustainable jobs or for affordable housing.	The majority of the land needed for the NRP is within the existing airport boundary. It would not be appropriate to located non-airport uses/operations within the airport boundary.	N
	Support for use of an existing runway as quicker to develop and having fewer impacts than building a new runway.	Noted.	N
	Concerns and opposition to the proposals due to potential environmental impacts and disruption. Questions raised about the need for the Project.	The application is supported by a document which sets out the Need Case (Doc Ref. 7.2) for the NRP. The likely environmental impacts of the project are assessed as part of the Environmental Statement and where required, mitigation is proposed to prevent, reduce and where relevant, offset any potential significant adverse effects. A full list of the mitigation proposed by the NRP is contained in the Mitigation Route Map in ES Appendix 5.2.3 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that the proposals are compatible with the 'Making Best Use' policy.	This is examined within the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1) and Needs Case (Doc Ref. 7.2) report submitted with the DCO application. The scheme is considered to comply with the Government's policy of making best use of existing runways and airport capacity.	N
	Suggestions that Gatwick should consider an additional runway or terminal in addition to the Northern Runway to further increase the economic benefit.	This is not a proposal which is part of the NRP. The NRP is GAL's proposal to allow for increased capacity at the airport based on its forecasts for passenger growth up to 2047. Any need for additional capacity beyond currently forecasted demand will need to be brought forward at the appropriate time alongside all appropriate economic, environmental and social considerations.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for improvements to existing airport facilities and infrastructure, including to make the airport a destination for non-travellers by including a shopping centre, cinema or ice-rink, space for plane spotters.	This is not a proposal which is part of the NRP. The NRP is GAL's proposal to allow for increased capacity at the airport based on its forecasts for passenger growth up to 2047.	N
	Concerns raised about the potential for further growth of the airport, including a third runway or additional infrastructure improvements to support the Project.	This is not a proposal which is part of the NRP. The NRP is GAL's proposal to allow for increased capacity at the airport based on its forecasts for passenger growth up to 2047. Any need for additional capacity beyond currently forecasted demand will need to be brought forward at the appropriate time alongside all appropriate economic, environmental and social considerations.	N
	Suggestions for improvements to freight and cargo infrastructure to enhance environmental benefits and provide more jobs.	An assessment has been undertaken of the need for addition freight / cargo infrastructure to support forecast increase in freight tonnage. This assessment has shown that the existing cargo facilities at Gatwick are able to handle the forecast increase in cargo freight	N
	Comments that assessments do not comply with policy, making evaluation and feedback difficult.	The Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1) submitted with the DCO application considers the scheme against the relevant national aviation and national and local planning policy in light of the conclusions of the environmental assessments that are set out and described in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Concerns raised about the sustainability of proposals, with suggestions for a more efficient design to support the sustainable use of resources.	We believe the project represents a sustainable approach to development as shown in sustainability statement and ES chapters.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Support for the proposed building of hotels, office spaces and other facilities.	Noted.	N
	Concerns raised that hotels, parking, offices and warehouses would need to be built on green spaces or floodplains.	Proposals for additional hotels, office accommodation and parking are accommodated within the existing airport boundary. Proposals for the Pentagon Field car park have been removed from the project. Where development impacts areas at risk of flooding flood compensation is provided.	N
	Suggestions for inclusion of improved business facilities and more office spaces in the proposals as well as short-term rental opportunities for offices and light industry.	An assessment has been undertaken on the need for operational offices and industrial / warehousing facilities required in the support of the Project and provision is made accordingly. Proposals are not included for speculative development that is unrelated to airport operational requirements.	N
	Comments that there should be no upgrading of the taxiway.	Upgrades to taxiways are necessary and informed by simulation modelling to ensure efficient airfield operations.	N
	Suggestions for more services within the airport, including luggage transfers, currency conversion options, ATMs, clearer signage and a greater police presence.	Noted.	N
CARE facility	Support for Option 1 as the most appropriate location and because it would have the least impact on local communities. Support for Option 2 due to accessibility during construction.	Overall, during consultation stakeholders supported Option 1 over Option 2 because of its more central location, away from the boundary and close to the source of most of the waste. Option 1 was therefore selected for inclusion in the proposals.	Y

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised about the impact of the facility on the environment, local community and transport network.	Gatwick are committed to ensuring that all materials used at Gatwick are repurposed for beneficial use i.e. repaired, reused, donated, re-cycled, composted or converted to fuel for heating or transport. Wherever possible, waste will be managed on-site.	N
	Suggestions that the facility should be designed for future growth and consider safety as well as whether incineration is consistent with net zero.	The development includes for the both the relocation of the existing facility and its future expansion. Biomass energy is carbon neutral i.e. the burning process only releases the carbon stored in the material burned. Conversion of on-site food waste into heat therefore offers a carbon neutral solution for heat that would contribute to the elimination of fossil fuel heat at the airport,	N
	Requests for more detail about the impacts of the proposed CARE facility, including plume visibility, and its differences to the current one.	ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides an assessment of the Project on air quality and odour. The assessment includes plume visibility and concludes that there would be no visible plumes greater than 20m in length during any part of the first year of operation (2029). The CARE facility has been assessed for the first year of operation only as the impact is assessed as being constant within each year. The total cumulative emissions have been taken into account in the total concentrations in all future years.	N
	Suggestions for alternative locations, both on and off the airport or for improvements to be made to the current facility instead.	An options appraisal for the location of the CARE Facility was undertaken to consider its feasibility and potential impacts. The following key requirements influenced the development of the options: operations, capacity and design, Two options were identified while Option 1 scored marginally better in terms of the business case, surface access and environment criteria, both options performed well overall, and were taken forward as part of the consultation on the Project in Autumn 2021.	Y

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, Option 1 has been selected. Respondents preferred its central location, noting the shorter journey from the central terminal areas where the bulk of the waste originates and its relative remoteness from the airport boundary.</p> <p>Gatwick are committed to ensuring that all materials used at Gatwick are repurposed for beneficial use i.e. repaired, reused, donated, re-cycled, composted or converted to fuel for heating or transport. Wherever possible, waste will be managed on-site, so off-site locations for the replacement CARE centre were not considered.</p>	
	Comments that increased air travel could contribute to the spread of future pandemics.	Borders were closed and air travel came to a virtual standstill during 2020. This proved to be ineffectual in limiting the spread of the Covid-19 virus, even in nations with the most draconian measures.	N
Airfield	Suggestions sustainable management and maintenance of airfield visual aids, the use of more durable airfield pavement, and the management of aircraft taxiing movement.	The technical standards relating to the airfield operation and safety are managed by the CAA and the project is designed to be fully compliant.	N
Pier 7	Requests for more information about how passengers and luggage would be moved between Pier 7 and different parts of the airport.	<p>Pier 7 will support passenger growth associated with the dual runway operations and will serve both North and South Terminals. It is proposed that passengers will reach the Pier using autonomous vehicles with stations for boarding and disembarkation from these vehicles being provided at each Terminal.</p> <p>The vehicles will operate on a shuttle basis, allowing passengers to make their own way to the Pier and from there to their gate. The Pier will consist of a ground floor plus two levels (arrivals and departures), including departure</p>	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>gate areas, together with some welfare and commercial facilities at the first-floor level.</p> <p>Baggage will be transported to and from the Pier 7 stands from the baggage sortation halls via electric baggage tugs and dollies in just the same way baggage is delivered to aircraft at the other six piers.</p>	
Timing	Requests for Gatwick to delay the expansion of the airport until it is possible to demonstrate there would be no detrimental impacts to the environment, including to noise pollution and carbon emissions.	It is not possible to completely remove all assessed likely environmental impacts by delaying the project to some future point. However, mitigation is planned to ensure that no significant adverse effects will arise when the project is implemented.	N

c. Forecasts

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Business travel	Suggestions for passenger numbers to be re-forecast to more realistically reflect the potential for decreased business travel given advances in digital and virtual technology.	Gatwick's traffic profile has been relatively stable over the last decade and future growth is assumed to be comparable to this baseline, growth at Gatwick is driven by a combination of Gatwick's current performance as well as wider London market demand. Gatwick's share of business passengers (15%) is slightly below the wider London market today and the route network will continue to favour outbound UK travellers.	N
Validity of forecasts	Concerns that passenger and air traffic forecasts are excessively optimistic.	The growth under the Development Case is driven by the new incremental runway capacity offered by the Northern Runway as well as a combination of larger aircraft and other factors. Wider London demand is forecast to significantly exceed supply in the baseline and Northern Runway Project forecasts over the long term.	N

d. Economics and socio-economics

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Support for the Project on the basis of the economic benefits and related proposals, with particular reference to the OESBS and contribution to post-pandemic recovery.	Noted. The economic impact assessments at the local and national level demonstrate the economic benefits of the Project and its potential contribution to post-pandemic recovery. The local economic impact assessment in particular is used as a reference to GAL's Employment Skills and Business Strategy (ES Appendix 17.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) .	Y
	Requests for more information on the measures included in the OESBS. (JR)	<p>The ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref.5.3) (ESBS) would provide a framework for project activity across six themes, which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inspire and motivate: harnessing the excitement and motivational potential of the Project to inspire the current and next generation of talent to invest their careers and futures within the local area and encourage new and different talent pools to pursue careers in STEM. ▪ Construction; creating clear pathways for construction employment and skills development and opening up contracting opportunities for SMEs. ▪ Employment and Skills (non-construction); creating pathways to employment and skills development with Gatwick and the Gatwick Family of businesses located on site. ▪ Adding Value through Procurement: leveraging the procurement process to support local recruitment and workforce development and increase the sustainability of local businesses. ▪ Innovation – maximising the potential of the Project to drive up entrepreneurship and business productivity; and ▪ Regional Promotion – creating the conditions for increasing the attraction of inward investment and the expansion of existing businesses and driving up the value of the visitor economy. 	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		More detail on project activities would be included within an Implementation Plan, developed in collaboration with partners and stakeholders and submitted following the DCO submission.	
	Comments that Gatwick's priority should be addressing its business needs and reducing noise pollution rather than expanding.	Noted.	N
	Comments that the Project is unlikely to bring significant local or regional economic benefits.	Economic benefits have been assessed by Lichfields, Oxera and Oxford Economics. Information on economic impacts is provided in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics (Doc Ref. 5.1), as well as in supporting economic assessments.	N
	Support for job creation and plans for training and up-skilling.	Noted.	N
	Comments that 'leakage of talent' to London should be prevented.	<p>The additional employment opportunities in combination with the Employment, Skills and Business Strategy in ES Appendix 17.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3) will prevent the local workforce and the young local professionals to commute for work to London as new employment opportunities of a wide range will be offered locally.</p> <p>The first of the four ESBS Objectives is to "Harness the excitement and motivational potential of the Project to inspire the next generation of talent and more experienced people to confidently invest their careers and futures with Gatwick Airport and other employees within the Labour Market Area". Thus, the desire to avoid leakage of talent to London and other areas within the UK would be at the very heart of our commitments.</p>	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that new infrastructure would be required to support the increase in jobs.	The likely impacts and needs associated with new job creation by the NRP have been fully assessed as part of the Environmental Statement and appropriate mitigation is put forward where required.	N
	Comments that the proposals would have a positive impact on local communities, helping with recovery from the pandemic, bringing general economic benefits, and encouraging future development in the area.	Noted.	N
	Suggestions that the Project be started as soon as possible as its economic benefits are needed now.	Noted.	N
	Concerns raised about the lack of job creation at national level and that local job estimates do not reflect recent trends.	While the estimated local economic benefits take account of displacement at a local level, spill over between airports, while not included within the scope of the assessment is expected to be limited given the limited passenger diversion between airports during the period of analysis. The estimated local job impact will impact sectors beyond the aviation industry and beyond the local area, for example, it also concerns the supply-chain, and the induced impact of Gatwick. It is assumed that this relationship between air traffic and local employment remains constant throughout the period of appraisal. While it is acknowledged that this relationship may evolve, there is limited information available on the direction and extent to which the relationship will evolve as different long-term trends may have opposing impacts. For instance, productivity improvements may reduce the employment impact of increased air traffic while stronger connectivity and agglomeration impacts may strengthen the relationship between air traffic and employment. The national EIA estimates the benefits to the national	Y

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		economy, including benefits to passengers, the government and the wider economy.	
	Concerns raised that air travel will likely decrease in the future, and therefore the Project would not provide continuous, secure employment.	This is not considered a realistic scenario. Demand for air travel is recovering well from Covid with Government and wider forecasts showing long term growth returning.	N
	Suggestions for more growth and improvement to airport facilities to further increase the economic benefits.	Noted.	N
	Comments that providing employment is not the responsibility of Gatwick, that there are already enough airport staff, and that sufficient jobs can be provided without expansion.	Employment impacts have been assessed by Lichfields, Oxera and Oxford Economics. Information on economic impacts is provided in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics (Doc Ref. 5.1), as well as in supporting economic assessments.	N
	Comments that the Southeast region has a low unemployment rate, and other regions would be better served by new jobs in line with the Government's 'Levelling Up' agenda.	<p>The Project would most likely have impacts to specific receptors which in terms of employment relate to the Local Study Area, FEMA, and LMA primarily followed by the Six Authorities Areas.</p> <p>Although in overall terms the Southeast performs well in relation to employment, there are pockets of employment deprivation alongside low qualifications across some of the study areas. These areas will be benefitted the most by the Project and through the implementation of the ESBS (ES Appendix 17.8.1: Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3)) those unemployed or lower qualified will have an opportunity</p>	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		to upskill their qualifications and find a new employment opportunity generated by the Project.	
	Suggestions that economic proposals should be introduced without the expansion and include staff training, terminal improvements, investment in the local community and businesses to create a tech-based city around the airport and returning to pre-pandemic service levels.	GAL invests in the local community and staff training currently and there will be additionality with the NRP and the growth that it brings.	N
	Requests for more information on the potential impact of the EU's proposed tax on aircraft fuel.	A tax on aircraft fuel would affect prices in the baseline (without the Project) and the Project scenario (i.e., this impact would not be specific to the Project). With respect to the impact of fuel taxes on passenger demand, the traffic forecasts are an input to the EIA and were provided to Oxera by ICF.	N
	Requests for more information on proposals to support the visitor economy.	There is an expanded discussion on tourism effects in the national impact report. However, the assessment doesn't quantify the welfare impacts associated with tourism due to limited evidence available. The local impact assessment includes a section discussing local tourism impacts. The national EIA estimates the Net Present Value of the Project accounting for both economic and environmental impacts.	Y
	Comments that economic growth must not be prioritised over sustainability.	The Government acknowledge in their 10-year strategic plan for aviation 'Flightpath to the Future' that aviation plays a key role in supporting their economic growth agenda. The Government remains supportive of sustainable airport expansion where it can be delivered within environmental obligations. The NRP has been fully assessed in	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		environmental terms and this has demonstrated that the scheme can deliver significant economic benefits in a sustainable way that meets Government climate change targets. These benefits weigh heavily in the planning balance according to relevant aviation policy.	
	Questions raised about whether the benefits could instead be achieved by the Heathrow expansion.	Expansion of Heathrow would likely offer significant benefits but is not currently being progressed and there is significant uncertainty surrounding when, or indeed if, a third runway will now be developed at Heathrow. Furthermore, Gatwick offers a range of benefits that are different to and additional to those which expansion of Heathrow would be able to offer. These are set out in The Needs Case (Doc Ref. 7.2) and include for example Gatwick's Northern Runway Project being able to provide benefits much earlier than would now be possible for expansion of Heathrow; and that Gatwick is particularly well suited to provide capacity for the Low-Cost Carrier market segment which continues to be the fastest growing market in UK aviation.	N
Modelling and assessment	Concerns about the accuracy of economic forecasts 60 years in the future.	Economic benefits and costs are assessed over a period of 60 years from the opening of the project in line with the Green Book. The national EIA uses economic forecasts up to the latest year available and then assumes no changes in forecasts given lack of data available, in line in with DfT guidance.	N
	Questions raised about whether the assessment considers a potential loss to the domestic tourism economy as outbound tourism increases.	ES Appendix 17.9.2: Local Economic Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) includes a section about the local tourism impact. It is estimated that Gatwick has brought, and will continue to bring, sizeable (positive) tourism impacts to the local area. There is an expanded discussion on tourism effects in the national impact report. However, the assessment doesn't	Y

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		quantify the welfare impacts associated with tourism due to limited evidence available.	
	Requests for more information about the extent of net employment benefit and how regional economic benefits were calculated.	More information is provided on how local impacts are calculated at ES Appendix 17.9.2: Local Economic Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3).	Y
	Queries around whether the displacement of jobs from other regions has been considered and whether there would be any impact on coastal areas.	The analysis in ES Appendix 17.9.2: Local Economic Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) accounts for displacement to other areas, the methodology applied is provided in additional detail under the ES.	Y
	Requests for more information on the data used to assess current job levels and how the figure of 90% of jobs being filled by the local community has been reached.	Information on the baseline assessment is set out in ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) Section 17.6 and ES Appendix 17.6.1 Socio-Economic Data Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3). The approach on defining the various study areas including the labour market area is set out in paragraph 17.4.11.	N
	Requests for copies of the Employment, Skills and Business Strategy Implementation Plan and the advice given from the New Economics Foundation.	The Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) (ES Appendix 17.8.1) (Doc Ref. 5.3)) will be made available to the local authorities at the time of the DCO submission. The New Economics Foundation has not provided advice directly on the ESBS.	Y
	Comments that national economic benefits are not supported by academic literature or the Project's studies.	The national impact assessment is following methodologies based on existing guidance and data published by the Department of Transport and available literature.	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that Gatwick's economic importance to the region and nation are overstated.	Input-output modelling (indirect and now induced) has been revised to refine multipliers which are now also reported. Moreover, potential overlaps with other estimated impacts are removed.	Y
	Comments that the published jobs and business numbers are not accurate.	The methodology applied provides conservative estimates of the jobs and value add generated by the Project which the documentation under the ES will detail.	Y
	Comments that the impact of outbound tourism on the UK economy and balance of trade have not been adequately considered and would result in negative impacts.	<p>There is an expanded discussion on tourism effects in the national impact report. However, given the limited evidence on the mechanisms through which inbound and outbound tourism would affect welfare in the UK, the welfare changes arising from increased tourism as a result of the Project are not quantified.</p> <p>Trade impacts have been quantified and result in positive benefits, although these are not included in the Net Present Value due to concerns about double-counting with other benefits.</p>	Y
	Suggestions that carbon cost calculations should be re-run using current values, and that forecasts should be produced on an annual basis.	In the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we published an Economic Impact Assessment which considered the economic effects of the Project. In September 2021, and after the Economic Impact Assessment was completed, the Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy updated the carbon values it uses to appraise policy proposals. While the carbon values used in our Economic Impact Assessment were up to date at the time of its preparation, we have updated the assessment to reflect the latest carbon values as a part of the planned update to the EIA for the DCO submission. Forecasts of emissions were received from Arup on an annual basis.	Y

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Jobs	Comments that new jobs are likely to be short-term or low-paid and would not justify negative impacts of the Project.	ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) sets out how Gatwick would maximise opportunities for sustainable employment, skills development and career opportunities for communities. The package of themes within the ESBS would provide both the framework and investment required not only for opening up employment and skills opportunities directly resulting from the Project, but it would facilitate the infrastructure, relationship-building and connections required to open up opportunities arising from 'business as usual' activity on-Airport. Thus, the Project would provide opportunities for access to a whole range of employment opportunities, from entry level right through to high level skilled positions.	N
	Requests for more information on the nature and scale of jobs created and the nature of up-skilling.	The Oxera analysis now includes an indicative breakdown of employment generated by the Project with respect to job skill level. This disaggregation is indicative given the high level of uncertainty over the skills level of the employment that would be generated by the Project. ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) (ESBS) sets out how Gatwick would maximise opportunities for sustainable employment, skills development and career opportunities for communities. The package of themes within the ES Appendix 17.8.1 would provide both the framework and investment required not only for opening up employment and skills opportunities directly resulting from the Project, but it would facilitate the infrastructure, relationship-building and connections required to open up opportunities arising from 'business as usual' activity on-Airport. Thus, the Project would provide opportunities for access to a whole range of employment opportunities, from entry level right through to high level skilled positions.	Y N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The detailed actions that would be delivered will be described within an Implementation Plan, which will set out how the ESBS will be delivered. However, initiatives would include provision of work experience opportunities, internships, apprenticeships, and graduate recruitment opportunities.	
	Concerns raised that the local area will become over-reliant on Gatwick as its main employer, with significant risk of severe impacts, for example in response to another pandemic or climate change. Suggestions that other sectors should be prioritised for new jobs.	Whilst the project will create a large number of jobs, both directly on the airport and through its supply chain in the local area and nationally, it will not significantly change the area's dependence on the airport. The increase in direct jobs on the site of just over 3,000 compares to over 200,000 jobs in the Functional Economic Market Area (the spatial geography across which the local economy operates). The project will bring additional jobs and offer people a chance of work they would not otherwise have.	N
	Concerns that low-skilled jobs provided by the airport would deter future investment in high-skilled jobs.	The package of themes within ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) (ESBS) would provide both the framework and investment required not only for opening up employment and skills opportunities directly resulting from the Project, but it would facilitate the infrastructure, relationship-building and connections required to open up opportunities arising from 'business as usual' activity on-Airport. Thus, the Project would provide opportunities for access to a whole range of employment opportunities, from entry level right through to high level skilled positions.	N
	Requests for local employment to be prioritised to reduce travel times and bring benefits to the local community.	Notwithstanding that there would be a need for a nuanced approach that would enable Gatwick to focus the Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (see ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) (ESBS)) investments and actions in locations and in ways that would deliver greatest impact, it is envisaged, from a high level	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>perspective, that benefits would particularly flow to the Local Authority Areas closest to the airport, then to the wider Labour Market Area from which the airport currently draws the majority of its staff and to a lesser extent the wider Six Authorities Area. It is expected that the ESBS employment and skills activities would be delivered primarily within the Local Authorities located closest to the Airport whilst business-focused initiatives would be delivered across the wider Six Authorities Area.</p> <p>Gatwick would particularly welcome the potential to address very localised circumstances and priorities (including pockets of deprivation and attendant characteristics) that would be highlighted through the baseline analysis that AECOM recommends that local authorities conduct, described in 3.226 of the Statutory Consultation Socio-Economics Response. Specific support would be provided customised to effectively tackle barriers to employment. Details will be outlined within the ESBS Implementation Plan. However, Some of the key ways in which GAL will work to engage local residents in employment are set out in the responses relating to sections two and four of the OESBS.</p> <p>They will include: enlisting the support of recruitment and skills development brokerage organisations who will reach into local communities, including within neighbourhood-based community settings; engaging with local schools and colleges, involving Airline and other employers on and beyond the Gatwick site, to recruit to a range of opportunities including Apprenticeships and graduate positions; working collaboratively with the Department for Work and Pensions/Jobcentre Plus to support job seekers into work; and conducting local awareness-raising campaigns, including use of social media. Again, we envisage introducing mechanisms to ensure that vacancies are advertised locally in advance of wider geographical recruitment campaigns. We envisage working with a collective of skills and</p>	

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		education support providers, with each playing to its strengths to meet clearly articulated collective needs of GAL and other on-site employers.	
	Concerns raised about the automation of jobs in aviation and its impact on job forecasts as well as queries around how it has been factored into the assessment.	The estimated local job impact will impact sectors beyond the aviation industry, for example, it also concerns the supply-chain, and the induced impact of Gatwick. It is assumed that this relationship between air traffic and local employment remains constant throughout the period of appraisal. While it is acknowledged that this relationship may evolve, there is limited information available on the direction and extent to which the relationship will evolve as different long-term trends may have opposing impacts. For instance, productivity improvements may reduce the employment impact of increased air traffic while stronger connectivity and agglomeration impacts may strengthen the relationship between air traffic and employment	N
	Suggestions that Gatwick should have minimum employment levels for the duration of the Project to handle future growth and maintain its role as the largest employer of the area.	Noted.	N
	Concerns that the local area will not benefit as a lack of affordable housing will prevent residents from getting jobs.	The labour market analysis within the ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) indicates that there are more than sufficient existing residents available to take up the additional jobs generated by the Project (e.g., local residents who are economically active and unemployed as well as those economically inactive who want a job). Similarly, ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) shows that the Project would not increase the need for affordable housing nor is likely to impact on the affordable housing provision within the relevant housing market areas during both the construction and operation phases.	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that employment be focused in other regions, supporting the levelling up agenda through growth at regional airports.	Noted.	N
	Suggestions for prioritisation of jobs for those living in rural areas around the airport.	<p>ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) (ESBS) identifies two key factors that would guide the geographical targeting of proposed ESBS activities, which would include the promotion of employment opportunities. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focusing activity where Gatwick is able to use its skills, resource, expertise and other assets to create the greatest impact; and ▪ Ensuring that benefits are delivered consistent with the nature and scale of the impacts of the Project that will be experienced by communities, places and businesses. <p>It is envisaged, from a high-level perspective, that benefits would particularly flow to the Local Authority Areas closest to the airport, then to the wider Labour Market Area from which the airport currently draws the majority of its staff and to a lesser extent the wider Six Authorities Area. It is expected that the ESBS employment and skills activities would be delivered primarily within the Local Authorities located closest to the airport. More detail would be included in the ESBS Implementation Plan, which will set out how the ESBS would be delivered. However, the promotion of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion would be a cross-cutting theme of the ESBS, and this would be an additional factor that would influence the targeting of activities.</p>	N
	Suggestions for re-hiring of workers who lost jobs during the pandemic before hiring	Noted. Wherever possible, Gatwick has re-connected with staff previously employed at Gatwick Airport Limited as the airport has rebuilt in the wake of the pandemic.	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	new people and that more benefits should be offered for airport employees.		
	Comments that there should be more advertising of jobs locally.	Some of the key ways in which Gatwick would work to engage local residents in employment include: enlisting the support of recruitment and skills development brokerage organisations who will reach into local communities, including within neighbourhood-based community settings; engaging with local schools and colleges, involving Airline and other employers on and beyond the Gatwick site, to recruit to a range of opportunities including Apprenticeships and graduate positions; working collaboratively with the Department for Work and Pensions/Jobcentre Plus to support job seekers into work; and conducting local awareness-raising campaigns, including use of social media. We envisage introducing mechanisms to ensure that vacancies are advertised locally in advance of wider geographical recruitment campaigns.	N
	Suggestions that green jobs outside of the airport should be prioritised and that, instead of the runway, Gatwick should help to expand employment in green industries to help achieve net zero and transition to a green economy.	GAL is committed to driving environmental sustainability through all of its actions. These include construction, engineering and innovation practices, all of which will expand green industries and jobs.	N
Business	Concerns about disruption affecting local businesses, including tourism.	There is an expanded discussion on tourism effects in the update to the national impact report. However, the assessment doesn't quantify the welfare impacts associated with tourism due to limited evidence available. ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) includes a section discussing local tourism impacts. Overall, the Project is expected to bring benefits at the national and local level (including local business).	Y

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns that the Project would make it more difficult for other employers or construction projects to hire new workers, and that the proposals would likely draw in more commuters from London.	The cumulative assessment presented in section 17.11 of ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics (Doc Ref. 5.1) deals with these concerns. In short, it concludes that labour supply issues are not anticipated due to the general scale and mobility of the construction workforce. Furthermore, most of the cumulative schemes relate primarily to housing and some commercial developments which by their nature may require construction workforce comprising different skills and trades compared to the profile of workers likely to be demanded by the Project.	N
	Comments that the proposals are not in the interests of local and national business, with economic benefits likely to shift between airports rather than produce a net national improvement.	While the estimated local economic benefits take account of displacement at a local level. Spill over between airports, while not included within the scope of the assessment is expected to be limited given the limited passenger diversion between airports during the period of analysis. The national EIA estimates the benefits to the national economy, including benefits to passengers, the government and the wider economy.	N
	Comments that East Midlands airport is better suited for increased freight.	Noted.	N
	Concerns raised about land-take uprooting local businesses and construction disrupting business productivity.	The ES Assessment concludes that there are no significant business disruption effects. There are no displacement effects outside the airport boundary and any displacement within the airport is mitigated prior to the effect taking place.	N
	Support for local economic benefits, including bringing local businesses into the supply chain, encouraging investment and attracting new businesses to the area.	Noted.	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Support for enhanced movement of goods and services in the region as well as access to international markets.	An indicative estimate of the potential trade benefits is now included in the national EIA. Freight impacts are discussed qualitatively.	Y
	Comments that Gatwick should support local infrastructure to prevent the Project from undermining other local economic activity and ensure tangible benefits for local businesses.	The ES assessment concludes that the Project will not give rise to adverse effects relating to additional job creation as considered in detail within ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3). Enhancement measures to maximise the benefits for the local population and businesses associated with the Project are set out in ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that improved freight and cargo facilities could help to grow UK exports.	An indicative estimate of the potential trade benefits is now included in the national EIA.	Y
	Suggestions for targets to be set for maximising opportunities for small businesses to ensure accountability.	Enhancement measures to maximise the benefits for the local population and businesses associated with the Project are set out in ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) (ESBS). One of the four objectives of the ESBS would be to “Drive up growth and productivity across the business base through the expansion of capacity and enterprise acumen of Small to Medium Sized and Micro Businesses”. Targets and projected outcomes for all employment, skills and business actions will be set out within an Implementation Plan.	N
Local community	Suggestions that community funding should increase in proportion to the negative impacts of expansion.	GAL currently operates an existing community fund through the Gatwick Airport Community Trust which awards grants annually for deserving projects within the area of benefit which covers parts of East and West	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Sussex, Surrey and Kent. The funds are channelled to those areas where people are directly affected by operations at Gatwick Airport and encourage and support schemes that benefit diverse sections of the local community. The Trust is funded under an obligation within the current Section 106 agreement (signed May 2022), with funding linked to annual passenger numbers. The current s106 agreement is due to expire on 31st December 2024.</p> <p>The Trust is complemented by a discretionary and voluntary arrangement by GAL known as the Gatwick Foundation Fund which also supports a range of community projects across Kent, Surrey and Sussex, and is managed by the individual Community Foundations. The aim is to merge these funds to create one, new, single Gatwick Community Fund which will be secured through the new Section 106. This fund will have similar aims and will be dedicated to supporting local communities through the funding of projects within those communities most affected by the airport operations. Further details are set out in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1).</p>	
	<p>Suggestions for supporting the local community included funding charities, growing the Gatwick Diamond Area, engaging in youth schemes, becoming a champion of inward investment, increasing wages, investing in the leisure industry, and building an observatory.</p>	<p>GAL propose to continue their commitment to funding local community projects and charities through a future s106 agreement for the Northern Runway project, which will link the level of funding to passenger numbers, as per the existing legal agreement.</p> <p>GAL have also set out (in the 2021 consultation) its Outline Employment Skills and Business Strategy (OESBS) which covers the core themes of Employment and Skills; Inspire and Motivate (education) Supply Chain opportunities; Innovation; and Regional Identity. Through these themes the OESBS provides a framework to ensure that local residents can develop the skills required and gain access to the wide range of job opportunities</p>	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		that will arise during the construction work and future operation of the airport as it continues to grow. It also addresses how Gatwick proposes to work with partners to support local businesses through the airport supply chain, drive opportunities for innovation and collaboration, and promote regional identity to support inward investment and tourism.	
	Suggestions for continued engagement with the community and stakeholders as well as organisations such as the Crawley Innovation Centre, Manor Royal BID, and proposed Institute of Technology, as well as establishing Knowledge Transfer Partnerships.	<p>GAL has an extensive engagement programme which helps it to understand local issues and priorities and look for opportunities to support, partner and collaborate.</p> <p>For example, throughout the pandemic, GAL held Keeping in Touch zoom calls with local parish councils; and in 2023 re-launched its pre-pandemic series of <i>Discover Gatwick</i> - behind the scenes visits for local community representatives. Engagement with its immediate neighbours is a priority and a regular dialogue is maintained with Manor Royal BID, including participating in events.</p> <p>GAL is also an active member of several local business membership organisations, including Gatwick Diamond Business and the Sussex Chamber of Commerce. GAL continues to engage with the Coast to Capital LEP and Gatwick Diamond Initiative on Gatwick's role in driving a thriving and resilient economy. Examples of active partnerships include commitment to a 6-year partnership with the Surrey and Sussex Institute of Technology as an industry partner; membership of the Crawley Innovation Centre Project Board; and strategic partner for inward investment with Gatwick Diamond Initiative.</p>	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Education and training	Suggestions for a greater commitment to apprenticeships or work placements as part of the Project, including engineering, construction, STEM areas, sustainability, architecture, and technology.	A suite of interlocking initiatives would be required to maximise employment and skills outcomes. These would include employment outreach and brokerage and a range of skills provision and actions to open up routes to work experience and careers. This would include work placements, apprenticeships and graduate recruitment opportunities. Gatwick would work with the Gatwick Family of on-site businesses to open up opportunities across the widest possible range of potential careers options.	N
	Suggestions that Gatwick engages more with higher and further education institutions to provide more graduate schemes, training programmes, and sponsorship and grant opportunities as well as providing school visits.	<p>Core to Gatwick’s proposed delivery methodology across employment and skills actions would be to establish a strong relationship with a consortium of delivery agencies, including further and higher education institutions and skills providers. Gatwick envisages that the consortium would be tasked with delivering Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) employment and skills outcomes, incorporating a range of interventions, with each provider playing to its strengths. The ESBS has been informed by close working with experienced further and higher education providers. The precise make-up of the consortium would be informed, over time, by the generation of increasingly detailed intelligence on precise construction and wider workforce requirements. However, Gatwick would envisage that the consortium would have, at its heart, the partnership of institutions behind the Sussex and Surrey Institute of Technology, which would be located in Crawley. These are the Chichester College Group, the Northeast Surrey College of Technology (NESCOT) and the Universities of Sussex and Brighton.</p> <p>Full and effective engagement with schools will be a central focus for using the Project to motivate and inspire young people to pursue STEM careers. Gatwick would build upon current areas of activity, including the Engineering and Construction Department collaborations with teaching staff</p>	N

Theme: Economic and socio-economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>to deliver interesting and motivational projects in schools, designed to capture the imaginations of primary and secondary school pupils and encourage them to pursue STEM studies and careers. Gatwick is currently testing and piloting actions to explore the feasibility of developing a STEM Centre on site, which would enable this work to extend onto the Airport site itself and be accompanied by tours where pupils and further and higher education students can view live engineering and other projects.</p> <p>Gatwick is considering grants and scholarships as a stimulus to enterprise and learning.</p>	
	<p>Comments that Gatwick should do more to improve training opportunities and help to implement the proposed Local Skills Investment Strategy.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) (ESBS) demonstrates GAL is committed to supporting the creation of the conditions required to successfully deliver the significant opportunities that would be expected from the Project for sustainable employment, skills and career progression for communities and enhancements in the productivity and growth of business. These include the generation of insight into contemporary labour and skills needs and demands; the availability of high quality, interconnected recruitment, training and business engagement infrastructure; and effective, clear processes for residents and businesses to access opportunities in a timely way. Thus, Gatwick would play its part in driving up the quality and relevance of skills infrastructure and opportunities, in keeping with the Local Skills Investment Strategy.</p>	N

e. Carbon and climate change

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Green technology and sustainability	<p>Suggestions for investment in green technology such as carbon capture and renewable energy as well as in research to achieve net zero.</p> <p>Suggested programmes included green aircraft, low-carbon alternatives and green technology training.</p>	<p>GAL has accelerated its goal of reaching net zero to 2030, bringing forward capital and operating investment ten years ahead of its previous target. Detailed plans are being developed and implemented to reduce GAL's emissions as far as possible. Currently, residual emissions are offset, however as part of its net zero commitment GAL is committed to removing residual emissions from 2030.</p> <p>As well as reducing its own direct emissions, GAL will provide the appropriate infrastructure for sustainable aviation and play its part in advancing and implementing the UK Government's Jet Zero strategy.</p> <p>The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the Carbon Action Plan.</p>	N
	<p>Suggestions for the use of green energy sources across the airport, selling sustainable products and minimising use of plastic.</p>	<p>GAL's Sustainability Strategy, the second 'Decade of Change', focuses on ten key topics over ten years, and includes goals relating to waste and energy. GAL has accelerated its goal of reaching net zero to 2030 bringing forward capital and operating investment, ten years ahead of its previous target. The capital programme includes energy-efficiency projects, such as the replacement of light fittings with LEDs, accelerating our asset-replacement programme for gas boilers and diesel vehicles, and exploring alternative fuel sources such as geothermal heat for our buildings and hydrogenated vegetable oil for our fleet. GAL will invest in on-site renewable energy such as solar power, and off-site Power Purchase Agreements. GAL has purchased REGO certified renewable electricity since 2013.</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the Carbon Action Plan.	
	Requests for more information around the timelines for green technology and storage of sustainable fuel.	<p>In 2021, Gatwick in partnership with easyJet, Q8 Aviation and Neste completed a proof-of-concept demonstration that the existing aviation fuel infrastructure at the airport is ready to utilise certified A1 jet fuel that contains sustainable aviation fuel (SAF).</p> <p>With regards to zero emission aircraft, the technology is still being developed. Airbus, for example aim to develop the world's first hydrogen-powered commercial aircraft by 2035. By 2050, predictions show a mix of conventional and zero emission aircraft.</p> <p>The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the Carbon Action Plan.</p>	N
	Suggestions for the creation of more green space.	<p>The areas of public open space permanently affected include approximately 1.03 ha of land within the area of Riverside Garden Park and approximately 0.13 ha of Church Meadow that both form part of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Riverside Green Chain, designated urban open space.</p> <p>The following areas of replacement open space would be created as part of the Project close to the areas of open space affected:</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An area of approximately 1.43ha currently located within an area of current area of Car Park B to the north and south of the A23. A new pedestrian walkway would be provided to connect the existing area of Riverside Garden Park to the area of replacement open space. This would be connected to Riverside Garden Park by the provision of a new pedestrian walkway An area of approximately 0.52ha of land to the west of Church Meadow, located to the west of the River Mole on land currently used as grazing land. This area of replacement space would be linked to the existing area of Church Meadow through the provision of a new pedestrian bridge over the River Mole. <p>These areas provide a total of 1.95ha of replacement open space in comparison to the 1.16ha of land permanently affected by the Project.</p>	
	Requests for more information about how Gatwick has improved sustainability in recent years as well as how it would seek to expand in a carbon-neutral way and reach net zero by 2050.	<p>GAL provides an annual update of its progress towards its sustainability goals, including its progress towards reaching net zero, in its 'Decade of Change' report, publicly available at: https://www.gatwickairport.com/business-community/sustainability/reports/. Updates are also provided in GAL's Annual Report.</p> <p>The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the Carbon Action Plan.</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for provision of land for generating green energy or carbon offset schemes.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the Carbon Action Plan.	N
	Support for proposed environmental mitigation, particularly use of renewable energy sources, low emission vehicles, and on-site heat generation.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the Carbon Action Plan.	N
	Suggestions for improving Project sustainability including, use of electric runway vehicles, sustainable jobs, investment in teaching climate change skills, cleaned-up local area, better building insulation, efficient heating, cooling and lighting systems.	<p>The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the Carbon Action Plan.</p> <p>The measures include some of the examples given here, namely the roll-out of electric vehicle recharging infrastructure, increase insulation within Gatwick buildings, and a number of measures related to heating and cooling systems.</p>	N
	Comments about the necessity of air travel and supporting the success Gatwick has had in reducing its impact to date. Also, optimism about the availability of future green technologies. Others suggest reducing air travel should be a priority and questioning the effectiveness of the	<p>Sustainable Aviation, an alliance of the UK's airlines, airports, aerospace manufacturers, air navigation service providers, sustainable fuel producers and key business partners, are together driving a long-term strategy to deliver cleaner, quieter, and smarter flying.</p> <p>With these actions, the UK will be able to accommodate significant growth in passengers through to 2050 whilst reducing net emission levels from just</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	proposals in mitigating the Project's environmental impact.	<p>under 40 million tonnes of CO₂ per year down to zero. Doing this can also support many new jobs in the UK renewable and low carbon economy.</p> <p>GAL is a member of Sustainable Aviation and, through its sustainability strategy the 'Decade of Change', is committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Playing our part in UK aviation and ground transport transition to net zero carbon ▪ Working with airlines and fuel providers to implement the Sustainable Aviation decarbonisation roadmap and interim goals. 	
	Suggestions for reduction of inefficient technology across the airport and use of sustainable energy and materials for all construction.	A commitment is contained within the Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) to reduce carbon emissions arising from the construction of the Project, along with a suite of measures.	N
	Suggestions for support of local green businesses and initiatives.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out outcomes that Gatwick is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the Carbon Action Plan.	N
Emissions	Comments that there should be a reduction in air travel, primarily to help tackle carbon emissions, with raising the cost of flights, decreasing air freight or banning short haul flights suggested to achieve this.	The Government's 10-year aviation strategy 'Flightpath for the Future' (2022) makes it clear that it does not believe that aviation must decline for the UK to meet its climate change targets. The Government states in this document that they support airport expansion where it's justified, to boost global connectivity and to level up the UK.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for the introduction of new taxes or levies, including on carbon emissions, aviation fuel, and frequent flyers.	Noted.	N
	Concerns raised about the amount of carbon emissions associated with the Project, including the amount of concrete required for construction. Suggestions for use of low carbon methods, techniques and construction materials.	<p>Section 16.12 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out a summary of the assessment effects and in paragraph 16.12.3 describes that the overall impacts arising from the Project are not so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets, including Carbon Budgets.</p> <p>A commitment is contained within the Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) to reduce carbon emissions arising from the construction of the Project.</p>	N
	Suggestions that approval for the Project should be conditional on Gatwick demonstrating a commitment to a progressive reduction in emissions against a 2019 baseline. Comments that enforceable monitoring resulting in fines or other penalties if mitigation targets are missed should be included for construction and operation.	<p>The ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) and the Project's mitigation approach has been developed alongside and in light of the environmental assessment work. The Carbon Action Plan seeks to reduce GAL-controlled emissions as much as possible by 2030 and remove any residual emissions to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030 for Scopes 1 and 2, before committing to 'zero emissions' for GAL direct Scope 1 and 2 emissions from 2040 onwards (i.e. no carbon removals required). Gatwick is committed to the CAP and its outcomes through the terms of the DCO.</p> <p>Gatwick Airport's second Decade of Change sets out Gatwick's goal to achieve net zero for GAL Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. GAL proposes to legally commit to this through the Carbon Action Plan under the terms of the DCO.</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information around how Gatwick will work to mitigate Scope 3 emissions.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out how GAL will seek to influence third parties (that it does not have control over) to reduce its emissions (i.e. Scope 3 emissions).	N
	Requests for more information around recent emissions from Gatwick and their effects.	Gatwick Airport calculates and reports GHG emissions on an annual basis through annual Decade of Change performance summaries, most recently in 2021, and has been carbon neutral since 2017. From the 2019 Decade of Change performance summary, Gatwick's direct emissions in 2019 reduced by 54.5% compared to a 1990 baseline. Gatwick will continue to publish its third-party independently verified carbon footprint, as part of the annual Decade of Change performance summaries.	N
	Requests for more information around how offsetting works.	Section 16.2 of ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) outlines the role of offsets and trading schemes in the wider aviation sector. The government's Jet Zero strategy sets out a framework and plan on achieving net zero aviation in the UK by 2050. The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) presents a hierarchy of carbon mitigation measures which include offsets/trading schemes in accordance with the Jet Zero Strategy.	N
	Requests for more information around the level of control Gatwick has over the types of planes flying in. Also, whether other companies operating inside Gatwick could help in mitigating the environmental impact of the development.	GAL is committed to minimising emissions under its control, in addition to guiding and influencing stakeholders and partners in reducing their emissions. The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) explains how GAL can "control", "guide" and "influence" emissions in line with the Airport Carbon Accreditation definitions and GHG Protocol.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that Gatwick commit to a 45% reduction in emissions by 2030.	Gatwick Airport's second Decade of Change sets out Gatwick's goal to achieve net zero for GAL Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. GAL proposes to legally commit to this through the Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) under the terms of the DCO.	N
Climate change	Comments that the hazards of flooding, droughts, and extreme weather are not considered and the risk of the 'heat island effect' due to the airport's proximity to towns.	<p>ES Chapter 15: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 5.1) Sections 15.8 and 15.9, ES Appendix 15.8.1: Climate Change Resilience Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 15.9.1: In-Combination Climate Change Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) consider the hazards of flooding, droughts and extreme weather on both the construction and operational phases. ES Appendix 5.3.4: Major Accidents and Disasters (Doc Ref. 5.3) also provides an assessment of risks associated with the Project in respect of potential major accidents and disasters.</p> <p>Whilst earlier Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers guidance indicated that Gatwick Airport does not experience a detectable Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect and the airport has a climate that is characteristic of its rural surroundings, an UHI assessment has been undertaken as part of the ES. This assessment compared the temperatures between an urban city location (London City Airport), a rural location (Charlwood) and Gatwick Airport (ES Chapter 15: Climate Change, Section 15.5 (Doc Ref. 5.1)).</p> <p>Evaluation of current UHI conditions at these sites during average and heatwave conditions highlighted that day-time temperatures at the airport are slightly higher than those in a nearby rural site, although this difference is not pronounced. This effect was found to be particularly pronounced in night-time temperatures which are, on average, 1.0°C higher at Gatwick airport but 1.4°C higher during a heatwave event. However, this UHI effect is low (ES</p>	Y

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Chapter 15: Climate Change , Section 15.5) Doc Ref. 5.1)). Further information can be found in ES Appendix 15.5.3: Urban Heat Island Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
Mitigation	Suggestions that mitigation measures go ahead either without or prior to the Project.	Gatwick Airport's second Decade of Change sets out Gatwick's goal to achieve net zero for GAL Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. This is Gatwick Airport's goal with or without the Project. However, under the terms of the Project, GAL is proposing to legally commit to this through the Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) under the terms of the DCO.	N
	Requests for more information about the 'design and other measures' that will be considered.	The full list of measures is contained in Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)). GAL will draw from the range of measures to identify the most effective carbon reductions using best available technologies to achieve the carbon targets under the CAP.	N

f. Traffic and transport

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Support for proposals, particularly rail and targets for sustainable transport as well as improved cycle lanes and footpaths.	Noted.	N
	Comments that the proposals are unlikely to be effective, targets are not binding, and cars will remain the most convenient mode of transport, encouraged by road improvements and parking increases.	<p>As part of the DCO application, GAL is committed to a number of surface access measures as part of the Project, which are set out in the Surface Access Commitments (SAC). As part of the SAC, GAL is committing to achieving a certain level of sustainable transport mode share for air passengers and airport staff. The SAC also sets out measures which we expect to be required to deliver those mode shares. The SAC also includes an approach to monitoring surface access outcomes to determine whether the mode shares are achieved and if they are not, a process to add to or alter the interventions if necessary.</p> <p>The assessment in the DCO application is based on the committed mode shares in the SAC and the associated measures to achieve them. In discussion with stakeholders, we have also undertaken sensitivity tests to assist in understanding the implications of both a higher and a lower sustainable mode share being achieved.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Project's highway mitigation has not been developed to encourage people to drive to the airport. The SAC demonstrates GAL's commitment to increasing the proportion of trips made by public transport and other sustainable transport modes. The highway improvements are necessary to ensure the efficient and safe movement of airport and non-airport traffic both of which are expected to grow in volume over the next 25 years. Accordingly, the Project proposals provide necessary capacity for</p>	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		growth, ensure the smooth flow of traffic between Crawley and Horley and deliver improved connections between the M23 motorway and Gatwick Airport.	
	Questions raised around how Gatwick would ensure improvements are made as the proposals are dependent on third parties, particularly rail and road improvements.	The Project Team has held extensive engagement with National Highways and the local highway authorities on the Project's proposed highway works. If the DCO is approved, these works would be funded by GAL and arrangements for construction would be agreed with stakeholders. The assessment indicates that GAL are not reliant on third parties providing additional rail services to mitigate the effects of the Project as no additional services are required, although clearly any further service improvements that might come forward would be welcomed in addition.	N
	Comments that the proposals will add to improvements such as the Fastway Bus Rapid Transport scheme which have already increased the frequency and quality of services.	Noted.	N
	Support for a flyover between the South Terminal and the A23.	Noted.	N
	Comments that the proposals are 'greenwashing'/attempting to hide the negative environmental impact of the Project. Also, trains and buses increase emissions so should not be considered 'sustainable'.	GAL is committed to growing the Airport in as sustainable a way as possible. For example, GAL is committed to increasing the proportion of journeys made by modes which are more sustainable than single-occupancy cars aim to contribute to reducing the overall impact of transport on the environment.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that road and rail improvements should be completed before the northern runway can be used.	The strategic and local highway models has been used to test the operation of the highway network in the year that the northern runway opens and three years afterwards. These indicate that the existing network will perform acceptably when the runway opens, but that the Project's proposed highway works will need to be in place within three years of the runway opening date.	N
	Suggestions for better advertising of sustainable transport, including the Thameslink, discounts, and incentives.	GAL promotes sustainable transport through its Airport Surface Access Strategy and through all of its media channels, as well in partnership with public transport service providers. We continue to monitor and update messaging to staff and passengers relating to sustainable travel choices.	N
	Suggestions for a fast link between Gatwick and Heathrow.	There are already several direct coach services between Gatwick Airport and Heathrow Airport each day and our assessment assumes that these will remain in place and that operators are likely to increase frequencies over time in response to general increases in demand, both at Heathrow Airport and at Gatwick Airport.	N
	Suggestions that expansion should be conditional on reducing the number of car users accessing the airport and that any targets should be set and monitored by an independent agency.	<p>The Project includes a comparatively small increase in the net number of car parking spaces available for air passengers, of around 1,100 spaces or about 2% of our total parking stock. The Project does not propose to increase the number of airport staff car parking spaces. Alongside this change, GAL will be implementing measures to discourage airport staff from travelling by single-occupancy car and to encourage and facilitate air passengers to travel by public transport in accordance with the SACs.</p> <p>The SACs include proposals for a monitoring regime which includes annual monitoring reports that would be shared with the Gatwick Air Transport Forum Transport Steering Group, which would provide external scrutiny of progress towards achieving our mode share commitments.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Data and assessment	Queries raised around whether the data for current use of sustainable transport takes account of the use of cars or taxis to access public transport.	The information provided for existing use of sustainable transport is based on the main mode of travel used for each journey. Where, for example, someone takes the train to Gatwick Airport, this is recorded as a rail journey, even if that person drove or took a taxi to their origin station before boarding the train.	N
	Questions regarding whether the data reflects post-pandemic levels and the potential for an increase in heavy goods vehicle (HGV) activity as cargo use expands.	<p>As ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1) explains, the modelling which informs our assessment is based on information from 2016. This provides a comprehensive and consistent data set, collected during a period when the transport network was operating in a relatively stable condition.</p> <p>During the period of 2018 to 2019, prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, the introduction of the Smart Motorways Scheme between Junctions 8 and 10 on the M23, and changes in railway timetabling through 2018 and 2019, led to a period of variability in access to the airport. 2016 was considered the most stable pre-pandemic period on which to base the modelling.</p> <p>Analysis of the changes in traffic flows at key locations adjacent to Gatwick Airport and on the strategic road network suggests that weekday daily traffic volumes in June 2022 were below the equivalent for 2016, indicating that traffic levels had not yet recovered to pre-pandemic levels. Slower recovery was indicated on the local road network. The analysis also suggested this was consistent across the day for a typical weekday, with peak hour traffic volumes tending to be lower than 2016 equivalents. By comparison, the assumptions used to produce the future baseline model scenarios imply general traffic growth between the 2016 base year and 2022 of around +6%. From this analysis, the 2016 base for modelling is considered to be robust and appropriate for assessing the effects of the Project.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) includes the effects of an increase in cargo activity at the airport, noting that we do not propose a different approach to cargo capacity through the airport. Whilst we anticipate an increase in cargo traffic, the trends in the logistics industry towards consolidation, 'just-in-time' deliveries and 'last mile' distribution hubs mean that we do not expect a significant increase in cargo movements by HGV.	
	Suggestions that targets should be based on potential emissions from journeys to the airport and not use percentages.	GAL is committing to certain proportions of journeys being made by different transport modes, because this means that we can readily monitor travel behaviour and report on progress towards achieving our commitments.	N
	Questions raised around whether the assessment includes transport requirements for the increased number of workers due to the Project.	The assessment takes account of the increase in the number of airport staff working at the Gatwick Airport with the Project. The modelling therefore includes the effects of those additional staff making choices about which modes of transport to use, and the impacts of those choices on the operation of the transport networks.	N
	Requests for more information on the differences between 2016 and future baseline traffic impacts.	The assessment presents the effects of the Project on traffic and transport, compared to the conditions that would exist if the Project were not to proceed. The changes between 2016 (the base year) and the various future baseline years are expected to occur irrespective of the Project and are not therefore matters which the Project should seek to mitigate. Nevertheless, we have shared the modelling outputs with stakeholders, including the information for the future baseline and with Project scenarios, to allow comparisons between 2016 and the future baselines to be made.	N
	Questions raised around the inclusion of other transport schemes in the future baseline, including the Croydon Area	We have reviewed the Uncertainty Log for our modelling, which is a long list of potential developments and schemes in the area covered by the models, identifying how certain each is to come forward. This approach is set out in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance and allows us to identify which schemes	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Remodelling Scheme and Lower Thames Crossing.	<p>and developments should be included in the core modelling scenarios. The list of developments and classification of certainty has been produced based on information received from, and discussions with, local planning authorities, local highway authorities, National Highways and Network Rail.</p> <p>We have now excluded the Croydon Area Remodelling Scheme from our core modelling scenarios given its level of certainty. The Lower Thames Crossing remains one of the schemes included in our core modelling.</p>	
	Questions about the use of single day counting for the Gatwick Airport Long Term Car Parking Monitoring Statement and whether it adequately measures unauthorised parking.	The Project's approach to car parking monitoring has been agreed with the local planning authorities and is reflected in our Section 106 agreement with Crawley Borough Council. As part of the Project, GAL is committed to an extensive transport monitoring approach, which includes access to and from the airport by all modes. The Surface Access Commitments (ES Appendix 5.4.1) (Doc Ref. 5.3) also include support for local authorities monitoring and enforcement of off-airport unauthorised parking and traffic impacts.	N
	Comments that the assessments should be based on public transport use at pre-pandemic levels.	The assessments are informed by the modelling which is based on transport provision and travel behaviour as it was in 2016, so the models therefore reflect pre-pandemic travel patterns. The assessments also include forecast changes in trip-making, based on the use of TEMPro factors as indicated in DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance.	N
	Comments that road traffic growth should consider forecast population growth across the Southeast.	The models for future years, with or without the Project, include allowance for population and employment growth through the application of growth factors derived from the TEMPro database, in line with guidance in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance. These factors cover the whole of the modelled area and therefore reflect anticipated population growth in the Southeast.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for further information about passenger travel patterns and volumes as well as the data sources used to calculate private vehicle mode share.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) explains the approach taken to develop the strategic transport models, and also contains a more detailed technical Strategic Modelling Report as Annex B, which provides further information.	N
Access	Comments that the airport is difficult to access, including east-west for residents, to/from other airports and areas to the south.	The Project includes enhancements to local and regional bus and coach services which aim to improve access from areas where direct public transport provision is currently less good. These have been developed since the PEIR (Autumn 2021 Consultation) was published and are reflected in the assessment presented in the DCO application.	Y
	Comments that the cost of accessing the airport using public transport is too high, especially for staff.	GAL provides discounts for staff travelling by public transport and will continue to keep these under review, seeking to increase these discounts as part of the measures in the SACs for the Project. The details of available discounts will be defined in due course, in consultation with employers and staff as well as public transport operators themselves.	Y
	Suggestions for more drop-off and pick-up points around the airport.	The airport's forecourts are already busy, and GAL introduced forecourt charges to help manage activity and encourage passengers to use public transport to reach the airport rather than travelling by car. GAL already provide free drop-off and pick-up facilities in our long-stay car parks, with passengers able to use the shuttle buses to travel to and from the terminals. Providing further pick-up and drop-off points is likely to encourage car use rather than support our commitments to increasing public transport mode share for air passenger journeys to and from Gatwick Airport.	N
Capacity	Concerns raised about lack of capacity in the public transport network to cope with increases due to the Project.	The assessment considers the capacity available in the public transport network, allowing for any committed changes in public transport infrastructure and services, as well as general background growth in demand, over the	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		period that has been modelled. The assessment considers the number of additional rail journeys that could be made as a result of the Project and identifies how this would affect crowding on rail services. It also considers the local and regional bus and coach service frequencies that would be needed to cater for the demands with the Project.	
	Concerns raised about the capacity of the road network, especially with increased freight traffic.	The assessment considers the capacity available in the highway network, allowing for any committed changes in highway infrastructure together with changes in background highway demand over the period that we have modelled. The assessment uses strategic and local highway models to identify the changes in operation that could result from the Project and identifies whether and where this would result in significant impacts on network operation that might require mitigation.	N
	Concerns raised about the capacity of local and rural roads, especially when drivers use them to avoid motorway congestion.	<p>The assessment considers the capacity available in the highway network, allowing for any committed changes in highway infrastructure together with changes in background highway demand over the period that we have modelled. The assessment uses strategic and local highway models to identify the changes in operation that could result from the Project and identifies whether and where this would result in significant impacts on network operation that might require mitigation.</p> <p>The strategic models include the local and rural road network around the Airport and therefore allow us to identify whether traffic flow changes on those roads would occur as a result of additional car-borne demand, or as a result of traffic reassigning from one route to another.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that congestion will be worsened by proposed housing developments alongside the Project, including during construction.	<p>The models for future years, with or without the Project, include allowance for population and employment growth through the application of growth factors derived from the TEMPro database, in line with guidance in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance. These factors reflect anticipated levels of new development across the modelled area.</p> <p>The cumulative effects assessment contained in ES Chapter 12 and ES Chapter 20 specifically includes the proposed developments at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and west of Ifield, recognising that although these developments are not yet sufficiently certain to be included in our core scenarios, they may have particular effects on the transport networks in the vicinity of Gatwick Airport.</p> <p>The Project's proposed highway improvements show reduced congestion compared to the Future Baseline in the absence of the Project. Any new developments coming forward may include their own mitigation of transport impacts arising from those developments and where these have been included in our core scenarios these network changes have been taken into account.</p>	N
Safety	Concerns raised about local roads becoming rat-runs, with traffic and HGVs impacting on the safety of residents.	The assessment considers the capacity available in the highway network, allowing for any committed changes in highway infrastructure together with changes in background highway demand over the period that we have modelled. The assessment uses strategic and local highway models to identify the changes in operation that could result from the Project and identifies whether and where this would result in significant impacts on network operation that might require mitigation. The strategic models include the local and rural road network around the airport and therefore allow us to identify whether traffic flow changes on those roads would occur as a result of additional car-borne demand, or as a result of traffic reassigning from one	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>route to another. The assessment includes consideration of the effects of traffic on severance, amenity and journey times for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The Project's proposed highway improvements support the continued use of the strategic road network for the majority of airport-related journeys.</p>	
	Comments that signage is inadequate and should be improved with the Project.	It is anticipated that the proposed highway works will include new signage, as necessary, to reflect the changes to the road layout that will occur. It is possible that this will also include revised signage on the approaches to the airport, although this has yet to be confirmed with the relevant highway authorities. Other than this, GAL is not responsible for signage on the public highway, which is a matter for the highway authorities.	N
Cost	Comments that taxpayer funds should not be used for transport improvements.	GAL will be responsible for funding the mitigation which is identified as being necessary to address any significant adverse effects resulting from the Project.	N
	Requests for more information on how the improvements, including maintenance during operation, would be funded.	GAL will be responsible for funding the mitigation which is identified as being necessary to address any significant adverse effects resulting from the Project. GAL is in discussions with the highway authorities about maintenance responsibilities. It is anticipated that GAL will also be providing funding for maintenance of the new highway infrastructure through commuted sum payments.	N
Car parking	Comments opposing any increase in parking.	The Project proposals were revised after the Autumn 2021 consultation to take account of consultation feedback, including a reduction to the amount of car parking proposed as part of the Project. In total, the Project is seeking permission for around 8,900 parking spaces, although 7,800 of these would replacement parking that will need to be relocated as part of the Project proposals. The net increase in on-airport passenger parking will therefore be	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		only 1,100 spaces, and we will only deliver these if we believe it is necessary to meet demand. The Project does not propose to increase the number of staff car parking spaces.	
	Concerns raised around the loss of staff parking, especially Car Park Y, while increasing passenger parking.	<p>The Project proposes to keep the number of staff car parking spaces at or below current levels. This is part of our approach to increase the proportion of staff travelling by more sustainable modes of transport. The modest increase that we propose in passenger car parking will only be delivered if we believe it is necessary to meet demand. It represents an increase of around 2% in the total number of passenger parking spaces, compared to an increase of around 20% in the annual number of passengers passing through the airport as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The loss of individual car parks, such as changes to Car Park Y will be replaced with additional car parks leading to 7,800 spaces being included for re-provision.</p>	N
	Comments that the car parks should be improved, particularly in relation to coverage for wet weather and signage.	Noted.	N
	Concerns raised about unauthorised parking on fields and residential streets.	Noted. As part of the Project's Surface Access Commitments, GAL will provide support to local authorities' enforcement and management activities for unauthorised parking and traffic impacts in local areas.	N
	Suggestions for improvements to Car Parks X and Y and provision of off-site park and ride facilities.	Noted.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for reduced charges to discourage parking in local roads.	<p>Car parking charges are an effective measure to support changes in travel behaviour and help GAL to achieve the Project's mode share commitments.</p> <p>The assessment is based on car parking charges increasing over time, although we will retain flexibility on the precise levels of charging to allow us the ability to vary charges to respond to seasonal demands and to other circumstances.</p>	N
	Suggestions for improvements to parking for locals, more off-site car parks further from the airport, more general improvements to long-stay car parks, a larger commuter car park at the railway station, and more spaces for short-stay parking.	<p>Additional short stay parking is likely to encourage a higher number of drop-off and pick-up journeys by private car, contrary to our aim of reducing the proportion of air passenger journeys made by car.</p> <p>GAL provides limited commuter parking at the railway station consistent with the area for which Gatwick is the local railway station. GAL promotes the use of sustainable modes to access the station rather than commuter parking, consistent with its Airport Surface Access Strategy.</p>	N
	Requests for more information about what would happen to new car parking spaces should more passengers use sustainable modes of transport.	The Project is seeking permission to provide up to 1,100 new additional parking spaces for passengers, but we will only deliver these if demand requires it.	N
Electric vehicles	Comments that there should be greater consideration of electric vehicles and proposals for more charging points.	<p>The assessment does not explicitly model the use of electric vehicles or changes in the proportion of electric vehicles in use over time. Increased use of electric vehicles will tend to reduce vehicle emissions for journeys to and from the airport.</p> <p>GAL continues to provide additional facilities for EV charging in accordance with its Decade of Change policies.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that more electric vehicles would not improve congestion issues.	Noted. The assessment does not explicitly model the use of electric vehicles or changes in the proportion of electric vehicles in use over time. The outcomes of the assessment, and the identification of environmental effects related to traffic and transport, therefore do not rely on the use of electric vehicles as a mitigation measure, but instead identifies locations where additional traffic could lead to increased delay and considers whether the effects in those locations are significant and require mitigation.	N
	Comments that greater use of electric vehicles may reduce the need for public transport.	It is not yet clear whether the increased proportion of electric vehicles available in the domestic vehicle fleet will affect the use of public transport. For air passengers and airport staff, the choice of whether to use an electric vehicle will still be heavily influenced by the availability and cost of parking at the airport. GAL is able to influence this directly, alongside the provision of infrastructure to support electric vehicle use and charging. Given the significant public transport mode share at present for journeys to and from the airport, and the incremental nature of the electrification of the vehicle fleet, we do not anticipate that electric vehicles will significantly reduce the level of public transport use.	N
Forecourt charges	Comments that forecourt charges were introduced for profit rather than environmental reasons.	Forecourt charging is a common feature at UK airports. Passengers that are dropped off and picked up have the least sustainable journeys as this involves four vehicle movements. Forecourt charging at Gatwick Airport was introduced through the Decade of Change sustainability strategy and the Surface Access Strategy targets to encourage more journeys to use public transport.	N
	Comments that forecourt charging penalises local residents, especially airport staff, and should be removed for these groups.	Forecourt charging is a common feature at UK airports. Passengers and staff that are dropped off and picked up have the least sustainable journeys as this involves four vehicle movements. Forecourt charging supports Gatwick Airport's Surface Access Strategy targets to encourage more journeys to use	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		public transport. For short journeys from local areas sustainable modes such as public transport and active travel are preferred modes.	
	Suggestions that charging should not apply during off-peak periods and that a 'grace period' be introduced.	<p>The transport modelling assumes that forecourt charges would apply throughout the day. GAL regularly reviews and amends the forecourt access charge as part of its strategy to discourage the least sustainable journeys and promote the use of active travel and public transport at any time of day.</p> <p>We will develop the details of the charging approach as part of a future ASAS, which will be based around our mode share commitments set out in the SACs (ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)). We anticipate the need to retain flexibility to allow us to respond to different circumstances at different times.</p>	N
	Suggestions that profit from the forecourt fee should be used to improve Gatwick's sustainability, for example planting more trees.	GAL's existing Sustainable Transport Fund creates a funding stream for initiatives aimed at increasing the use of sustainable transport modes, including funds for better bus services and active travel facilities, and which is partially funded by the forecourt charge revenues.	N
Taxis	Concerns raised around taxi infrastructure, including that facilities for taxi parking are insufficient.	Noted. GAL regularly engages with taxi and private hire providers to ensure there is choice and convenience for passengers. Concerns and issues raised in relation to taxis and other modes using our forecourts are reviewed in the context of available capacity and GAL will make further changes as necessary as part of its ongoing surface access strategy.	N
	Comments that taxis are becoming more environmentally friendly, and this should be considered in the assessments.	Many taxi operators are moving towards the use of electric vehicles for both environmental and economic reasons. GAL has worked closely with Gatwick Cars to promote the use of the lowest emission vehicles, and this remains part of the Airport's surface access strategy. As explained in the SAC, GAL has longer-term aspirational mode share targets, irrespective of the Project, and	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		identified a potential opportunity to work with service providers to speed the transition of taxis and car rental vehicles to electric vehicles. For the purposes of the Project's transport assessment, it does not explicitly model the use of electric vehicles or changes in the proportion of electric vehicles in use over time. The outcomes of the assessment, and the identification of environmental effects related to traffic and transport, therefore do not rely on the use of electric vehicles as a mitigation measure.	
	Concern about diesel-using taxis and suggestions that there should not be a taxi monopoly at the airport.	GAL work with all taxi and private hire providers accessing the airport to provide choice and convenience for passengers. This includes Gatwick Cars, local private hire, and taxi companies, Uber and other nationally recognised providers. No monopoly exists and all providers that meet required standards are able to access the airport. As explained in the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) , GAL has longer-term aspirational mode share targets, irrespective of the Project, and identified a potential opportunity to work with service providers to speed the transition of taxis and car rental vehicles to electric vehicles.	N
	Comments that the Project could encourage taxi driver anti-social behaviour, including littering in local roads.	Gatwick Airports Surface Access Commitments (ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) includes support for local authorities to manage and enforce unauthorised parking, traffic impacts and anti-social behaviour such as littering from vehicles in local communities around the airport.	N
Rail	Comments that there are insufficient rail links to Gatwick outside of the Brighton and London lines.	The transport assessment includes all rail services in the modelled area, which covers much of southeast England. It considers the effects of the Project on the busyness of rail services. In addition, the assessment includes our proposals for new or enhanced local and regional bus and coach services to and from the Airport, including routes to locations where there are no direct rail	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>services. Whilst GAL will continue to work with Network Rail and train operating companies to encourage the implementation of new connections and services, GAL are not directly able to provide these services, nor do we need to do so in order to mitigate the effects of the Project.</p> <p>Gatwick Airport remains the best-connected UK airport by rail with direct services and journeys involving a single interchange to far more stations than any other UK airport.</p>	
	Concerns that there is insufficient capacity on the railway network to support the Project.	We have undertaken an assessment of the impacts of the Project on crowding on rail services, which indicates that although some trains will get busier, there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate both airport and non-airport related passengers without the need to provide additional services at peak or other times of day.	N
	Comments that the price of rail tickets makes driving more affordable for staff.	GAL is not able to control the fares set by public transport operators. However, GAL do provide discounts for airport staff travelling by public transport and will work with train operators to increase these discounts as part of the measures in the SACs for the Project. The details of available discounts will be defined in due course, in consultation with employers and staff.	N
	Comments that the station infrastructure needs to be improved, including links between platforms, access for those with luggage, platform widths, and better parking/drop-off areas provided.	Gatwick Airport station is currently undergoing a significant upgrade, being delivered by Network Rail and which will be complete in 2023. This will provide additional capacity for passenger movements, regardless of the Project.	N
Buses and coaches	Comments that access to local towns is poor, journey times are long and unreliable,	As part of Gatwick Airport's current ASAS, GAL continue to work with local bus operators to support enhanced services to and from the Airport.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	tickets are expensive, and services do not support shift patterns.	The assessment for the Project assumes that enhancements to a number of routes will have been put in place whether or not the Project proceeds, and further enhancements would be part of the SACs (ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) for the Project. Where necessary, we will also provide funding to support the introduction of new services, including providing direct connections to some local communities that currently are required to change buses. We already provide discounts for staff travelling by public transport and we intend to increase these discounts as part of the measures in the SACs for the Project. The details of available discounts will be defined in due course, in consultation with employers and staff. GAL subsidises several bus services to provide early morning, late evening and 24hr bus services in the area and will continue to invest in the local bus network through its Sustainable Transport Fund.	
	Concerns that the proposals do not include a commitment to increasing the number of services.	As part of Gatwick Airport's current ASAS, GAL continue to work with local bus operators to support enhanced services to and from the airport. The assessment for the Project assumes that enhancements to a number of routes will have been put in place whether or not the Project proceeds, and further enhancements would be part of the SACs for the Project. Where necessary, GAL will also provide funding to support the introduction of new services.	N
	Comments that bus stops are too far from the terminals, there is little access to the North Terminal, and signage is inadequate.	Bus stops for local buses and regional services are located within a short walk of the terminals and principal workplaces. GAL regularly review the quality and location of wayfinding to ensure users are familiar with the location of bus stop facilities and walking routes across the campus.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for route improvements, particularly to Crawley, East Grinstead, Horley, Edenbridge and Reigate, and, more broadly, to Kent and South London.	<p>The Project has identified enhancements to a number of local bus routes, including routes serving Crawley, Horley, Redhill and Reigate, and GAL will be working with bus operators to secure these improvements even without the Project.</p> <p>The SACs for the Project include commitments to delivering new or enhanced regional coach routes to Worthing, East Grinstead, Uckfield, Royal Tunbridge Wells, Sevenoaks, Maidstone, Chatham, Bexley and Romford.</p>	Y
Walking and cycling	Concerns raised about the accessibility of the airport via active travel, especially for passengers with luggage.	<p>A very small percentage of air passengers arrive on foot or by cycle, particularly those with hold luggage.</p> <p>The proposals for the Project have been modified since the Autumn 2021 Consultation to include improved active travel infrastructure and crossings at Longbridge Roundabout and on the A23 London Road, together with links between Longbridge Roundabout and North Terminal, Balcombe Road and South Terminal and Riverside Garden Park and South Terminal.</p>	Y
	Concerns raised about the quality and safety of footpaths and cycle paths, including lighting, crossing points, signage, and travelling alongside traffic on the A23.	The proposals for the Project have been modified since the Autumn 2021 Consultation to include improved active travel infrastructure and crossings at Longbridge Roundabout and on the A23 London Road, together with links between Longbridge Roundabout and North Terminal, Balcombe Road and South Terminal and Riverside Garden Park and South Terminal.	Y
	Comments that the existing routes are not well connected to the station and wider travel network.	The proposals for the Project have been modified since the Autumn 2021 Consultation to include improved active travel infrastructure and crossings at Longbridge Roundabout and on the A23 London Road, together with links between Longbridge Roundabout and North Terminal, Balcombe Road and South Terminal and Riverside Garden Park and South Terminal. These improvements are proposed as part of the proposed highway works for the	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Project. Connections in the wider area are a matter for the local planning and highway authorities to provide, as they consider appropriate.</p> <p>There is already step-free access from NCR 21 to the railway station, between the North Terminal forecourt and the railway station and from either the South Terminal forecourt or nearby workplaces and the railway station.</p>	
	<p>Comments that many staff live too far away to be able to cycle or walk to work and that facilities at the airport are inadequate to support a modal shift.</p>	<p>The proposals for the Project now include improved active travel infrastructure linking Longbridge Roundabout to North Terminal, Balcombe Road to South Terminal and South Terminal to Riverside Garden Park. The Project also proposes improving active travel facilities in and around Gatwick Airport and which will be defined in more detail in a future ASAS which we will develop once we obtain permission for the Project.</p> <p>As part of the airport's current ASAS, GAL will continue to work with local bus operators to support enhanced services to and from the airport.</p> <p>The transport assessment for the Project assumes that enhancements to a number of local and regional bus and coach routes will have been put in place whether or not the Project proceeds, and further enhancements would be part of the SACs for the Project. Where necessary, GAL will also provide funding to support the introduction of new services.</p> <p>GAL already provide discounts for airport staff travelling by public transport and we intend to increase these discounts as part of the measures in the SACs for the Project. The details of available discounts will be defined in due course, in consultation with airport employers and staff.</p>	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for specific route improvements, including crossings near the Marriott and across the A23 and A217, as well as direct routes to Horley, City Place, Balcombe Road, terminal hotels, and the Contractor Support Centre.	<p>We have considered a number of infrastructure enhancements for pedestrians and cyclists as part of a review of our highway works proposals which was undertaken after the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p> <p>The Project proposals now include improved active travel infrastructure and crossings at Longbridge Roundabout and on the A23 London Road, together with links between Longbridge Roundabout and North Terminal, Balcombe Road and South Terminal and Riverside Garden Park and South Terminal.</p>	Y
Environment	Concerns that the Project would result in increased carbon emissions and pollution due to more travel to the airport and an increase in freight movements.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out Gatwick's commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by committing to and extending its existing net zero ambitions set out in the Decade of Change. The CAP commits to carbon reduction outcomes for the four focus areas, including emissions arising from aircraft at the airport; and emissions from surface access travel by passengers and staff.	N
	Concerns raised around increases in noise due to traffic and HGV movements.	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) reports the results of noise modelling and assesses the increases in cars and HGVs expected as a result of the Project. No significant effects are predicted.	N
	Concerns around potential flood risk due to the proposals for Car Parks J, V, and X being close to watercourses/ in areas of high flood risk.	The Project would not increase flood risk offsite. Increases in flood risk on site would be safely managed via existing flood response procedures developed by GAL.	N
Internal airport transport	Comments that the shuttle is difficult to navigate, requires a long walk to the outer gates, and increases journey times to arrivals. Suggestions for more travelators.	Noted. The inter-terminal shuttle provides convenient transfer between the South Terminal and North Terminal with clear wayfinding.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Clarity was requested on terminology and commitments, including the use of 'sustainable transport', zero emission vehicles, and incorporation of sustainable energy sources during construction and operation.	<p>The Project's Surface Access Commitments (SACs) (ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) include commitments to achieving certain mode shares:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 55% of air passenger journeys will be made by public transport (rail, local bus and regional bus and coach services) ▪ 55% of staff journeys to work made by public transport, shared travel (car-sharing or company-provided transport such as minibuses) and active modes (walking and cycling). <p>Taken together we refer to these modes as 'sustainable transport modes'.</p> <p>Zero-emission vehicles refer to vehicles which produce no emissions in the course of their journeys. Journeys made by zero-emission vehicles are not included in the mode share commitments above, although clearly the use of such vehicles will help to reduce emissions associated with travel to and from the Airport.</p> <p>In the context of journeys to and from the airport 'sustainable modes' include public transport and active travel, with support for shared travel above single occupancy journeys by car.</p>	N
	Requests for more information about how access to Pier 7 and the South Satellite would be achieved, especially for vulnerable users. Suggestions for a new or extended shuttle.	Wilson James provide access services to the airport for those with accessibility requirements and will continue to do so. These services will be kept under review, but it is not intended to provide a new shuttle service.	N
	Comments that the use of staircases would undermine accessibility for passengers with luggage.	Wherever possible step free access is provided throughout the landside and surface access areas to provide fully accessible routes between access modes and the terminals.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for more help for people with disabilities and sensory friendly areas.	Wherever possible step free access is provided throughout the landside and surface access areas to provide fully accessible routes between access modes and the terminals. Wayfinding takes account of those with visual impairments and support is available throughout the airport journey.	N
Mode share	Suggestions that the target should be increased beyond 60% and include separate targets for rail, walking and cycling.	<p>Since the Autumn 2021 Consultation we have undertaken further analysis of the measures and interventions that we could deploy as part of the Project, and of the mode share outcomes that would result. The Project's commitments are set out in the Surface Access Commitments (SACs) (ES Appendix 5.4.1) (Doc Ref. 5.3)). These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 55% of air passenger journeys made by public transport ▪ 55% of staff journeys to work made by public transport, shared travel and active modes ▪ A reduction of all air passenger drop-off and pick-up car journeys to 12% ▪ 15% of staff journeys to work originating within 8km of the Airport to be made by active modes. <p>GAL are committing to achieve these within three years of the opening of the new runway. They do not include separate metrics for rail, within the public transport percentage, because we consider that all public transport journeys contribute to a more sustainable outcome.</p> <p>We have also identified aspirational mode share targets which go beyond those to which GAL are committing in the SACs. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 60% of air passenger journeys made by public transport ▪ 60% of staff journeys to work made by public transport, shared transport and active modes 	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		GAL will continue to work towards these, once the committed mode shares have been achieved, and in due course will prepare a new ASAS which will set out the way in which we will deliver interventions and monitor progress towards the commitments.	
Public transport	Comments that the quality of public transport should be improved, including around frequency, affordability, and reliability of services as well as to support staff shift times.	<p>GAL is not able to directly influence the quality of public transport infrastructure and vehicles, except where we are providing funding to support new and continued bus services. The reliability of services is the responsibility of the operators.</p> <p>GAL are intending to support increased frequencies on some local bus services irrespective of the Project, and our SACs (ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) for the Project include commitments to providing further enhancements to the bus network. We will continue to work with operators to explore the potential for increasing bus service frequencies in the early mornings, evenings and at weekends, to provide an improved service for staff starting or ending their shifts at these times. GAL already subsidises services during these periods to provide sustainable travel choices for staff.</p> <p>We already provide discounts for staff travelling by public transport and we intend to increase these discounts as part of the measures in the SACs for the Project. The details of available discounts will be defined in due course, in consultation with employers and staff.</p>	Y
	Suggestions for better links to local areas and other regions.	We have considered the potential for improved links, particularly by local and regional bus and coach services, as part of our SACs for the Project. We have identified a number of new or enhanced routes linking Gatwick Airport to West Sussex, East Sussex, Kent and south and east London. These services form	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		part of the Project's SACs and are included in the modelling and assessment for the Project scenarios.	
	Suggestions for creation of a dedicated transport hub to avoid long interchanges and better use of technology to present public transport information.	Gatwick Airport already functions as a transport interchange with integrated facilities connecting rail, bus, active travel and air travel.	N
	Suggestions for reduced or subsidised ticket prices and other incentives to encourage use of public transport.	GAL is not able to control the fares set by public transport operators. However, GAL already provide discounts for staff travelling by public transport and we intend to increase these discounts as part of the measures in the SACs for the Project. The details of available discounts will be defined in due course, in consultation with employers and staff.	N
	Suggestions for electric and hydrogen powered buses, dedicated bus lanes, and more Fastway routes.	<p>GAL is not able to directly influence the choice of vehicles used by the bus operators, except in some cases where we are providing financial support to enable the delivery of a route or service.</p> <p>We have identified a number of local bus service improvements which we will continue to discuss with bus operators, whether or not the Project proceeds. We have also considered whether our proposed highway works should include the provision of bus priority measures and have concluded that these will not be necessary, given the expected performance of the highway network with our proposed works in place.</p>	N
	Comments that the railway station should be improved.	Gatwick Airport station is currently undergoing a significant upgrade, being delivered by Network Rail and which will be complete in 2023. This will provide additional capacity for passenger movements, regardless of the Project.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more local, regional and national rail routes from Gatwick as well as increased frequency of existing services and more luggage space on trains.	<p>GAL is not able to control the number of rail services operated through Gatwick Airport station or on the wider network, as this is the responsibility of Network Rail working with the train operators, in the context of the expected passenger demand. GAL is not able to control the type of rolling stock used by train operators.</p> <p>The transport assessment shows that additional rail services would not be necessary as a result of the Project.</p>	N
Road improvements	Support for proposals due to increasing demand for road use as well as due to the Project.	Noted.	N
	Support for lane widening, M23 upgrades, and the enhancement of local roads such as the A23.	<p>Noted. The Project's highway proposals would provide additional capacity through revised highway geometry including lane widening and reconfiguration of junctions between Longbridge Roundabout and M23 Junction 9, including the section of the A23 London Road between Longbridge Roundabout and Airport Way.</p> <p>GAL are not proposing any works to upgrade the M23 because our assessment indicates that this is not necessary to mitigate the effects of the Project.</p>	N
	Concerns raised about local disruption during construction due to congestion, diversions, and road closures.	The ES Appendix 5.3.2 Outline Construction Transport Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) which, together with related documents and the Buildability Report (ES Appendix 5.3.1) (Doc Ref. 5.3) describes the approach to construction sequencing, phasing, traffic management and vehicle routes. We expect that this will be developed further once we have permission for the	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Project and it would need to be agreed with the relevant stakeholders in advance of construction commencing.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) assesses the potential impact of construction on local traffic flow, diversions, and road closures. These reports provide a detailed analysis of the likely effects of the construction process on local transport infrastructure and outline measures to reduce any disruption.</p>	
	<p>Suggestions for improvements to the M23 as well as local link and B roads, including reducing the complexity of the road network, improving lighting and signage, and widening roads.</p>	<p>Noted. The Project's highway proposals would provide additional capacity through revised highway geometry including lane widening and reconfiguration of junctions between Longbridge Roundabout and M23 Junction 9, including the section of the A23 London Road between Longbridge Roundabout and Airport Way.</p> <p>GAL are not proposing any works to upgrade the M23, or other local roads, because our assessment indicates that this is not necessary to mitigate the effects of the Project.</p>	N
	<p>Suggestions for specific improvements, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. installing flyovers at the M23 junction 2. improving access to the north when entering the A23 from the airport, without having to use the roundabout to double-back 3. allowing staff access to Povey Cross 4. improving the link road from M25 Junction 9 to the A3 	<p>We have reviewed our highway works proposals since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, in conjunction with National Highways and the local highway authorities. Alongside this, we have also undertaken our assessment of the effects of the project on the highway network, to determine whether mitigation is required in other locations as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Our proposed highway works include a revised arrangement for traffic leaving North Terminal wishing to head southeast, by including a traffic signal junction that will allow that movement to take place without drivers having to make U-turns at Longbridge Roundabout.</p>	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	5. allowing a right-turn outside Atlantic House 6. building an airport-only access road	Our proposals do not include the other improvements suggested here as they are not necessary to mitigate the effects of the Project.	
	Suggestions for removal of the red route around the airport.	<p>The red routes introduced around the airport are required to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the local roads following the introduction of forecourt charging.</p> <p>Restrictions on parking, waiting and loading are necessary to avoid vehicles blocking operational and emergency vehicles and public transport services, which could impact safety.</p>	N
	Concerns raised that the proposed improvements would not reduce congestion in local areas.	<p>The assessment includes local roads as well as the strategic road network, since all are included in the strategic highway model which informs our analysis. We have used the models to determine whether, where and when any significant adverse effects would arise as a result of the Project. This indicates that, aside from our proposed highway improvements, mitigation in other locations is not expected to be required.</p> <p>Our SACs (ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) include commitments to achieving higher proportions of passengers and staff travelling by sustainable transport modes. Together with the other interventions we are committing to, and the small net increase in car parking provision, our assessment indicates that there are very few adverse effects expected for the highway network in the wider area.</p>	N
	Concerns raised about potential environmental impacts, including air, noise and light pollution, emissions, flood risk and	The assessment of impacts on heritage assets including listed buildings, is presented within Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	proximity of roads to listed buildings and ancient sites.		
	Concerns raised about the designation of the M23 as a smart motorway.	The designation of motorways is a matter for National Highways and the Department for Transport.	N
	Questions raised about the effectiveness and feasibility of the Longbridge roundabout, particularly how it would connect to the M23.	The design of our proposed highway improvements has been revised since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, as a result of extensive engagement with National Highways to arrive at a revised design. This has included consideration of the relevant highway design standards, and any departures from them which would need to be agreed by National Highways. We have assessed the operation of our proposals using both our strategic and local highway models to provide confidence that they will operate satisfactorily and safely.	Y
	Comments that the proposed North Terminal roundabout design is too complex and that traffic signals could increase congestion. Also, that the flyover may not be compliant with motorway design regulations.	The design of our proposed highway improvements has been revised since the Autumn 2021 consultation, as a result of extensive engagement with National Highways to arrive at a revised design. This has included consideration of the relevant highway design standards, and any departures from them which would need to be agreed by National Highways. We have assessed the operation of our proposals using both our strategic and local highway models to provide confidence that they will operate satisfactorily and safely.	Y
	Comments that the design of the loop linking the A23 to the South Terminal may be too tight a bend and that there may be no need for a South Terminal roundabout.	The design of our proposed highway improvements has been revised since the Autumn 2021 Consultation, as a result of extensive engagement with National Highways to arrive at a revised design. This has included consideration of the relevant highway design standards, and any departures from them which would need to be agreed by National Highways. We have assessed the operation of our proposals using both our strategic and local highway models to provide confidence that they will operate satisfactorily and safely.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions made for upgrades to the M25, A264, A2, A23, A22, and local roads around Horley and Crawley.	We have assessed the effects of the Project on the highway network across a wide area of southeast England, using our strategic highway model. The assessment shows that improvements to these roads are not required to mitigate the effects of the Project, with the exception of the A23 London Road between Airport Way and Longbridge Roundabout and the A23 Brighton Road on the approach to Longbridge Roundabout. Changes to these parts of the A23 form part of our proposed highway works.	N
	Suggestions that the M23 should be considered for lane widening, that improvements are required at Junctions 9 and 10, and that the M23 spur should be designed to match the northern spur.	We have assessed the effects of the Project on the highway network across a wide area of southeast England, using our strategic highway model. The assessment shows that improvements to the M23 or to Junctions 9 and 10 are not required to mitigate the effects of the Project. There will be some changes to the eastbound M23 Spur as part of our proposed highway works.	N
	Suggestions for mitigation measures such as compensation, noise barriers, and traffic control measures.	Our proposed highway works will include the necessary technology to monitor and control traffic flows, as necessary and as required by highway design standards and the highway authorities. The mitigations measures are identified in Environmental Assessment, including ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3).	N
Construction	Comments that the road improvements should be built before the airport is expanded.	We have used our strategic and local highway models to test the operation of the highway network in the year that the runway opens and three years afterwards. These indicate that the existing network will perform acceptably when the runway opens, but that our proposed highway works will need to be in place within three years of the runway opening date.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that the road improvements should be completed out of hours and in stages to reduce disruption.	The construction sequence and methodology for the surface access improvements is contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3). It is not practical to complete all the works out of hours.	N

g. Noise and vibration

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Local impacts	Concerns raised about the impact of noise on the physical and mental health of residents due to sleep, disturbance, increased stress and the diminished appeal of spending time outdoors.	Noted. ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) have regard to these issues and set out findings and mitigation.	N
	Concerns raised that the need to close windows to reduce aircraft noise goes against COVID-19 guidelines.	The ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme (Doc Ref. 5.3) includes appropriate consideration of the need to provide both insulation and ventilation.	N
	Comments that Project noise impacts are minimal. Also, support for Gatwick's proposals for reducing noise impacts, including the noise envelope.	Noted.	N
	Comments that Gatwick was less noisy than it used to be and that residents should expect living next to an airport to be noisy.	Noted.	N
	Questions raised about why Gatwick does not comply with the Fair and Equitable Dispersal agreement.	This comment relates the current operation of the airport.	N
	Requests for more information about the precise number of local residents impacted by an increase in day and night time flights.	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides detailed estimates of the number of people impacted by aircraft noise due to the Project.	N

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information about the effect of take-off and landing profiles on noise.	Landing and take-off profiles are not expected to change as a result of the Project.	N
Heritage and local character	Concerns were raised about the noise impacts of overflying aircraft on historic villages and buildings, particularly Hever Castle. Suggestions made that Gatwick work with stakeholders to insulate historic buildings.	In respect of any listed buildings that fall within the zone where the Noise Insulation Scheme is available to owners/occupiers, it is acknowledged that Listed Building Consent may be required for certain types of noise attenuation, including the installation of acoustic glazing. There are specialist designs of secondary glazing that are designed to minimise impact on listed buildings and have been found acceptable. Similarly acoustic ventilators can be designed and located to minimise impact.	N
Reducing air travel	Comments that there should be a reduction in air travel to reduce noise pollution.	Noted.	N
Assessments and delaying expansion	Comments that the Project should be delayed until it is possible to demonstrate that quieter aircraft could be introduced there would be no detrimental impacts from noise pollution.	Noted.	N
Monitoring	Suggestions that noise compliance monitoring and enforcement penalties be introduced as part of the planning conditions for the Project and carried out by an independent body.	The ES Appendix 14.9.7: Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3) requires annual reporting on compliance with legally binding noise limits and will be subject to scrutiny by an independent body.	Y
Noise envelope	Concerns raised that the noise envelope would be insufficient, would not prevent noise from the increased number of flights,	The ES Appendix 14.9.7: Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3) proposes to set limits on noise from future operations at the airport. Noise limits are proposed for two periods, the latter noise contour areas are smaller. The area of the Leq day and night contours would not exceed these limits, and the noise	N

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	and would not help areas currently affected by noise.	envelope would provide certainty to the community that noise levels would be limited and would reduce in the future.	
	Requests for more information about how the noise envelope would be reviewed and adjusted.	This was discussed at the Noise Topic Working Group and the Noise Envelope Group through the summer and autumn of 2022. Further detail on engagement is contained within ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1). The need for review of the noise envelope in the future was noted and taken into account in developing the final Noise Envelope proposed with the DCO Application.	Y
	Comments that the mitigation is too reliant on unproven technology. Others optimistic about advances in technology to reduce noise.	The natural transition of the fleet is not proposed as a measure for the Project, rather it is assumed in the future baseline (or do-minimum). The Northern Runway is not planned for flights between 2300 and 0600 hours, this mitigates night noise impacts, The noise insulation scheme is based on proven technology to reduce noise levels indoors.	N
	Requests for more information about the data used to inform the noise envelope design. Suggestions for a greater range of metrics to be used and that the approach is inconsistent with both CAA and government policy.	The choice of noise metrics for the draft Noise Envelope for consultation was explained in Appendix 14.9.5 of the PEIR. During the Summer 2022 Consultation, a range of noise metrics were discussed, and this has been taken into account, along with government policy and guidance in developing the Noise Envelope submitted with the DCO Application.	Y
	Comments that the envelope is too small and people outside of the 51 dB contour would still be detrimentally affected by aircraft noise. Suggestions to use it to keep	GAL is proposing a Noise Envelope that sets limits in terms of the areas of the daytime LOAEL contour Leq, 16-hour day 51 dB, and the night-time LOAEL contour Leq, 8-hour night 45 dB.	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	noise lower than 2017, 2019, or 2020 levels.	<p>The LOAEL contours have been chosen because they represent the lowest level of observable adverse effects during the day and night and can be modelled with reasonable accuracy so as to provide forecasts of future performance. The limiting Leq, 16-hour day and Leq, 8-hour night contour areas are proposed with reference to the forecast noise impacts reported in the ES, taking account of operating and other measures to limit noise.</p> <p>A contour which fixes the maximum noise footprint of the airport would limit the throughput of the airport unless quieter planes can be encouraged to operate. It would incentivise the airport to encourage airlines to use the quietest aircraft and quietest operating procedures, whilst allowing growth to occur within a clear noise limit. It would also provide local communities with certainty on future noise levels.</p>	
	Questions raised about whether unexpected noise events were factored into the design of the envelope.	It would not be reasonable to expect the airport to meet a noise limit for an event that cannot be predicted and is by its nature very rare.	N
	Comments that the noise envelope could help sustain the level of house prices in the area.	Noted.	N
	Suggestions for the establishment of a noise envelope development group with local residents and stakeholders.	Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, further stakeholder engagement was undertaken on the developing proposals for the Noise Envelope. In addition, the Applicant formed a Noise Envelope Group to seek further views on the noise envelope and guide development of the final proposal for the DCO Application. Terms of reference were produced, and two sub-groups were established; the Local sub-group and the Aviation sub-group, to facilitate discussions with local communities, local authorities, and aviation	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>stakeholders. A total of 13 meetings were held between 26 May and 11 October 2022. These were structured around four themes drawn from consultation feedback and the CAP1129 guidance.</p> <p>Further detail on engagement on the Noise Envelope is contained in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>	
	Comments that Gatwick should listen to the recommendations of the Noise Management Board.	The Noise Envelope Group invited Noise Management Board (NMB) members to its meetings. NMB members made significant contributions, and these have been taken into account in forming the noise envelope to be submitted with the DCO Application.	Y
	Comments that Gatwick employees should visit different areas to experience different noise levels around the airport.	Noted. Surveys have been undertaken and are reported in the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Support for the Project if the noise envelope goes ahead as proposed and the noise reduction methods are successful.	Noted.	N
	Comments that previous commitments had not been met and doubts raised about implementation of the noise envelope.	Noted.	N
	Requests for more information about the effectiveness of noise envelopes.	The details of the noise envelope, how it will operate, and who will help ensure its effectiveness have developed as a result of the consultation and through further consultation to help ensure it will be effective.	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information about the dates for implementation of the noise envelope and what future tightening of it would look like.	The draft Noise Envelope in the PEIR showed the reduced noise limits in future years. Further detail has been developed and is provided in the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Appendix 14.9.5: Air Noise Envelope Background (Doc Ref. 5.3).	Y
	Requests for further details on the effect of timings of planes on the noise envelope.	The Noise Envelope will include separate noise limits for the day and night periods. The timing of an aircraft will therefore determine which limit it contributes to. There are of course specific limits on the numbers and noise from aircraft at night under the Night Restrictions.	Y
Flight paths and frequency of flights	Concerns raised about the frequency of night-time and early morning flights.	Noted. There are specific limits on the numbers and noise from aircraft at night under the Night Restrictions and it has been assumed that these will continue in the future with the Project.	N
	Concerns raised about the impacts of noise from new flight paths, particularly in areas not currently affected by aircraft noise.	The Project does not require additional flight paths to those already flown.	N
	Comments that Gatwick is unable to adequately control where aircraft choose to fly and that prescribed flight paths are often ignored.	This comment relates to current or past operations.	N
	Comments that Gatwick often implements modified routes without adequate consultation, with reference to Route 4 changes.	This comment relates to current or past operations.	N

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the proposals would encourage pilots to take riskier routes to reduce noise.	Safety would not be compromised by any noise reduction measure.	N
	Suggestions for widening flight paths to spread noise out and avoid creation of new ones. Others that flying over urban areas should be avoided.	The Project does not propose changing flight paths that would require an airspace change.	N
	Suggestions for caps on aircraft movements and absolute passenger numbers.	These forms of caps have been considered as means to control noise as part of the Noise Envelope.	Y
	Comments that flight paths should return to 2013 routes.	Noted.	N
Mitigation	Comments that insulation is insufficient to reduce noise impact. Also, that it might not be possible to insulate historic properties.	It is acknowledged that Listed Building Consent may be required for certain types of noise attenuation, including the installation of acoustic glazing. There are specialist designs of secondary glazing that are designed to minimise impact on listed buildings and have been found acceptable. Similarly acoustic ventilators can be designed and located to minimise impact.	N
	Support for the insulation proposals and acoustic barrier measures as well as the rehousing scheme and Gatwick's shift towards the use of quieter aircraft.	Noted.	N
	Requests for more detail about the area covered by the homeowner's support scheme.	Further details of the homeowners assisted moving scheme and the noise insulation scheme have been developed, including with consultation from Local Authorities in the Noise Topic Working Group, including monetary limits for the various ranges of noise within the two-tier insulation scheme. The	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		schemes are summarised in Section 14.8 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) with detail in ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
	Comments that communities outside the noise envelope, including in rural areas, would be affected but would not receive any insulation or compensation.	Noted, but by limiting noise within the noise envelope area, noise levels outside it will also be limited.	Y
	Suggestions that compensation for falls in property values should match what was offered in 2014.	The Land Compensation Act 1973 provides for depreciation in property price caused by noise as a physical factor from public works (highway or aerodrome) to be compensated if noise impact is sufficiently high that it can be demonstrated that a property's value has been reduced.	N
	Concerns raised that Gatwick had not offered any compensation to property owners should values be affected.	The Land Compensation Act 1973 provides for depreciation in property price caused by noise as a physical factor from public works (highway or aerodrome) to be compensated if noise impact is sufficiently high that it can be demonstrated that a property's value has been reduced	N
	Comments that the mitigation proposals do not factor in new flight paths that may be used in future.	The Project does not necessitate any such future new flight paths.	N
	Suggestions that the insulation scheme be provided over a wider area and that triple glazing be provided.	The area covered by the Noise Insulation Scheme has been carefully considered, is considerably larger than the current scheme, exceed policy guidelines and that offered by other UK airports.	N
	Suggestions that the proposed sound barriers should cover more of the southern part of the airport and be made from trees or sustainable materials.	It is not considered practicable to construct a noise bund of sufficient scale to reduce noise adequately on the southern side of the runway.	N

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that Noise Abatement Departure Procedure 1 should be incorporated into the proposals.	The Project does not affect departure operating procedures.	N
Assessment	Comments that Gatwick already exceeds WHO's Environmental Noise Guidelines and suggestions that they are used to inform the noise envelope.	Noted. The WHO guidelines and their relevance to the Project are described in Section 14.2 of the ES.	N
	Comments that the centre lines on the sound footprint are inaccurate, misrepresenting current and future locations of overflight and noise impacts.	The Lmax footprints are illustrative for particular routes. The overflight assessment has been refined and updated for the ES.	Y
	Comments that the noise maps do not correctly display maximum impacts.	The noise maps use the noise metrics recommended by the CAA (CAP 1616) to display noise impacts.	N
	Comments that the baseline and scheme effects were difficult to compare.	Noted, we are considering a web-based noise map view for the DCO.	Y
Aircraft	Requests for information about how noise is considered in aircraft design.	This is considered to be outside the scope of this Project.	N

h. Air quality

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Concerns raised about the potential for worsened air quality due to increased aircraft movements as well as possible changes to flight paths.	<p>The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues are presented and discussed in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) and corresponding appendices.</p> <p>The air quality assessment has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project and the Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p>	N
	Comments that air quality monitoring could be misleading.	A full review of all baseline data in the study area has been carried out as detailed in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1). The assessment also uses data from a monitoring survey undertaken between 2016 and 2020 at key areas of concern around the airport. This chapter contains full details of relevant monitoring carried out for the Project. The results were used to inform the baseline conditions reported in the ES. Relevant information is presented in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) and in ES Appendix 13.6.1: Air Quality Data and Model Verification (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Concerns that air quality issues beyond the immediate area of the airport have not been acknowledged.	The 11 km by 10 km domain has been used to provide contour plots of predicted concentrations (ES Air Quality Figures 13.1.1, to 13.1.9 (Doc Ref. 5.2)). It does not limit or define the extent of the emissions calculations. All roads are included in the air quality model within this 11 km by 10 km domain, and traffic screening using the IAQM/EPUK criteria has been undertaken outside this domain to define the relevant wider study area for each scenario.	Y
	Concerns about the impact on air quality from increased car and HGV movements as	The air quality assessment for the ES has included all routes likely to be used by construction traffic around the airport, and any roads affected during operation. Pollutant concentrations have been predicted at discrete receptors	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	a result of the construction and operation of the Project.	in the AQMAs and the wider study area. Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
	Requests for more information about the impact on air quality of construction of housing, hotels, car parks and noise barriers.	<p>The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues are presented and discussed in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) and corresponding appendices. The assessment undertaken for the ES for construction and operation concludes that no significant air quality effects are predicted using the latest UK air quality objectives at time of assessment.</p> <p>The assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice.</p>	N
Health	Concerns raised about the potential impact of poor air quality on the health of local residents. Comments that air quality related health conditions improved during the pandemic.	<p>A detailed air quality assessment has been undertaken for the ES, taking into account predicted increases in aircraft numbers and traffic forecast and details of the methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers how the Project's air quality effects are likely to influence health at the population level, including for the population close to the airport.</p>	N
Livestock	Concerns raised about the risks to health of livestock, particularly to those under the flightpath.	There is no reason to believe there is any greater risk of health to livestock with the proposals, or without.	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Flight paths	Questions were raised about the cumulative impact on air quality from the Project and the airspace modernisation programme.	There would be no cumulative effects from the airspace modernisation programme, the study area was selected to take into account the effect of aircraft emissions which have been assessed for the landing and take-off (LTO) cycle up to 3,000 ft (approximately 915 metres) in height as defined by the ICAO. Beyond this height effects to air quality would be negligible and all impacts from the airspace changes would be above that level. For each of the future case options, future fleet mixes were taken into account using fleet data in the form of annual forecasts of aircraft movement provided by GAL. A slow fleet transition sensitivity test was also carried out, based on the assumption that the transition rate of the airline fleet is slower. Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology.	N
Local health services	Concerns raised about the cost to the NHS of treating conditions resulting from poor air quality.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers how the Project's air quality effects are likely to influence population health, significant NHS effects associated with changes in air quality due to the Project are not expected.	N
Aviation fuel	Concerns raised about the smell of jet fuel and the impact of dirt and dumped fuel on nearby properties.	Records of odour complaints were obtained from GAL's air quality team and local authorities for the last 5 years and a qualitative assessment has been included in the ES. As the IAQM guidance notes, modelling is not always the preferred approach and " <i>it should always be considered in an odour assessment that there are some types of odour source that may exist that are not easily modelled (e.g. diffuse sources, fugitive emissions or intermittent sources)</i> " (IAQM, 2018). Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Waste disposal	Questions raised about the potential impact of burning rubbish as part of waste disposal.	Air quality impacts from the CARE facility are assessed in the ES. The pollutants assessed in the ES have been expanded to take into account all pollutants which could result in a significant impact, including those from the CARE facility. Details of the pollutants assessed is provided in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1).	Y
Airfield	Comments that the regular use of two runways could result in delays which worsen air quality.	<p>The air quality assessment gives due regard to the pollution sources from aircraft in the air and aircraft on the ground in the operational assessment.</p> <p>The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues are presented and discussed in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) and corresponding appendices. The air quality assessment has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project and the Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p>	N
Designated sites	Concerns raised about the impact of poor air quality on designated sites such as South Downs National Park and tourist attractions	The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues are presented and discussed in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) and corresponding air quality appendices. The assessment included all designated ecological sites within the wider study area, defined by traffic screening using the IAQM/EPUK criteria. South Downs National Park is not located in the study area.	N

i. Landscape, townscape and visual resources

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Suggestions that the information provided was 'greenwashed' as airport expansion would have a negative environmental impact.	<p>The LTVIA in ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides a thorough and robust description, analysis and assessment of the likely effects on landscape, townscape and visual receptors as a result of the Project.</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) is included in ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3). The report outlines the various soft landscape zones, elements and habitats which will be created as part of this proposal and puts forward the necessary actions and ecological strategy required for their ongoing maintenance and management.</p> <p>The OLEMP includes a Landscape Master Plan defining the key existing and proposed green and blue infrastructure within and around the airport and how this will integrate development, public open space and ecological habitats with the landscape and townscape context.</p>	N
	Requests for more information about the realignment of the river Mole, including drainage, habitat creation, and impacts on ancient woodland of the airfield satellite contractor compound.	The impact of the airfield satellite compound on ecology receptors, including ancient woodland, is considered in Section 9.9 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Suggestions that Gatwick should consider alternatives to diverting the River Mole and consult relevant stakeholders like the Environment Agency and West Sussex Wildlife Trust on possible proposals.	The Environment Agency has been consulted on numerous occasions and have not raised any concerns regarding the renaturalisation of the River Mole. The proposals would replace an existing 300 metre canalised section of channel increasing biodiversity and increasing flood water storage.	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>Comments that the Project would negatively affect the character of the rural landscape across Surrey, Kent and Sussex. Other areas mentioned include the River Mole, wooded areas such as Picketts Wood, Birchden Forest and Ashdown Forest, open space around Crawley, Knepp and Tunbridge Wells; amenities like Riverside Garden Park, Tilgate Park and Box Hill.</p>	<p>The LTVIA in ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides a thorough description and analysis of the landscape character of the study area and the perception of tranquillity within nationally designated landscapes including the Surrey Hills and Kent Downs AONB's.</p> <p>The landscape/townscape character of public open space at Riverside Garden Park and the visual amenity of the people that use it and live next to it have been described and analysed.</p> <p>Views from the Crawley Important View at Tilgate Park have been described during summer and winter and during the day and at night and photography and photomontages undertaken.</p> <p>Ashdown Forest forms a representative receptor site within Sussex where the perception of tranquillity has been assessed.</p> <p>Section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides an assessment of effects on landscape and townscape character, visual amenity and the perception of tranquillity as a result of the Project. Adverse effects have been identified for all these receptors however, significant adverse effects are considered to be limited to the construction phase and early completion phase for the Mole Valley Open Weald at Longbridge Roundabout, Riverside Garden Park and Church Meadows adjacent to the surface access improvements and occupiers of the Hilton Hotel Gatwick and a residential property at Horley. All of these effects would reduce, in time, to levels that are no longer significant as mitigation planting matures.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised about the loss of green space, agricultural land and the increase in hardstanding.	<p>The effects of the Project on agricultural land, including agricultural land quality and farm holdings is assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Project would have no effect on the best and most versatile Grades 1, 2 or 3a land, with the land affected comprising on lower quality Subgrade 3b land.</p> <p>The areas of open space permanently affected by the Project, together with proposals for the provision of replacement open space are also provided in Chapter 19 of the ES, Agriculture and Recreation.</p> <p>The areas of public open space affected include approximately 1.03ha of land within the area of Riverside Garden Park and approximately 0.13 ha of Church Meadows that both form part of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Riverside Green Chain.</p> <p>The following areas of replacement open space would be created as part of the Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An area of approximately 1.43ha currently located within an area of current area of Car Park B to the north and south of the A23. A new pedestrian walkway would be provided to connect the existing area of Riverside Garden Park to the area of replacement open space. This would be connected to Riverside Garden Park by the provision of a new pedestrian walkway ▪ An area of approximately 0.52ha of land to the west of Church Meadow, located to the west of the River Mole on land currently used as grazing land. This area of replacement space would be linked to the existing area of Church Meadow through the provision of a new pedestrian bridge over the River Mole. 	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that Gatwick should discuss its proposals with stakeholders including local authorities, National Trust, Natural England, Environment Agency, RHS, Gatwick Greenspace Partnership, Surrey and Sussex Wildlife Trusts, the Angling Trust and Heathrow and Manchester Airports, as examples of airports that have improved local ecology.	Extensive consultation and stakeholder engagement has taken place throughout the design and assessment process for the DCO. This includes through both the Topic Working Groups and Biodiversity Working Group. A full explanation on the consultation and engagement undertaken from the Project is contained in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1).	N
	Suggestions that suppliers to Gatwick should meet ISO14001 Environmental Management accreditation.	GAL does not currently stipulate compliance with ISO14001 from our suppliers. However, GAL regularly reviews our supply chain to ensure that it is meeting our sustainability, CSR and ethical sourcing requirements.	N
Heritage	Concerns raised about the noise impact on sites like Hever Castle and Penshurst Place.	The assessment of the impact of air noise on heritage assets has been undertaken in accordance with the appropriate guidance as advised in the Airports National Policy Statement and is presented within Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1). No impacts are predicted with regard to Hever Castle or Penshurst Place. The methodology for this assessment has been agreed with Historic England. The potential for impacts at Hever Castle in respect of tourism are discussed elsewhere in this Annex.	N
Visual impact	Concerns raised about the visual impact of the proposals in the landscape.	The LTVIA in ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides a thorough description and analysis of the landscape character of the study area and the visual receptors within it and an assessment of the effects on visual amenity as a result of the Project.	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Views from 32 representative viewpoint locations have been agreed through stakeholder engagement and form the basis for the assessment. Views have been described during summer and winter and during the day and at night and photography and photomontages undertaken.</p> <p>Adverse effects have been identified for many visual receptors however, significant adverse effects are considered to be limited to the construction phase and early completion phase for some visual receptors at Riverside Garden Park and Church Meadows adjacent to the surface access improvements, occupiers of the Hilton Hotel Gatwick and a residential property at Horley. All of these effects would reduce, in time, to levels that are no longer significant as mitigation planting matures.</p> <p>Mid to long distance views from the surrounding landscape, including AONB's, may include tall buildings, the CARE facility flue and lighting or some high-level construction activities such as cranes in limited locations. These would form recognisable additions, some slightly discordant in nature that would generally be visible above intervening treetops and within areas of existing built development at the airport.</p> <p>The special qualities experienced by people living within and visiting the nationally designated landscapes within the study area would be affected to some extent as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft, they would still be positive qualities that would be perceived. The minor adverse effects on the perception of tranquillity during the day and at night would not be significant.</p>	

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the landscaping proposals, including overgrown areas, would be visually unappealing.	<p>Environmental mitigation areas are embedded within the Project as part of the DCO application and will deliver a significant net increase in attractive, biodiverse and functional public open space at Gatwick Airport.</p> <p>Areas for proposed environmental mitigation included within the Project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Approximately 0.79 hectares of land immediately to the west of the London to Brighton railway line, north of the current A23. ▪ Approximately 0.64 hectares of land immediately to the west of the London to Brighton railway line, south of the current A23. ▪ Approximately 0.52 hectares of land to the northeast of Longbridge Roundabout. ▪ Approximately 17 hectares of land to the west of the River Mole including the area of Museum Field. ▪ The River Mole diversion would provide opportunities for ecological mitigation in this area. ▪ Two areas of hedgerow are proposed to the south and eastern parts of the airfield. ▪ A 15-metre-wide belt of trees is proposed to be planted on the eastern edge of Pentagon Field, adjacent to the Balcombe Road and further planting added to the northern edge and within the field to the south of Pentagon Field. <p>The DCO Application is also supported by two key documents that will control the design and management of the environmental mitigation areas: namely the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP) contained in ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3); and the Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3).</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>The OLEMP outlines the various soft landscape zones, elements and habitats which will be created as part of this proposal and puts forward the necessary actions and ecological strategy required for their ongoing maintenance and management. The OLEMP also includes a Landscape Master Plan defining the key existing and proposed green and blue infrastructure within and around the airport and how this will integrate development, public open space and ecological habitats with the landscape and townscape context.</p> <p>A Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3) has been prepared as part of the DCO to provide design quality control without being too restrictive for future design stages development. Guidance reflects national and local design strategies and legislation.</p>	
	<p>Comments that the visual amenity of the area would be affected due to the development of housing and services for the new workforce, as well as hotels, parking and warehouses would need to be built on green spaces, impacting the countryside.</p>	<p>Two contractor compounds would be temporarily located within fields outside Gatwick Airport. When the construction phase is complete the land north of the South Terminal roundabout will be returned to grassland whilst the land to the north of Longbridge Roundabout will be used to create an area of public open space linked to Church Meadows. Some green infrastructure within Gatwick would be removed to accommodate permanent development for the Project.</p> <p>Landscape proposals would be included to mitigate and replace planting and four environmental mitigation areas will be created to provide biodiverse public open space.</p> <p>No new housing is proposed as part of the Project.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the visual impact of the CARE facility on local communities should be minimised.	<p>Section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes an assessment of the effects of the CARE facility on landscape character and visual amenity. Photomontages illustrate the maximum parameters of the development and are included in the ES for assessment purposes, appropriate to the level of detail required for a DCO application.</p> <p>A Design and Access Statement has been prepared to provide design quality control without being too restrictive for future design stages development. Guidance reflects national and local design strategies and legislation.</p>	N
	Concerns raised that the Project would have a detrimental effect on the attractiveness of the area. Comments that the Project should seek to be visually appealing.	<p>Section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes an assessment of the effects of the Project on landscape and townscape character and visual amenity. Photomontages illustrate the maximum parameters of the key elements of the development and are included in the ES for assessment purposes, appropriate to the level of detail required for a DCO application.</p> <p>A Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3) has been prepared to provide design quality control without being too restrictive for future design stages development. Guidance reflects national and local design strategies and legislation.</p> <p>An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan is included in ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3). The report outlines the various soft landscape zones, elements and habitats which will be created as part of this proposal and puts forward the necessary actions and ecological strategy required for their ongoing maintenance and management</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Mitigation and enhancement	Comments that mitigation of the Project's effects would not be possible or effective.	<p>The broad objectives of the Landscape Strategy within the OLEMP at ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To provide an appropriate setting for the new developments within the Project, responding to adjacent urban and rural land uses and the existing character of the airport. ▪ Retention of green infrastructure assets. ▪ Integration with and expansion of the existing green infrastructure network within and around the airport. ▪ Enhancing, restoring and reintroducing characteristic landscape elements which have been lost or degraded. ▪ To respond to the scale and character of the airport and enhance the experience of people working within and visiting the airport, the local communities that live next to the airport and people travelling through the area. ▪ To protect, manage and enhance the nature conservation value of appropriate areas of the site. 	N
	Suggestions that Gatwick could include more environmental mitigation and support initiatives in the wider region.	Landscape mitigation measures are currently restricted to land within or adjacent to Gatwick Airport. No landscape mitigation is currently planned in the wider landscape of the study area.	N
	Comments that landscape and environmental improvements should be undertaken without the Project.	Landscape and environmental mitigation measures are proposed for development within or adjacent to Gatwick Airport associated with the Project. Landscape and environmental implementation and management associated with Gatwick Airport remain ongoing within the airport.	N
	Requests for more information about the species of trees and shrubs that would be planted.	An Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan is included in ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3). The report outlines the various soft landscape zones, elements and habitats which will be created as part of this proposal	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		and includes typical plant species and mixes. The majority of planting will comprise native species with ornamental species associated with terminal buildings and urban areas.	
	Suggestions for the use of living walls or other greenery within airport buildings, or on rooftops.	Whilst green walls or roofs do not form a specific element of the Project at this stage of the design process a Design and Access Statement has been prepared as part of the DCO to provide design quality control without being too restrictive for future design stages development. Green walls could form part of the design solution. Guidance reflects national and local design strategies and legislation.	N
	Suggestions for the use of screening, landscaping and other features as well as and removing litter.	Proposed landscape mitigation proposals would comprise: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ woodland, tree, scrub, shrub, wetland, amenity and grassland planting ▪ earth shaping, embankments, cuttings or bunds ▪ fences, walls or barriers ▪ hard landscaping 	N
Monitoring	Comments that the landscape impact of the Project should be monitored by an independent organisation.	Monitoring of effects will be included as part of the proposed mitigation and reported on to the LPA.	N

j. Ecology and nature conservation

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
PEIR and assessment	Comments that inaccurate information has been included, for example, that the designation information for the dormouse relates to otters.	Such inaccuracies have been corrected in the final ES.	N
	Requests for more information about the potential habitat loss and wildlife impacts, including an EIA with guarantees and consideration of waste management, and water and energy usage.	Details of the habitat lost/gained as result of the Project are provided in Figures 2.1-2.6 in ES Appendix 9.9.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3) of the ES.	N
	Concerns raised about a lack of information about potential noise and biodiversity impacts, as well as approaches to avoiding, mitigating or compensating for such impacts and considering enhancement measures.	Impacts on biodiversity receptors are considered in Section 9.9 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1). This includes assessments with respect to noise where appropriate. Details of mitigation and enhancement measures are also presented within ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 8.8.1: OLEMP (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Suggestion that surveys could be updated with data collected from Gatwick's Biodiversity advisor.	Data collected by Gatwick's Biodiversity team are provided to the relevant records centre each year. Updated data from the records centres have been included within the ES – this includes those records provided by the Gatwick team.	N
	Suggestions that an assessment of the potential impact of the Project on valued habitats should be undertaken.	Impacts on habitats of ecological value are considered in Section 9.9 of ES Chapter 9: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that an assessment should be undertaken of environmental impacts from habitat loss connectivity and surveys beyond the project site boundary.	Impacts due to loss of connectivity are considered, where appropriate, in Section 9.9 of ES Chapter 9: Biodiversity and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1). Surveys have been undertaken outwith the Project Boundary, as necessary. For example, within the wider landscape for bats.	N
Biodiversity	Comments that biodiversity would deteriorate in the area as well as where biofuels might be grown.	The use of biofuels is currently uncertain. As such, it is not possible to assess the potential impact of their use on biodiversity.	N
	Support for the planting of new trees and native species to enhance biodiversity and wildlife as well as helping to combat Climate Change.	Noted. Tree planting will use native species as set out in the OLEMP.	N
	Comments that the ecology and biodiversity proposals should be implemented without the Project.	GAL have a programme of ecological enhancement as part of their Decade of Change that is outwith the NRP.	N
	Requests for more information about proposed mitigation and compensation, including whether a Biodiversity Net Gain approach is proposed, and what the species diversity of proposed planting would be.	Details of the approach to BNG are set out in ES Appendix 9.9.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3). Information regarding the proposed mitigation and enhancement, including indicative planting proposals are provided in the OLEMP.	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that an emissions-free area inside and around the airport should be established.	It is not feasible to create an emissions free zone but consideration is being given to a low emissions zone. A target for having a fully electric or hybrid fleet for Gatwick Cars operation is being reviewed. GAL will work with the provider to agree an implementation date, and for a mechanism by which zero emission capable vehicles can observe a “low emission zone” around the airport.	N
	Suggestions for the introduction of wetlands and wildlife reserves.	Noted. The Project includes wetter habitat creation in the form of various flood compensation areas along with the River Mole diversion. Extensions to existing wildlife reserves are included, as set out in the Ecology Strategy for the Project, detailed in the OLEMP.	N
Wildlife	Suggestions for use of lighting that would not disturb wildlife and insects.	Noted. Lighting for the Project has been designed to accord with best practice measures to ensure impacts to wildlife are avoided.	N
	Concerns raised about specific wildlife, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ birds, such as geese, herons, gulls, pigeons, and starlings, with particular reference to migrating and nesting birds; ▪ wild animals such as hedgehogs and bats; ▪ farm animals such as horses, as aviation fuel may be dumped over farms; 	The ES includes a full assessment of the potential impacts on biodiversity with the scope of such work agreed with Natural England.	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ insects such as butterflies, moths and bees; and ▪ invertebrates such as the Shining Ram's-horn snail. 		
	Comments that the proposals would lead to the disruption of wildlife connectivity corridors.	Whilst there is the potential for some disruption of wildlife corridors, the Project has been designed to limit these as far as practicable. In the long-term, habitat design has been included to enhance connectivity around the site, as set out in the Ecology Strategy for the Project, detailed in the OLEMP.	N
	Concerns raised about the potential risk of bird strikes on planes and that Gatwick would seek to deter birds in the local area.	<p>Landscape design for the Project has been undertaken in close consultation with the GAL Safeguarding Team to ensure there is no increased risk of bird strike.</p> <p>GAL will continue to operate their current Wildlife Management Plan with respect to avoidance of bird strike post construction.</p>	N
Mitigation	Suggestions for a centre of excellence in green technology.	The airport's policy document 'Decade of Change' sets out the target of being Net Zero by 2030 utilising best practice in various green technologies being developed by others. GAL looks to use these technologies as efficiently as possible across the airport and will continue to collaborate with local partners to support skills development and investment in green technologies.	N
	Suggestions for a rubbish incinerator to generate power for the local community.	We don't anticipate that the on-site renewables would generate sufficient energy to justify the infrastructure necessary to share power with the local community.	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Mitigation	Suggestions for the creation of more greenspace.	New open space is created within the project adjacent to Church Meadow and within the areas of car park B.	N

k. Land-use and recreation

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Land use	Requests for more information about the location of temporarily used land.	Gatwick's NRP boundary encompasses a number of different categories of land acquisition, which will be proportionate to the rights which are required for the delivery of the project. The Land Plans detail the land affected, and well as the rights sought within the various plots included within the proposed DCO.	N
	Comments that temporarily used land should be restored to a better condition than before.	On completion of construction works, plant, materials, equipment, temporary buildings and vehicles not required during subsequent activities will be removed from the site. All reinstatement will be completed in accordance with the requirements of the DCO.	N
	Comments that Gatwick should consider whether fracking activity has any implications for the project such as increased earthquakes.	Fracking developments will need to consider potential impacts on the existing environment and local infrastructure including the risk of earthquake, ground-cracking, pollution of the groundwater, etc. This would be undertaken as part of the consenting process and would form a component of a development's EIA. This would be the means by which the issue would be assessed.	Y
	Suggestions that International Civil Aviation Organization standards should be used to inform the proposed land use rather than European Aviation Safety Agency requirements.	Prior to Brexit the EASA regulations are the ones we signed up to in order to govern safety. Most of the EASA has been absorbed by the British regulations that have replaced EASA with Civil Aviation Publication (CAP). EASA regulations meet the ICAO requirements or is more restrictive.	N
	Suggestions for use of land for better hotels, restaurants, shops, leisure facilities, and other amenities. Comments that retail and catering were inadequate when compared to other airports.	Gatwick's proposals include opportunities for additional on-site hotels. Expansions of the departure lounges in both terminals are included, which would provide space for enhanced retail, catering, and leisure facilities for departing passengers.	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised about the use of land for hotels, offices and retail space.	<p>Following the Autumn 2021 Consultation, we refined and updated our assessments to further understand the additional office and hotel demand that would be generated by the Project, given the quantum of office and hotel proposals is directly driven by the Project and its components (e.g., by passenger numbers). The updated assessment also took into account changes to the future baseline position and changes in occupancy rates between 2019 and 2022. These updates were presented in the Summer 2022 Consultation and are the basis of the DCO Application.</p> <p>A full explanation on the role of the hotel and office proposals as Associated Development is provided in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1). This was also presented as part of the Planning ‘Group A’ Topic Working Group #3 on 23rd November 2022.</p> <p>In summary and in line with PINS Guidance (April 2023):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relationship and proportionately to the Principal Development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -.. Hotel occupation has a direct relationship to the airport’s operation by providing accommodation for visitors and users to the airport. the demand for hotel bedrooms is driven by passenger demand -.. The proposed office space is for airport-related use, driven by the residual airport-related office demand taking account of the conversion (loss) of Destinations Place; existing vacant office space at the airport; and displacement of non-airport related tenanted space to an off-airport location. -.. Both hotels and office provisions are typical land uses associated to and found commonly at airports. ▪ Subordinate to the Principal Development – the provision of hotel and office space is subordinate to the Principal Development and not an aim in itself. 	Y

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that land should be used for affordable housing.	Based on the findings of the Housing and Population Report (ES Appendix 17.9.3) (Doc Ref. 5.3) the Project would not likely increase the need for affordable housing nor is likely to impact on the affordable housing provision within the relevant housing market areas.	N
	Comments that Concorde House should be moved to allow improvements to South Terminal facilities.	Concorde North and/or Concorde South's location is poorly placed for expansion of the South Terminal. The site is relatively small and away from the passenger flow. Removal of the building(s) would require additional office accommodation to be constructed on site to replace it. Concorde South houses a crew training facility for easyJet and Concorde North houses a number of airport related business and GAL security training.	N
	Requests for more information about the construction compounds, and the location of the Construction Logistics centre.	The details of construction compounds are given in ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report Part A and Part B (Doc Ref. 5.3), the ES Appendix 5.3.2 Construction Resources and Waste Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) and the ES Appendix 5.3.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3). The Project does not propose a Construction Logistics Centre.	Y
	Suggestions for use of land to create research, education and training facilities.	Gatwick Airport is currently piloting and testing the establishment of a Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths (STEM) Centre on the airport site as part of the Project ESBS. Core provision would be an extension of Gatwick's schools-based STEM motivational project work, but it could include accommodation for collaborative projects between Gatwick and education, skills and training providers and research institutions as well as other businesses based on or beyond the Airport.	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that Gatwick should make more efficient use of land to increase stand availability and allow for additional development, including freight and cargo infrastructure.	<p>Gatwick Airport's footprint is highly utilised and highly efficient. The Northern Runway development will deliver 19 additional stands above the baseline, which further includes an additional 8 stands (currently being developed on Pier 6) over and above current stand capacity. Overall, we are planning a 20% increase in stand capacity within the current footprint.</p> <p>Gatwick Airport does not currently have cargo only freight operators and it is not part of Gatwick's case to attract such operators. Cargo is, however, carried in the belly-holds of passenger aircraft as part of many airlines' operating models and this provides efficient use of resources and important business benefits to supporting trade and investment in addition to cargo operations at other UK ports and airports.</p> <p>An assessment has been undertaken of the need for addition freight / cargo infrastructure to support forecast increase in freight tonnage. This assessment has shown that the existing cargo facilities at Gatwick are able to handle the forecast increase in cargo freight.</p>	N
	Comments that land should be provided for generating green energy.	Gatwick Airport are exploring the generation of on-site renewable energy as a component of its drive to reduce energy consumption and be net zero (Scope 1 and 2) by 2030. Opportunities include the provision of solar arrays in surface car parks, so called 'solar car ports' which have been successfully deployed at other airports such as Lyons. Any plans for renewable generation by GAL are independent of the Northern Runway Project and will be brought forward separately.	N
	Comments that land should be used to build a new terminal or subterminal to serve Pier 7.	A total of 6 options were evaluated when considering how best to provide additional processing capability, including two new terminals either to the south of the main runway or in the northwest quadrant. Option 6, modest expansions	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		of both the existing terminals, performed best overall in the evaluation as it maintains balanced split of demand that makes the best use of residual capacity in both terminals, thereby limiting the scale of expansion required in each. It was also an option that did not require the acquisition of additional land outside the airport boundaries and the balanced growth avoids placing too much pressure on any particular element of surface access infrastructure. It was also the option which scored best for planning, water and community criteria.	
Land restoration	Comments that Gatwick should formally commit to restoring land or ring fence money for restoration in advance of construction. Also, that ecological surveying should be done prior to construction to help with restoration.	A programme of pre-construction surveys will be undertaken to ensure that an up-to-date baseline with respect to ecology is established.	N
	Comments that restoration of the ecosystems lost during construction would be impossible, particularly woodland.	Restoration of habitats lost during construction would be undertaken according to best-practice guidelines, as set out in the LEMP. As such, there is high confidence that these measures would be successful.	N
Land take	Concerns raised about loss of green space, particularly woodland, for example near Picketts Wood.	No woodland is to be lost near to Picketts Wood.	N
	Concerns raised about buffers and the inclusion of Viking House within the proposed boundary.	Gatwick though the development of the Project will ensure that a reasonable and proportionate approach is taken to land acquisition, whether for temporary or permanent land and rights. The project is using all reasonable endeavours to contact affected parties.	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the proposals should be kept entirely within the existing airport footprint. Also, that brownfield land should be prioritised.	A significant proportion of the land required for the Project falls within Gatwick Airports Estate. Gatwick's NRP boundary encompasses a number of different categories of land acquisition, which will be proportionate to the rights which are required for the delivery of the project.	N
	Concerns raised about the amount of land required beyond the existing boundary. Others supported the proposals to keep development largely within the existing airport boundaries.	A significant proportion of the land required for the Project falls within Gatwick Airports Estate. Gatwick though the development of the project will ensure that a reasonable and proportionate approach is taken to land acquisition, whether for temporary or permanent land and rights.	N
	Comments that land take could be reduced if public transport were better utilised.	Our assessment already assumes a range of interventions to increase the proportion of journeys made by public transport by both air passengers and staff. We have assessed the mode share outcomes resulting from those interventions and tested the ability to go further on public transport mode share. Our assessment also shows that the nature of the road network operation is such that improvements will be needed to accommodate demand arising from the Project, even with higher public transport mode shares than we experience today. The nature of highway improvements and the standards required means that we would be unlikely to be able to provide the necessary highway improvements with a reduced land-take.	N
	Requests for more information on the rationale for land take and plans for safeguarded land.	Gatwick's NRP boundary encompasses a number of different categories of land acquisition, which will be proportionate to the rights which are required for the delivery of the project. The Land Plans will detail the land affected, and well as the rights sought within the various plots included within the proposed DCO.	N

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Compulsory purchase	Support for the avoidance of use of CPOs.	The Land Rights strategy employed by Gatwick and their consultants seeks to secure all necessary consents from affected parties by voluntary agreements. Due to the scale and nature of the project, to ensure delivery Gatwick are seeking various rights and powers to ensure that the project can be delivered. Where compulsory acquisition powers are utilised, compensation is available to affected parties on a statutory basis.	N
Mitigation	Comments that the proposals would not do enough to mitigate disruption and restore land.	The proposed landscape design for the Project has taken account of all impacts identified and includes plans to restore as much habitat as possible post development, accounting for issues around aircraft safeguarding.	N
	Requests for more information about how mitigation efforts would protect against the consequences of land use associated with the Project.	The Land Plans (Doc Ref. 4.2) identify which land is needed for the Project. Where land it to be used, and in the event that there is potential for likely adverse environmental effects from doing so, mitigation is proposed to address the adverse effects. This mitigation is either included as part of the Project or is offered as further mitigation. Full details of the mitigation offered by the Project are provided in the Mitigation Route Map ES Appendix 5.2.3 (Doc Ref. 5.3)	N

I. Health and well-being

Theme: Health and well-being			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Concerns raised about possible increases in air, noise, and light pollution and their impacts on health and wellbeing during both construction and operation.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers how changes in air, noise, and light pollution due to the Project are likely to influence population health. Significant adverse effects to population health are not expected, including due to the design and mitigation measures described in the ES air quality, noise and vibration and landscape and visual impact assessments.	N
	Requests for more detail about the possible impact on the health and livelihood of local people.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out detail on the effects of the Project on population health. This includes both beneficial effects in terms of employment opportunities that support local livelihoods and environmental exposures, such as air quality and noise emissions.	N
	Questions raised about whether impacts on mental health have been included in the assessments.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) uses the World Health Organization definition of health, which includes mental health as a fundamental element. The health assessment considers mental health outcomes as appropriate, given them parity with physical health outcomes.	N
	Concerns were raised about the impact of night construction and traffic on the quality of residents' sleep.	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) consider sleep disturbance effects from night-time construction and traffic. The Noise chapter sets out mitigation, including the Noise Insulation Scheme.	N
	Comments about the cumulative impact of noise from the Project and Crawley Goods Yard and Railhead.	The Crawley Good Yard is no longer a part of the Project. Section 14.11 of the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) reports the cumulative noise impacts of the Project. It reports on both 'combined effects' of different forms of noise combining at different time, such as construction noise and aircraft noise. And it reports on possible 'cumulative effects' of other development projects in the area with reference to developments plans	N

Theme: Health and well-being			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		submitted to the local authorities around the airport. Section 14.9 and 14.12 also provide the results of modelling and mapping the cumulative numbers of additional overflights generated by the Project and other airports in the wider area.	
	Concerns raised about proposals to relocate some residents during construction and the potential impacts on health and wellbeing, particularly for children.	Whilst the ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes the provision for temporary voluntary relocation support as a mitigation mechanism during construction, this is very much a last resort measure and, if used, would be for a very few people and for a short period of time. The support would aim to avoid rather than cause adverse effects on health and wellbeing.	N
	Concerns raised about the level of disruption as a result of the Project and the negative impacts on quality of life for local communities.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) assesses a variety of reasons for disruption, disturbance and emissions due to the Project. The Project includes a comprehensive design and mitigation package with the aim of greatly reducing disruption. For example, through the phasing of works, the use of diversions and the maintaining of good communications with local communities about planned works.	N
	Concerns raised about the health impacts that could result from noise and air pollution from the CARE facility.	Air quality impacts from the CARE facility are assessed in the ES. The pollutants assessed in the ES have been expanded to take into account all pollutants which could result in a significant impact, including those from the CARE facility. Details of the pollutants assessed is provided in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1). The CARE facility is also assessed in the noise assessment in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1), with suitable design standards derived to avoid significant environmental noise impacts.	Y

Theme: Health and well-being			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Local communities	Comments that greater consideration of construction impacts was needed of communities nearer to London along the M23 and M25.	ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes model outputs at discrete sensitive receptors within the 11 km by 10 km domain and wider study area outside of this domain. All roads are included within the 11 km by 10 km domain, and traffic screening using the IAQM/EPUK criteria has been undertaken outside this domain to define the relevant wider study area for each scenario. The wider study area includes areas of the M25 and sensitive receptors are modelled here, including residential properties, schools, hospitals and care homes.	Y
	Comments that the character and identity of local places would be changed by the Project.	<p>The LTVIA within chapter 8 of the ES incorporates baseline information from published district wide landscape and townscape character assessments. These assessments have informed judgements regarding the relative value of these receptors.</p> <p>The implementation of the surface access improvements will require removal of highway planting and mature vegetation which will initially result in a change in character of the edges of existing public open space at Church Meadows and Riverside Garden Park and a change in view for visual receptors, mainly in close proximity to the road corridor including some locations outside of Gatwick Airport.</p> <p>Reinstatement of vegetation removed as a result of the A23/M23 spur improvements will form part of the mitigation proposals within the Project. Additional environmental areas will also form part of the Project to compensate for any loss of landscape/habitat and provide extensive areas of replacement public open space, resulting in a beneficial effect in the long term.</p>	N

Theme: Health and well-being			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that increased congestion could have a detrimental impact on health services such as hospitals, posing a risk to local residents.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers access to healthcare based on the modelling results reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1). Significant adverse effects on population health associated with changes in health-related journey times, including ambulance response times, are not expected.	N
	Comments that more investment is needed in schools, healthcare, housing, social care, and employment of healthcare staff to help local residents with potential health impacts as a result of the Project.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers the Project's effect on local healthcare services. The NHS is publicly funded and manages changing demand through routine strategic healthcare service planning. The Project supports such planning through sharing data, as well as commitments to provide appropriate healthcare support for its workforces. Other aspects of local services demand are considered in the ES Socio-economics chapter.	N
Mitigation	Comments that local residents should be offered triple glazed windows or other soundproofing measures to ensure their wellbeing.	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the assessment of how changes in noise due to the Project are likely to be distributed and the criteria relevant to providing appropriate mitigation, as set out in the Noise Insulation Scheme. This includes additional glazing as well as other measures.	N

m. Major accidents and disasters

Theme: Major accidents and disasters			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Safety	Concerns raised about having no emergency runway in place, including in relation to resilience.	The northern runway is rarely used for emergency situations. The Project would offer a number of resilience benefits, which are set out in the Need Case.	N
	Concerns raised about the risks of operating two runways simultaneously and the limited distance between the two runways.	Technical standards relating to the airfield operation and safety are managed by the CAA and the project is fully compliant. Dual runways will be operated in a semi-dependent parallel runway operation. The departure on the Northern runway will not take off at the same time but upon touchdown of the arrival on the southern runway. Various other rules apply in terms of wake vortex dissipation and others. The spacing between runways complies with the regulations which do take into account relative safety of two aircraft operating on the two runways at the same time.	N
	Concerns raised about the increased risk of accidents during the overflight of populated areas.	Nothing changes to the BAU risk of today, but we anticipate that the likelihood of go-arounds should reduce as the dual runway operations are scattered across two runways rather than one, so one runway is available for longer without having other aircraft on it.	N
	Concerns raised about the potential for terror attacks.	The risk of potential terrorist activities is not really a function of passenger numbers or forecourt development. The increased capacity associated with the Project would not therefore be expected to have a direct effect on this aspect.	N

Theme: Major accidents and disasters			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised about the proximity of the Northern Runway to the South Terminal.	<p>Technical standards relating to the airfield operation and safety are managed by the CAA and the project is fully compliant.</p> <p>Northern runway has been in operation ever since it has existed as a runway and still operates safely today and in accordance with regulations and is managed by the airport on a day-to-day basis.</p>	N
	Concerns raised about the potential for breakdowns of communication due to damage to satellites, solar flares or hacking.	This issue is not a function of the Project. It is a C&I issue.	Y
	Concerns raised about the possibility of increased competition leading to a decline in safety standards.	This issue is not a function of the Project.	N
	Comments supporting the use of the northern runway for take-offs as it would ensure safety. Also, that parallel runways are widely used around the world.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>GAL is aware of the benefits and have been exploring these operations to learn from the examples around the world and ensure what we are proposing are safe and efficient. Examples include Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) and Toronto.</p>	N
	Comments that expanding Gatwick would improve resilience if an accident or terror attack prevents use of Heathrow or the existing runway at Gatwick.	Noted.	N

Theme: Major accidents and disasters			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Car Parking	Comments that the proposal to reduce available staff car parks could lead to increased fatigue for aircrew and be detrimental to flight safety.	This is not considered to be a fundamental contributor to flight safety.	Y
CARE Facility	Concerns raised about safety, including transport of waste to the facility, with specific reference to the risk of fire and contamination.	The existing CARE Centre operates under a full Environmental Permit issued by the Environment Agency. This includes a Fire Prevention Plan and Trade Effluent Discharge Consents. Both of these would remain in place at the future site. It is assumed future operations will meet environmental standards in accordance with ISO14001 and health and safety standards in accordance with ISO45001 and work to minimise the risks of pollution, accidents and incidents. Whilst site operation is being done in accordance with these standards the existing site/operation doesn't hold this accreditation. The GLCC (Logistics) operation is ISO45001 accredited but this doesn't apply to the GDRC operation. The operation would also be managed under an approved competence scheme.	N

n. Law and order

Theme: Law and order			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Police numbers	Questions raised about Gatwick's claims that increased police numbers would not be required.	In consultation, Sussex Police advised that the additional policing demands would require additional headcount.	N
Public transport	Requests for increased police presence on public transport to prevent theft of luggage.	This is not an issue associated with major accidents and disasters.	N
	Comments that the narrow platforms at Gatwick station would lead to safety risks as passenger numbers increased and some passengers exhibited anti-social behaviour, making passengers feel unsafe.	<p>As part of the Gatwick Airport Station Project, some of the platforms are being widened to allow better circulation of passengers. The addition of more escalators, lifts and stairs will also help distribute passengers along the platforms thereby reducing areas of crowding. The project is being delivered by Network Rail and which will be complete in 2023, regardless of the Project.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the railway station has been modelled in detail and the assessment concludes that with the Gatwick Airport Station Project, the station can accommodate additional rail demand in the Future Baseline and arising from the Project at reasonable levels of service, allowing for some peak crowding but maintaining safe operation.</p>	N
Unauthorised car parking	Comments that Gatwick should do more to manage unauthorised and anti-social parking, such as in agricultural fields.	The investigation and enforcement of planning breaches, including unauthorised parking operations, is the responsibility of the respective local planning authority. Notwithstanding this, GAL has committed funds to be used by the local authorities to enforce against off-airport parking and fly-parking in local residential areas.	N

o. Hazards

Theme: Hazards			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Construction	Concerns raised about the health effects of exposure to environmental hazards during construction, including dust, noise, air and light pollution.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers the population health implications of changes due to the Project associated with exposure to dust, noise, air pollution and light pollution during construction. The assessment is informed by other chapters of the ES which provide supporting data and analysis for individual receptors. Significant adverse population health effects during construction are not expected due to mitigation measure set out in the Code of Construction Practice contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
Flooding and drought	Comments that the proposals do not consider the hazards of flooding, droughts and extreme weather.	ES Appendix 5.3.5: Major Accidents and Disasters (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides an assessment of risks associated with the Project in respect of potential major accidents and disasters. The assessment considers flooding and extreme weather (including snow, storms, lightning strikes and wildfire) and droughts. Measures that form part of the Project design, including those relating to climate change (flooding and extreme weather) are described in the topic chapters, including ES Chapter 11: Water Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Chapter 15: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Active travel	Concerns raised about the increased risk of collision and inhalation of pollution for cyclists and pedestrians due to increased traffic.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers the population health implications of changes due to the Project associated with active travel and road safety. The scientific literature cited notes that in general terms the health gains from active travel exceed detrimental effects of traffic incidents and air pollution exposure. The changes due to the Project are not expected to significantly affect population health through increased accident risk or air pollution exposure.	N

p. Existing infrastructure

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Suggestions for improving customer experience, renovating terminals, attracting more long-haul carriers, and upgrading public transport links.	<p>The expansion of the departure lounges in both terminals are included, which would provide space for enhanced retail, catering, and leisure facilities for departing passengers. Alongside developing our proposal to bring the existing Northern Runway into routine use, GAL are ramping back up its capital investment programme. The recently published 2023 Capital Investment Programme forecasts investment of circa £1.65 billion over the next six years (2023 – 2029) which includes significant investment in the refurbishment of areas of the campus such as both the North and South departure lounges and gate rooms which have been highlighted by passengers as being tired and dated.</p> <p>Gatwick is working hard to rebuild its long-haul network post-pandemic and have been delighted by the return of airlines such as Air China and Delta Airlines and the arrival of new airlines such as Norse, Air India and Air Mauritius in 2023. It is fully expected that long haul growth will continue.</p> <p>We have developed a number of Surface Access Commitments (SACs) (ES Appendix 5.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) which form part of the DCO application. These include commitments to achieve a 55% of air passenger journeys made by public transport and 55% of staff journeys to work made by public transport, shared travel (a journey made by private car containing more than one person) and active modes (walking and cycling), three years after the opening of the new runway.</p> <p>We will develop a future ASAS in due course, which will be based on the commitments and measures set out in the SACs. These will build on initiatives</p>	N

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		and plans that we already have in place, or that we are preparing to do even if the Project were not to proceed.	
	Comments that operating hours and the number of flights should be increased.	Noted.	N
	Questions raised about whether the existing terminals could cope with the forecast growth.	Comprehensive capacity assessments have been carried out for each stage of the passenger journey. The Northern Runway development proposals include modest expansions of both terminals to provide additional space for outbound baggage handling, departure lounges, inbound baggage reclaims, coaching gates and stations to transit to Pier 7. Internal reconfigurations will provide additional security, check-in and border capability. GAL expect technology development to continue to provide improvements in processing capability, driving improved passenger experience and more efficient operational resources.	N
	Suggestions for improved facilities, including shops, food outlets, hotels and duty free as well as click and collect services for airport passengers and local residents.	Gatwick's proposals include opportunities for additional on-site hotels. Expansions of the departure lounges in both terminals are included, which would provide space for enhanced retail, catering, and leisure facilities for departing passengers.	N
	Comments that local sewage and water infrastructure should be upgraded.	Thames Water are due to complete an impact assessment of future development in their Horley and Crawley catchments that would include the Project. To date Thames have not indicated any impediments to the Project.	N
	Comments that all existing infrastructure should be made net zero.	ES Appendix 5.4.2 Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) commits GAL to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030 for Scopes 1 and 2. This includes existing infrastructure and any built as part of the NRP.	N

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Questions raised about whether the railway infrastructure could cope with the predicted growth.	<p>Gatwick station has been modelled in detail and the assessment concludes that with the Gatwick Station Project the station can accommodate additional rail demand in the Future Baseline and arising from the Project at reasonable levels of service.</p> <p>We have undertaken an assessment of the impacts of the Project on crowding on rail services, which indicates that although some trains will get busier, there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate both airport and non-airport related passengers without the need to provide additional services at peak or other times of day.</p>	N
	Comments that Gatwick should improve existing infrastructure and reduce car use before starting construction of the proposals, to show that it could be successful.	GAL's existing Airport Surface Access Strategy sets out how car mode share has consistently declined over recent years and sets out the measures that will be taken to further reduce car use relative to growth without the Northern Runway Project. The proposed infrastructure improvements are designed to allow for growth in non-airport traffic as well as some growth in airport traffic whilst maintaining safe and efficient operation of the highway. The analysis of network performance takes into account an increase sustainable travel mode share with GAL's proposals supporting more public transport and active travel journeys.	N
Airfield	Comments that the existing runway should be extended to accommodate larger aircraft.	The Main runway is already very long and does not need extending. The runway length could accommodate up to Code F aircraft which covers every type of aircraft. The Northern runway will accommodate up to Code E aircraft subject to their loading, and the different capabilities will be accommodated in how airport is operated.	N

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that new piers and remote stands be built along with a fast slip off the main runway for small aircraft.	This suggestion would be unsafe for aircraft operations within the proposed concept. An aircraft crossing the runway early in front of a departing aircraft would lead to conflicting aircraft movements. As this is not a safe suggestion, we are not proposing it at the airport.	N
Freight	Suggestions that Gatwick should improve the necessary infrastructure to support increased freight movements, including on-site storage.	An assessment has been undertaken of the need for addition freight / cargo infrastructure to support forecast increase in freight tonnage. This assessment has shown that the existing cargo facilities at Gatwick are able to handle the forecast increase in cargo freight	N
	Comments that all freight should be transferred to Luton.	Gatwick does not currently have cargo only freight operators and it is not part of Gatwick's case to attract such operators. Cargo is, however, carried in the belly-holds of passenger aircraft as part of many airlines' operating models and this provides efficient use of resources and important business benefits to supporting trade and investment.	N
Taxis	It was said that existing taxi parking was insufficient. Concerns were expressed about taxi provision and suggestions existing taxi monopolies should be disbanded to improve quality and cost.	We work with all taxi and private hire providers accessing the airport to provide choice and convenience for passengers. In addition to Gatwick Cars, this includes local private hire, and taxi companies, Uber and other nationally recognised providers. No monopoly exists and all providers that meet required standards are able to access the airport. Our preference is for the use of low or zero emission vehicles for Gatwick Cars and other providers.	N
Local communities	Comments that Gatwick should spend money to improve local infrastructure for local communities.	Gatwick Airport currently operates an existing community fund through the Gatwick Airport Community Trust which awards grants annually for deserving projects within the area of benefit which covers parts of East and West Sussex, Surrey and Kent. The funds are channelled to those areas where people are directly affected by operations at Gatwick Airport and encourage and support schemes that benefit diverse sections of the local community. The Trust is	N

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		funded under an obligation within the current Section 106 agreement (signed May 2022), with funding linked to annual passenger numbers. The current s106 agreement is due to expire on 31 st December 2024. The Trust is complemented by a discretionary and voluntary arrangement by GAL known as the Gatwick Foundation Fund which also supports a range of community projects across Kent, Surrey and Sussex, and is managed by the individual Community Foundations. The aim is to merge these funds to create one, new, single Gatwick Community Fund which will be secured through the new Section 106. This fund will have similar aims and will be dedicated to supporting local communities through the funding of projects within those communities most affected by the airport operations. Further details are set in the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1).	
	Support for increased employment as long as pressure on existing infrastructure was minimised and continually reassessed.	ES Appendix 5.2.3 Mitigation Route Map (Doc Ref. 5.3) includes mitigations measures that will be implemented in conjunction with the growth of the airport through the NRP project.	N
	Comments that there should be improvements in electric infrastructure in local communities around the airport.	The NRP does not impact directly on the need for electric infrastructure on local communities around the airport.	N

q. Construction

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments that temporary disruption is necessary for the benefits of the Project.	Noted.	N
	Comments that Gatwick has a good relationship with the local community and positive approach to engagement on previous developments. Others commented that their experience has been negative. Suggestions for early engagement with the community on construction issues.	Noted. The measures for managing construction impacts, including proposals to minimise effect on local communities/highway users are identified in ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3).	N
	Support for proposal to re-use earthworks materials and requests for more information about how potential contaminants will be treated.	During the detailed design process, GAL will develop a comprehensive plan for identifying and managing any potential contaminants on the construction site. This plan will include measures for preventing contamination, as well as strategies for treating any identified contaminants to ensure that they do not pose a risk to human health or the environment. Further detail is set out in ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Resources and Waste Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Requests to avoid disruption to local businesses, especially around phasing of the decking of Car Parks V and X and use of the Construction Logistics Centre.	The construction works will be planned and operated to avoid/reduce disruption to local communities.	Y
Environmental impacts	Concerns raised about noise, air and light pollution as a result of construction activities.	The air quality assessment for the ES has included all routes likely to be used by construction traffic around the airport, and any roads affected during operation. Pollutant concentrations have been predicted at discrete	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		receptors in the AQMAs and the wider study area. Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3). Construction mitigation measures (including monitoring recommendations) will follow best practice IAQM guidance and would be implemented through the ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3) to ensure air quality impacts are minimised.	
	Concerns raised about the impacts of overnight works on local communities.	ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3) and ES Appendix 5.3.1: Buildability Reports Part A and Part B (Doc Ref. 5.3) gives information on indicative construction methodology, working hours and the measures to reduce the impacts of construction works on local communities. The measures have been designed to reduce impacts on local communities, including impacts arising from any overnight works.	N
	Concerns raised about specific construction impacts, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. greenhouse gas emissions 2. effects on local wildlife, habitats, biodiversity and soils 3. visual impact 4. loss of green space and woodland 5. HGVs and traffic 6. effects on land and flood relief infrastructure 	The construction impacts arising from the Project on these specific elements are considered in the relevant ES Chapters, including ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources; ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation; ES Chapter 11: Water Environment; ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport; and ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases . These chapters are contained in Doc Ref. 5.1.	N
Traffic	Concerns raised about the potential disruption and congestion on motorways and local roads during construction.	We have assessed the performance of the highway network during the period when the airfield works are being constructed, and during the period when the highway works are being constructed. The assessment indicates	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		that while there may be some reassignment of traffic during this period, there are no significant effects expected which would require mitigation.	
	Requests for further information about construction worker traffic, access and parking.	ES Appendix 5.3.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) gives further information on worker traffic, access and parking.	N
	Concerns that the analysis of construction traffic is limited to the M23 spur link and the M23.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) includes scenarios covering the periods of airfield construction and highway construction. This has been undertaken using the strategic highway model. The assessment examines the potential effects of construction on the whole of the highway network contained in that model, not just the M23 and M23 Spur.	N
	Concerns raised about the impact on Horley Business Park.	Access to Horley Business Park is not included within the highway design proposals, nor the construction access proposals, as it is not a committed scheme at this stage and there is insufficient detail about the access proposals for that development.	N
Contractor compounds	Concerns raised about potential hazards and congestion due to the Longbridge contractor compound.	All the construction activities will be planned and operated according to the ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3). The indicative construction methodology is given in ES Appendix 5.3.1: Buildability Reports Part A and Part B (Doc Ref. 5.3)	N
Sustainability	Comments that the Project should be carbon neutral and use sustainable materials. Suggestions included: 1. designing sustainable buildings 2. using responsible, eco-friendly, Tier 1 construction companies	See Section 16.8 of ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) for details of the mitigation measures embedded within the GHG assessment. ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides commitments across three of the GHG assessment topics: construction, surface access and aviation. GAL commits to a construction carbon budget	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. using alternatives to concrete or ensuring all concrete is sustainably produced 4. having a recycling strategy 5. using zero emission and low noise construction equipment 6. offering unused materials to the local community 7. adopting circular economy principles 8. ensuring buildings conform to BREEAM outstanding level 	of 1.15 MtCO ₂ e for airfield, buildings, and highways construction, representing a 17% reduction based on typical industry construction practices.	
Wildlife and ecology	Comments that disruption to local wildlife and ecology should be minimised, including suggestions of a wildlife audit, involvement of relevant agencies, use of living roofs and bee-friendly planting, and inclusion of hedgehog houses and fox shelters.	<p>The Project has been designed to minimise impacts to ecology through control of lighting, emissions to water etc. Pre-construction surveys for ecology will be undertaken to determine the up-to-date baseline prior to works commencing and further monitoring surveys will be undertaken during and post construction.</p> <p>Living roofs are not considered safe within the context of an airport due to their attractiveness to bird species (e.g. gulls) that are a risk for bird strike. The use of pollinator-friendly planting and other features of benefit to biodiversity is presented in the OLEMP.</p>	N
	Comments that all damaged land should be restored, and donations made to land management charities.	A soil management strategy for areas of agricultural land temporarily affected by the Project is included in the Code of Construction Practice. This has been developed in accordance with recognised best practice, including the DEFRA Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites (2009). The principal objectives of the outline strategy are:	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the conservation of soil resources; ▪ avoidance of damage to soil structural characteristics; ▪ maintenance of soil drainage; and ▪ the identification of principles for the reinstatement of the soil profiles. 	
Construction management	Comments that noise, light, and vibration impacts should be modelled and mitigated, especially those near sensitive receptors such as schools and nurseries.	Noise from construction work has been modelled at sensitive receptors including schools and nurseries as reported in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1). Vibration has been predicted at the properties nearest to piling work, as reported in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Appendix 14.9.1 Construction Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Requests for construction working hours to be limited to 8am-6pm Monday to Friday.	<p>While we understand the importance of minimising disruption to local communities, it is important to note that there will be elements of work and occasions that require working hours beyond these normal hours.</p> <p>As outlined in ES Appendix 5.3.1: Buildability Reports Part A and Part B (Doc Ref. 5.3), GAL has identified certain aspects of the construction process that may require 24/7 working, night working, or extended working hours to ensure that the project is completed safely for the workforce, road users and local community and within the required timeframe. ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3) sets out the construction working hours for the Project.</p>	N
	Suggestions for the use of rail to transport construction freight.	This has been considered but is not considered practical. It is not planned to construct a rail head for the delivery of construction materials and removal of spoil.	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions for mandatory routes for construction traffic and limiting it to outside peak hours with penalties for breaches.	ES Appendix 5.3.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) gives information on the construction traffic routes. ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3) sets out the construction working hours for the Project. The prescribed working hours have sought to reduce the disruption to road users and local residents as practical as possible.	N
	Requests for temporary noise buffers and the option of temporary accommodation if necessary.	The proposed highways improvement works as part of the Project incorporate noise barriers and bunding, described in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Project is also supported by a homeowners assisted moving scheme which offers homeowners the option to move from the areas most affected by the highest noise levels. The scheme is summarised in Section 14.8 of the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Comments that construction should be completed as quickly as possible (24 hours a day, seven days a week) to minimise disruption.	Noted.	N
Construction practices	Suggestions for use of sustainable technologies, low carbon materials, water conservation, reuse of waste products on-site, and modular buildings to reduce environmental impact.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.2)) sets out outcomes that GAL is committed to achieve to reduce carbon emissions for four key airport emission sources, including construction. To meet those outcomes, GAL will draw from a range of measures set out in the CAP.	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for contractors to be part of the Considerate Constructors scheme, undertake disability awareness training and use measures such as wheel washing and road cleaning to minimise impacts.	<p>ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3) requires the Principal Contractors to sign up to, and implement, the Considerate Constructors Scheme or a locally recognised certification scheme.</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice also sets out a good housekeeping policy which will be applied to construction areas at all times. This includes measures such as wheel washing.</p>	N
	Comments that a detailed logistics plan and Environmental Management plan in line with ISO 14001 are required.	<p>GAL's construction and operation teams currently do and will continue to operate an Environmental Management System, which is certified to British Standard EN ISO 14001.</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2: Construction Code of Practice (Doc Ref 5.3) requires each Principal Contractor to have an EMS accredited to ISO 14001.</p>	N

r. Approach to EIA

Theme: Approach to EIA			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Construction	Comments that the Environmental Impact Assessments should have the support of local community groups.	Gaining the support of local community groups is not a requirement of the EIA process, however, local community groups have been consulted to ensure they have an opportunity to express their views.	N
CARE Facility	Comments suggested that changes to the CARE facility represented a major component of the project and would require a separate Environmental Impact Assessment.	The proposals for the CARE facility are assessed as part of the ES for the Northern Runway Project.	N
Assessments	Comments that the scale of changes proposed, and associated impacts had not been given due attention in the assessments carried out.	We consider that we have conducted a robust assessment of the impacts of the proposals and that it complies with the EIA scoping opinion prepared by PINS.	N
	Comments that cumulative impacts should be assessed and that assessments have the support of local environmental groups.	The cumulative impacts of the Project are assessed in the ES, as set out in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N

s. Mitigation

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments that mitigation should be proposed to support increased pressure on housing, education, transport and health infrastructure.	Based on the findings of the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment as presented in the ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref 5.1), there is no significant impact in relation to housing or education that would require mitigation.	N
	Support for proposed mitigation strategies and requesting that they should be introduced regardless of expansion.	The support for the mitigation strategies is noted. The mitigation strategies presented as part of the NRP look to directly prevent, reduce and where relevant, offset any potential significant adverse effects that are specific to the NRP. There are existing planning measures that control airport operations to ensure that they do not cause harmful effects.	N
	Concerns that mitigation will be difficult, the proposals rely on unproven technology, and carbon offsetting is an ineffective approach to preventing climate change.	<p>The Government published its Jet Zero Strategy containing goals to achieve net zero UK aviation emissions by 2050 and specific targets for domestic and international aviation emissions. The Strategy recognises that many of the technologies needed to decarbonise the sector are at an early stage of development. As such, the Strategy will be subject to a monitoring process every five years to allow new technology to be developed, tested and adopted across the industry.</p> <p>The Project has been prepared in line with the Jet Zero Strategy and taking account of ongoing development of low emission technologies. The list of measures within the Carbon Action Plan (CAP) - see ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) - includes some measures where the details are yet to be finalised, for example as technology improves, and there will be choices to be made from multiple options. The CAP is clear, however, that Gatwick commits to clear outcomes in each of the four focus areas.</p>	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more detail and further consultation on all mitigation proposals, particularly the CARE facility, approach to active travel, noise mitigation and flight paths.	The Mitigation Route Map submitted with the DCO (ES Appendix 5.2.3 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) application sets out all the mitigation that is required to prevent, reduce and, where relevant, offset any potential significant adverse effects of the NRP as identified through the environmental assessment. Throughout pre-engagement with the LPAs, there have been updates provided on the proposed NRP mitigation and this has been communicated on a topic-by-topic basis through the TWGs and separately with Council representatives as part of the SoCG negotiations.	N
	Comments that the mitigation of potential landscape and ecological impacts is appropriate compared with the need to develop the airport.	The broad objectives of the Landscape Master Plan are within the ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Ecology and Landscape Masterplan (Doc Ref. 5.3) and are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ to provide an appropriate setting for the new developments within the Project, responding to adjacent urban and rural land uses and the existing character of the airport. ▪ Retention of green infrastructure assets. ▪ Integration with and expansion of the existing green infrastructure network within and around the airport. ▪ Enhancing, restoring and reintroducing characteristic landscape elements which have been lost or degraded. ▪ to respond to the scale and character of the airport and enhance the experience of people working within and visiting the airport, the local communities that live next to the airport and people travelling through the area. ▪ to protect, manage and enhance the nature conservation value of appropriate areas of the site. 	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Support expressed for the sustainability plan, the biodiversity plan, targets for reducing noise and emissions, and for the prospect of improvements in aviation technology which could result in quieter and less polluting aircraft.	The support is noted.	N
	Comments that environmental mitigation should extend to the wider region.	Where the environmental assessment dictates that mitigation is required outside of the Order Limits, this is put forward to prevent, reduce and, where relevant, offset any potential significant adverse effects of the NRP. Full details of the mitigation proposed by the NRP are set out in ES Appendix 5.2.3: Mitigation Route Map (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that there should be more screening of the project and of existing airport buildings.	<p>The broad objectives of the Landscape Master Plan are within the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan set out at ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Ecology and Landscape Masterplan (Doc Ref. 5.3)</p> <p>The existing network of green infrastructure within and around the airport comprising hedgerows, hedgerow trees and mature woodland provide an important element of the landscape character and an excellent screen for visual receptors within the surrounding urban and rural areas. The landscape mitigation measures proposed as part of the Project retain these elements, where possible and expand the green infrastructure to maintain character and screening.</p>	N
Noise	Comments that the noise mitigation methods are ineffective and do not cover all people affected by noise.	Noted.	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for exploration of additional noise mitigation measures, including research, incentives and using woodland around Gatwick to reduce noise.	Woodlands are not likely to significantly reduce noise, particularly noise for aircraft in the air.	N
CARE facility	Comments that the CARE facility should have specific mitigation, including noise, air quality, flood management and traffic flow, including a consideration of the cumulative impacts from other local developments.	The ES includes an assessment of noise and air quality from the CARE facility and commits to design standards to ensure noise and air impacts are not created from its operation.	N
Flooding	Suggestions that pollutants be removed from water before it is released, that run-off water is re-used, and that local stakeholders are consulted before stored water is released.	The Project makes provision to treat additional de-icer loading in runoff due to increased air traffic movements via the provision of a new treatment works.	N
Transport	Comments that Gatwick is unlikely to succeed in attracting more passengers through public transport as it is only accessible from London.	Gatwick is not accessible only from London but can be reached either directly or with a single interchange from many stations in the Southeast and beyond. We acknowledge that some areas have poor rail connections to the Airport, but our SACs include provision of regional bus and coach services to provide a public transport alternative for passengers travelling to and from these areas. Our modelling demonstrates that we can achieve the mode shares which we are committing to in our SACs.	N
	Comments that mitigation should be provided for potential disruption of bus services due to construction.	GAL will continue to work with the bus operators, alongside local authorities, to develop and agree the detailed plans for any temporary diversions that may be needed to bus services during construction. Our assessment indicates that journey times may not be significantly affected,	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		and not all bus services pass through the area where highway works will be taking place.	
Road improvements	Suggestions for a bypass for north-south travellers, upgrades for users coming from the east and west, and more connections with local roads.	Our proposed highway works will improve the network on the approach to the Airport from the M23 and from the direction of Longbridge Roundabout. The majority of our passengers arriving or leaving by car do so via the M23. We have assessed the effects of the Project, including the proposed highway works, and have concluded that there is no requirement for a north-south bypass or for additional connections with local roads.	N
	Suggestions for road improvements to be constructed before the airport is expanded.	We have used our strategic and local highway models to test the operation of the highway network in the year that the runway opens and three years afterwards. These indicate that the existing network will perform acceptably when the runway opens, but that our proposed highway works will need to be in place within three years of the runway opening date.	N
Construction	Comments that negative impacts would remain despite the proposed mitigation measures.	A Code of Construction Practice will set out how temporary construction impacts will be mitigated as far as practicable – see ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Concerns raised about construction traffic using local roads, with requests for further information about monitoring and enforcement measures.	The Environmental Assessment gives more detail on this matter.	N
	Requests for detailed modelling of construction impacts on noise, air quality and local transport and their proposed mitigation strategies.	Construction noise has been assessed across 12 noise receptor areas covering the entire area that could be affected around the airport and highways upgrading scheme, based on the current design of the works, making a series of worst-case approximations where necessary. Noise	Y

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>levels have been predicted for 24 stages of construction at 170 locations across the airfield and highway areas. The likely programme of day and night works has been analysed to make sure that cumulative noise from potentially overlapping works have been modelled and assessed. Predicted noise impacts are based on assumed standard methods of working and assuming the Best Practicable Means to reduce noise on site are adopted as listed. The effect of site perimeter noise barriers has been assessed to mitigate four areas of noise impact. ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides the report on construction noise impacts and ES Appendix 14.9.1 Construction Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides details of the noise modelling carried out.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) contains an assessment of the likely transport-related effects of the Project during construction, based on the strategic transport modelling that has been undertaken, and additional information is provided in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4).</p>	
	Requests for local residents to be involved in development of traffic management plans. Also, that advance notice be given of road closures.	This will be identified in Code of Construction Practice.	N
	Requests for compensation for local businesses affected by construction.	Where valid and mitigated claims for losses are received by Gatwick, the Project will review them and seek to settle them expediently in line with their statutory requirement and the Compensation Code.	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Climate change and carbon	Support for use of renewable energy sources, low emission vehicles, and on-site heat generation.	Low emissions / renewable energy sources are a consideration with the Carbon Action Plan (see ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)). The CAP commits GAL to achieving net zero for Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030, and zero emissions by 2040.	N
	Comments that, rather than expanding the airport, flights should be limited to reduce its environmental impact, emissions mitigation should be implemented without the Project, and the aim should be to achieve zero carbon.	The Government's 10-year aviation strategy 'Flightpath for the Future' (2022) makes it clear that it does not believe that aviation must decline for the UK to meet its climate change targets. The Government states in this document that they support airport expansion where it's justified, to boost global connectivity and to level up the UK.	N
	Comments that approval of the project should be conditional on a progressive reduction in emissions against a 2019 baseline.	The Airport National Policy Statement makes clear that <i>"any increase in carbon emissions alone is not a reason to refuse development consent, unless the increase in carbon emissions resulting from the project is so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets, including carbon budgets"</i> . Notwithstanding this, Gatwick's second Decade of Change sets out Gatwick's goal to achieve net zero for GAL Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions by 2030. GAL proposes to legally commit to this through the Carbon Action Plan under the terms of the DCO.	N
	Requests for the Carbon and Climate Change Action Plan to include specific targets for reducing emissions during construction.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) commits GAL to a construction carbon budget of 1.15 MtCO _{2e} for airfield, buildings and highways construction, representing a 17% reduction on typical construction practices.	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information about noise mitigation.	Section 14.8 and 14.9 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) provide details of noise mitigation.	Y
	Comments that airlines should be incentivised to modernise their fleets.	<p>The Government published its Jet Zero Strategy containing goals to achieve net zero UK aviation emissions by 2050 and specific targets for domestic and international aviation emissions. The Strategy recognises that many of the technologies needed to decarbonise the sector are at an early stage of development. As such, the Strategy will be subject to a monitoring process every five years to allow new technology to be developed, tested and adopted across the industry, such as the use of sustainable aviation fuel and zero emission flights.</p> <p>The Carbon Action Plan (see ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) has been prepared in line with the Jet Zero Strategy and taking account of ongoing development of low emission technologies. The list of measures within the CAP includes some measures where the details are yet to be finalised, for example as technology improves, and sets out how GAL can look to influence airlines on the use of low emission technologies. The CAP is clear, however, that Gatwick commits to clear outcomes in each of the four focus areas.</p>	N
	Comments that flight paths should be alternated to vary the impact on residential areas. Also, that aircraft should fly at higher altitudes and use a steeper approach.	Flights are spread across the available departure routes according to air traffic control requirements including the need to separate aircraft safely that are not affect by the Project.	N
	Comments that Noise Abatement Departure Procedure 1 should be incorporated into the proposals.	The Project does not affect departure operating procedures.	N

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information on the design of noise barriers, flight timings, enforcement of mitigation measures, funding, and the insulation scheme.	The ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and associated appendices provide further information along with the Noise Insulation Scheme (ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme (Doc Ref. 5.3) and Noise Envelope (ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3)).	N

t. Airspace and overflights

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
FASI- South	Comments that the airspace modernisation plans have not been adequately considered.	Once FASI South proposals are understood they will have their own Environmental Assessment which will be consulted upon.	N
	Comments that cumulative impacts of the airspace modernisation programme and the Project should be considered.	The Project will be considered in conjunction with the cumulative of the airspace modernisation programme.	N
Airspace	Concerns about the impact of the proposals on surrounding airspace and flight paths, such as Biggin Hill and Heathrow.	The Northern Runway Project does not require changes to Gatwick's Standard Instrument Departures, Standard Arrivals or Instrument Approach Procedures. Dual runway operations would operate using existing, published procedures and in accordance with the related Gatwick Northern Runway Project Airspace Change Proposal (ACP-2019-81); thus, no changes are required to the arrival and departure procedures of any adjacent aerodromes.	Y
Airfield	Comments that the proposed airfield design and increase in aircraft could result in more holding of aircraft and worsening congestion.	The proposed layout and configuration of the airfield has been subject to, and informed by, detailed simulation modelling. Further information including how the project would affect performance of the airfield, such as aircraft taxi and holding times is provided in the Note on Simulation Report provided at Annex 8 of Appendix 4.3.1: Forecast Data Book (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
Overflights	Comments that the maps and diagrams in the documents did not show impacted areas clearly or in a way that allowed people to assess the increase in overflights at a given location.	The overflight modelling has been revised and refined for the ES allowing the grid size to be reduced from 3.2km to 1km.	Y

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns were raised about the detrimental impacts of overflying on listed buildings, the historic environment and villages.	The assessment of the impact of air noise on heritage assets has been undertaken in accordance with the appropriate guidance as advised in the Airports National Policy Statement and is presented within Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1). The methodology for this assessment has been agreed with Historic England.	N

u. Water and flood risk

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Water management	Questions raised about whether Gatwick would aim to reduce consumption of water.	<p>The Project would increase water consumption due to the increase in passengers. Sutton and East Surrey Water supply Gatwick's water and to date have not raised any concerns regarding their ability to meet the additional demand.</p> <p>Separately to the Project GAL are progressing their second Decade of Change which commits to reducing water usage at the airport by 50% from 2019 levels by 2030.</p>	N
	Requests for more information about the impact of the CARE facility on water use.	The impact of the CARE facility is considered in the impact on water supply, wastewater and drainage in the water environment chapter of the ES.	N
	Suggestions that run-off water be reused for electricity generation.	This is not a consideration of the Project as it would need to take into account the operation of the wider airport but could be considered by GAL as part of a future Decade of Change.	Y
	Comments that the PEIR does not consider the hazard of flooding.	ES Appendix 5.3.5: Major Accidents and Disasters (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides an assessment of risks associated with the Project in respect of potential major accidents and disasters. The assessment considers flooding and extreme weather (including snow, storms, lightning strikes and wildfire) and droughts.	N
	Comments supporting the water management proposals, including ecological mitigation on the floodplains of the river Mole and Gatwick Stream.	Noted.	Y

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the Project would place greater demand on water supplies.	<p>The Project would increase water consumption due to the increase in passengers. Sutton and East Surrey Water supply Gatwick's water and to date have not raised any concerns regarding their ability to meet the additional demand.</p> <p>Separately to the Project GAL are progressing their second Decade of Change which commits to reducing water usage at the airport by 50% from 2019 levels by 2030.</p>	N
Assessments	Questions raised about why emissions of water vapour are not included.	Water vapour emissions are not considered to be environmentally significant.	Y
	Comments that a detailed EIA supported by guarantee should consider the impacts of waste management and water.	Impacts of the Project on water are fully considered in the water environment chapter of the ES and its supporting appendices.	Y
	Comments that climate change should be factored into flood risk modelling.	The predicted impact of climate change based on UKCP18 is factored into the assessment of flood risk and the proposed mitigation as reported in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that the worst-case scenario modelling should be conducted on potential flooding of car parks.	An assessment has been undertaken of the flood risk implications of a 'Credible Maximum Scenario' as required by Environment Agency guidance which is reported in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) for all elements of the Project.	Y
Local infrastructure	Comments that local sewage and water infrastructure should be upgraded to support increased passenger numbers.	Discussions with Thames Water have been ongoing throughout the development of the Project and continue with regard to its impact on Crawley and Horley STW. Thames Water are due to complete an impact	Y

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		assessment of future development in these catchments. To date Thames have not indicated any impediments to the Project.	
	Requests for further information about water consumption and wastewater discharge from the proposed new hotels and offices.	The details of the assessment of the impact of the Project on wastewater and water supply are included in ES Appendices 11.9.7 Wastewater Assessment and 11.9.8 Water Supply Assessment (both in Doc Ref. 5.3) respectively.	Y
Flood risk	Concerns raised about increased flood risk, including for those living downstream, as well as the need for flood defences and diversion of the River Mole.	The Project would not increase flood risk offsite. Increases in flood risk on site would be safely managed via existing flood response procedures developed by GAL, as reported in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Concerns raised about the possibility of sewage being discharged during flooding.	Surface water runoff may only be discharged to local watercourses when of sufficient quality as regulated by the Environment Agency. Otherwise, surface water runoff would be treated prior to discharge.	Y
	Comments that the construction of impermeable roads would lead to greater risk of flooding.	The surface water drainage strategy for the Project includes measures to store and attenuate the additional runoff. The discharge to receiving watercourses would be limited to ensure no increase in peak flows and consequently flood risk to other parties.	N
	Comments that additional hardstanding should be reduced, particularly near to the River Mole.	The surface water drainage strategy for the Project includes measures to store and attenuate the additional runoff. The discharge to receiving watercourses would be limited to ensure no increase in peak flows and consequently flood risk to other parties.	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that natural solutions should be explored to increase the resilience of the area to flooding.	The Project includes SuDS measures as part of the surface water drainage strategy that would provide biodiversity benefits in addition to flood risk mitigation.	N
	Concerns raised about potential flood risk and the defences that would be required.	The Project includes mitigation measures (as detailed in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3)) to ensure no increase in flood risk offsite.	N
	Comments that the area is already prone to flooding and climate change would make this worse. Suggestions to explore natural solutions to increase the resilience of the area to flooding.	The Project includes mitigation measures (as detailed in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3)) to ensure no increase in flood risk offsite. The Project includes SuDS measures as part of the highway drainage network.	N
	Comments that the construction of impermeable roads would increase flood risk.	The highways drainage strategy demonstrates that there would be no increase in flood risk on receiving watercourses as a result of the provision of flood attenuation and storage measures.	N
	Comments that flood mitigation should start before any construction that increases hardstanding.	Mitigation measures would be constructed in advance of any loss of associated flood plain. Drainage attenuation measures would be constructed in advance of associated additional impermeable areas.	N
Mitigation	Comments that flood mitigation should be implemented before the start of any construction that increases hardstanding.	Mitigation measures would be constructed in advance of any loss of associated floodplain. Drainage attenuation measures would be constructed in advance of associated additional impermeable areas.	N
	Comments that pollutants should be removed from water before it is released into local watercourses.	Surface water runoff may only be discharged to local watercourses when of sufficient quality as regulated by the Environment Agency. Otherwise, surface water runoff would be treated prior to discharge.	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Suggestions that improvements be made to the flow and oxygen concentration of the River Mole.	Surface water runoff may only be discharged to local watercourses when of sufficient quality as regulated by the Environment Agency. Otherwise, surface water runoff would be treated prior to discharge.	N

v. Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology

Theme: Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Land use	Concerns raised about the detrimental effects of land use on biodiversity.	Details of the potential impacts of the Project from changes in land use are provided in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Suggestions that temporarily used land could be restored to improve local biodiversity.	Noted. The need to ensure that land required for temporary works is restored to a higher biodiversity value, where appropriate, has been accounted for within the landscape plans for the Project (to the north of Longbridge Roundabout, for example).	N
Construction Impacts	Concerns raised about the impact of construction on biodiversity and local soils.	Details of the potential impacts of the Project during construction are provided in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Mitigation	Comments supporting elements of mitigation such as the biodiversity plan.	Noted.	N
	Comments that the impact of the proposals on local biodiversity would be minimal.	Noted.	N
	Requests for more information about the approach to avoiding, mitigating or compensating for impacts.	Details of how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied are set out, where appropriate, in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1). ES Appendix 5.2.3 Mitigation Route Map (Doc Ref. 5.3) sets out all the mitigation that is required to prevent, reduce and, where relevant, offset any potential significant adverse effects of the NRP as identified through the environmental assessment. Throughout pre-engagement with the LPAs, there have been updates provided on the proposed NRP mitigation and this	N

		has been communicated on a topic-by-topic basis through the TWGs and separately with Council representatives as part of the SoCG negotiations.	
Assessment	Requests for more information about the impacts of the Project on biodiversity.	Details of the potential impacts of the Project are provided in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Comments that surveys should be updated with data collected by Gatwick's biodiversity advisor.	Data collected by Gatwick's Biodiversity team are provided to the relevant records centre each year. Updated data from the records centres have been included within the ES – this includes those records provided by the Gatwick team.	N

w. Sustainability assessment

Theme: Sustainability assessment			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a			

x. Geology and ground conditions

Theme: Geology and ground conditions			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Soil	Suggestions for including soil nurturing schemes in the proposals.	The Soil Management Strategy for the Project (ES Appendix 5.3.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) contains measures to maintain soil resources affected by the Project through the construction period. Planting proposals as part of the OLEMP (ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3)) provide the potential to enhance soil health through the increase in organic matter content and development of soil structure in areas of land currently managed as agriculturally improved grassland which would instead be managed less intensively in the long term for landscape and biodiversity benefit.	N

y. Cumulative effects

Theme: Cumulative effects			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Concerns raised about the cumulative effects of expansion at both Gatwick and Heathrow.	Due to the uncertainty associated with Heathrow's third runway, it has not been included in the main cumulative assessment. However, a separate qualitative assessment is included about potential cumulative effects, should the Heathrow third runway project come forward during the timescale for this Project. This is provided in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Air quality	Concerns raised about the cumulative impact on air quality of expansion at Gatwick and the Air Modernisation Strategy.	Once FASI South proposals are understood, they will have their own Environmental Assessment which will be consulted upon.	N
Construction	Comments that cumulative impacts with other works in the area should be considered.	Cumulative effects with other developments are addressed in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships (Doc Ref. 5.1) taking into account PINS Advice Note 17.	N

z. Consultation

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
General	Support for the consultation, including comments that it was well managed and appropriate. Also, the opportunity to comment was welcomed, regardless of views on the Project.	<p>The Applicant approached pre-application consultation with a commitment to ensuring consultees were given the opportunity to understand and provide feedback on the Project proposals. It undertook consultation guided by the principles of: integrity and transparency (particularly ensuring audiences could understand the scope of the consultation and how their feedback might affect plans), as well as accessibility and visibility (making sure a range of engagement techniques were used, that materials were available in different formats and with content at an appropriate level, and that the consultation was widely publicised).</p> <p>This approach is consistent with Government guidance² which states, “<i>an inclusive approach is needed to ensure that different groups have the opportunity to participate and are not disadvantaged in the process. Applicants should use a range of methods and techniques to ensure they access all sections of the community in question.</i>”</p>	N
General	Comments supporting the overall transparency of the consultation process, saying that it was open, honest, and fair.	<p>The Applicant approached pre-application consultation with a commitment to ensuring consultees were given the opportunity to understand and provide feedback on the Project proposals. It undertook consultation guided by the principles of: integrity and transparency (particularly ensuring audiences could understand the scope of the consultation and how their feedback might affect plans), as well as accessibility and visibility (making sure a range of engagement techniques were used, that materials were available in different formats and with content at an appropriate level, and that the consultation was widely publicised).</p>	N
	Support for the accessibility of the consultation, including the range of options for accessing information and submitting responses. Suggestions		

² Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application process, published by the former Department for Communities and Local Government, March 2015

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	included encouraging use of the website, making printed documents available, and providing information by email.	This approach is consistent with Government guidance ² which states, “ <i>an inclusive approach is needed to ensure that different groups have the opportunity to participate and are not disadvantaged in the process. Applicants should use a range of methods and techniques to ensure they access all sections of the community in question.</i> ”	
	Comments that the consultation did not meet the requirements of the Planning Act and that Gatwick did not engage with the local community in a positive or proactive manner. Concerns were raised about whether feedback would be taken into account, along with suggestions for more weight to be given to comments from local residents.	Table 4.1 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out the statutory requirements for pre-application consultation and the ways in which the Applicant complied with it. This includes a requirement for applicants to have regard to all relevant consultation responses. This Annex includes a summary of comments by theme and the Applicant’s response to them.	N
	Comments that Gatwick should engage with local residents and stakeholders as plans progress. Suggestions for further consultation on storage of biofuels, electricity supply infrastructure and transport of freight and cargo.	<p>Ongoing engagement has facilitated continuous improvements to the Applicant’s proposals and related assessments that form the basis of this Application. Similarly, it has set a strong foundation to facilitate the ongoing engagement that will follow throughout the pre-examination and examination stages, and beyond into the delivery stage.</p> <p>Feedback received from the Autumn 2021 Consultation, along with on-going studies and assessments, resulted in changes to some of the Project proposals, particularly in relation to the highway improvements. The Summer 2022 Consultation sought feedback on the proposed changes.</p> <p>The changes to the highway improvement proposals involved amendments to the red line and included some new or materially different environmental effects</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>to those reported in the Autumn 2021 Consultation. Other changes to the proposals (described as Project updates in the consultation documents) did not introduce any new or materially different significant effects from those set out previously. For these reasons, the Applicant took a hybrid approach to the Summer 2022 Consultation, being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Targeted, statutory consultation on the design changes to the proposed highway improvement works; and ▪ Non-statutory Project update consultation on proposed changes to other aspects of the proposals, namely car parking, the airfield, hotels and offices, and the strategies relating to water management, carbon, noise, as well as other Project updates. 	
	Requests for more information about the consultation process, including who Gatwick consulted with and how, when the results will be published and what would happen if the DCO is refused.	The Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out detailed information on the consultation process undertaken for the Project.	N
Advertising and promotion	<p>Comments that the consultation was well publicised on social media, in newspapers, and through letters, emails and leaflets sent to the local community.</p> <p>Others that it was not well publicised, with suggestions for more social media advertising, letters to all homes within a 10-20 mile radius, promoting the consultation in local and regional media, using apps and online platforms, and</p>	<p>To ensure consultation activity was targeted towards those living, working or otherwise using the areas likely to be most affected by the Project, the Applicant defined two geographic zones – an inner zone and an outer zone.</p> <p>The inner zone covered an area where people who live, work or otherwise use the areas closest to Gatwick Airport may be affected by the Project. The inner zone contained the area covered by the indicative day and night noise contours in 2032 (with the northern runway in operation), which includes communities in the 'lowest observable adverse effect level' (LOAEL) for aircraft noise, as defined by government guidance. Consultation newsletters were delivered to over 100,000 homes and businesses within the inner zone.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	using local MPs and councillors to reach local residents.	<p>The outer zone covered those living and working further away from Gatwick Airport, but still potentially affected by the Project. It also covered communities where the Applicant knew from previous engagement that there is a strong interest in the airport. The outer zone is shaped around the ‘Gatwick Diamond’ business area and consultation was undertaken within it to help gather feedback from communities further away from the airport.</p> <p>A number of different methods of advertising were used to publicise the consultation to ensure as many people as possible knew about it across the inner and outer consultation zones. Methods include newspaper advertising (in four local papers), social media, and radio and digital advertising.</p> <p>All Autumn 2021 Consultation advertising activity – both statutory and the wider advertising campaign - covered the outer consultation zone as well as the inner. The MPO also visited a total of 36 locations across the region with 19 in the outer consultation zone.</p> <p>To further raise awareness of the consultation among local communities, the activity outlined above was augmented by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ issuing press releases to attract media coverage and raise awareness of the consultation at publication of the SoCC on 25 August 2021 and at the start of the consultation on 9 September 2021, along with regular topic-specific media releases throughout the consultation period; ▪ promotion of the consultation on the Project website and social media channels from 25 August 2021 to the end of the consultation period; ▪ a multi-channel advertising campaign that ran from 25 August to 1 December 2021; and ▪ a poster distribution to 110 hard to reach groups and 260 community venues across the region as part of a consultation pack. 	

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Materials	Concerns raised about the online-based consultation, including that documents were not compatible with some mobile devices and that some people may have been excluded from the consultation.	<p>For those who could not access Project documents online, there were a number of alternative ways do so, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Attending one of the 18 public buildings in the local community where the SoCC was placed from 25 August 2021, the full suite of documentation was available from 9 September 2021, and Consultation Summary Documents and Questionnaires were available to take away. The deposit point locations were published in the SoCC, online, in newspaper adverts, and in a newsletter distributed to over 102,000 local homes and businesses surrounding the airport. Stocks of documents were checked and replenished monthly. ▪ Calling the consultation freephone line (which was included in adverts, the SoCC, and the consultation newsletter, in addition to online) to request copies of documents. The project team posted around 132 Consultation Summary Documents and Questionnaires to members of the public who contacted us via the freephone line and email address. A small number of additional requests were made for specific technical documents or chapters, and these were also provided free of charge. ▪ Visiting the MPO at one of 36 local community visits (published in the SoCC, adverts, the consultation newsletter, and online). Hard copies of the Consultation Summary Document and Questionnaire were available to take away (free of charge) from the MPO, along with USBs containing all consultation documents. Around 425 Consultation Summary Documents and Questionnaires and 220 USBs were distributed from the MPO. MPO team members were also able to take and fulfil requests for hard copies of other consultation documents, however no such requests were received. 	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	<p>Comments that the consultation did not include accurate information and provided limited details, with the scale of the Project and its impacts underplayed.</p> <p>Comments that the complexity and volume of information made commenting difficult. Other comments that there was a lack of detail provided and that the maps and diagrams did not show impacted areas clearly, were inaccurate and did not allow users to zoom in.</p>	<p>Information on the Project proposals was provided in a number of different ways and in different levels of detail to ensure that anyone interested in the Project plans could access it.</p> <p>For the Autumn 2021 Consultation, information was available via newsletter (high level), consultation summary document, in the Consultation Overview Document, in more detailed technical documents, and through a range of virtual methods, including a virtual exhibition, interactive portal and video content.</p>	N
	<p>Comments that the consultation materials were informative and comprehensive.</p> <p>Support for the virtual exhibition and for the content and presentation of the Project website, Consultation Document and the newsletter.</p>	Noted.	N
Mobile Project Office	<p>Comments that the MPO was not well publicised, should have visited more locations, and included technical specialists to answer questions. Other comments appreciating the opportunity to discuss the proposals in person at accessible venues.</p>	<p>Throughout the consultation, the staffed MPO visited 36 locations in local communities to encourage consultation participation and to distribute materials for people to take away at no cost. Visitors to the MPO were also able to submit completed hard copy questionnaires and book 'call the expert' sessions.</p> <p>The MPO was stocked with hard copies of the Consultation Summary Document and Consultation Questionnaire, with USB drives containing the consultation</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>documents also available. Around 425 Consultation Summary Documents and Questionnaires along with 220 USBs were distributed from the MPO.</p> <p>The aim of the MPO was to provide as many opportunities as possible for people to access the consultation. The visits were planned for prominent locations and timed to coincide with periods where people would ordinarily be in the area. Location choices were also made to ensure safe and legal operation in light of the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.</p> <p>Details of dates and times for the MPO visits were published in advance in the SoCC and on the Project website.</p>	
	Suggestions that an eco-friendly vehicle should have been used.	Noted.	N
	Comments that the MPO visits were held only during working hours and were therefore not accessible to many people.	<p>MPO visits were arranged to provide as many opportunities as possible for people to visit. More than a quarter of the 36 MPO visits were held on Saturdays or between 6pm-8pm to allow for visits outside of working hours, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Two locations on Saturday 2 October 2021 ▪ One location on Saturday 9 October 2021 ▪ Two locations Saturday 16 October 2021 ▪ Two locations on Saturday 13 November 2021 ▪ Visits to three locations between 6pm-8pm (5, 12, and 21 October 2021) 	N
Consultation period	Comments that the consultation period was not long enough and others that it was too long.	As required by Section 47(1) of the 2008 Act, the Applicant prepared a statement (the Statement of Community Consultation or 'SoCC') setting out how it proposed to consult about the Application with people living in the vicinity of the proposals. In accordance with Section 47(2) of the 2008 Act, before	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>preparing the SoCC, the Applicant consulted each local authority within section 43(1) of the 2008 Act (i.e. the host authorities) about what was to be in the statement.</p> <p>The Applicant consulted: Crawley Borough Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Mole Valley District Council, Tandridge District Council, Surrey County Council and West Sussex County Council. It also engaged with a number of neighbouring local authorities: Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council, East Sussex County Council, and Kent County Council.</p> <p>The length of the Autumn 2021 Consultation period was of particular interest to the local authorities during this process. Feedback from the majority of local authorities was that a 12-week consultation period (increased from the nine weeks proposed by the Applicant) would allow sufficient time for consultees to review and provide feedback on the proposals.</p>	