



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Consultation Report Annex C - Summer 2022 Consultation Issues Tables

Book 6

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: JULY 2023

Application Document Ref: 6.1

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

Table C.1: Summary of Section 42 responses and consideration by topic	3
a. Need and benefits	3
b. Development proposals	5
c. Forecasts	11
d. Economics and socio economics	13
e. Carbon and Climate Change	23
f. Traffic and transport	34
g. Noise and vibration	82
h. Air quality	90
i. Landscape, townscape and visual resources	94
j. Ecology and nature conservation	106
k. Land and recreation	116
l. Health and wellbeing	119
m. Major accidents and disasters	120
n. Law and order	121
o. Hazards	122
p. Existing infrastructure	123
q. Construction	125
r. Approach to EIA	128
s. Mitigation	129
t. Airspace and overflights	132
u. Water and flood risk	137
v. Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology	143
w. Sustainability assessment	144
x. Geology and ground conditions	146
y. Cumulative effects	147
z. Consultation	149
Table C.2: Summary of Section 47 responses and consideration by topic	161
a. Need and benefits	161
b. Development proposals	163
c. Forecasts	166

d.	Economics and socio economics	167
e.	Carbon and Climate Change	170
f.	Traffic and transport	174
g.	Noise and vibration	191
h.	Air quality	193
i.	Landscape, townscape and visual resources	195
j.	Ecology and nature conservation	200
k.	Land use and recreation	202
l.	Health and wellbeing	203
m.	Major accidents and disasters	204
n.	Law and order	205
o.	Hazards	206
p.	Existing infrastructure	207
q.	Construction	208
r.	Approach to EIA	209
s.	Mitigation	211
t.	Airspace and overflights	213
u.	Water and flood risk	214
v.	Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology	216
w.	Sustainability assessment	217
x.	Geology and ground conditions	218
y.	Cumulative effects	219
z.	Consultation	220

Table C.1: Summary of Section 42 responses and consideration by topic
a. Need and benefits

Theme: Needs and benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Policy	Comments that the Project is inconsistent with aviation policy, noting that the Airport Commission favoured expansion of Heathrow and the case for DCO is not justified.¹	The Planning Statement 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).	N
	Comments that expansion at Gatwick does not support environmental policy or Gatwick's sustainability aspirations.	Sustainability has been a key part of Gatwick's transformation since 2009. Gatwick published the second Decade of Change sustainability policy in 2021. This takes Gatwick up to 2030 and builds on the success of the first Decade of Change Strategy that ran from 2010 to 2020. Gatwick's goal is to achieve net zero for GAL Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 2030. The Northern Runway Project has been designed in line with Gatwick's sustainability aspiration. Through the Project, Gatwick is proposing to strengthen its capacity to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by formalising the carbon reduction commitments to the second Decade of Change and build on them. This is proposed to be achieved by a range of measures to reduce	N

¹ Note: Comments in bold and shaded grey were also raised by Section 47 consultees.

Theme: Needs and benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		carbon emissions on the airport's four key emission sources. Gatwick's Project commitments are set out in the Carbon Action Plan and the Surface Access Commitments, proposed to be legally secured under the DCO.	
	Comments that Gatwick is considered to have reached its optimum performance in 2019 and the Project is therefore not needed.	Information supporting the need for the proposed development against forecast aviation demand in the UK and in London and the South East, is provided in the Need Case. The Need Case also provides further information explaining why the Project is needed and its benefits.	N
	Comments that the Project is not appropriate at a time of reduced demand for flights and great financial impact on the airport as a result of the pandemic.	Information supporting the need for the proposed development against forecast aviation demand in the UK and in London and the South East, is provided in the Need Case. The Project would provide capacity to meet forecast increases in passenger demand in the medium and long terms. The COVID pandemic is not expected to have a lasting effect on the demand for air travel.	N

b. Development proposals

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments that the Project should be deferred until the full impacts are known and detailed mitigation proposals are prepared.	The Development Consent Order process requires the preparation of an Environmental Statement detailing the full range of likely impacts of the project and any proposed mitigation associated with these impacts. This is examined publicly on behalf of the Secretary of State before any consent can be given which would enable the project to proceed.	N
	Concerns that the road improvements would be completed after the planned opening of the realigned northern runway.	Our strategic and local highway models 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
	Suggestions that all airport related functions and activities (including car parking and hotels) should be provided within the airport site, as far as possible.	All airport related infrastructure, including hotels and car parks, is being provided within the airport site. The only additional land take proposed is associated with the reconfiguration of the highways.	N
	Comments that businesses on the airport site that are non-airport related should be moved.	There are only two small non-airport related business on site, both of whom are tenants in First Point office accommodation near South Terminal.	N
	Requests for more about the massing of new car parks, CARE facility, offices, hotels and acoustic bunds.	Indicative massing of all buildings will be provided in the Design and Access Statement.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the proposals lack clarity and detail and that the rationale for inclusion and exclusion of certain parts of the Project since the previous consultation was unclear.	Topic Working Groups (TWGs) have reviewed further detail on many of the topics about which respondents requested more information. The DCO submission will set out GAL's final proposals for the development including feedback from the TWGs. The project description will be updated and revised drawings and plans will also form part of the final submission, along with some additional documents such as the Design and Access Strategy which will cover visual queries and the Carbon Action Plan which will address net zero questions.	Y
	Requests for a description of the Project including changes made after the Autumn 2021 Consultation.	The description of the Project upon which the assessment reported in the ES is based is in ES Chapter 5 Project Description. The alternatives considered are reported in ES Chapter 3 Alternatives Considered.	N
	Questions raised about why the scale of highway infrastructure proposals had not changed in parallel with the parking revisions.	Although we have reduced the number of net additional car parking spaces, our assessment shows that the highway works are needed to cater for the expected growth in traffic (both background and Airport-related) over time. Highway design standards mean that highway improvements tend to be step-changes in provision, as it is not possible to provide small incremental improvements in capacity (e.g., one can only provide whole lanes).	N
Access	Comments that access options are limited due to Gatwick being served by a single arterial road and railway line.	Gatwick benefits from excellent rail services as well as a comprehensive local bus network and access via the M23 and other road routes.	N
	Concerns raised about access to nearby properties and agricultural land during construction and operation.	We understand that the construction activities may cause some disruptions to the access to nearby properties and agricultural land. However, practical measures will be taken to minimize these disruptions. We will also work closely with local communities and stakeholders to ensure that alternative routes and arrangements are implemented where required.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Hotels and offices	Comments that hotels and offices should not be considered associated development for the planning application.	<p>Consent is sought for ‘other associated development’ as defined in Schedule 1 of the Draft Development Consent Order (DocRef. 2.1. Section 115(1) of the 2008 Planning Act provides that development consent may be granted for (a) development for which development consent is required, or (b) associated development.</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. 	N
	Comments that demand for hotel spaces was unclear and should not compromise Gatwick’s ability to meet the operational needs of the airport.	Meeting the operational needs of the airport is the principal purpose of the Project.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for clarification about the location of the hotel proposed for north of MSCP3, which appears to be in location MSCP and which the consultation described as being unchanged.	Following the Autumn 2021 consultation the hotel and office accommodation proposals were updated and the site adjacent to MSCP3 was re-purposed from a car park to a hotel, to give the hotel the best access to the station and the terminal to support passengers travelling by public transport, particularly those with early departing or late arriving flights. The “unchanged” statement was an error.	Y
	Requests for further explanation and justification for the conversion to a hotel of the Destinations Place office building.	The Bloc hotel above South Terminal was previously an office block, almost identical to Destinations Place. The Bloc hotel has proved extremely popular with passengers, offering the easiest possible access to and from both the station and the terminal, which is particularly useful for passengers leaving early or arriving late in the day. The Bloc hotel is routinely full and there is an opportunity to convert Destinations to meet excess demand.	N
CARE facility	Requests for more details about (and consultation on) the final design of the facility before finalising the DCO submission.	<p>The current design replicates the current facility and includes one relocated and one additional biomass boiler to manage organic material, a material recovery facility (MRF) to sort waste, card baling facilities, vehicle weight facilities and bin storage space.</p> <p>Technology to improve the recycling of waste is developing all the time and GAL will incorporate the best current thinking in its final designs, for example, exploration of anaerobic digestion as an alternative solution for organic matter.</p>	N
	Comments suggesting the height of the CARE facility and its flue should be reduced.	The height of the flue was determined by an assessment of air quality The analysis is detailed in Appendix 13.9.1: Air Quality Results Tables and Figures.	N
	Questions raised about the materials that would be used to fuel the boiler in the facility.	The biomass boiler would only burn airport-generated organic matter, primarily food waste.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised about the environmental impact of the biomass boiler.	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 Chapter 13: Air Quality.	Y
Land take	Comments that the need for land has not been justified. Others that all land take is justified in accordance with the rules and tests applying to compulsory acquisition.	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.	N
	Comments that further work is needed to ensure that compulsory acquisitions are in the public interest and that reasonable alternatives have been explored.	Gatwick Airport Ltd will ensure, though the development of the project, that a reasonable and proportionate approach is taken to land acquisition, and where appropriate, alternatives have explored.	N
	Comments suggesting that no more land is taken than absolutely necessary.	A significant proportion of the land required for the project falls within Gatwick Airports Estate. Gatwick Airport Ltd will ensure, though the development of the project, that a reasonable and proportionate approach is taken to land acquisition, ensuring that all land required is justified.	N
	Comments that compensation for acquired land should reflect 'appropriate alternative development' and that landowners must be left in a position of equivalence to that before the acquisition took place.	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.	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for further information in relation to the Worth Park Nurseries, which has been marked as an Area of Interest.	Gatwick will endeavour to provide all relevant and available information to affected parties and their representatives have consulted and are in negotiations with the affect parties at Worth Park Nurseries.	N
	Requests for further information on all temporary and permanent land required, including for construction.	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
	Requests for details of the defined project boundary.	The NRP boundary has been available throughout the various stages of consultation and will continue to be refined until DCO application	N
	Requests for a detailed access plan.	The DCO will contain relevant plans and drawings showing the alterations to surface access, notably highway works and active travel improvements. The Transport Assessment makes reference to all other existing access routes by all modes.	N

c. Forecasts

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Growth and demand	Comments that questions raised about passenger growth forecasts have not been fully answered and are fundamental to transport modelling.	<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>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) to ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation.</p>	N
	Comments suggesting that the use of past data was not reliable due to the impact of the pandemic on travel decisions.	A recovery profile from the pandemic has been considered with volumes returning to 2019 levels around 2024-25. Long term growth trends and assumptions have been based on periods absent of such pandemic restrictions on travel demand.	N
	Comments suggesting that post-pandemic growth forecasts were optimistic and that assessments should also consider the growing numbers of people reducing aircraft use to reduce individual carbon footprints.	Growth at Gatwick and the wider London market align well with latest UK Government projections used to support recent Jet Zero modelling work which assumes total demand for aviation in the UK will grow 70% versus the 2018 baseline. Within these forecasts assumptions around the cost of flying and sustainability related considerations are captured. This includes fuel prices, cost of carbon as well as mandates from the UK Government with regards to the usage of SAF (sustainable aviation fuel)	N
	Comments suggesting comparison of 2047 demand projections with the DfT Jet Zero updated national forecasts for 2050 is misleading.	Whilst 2047 is the final assessment year, comparisons of growth are on a like for like basis considering 2050 or the nearest financial year.	N

Theme: Forecasts			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that growth forecasts need to be agreed as soon as possible.	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) to ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation (Doc Ref. 5.1)	N
	Comments suggesting capping passenger numbers to limit the environmental impact of the proposals.	GAL has investigated ways to mitigate all environmental impacts likely to arise from the project and has proposed effective mitigation measures where the assessed impacts require this. These proposals are contained in the Environmental Statement and summarised in ES Appendix 5.2.3 Mitigation Route Map (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Requests for more information to support forecasts of future demand in order for them to be validated.	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) to ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation (Doc Ref. 5.1)	N
	Concerns raised that the ability to achieve projected growth in passengers could be affected by the proposed reduction in the number of proposed parking spaces.	Our proposals are based around the requirements that arise from achieving the projected growth in passengers. GAL has assessed the requirements for car parking and other transport elements of the Project against those forecasts.	N
Baseline case	Comments that the baseline assumptions for passenger demand as well as the working assumptions on which the Project is based are unclear.	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) to ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N

d. Economics and socio economics

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments that the Project is based on an 'inevitable need to expand' rather than balancing economic opportunity with environmental consequences.	The Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1) considers the balance between the benefits deriving from the project, including economic benefits and passenger connectivity benefits, and the residual environmental impacts which are likely to arise after the mitigation included in the project proposals has been accounted for. The Secretary of State will determine whether this balance can justify the granting of permission for the project to proceed.	N
	Comments that there is not adequate infrastructure (housing/public services) to support the proposals.	The impacts on housing and community infrastructure are assessed in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the accompanying ES Appendix 17.9.3 Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3). This concludes that the impacts are Not Significant.	N
Employment	Comments suggesting Gatwick intends to reduce jobs, such as baggage handlers, air traffic control and check-in, through automation and this is not included in the assessment.	Forecasts of on airport (direct) employment have been prepared by ICF. These forecasts take into account anticipated improvement in productivity and advances in technologies. Further information on the methodology used to forecast direct employment is provided in ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3) (Annex 3) of ES Chapter 17: Socio – Economics .	N
	Comments that shortages in labour supply across many industries need to be considered in the revised Employment Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS).	The Project would be delivered against a backdrop of a highly dynamic, complex labour market, which is closely linked to wider economic trends and conditions. By the time the Project becomes operational in 2029, significant changes to jobs would have resulted from automation and many types of jobs would never have existed before. The successful transition of people and businesses to new and different roles and ways of working requires support infrastructure that is	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>informed, fleet of foot, appropriately resourced and capable of scaling and reimagining job retraining and skills development. There will also need to be a step change in practical collaborative working between businesses generally, and the construction industry in particular, around planning for and enabling the movement of the workforce between projects.</p> <p>Gatwick understands that it needs to contribute fully to enabling regular and accurate dialogue with education, employment and skills and business engagement agencies to embed greater flexibility to adjust within the employment and skills network of providers if it is to adequately support economic stability and growth. There will be a need to invest to achieve the required coherence. Gatwick would work with the Gatwick Family of on-site businesses and, indeed, businesses beyond the airport boundary to consistently predict and clearly articulate employment and skills demands to education and skills providers to drive up the responsiveness of learning and skills providers to contemporary employer needs.</p> <p>The duration of the Environmental Impact Assessment period is 23 years. The ESBS would deliver activity throughout this period. Review and recalibration intervals will be built into the programme to ensure that the ESBS and associated activities reflect contemporary needs and opportunities and reflect the policies, priorities and ambitions of key stakeholders with an interest in promoting timely and relevant skills provision.</p>	
	Comments suggesting that commitments in the ESBS should be included in a new S106.	The commitments In Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) will be included in a Section 106 Agreement.	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments supporting the creation of well-paid, permanent jobs.	Noted	N
	Questions raised about whether the reduction in office space has been considered the economic and employment modelling.	The likely future levels of demand for office accommodation has been taken into account in the economic and employment monitoring.	N
	Comments that the Labour Market Area and the Five Counties Area were too large to properly understand the effects areas closer to the airport.	Different study areas have been selected based on the impacts that need to be assessed. The reasoning is detailed in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) paragraphs 17.4.10 and 17.4.11.	N
	Comments that the area already has high employment and employers, including Gatwick, struggle to fill existing vacancies.	Based on the baseline socio-economics assessment as detailed in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) Section 17.6, and particular in paragraphs 17.6.15 to 17.6.20 as well as ES Appendix 17.6.1 Socio Economic Data Tables (Doc Ref. 5.3) Tables 2.1.3 to 2.1.8, the unemployment rates vary across all the study areas, with some specific pockets of employment deprivation. In addition, the baseline assessment indicates that the local population across the various study areas is also increasing, and, on this basis, the additional employment opportunities will be occupied by the existing and future population that will reside in the area as a result of the housing trajectories presented by the various local authorities.	N
	Comments that the area is too reliant on Gatwick for jobs and economic benefits.	Aviation was one of the sectors impacted the most through the Covid-19 pandemic and as a result Gatwick saw significant revenue losses during the lockdown periods (in particular) that led on aviation job losses. Combined with the fact that the Airport has a significant economic and employment footprint in Crawley's economy (almost 10.3% of jobs in Crawley were in aviation in 2019	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>according to BRES 2021 data), the Borough was disproportionately impacted during the pandemic.</p> <p>In response, the Borough has oriented its economic strategy towards other sectors to increase the area’s economic resilience. This is noted; however, it should be also noted that Gatwick continues to be a key employer in the area and based on the latest BRES data 9.2% of Crawley’s employment relates to aviation as in 2021 (i.e., the latest available data).</p> <p>Given the existing economic interrelationships between Gatwick and Crawley, the latest econometric forecasts that have been used for the purposes of the socio-economic assessment presented in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1) Section 17.9, Crawley will see the highest employment gains in relation to Gatwick’s growth.</p> <p>ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) recognises that the Project would be delivered against a backdrop of a highly dynamic, complex labour market, which is closely linked to wider economic trends and conditions. By the time the Project becomes operational in 2029, significant changes to jobs would have resulted from automation and many types of jobs would never have existed before. The successful transition of people and businesses to new and different roles and ways of working requires support infrastructure that is informed, fleet of foot, appropriately resourced and capable of scaling and reimagining job retraining and skills development. There will also need to be a step change in practical collaborative working between businesses generally, and the construction industry in particular, around planning for and enabling the movement of the workforce between projects. Gatwick understands that it needs to contribute fully to enabling regular and accurate dialogue with education, employment and skills and business engagement agencies to embed greater flexibility to adjust within</p>	

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>the employment and skills network of providers if it is to adequately support economic stability and growth. There will be a need to invest to achieve the required coherence.</p> <p>GAL would work with the Gatwick Family of on-site businesses and businesses beyond the airport boundary to consistently predict and clearly articulate employment and skills demands to education and skills providers to drive up the responsiveness of learning and skills providers to contemporary employer needs. This will support people to gain the skills required by employers at the right time, which would enhance the stability and sustainability of businesses and communities right across the Labour Market Area.</p>	
	<p>Comments suggesting Gatwick should compensate the local community for the impacts of the Project, including by investing in local services, providing job opportunities exclusively to local residents, and offering direct financial compensation for those most affected.</p>	<p>In the 2021 consultation GAL set out its Outline Employment Skills and Business Strategy which provides a framework to ensure that local residents can develop the skills required and gain access to the wide range of job opportunities that will arise during the construction work and future operation of the airport as it continues to grow.</p> <p>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 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. 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</p>	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		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.	
Economic benefit	Comments that the value of economic benefits from the Project are incorrect and overstated.	The analysis presented in the Environmental Statement has been revised to take into account consultation feedback, particularly with respect to job multipliers and catalytic impacts. The Oxera analysis takes a conservative approach to assessing job/value-add and national benefits arising from the Project.	Y
	Comments suggesting that the economic downturn would have a significant impact on Gatwick due to its reduced leisure travel and should be included in the assessment.	By the time the Project is completed in 2029, it is expected that the pandemic / current economic downturn will no longer have an impact on the UK aviation sector as a whole, and Gatwick Airport in particular. As a result, the analysis is based on the assumption that the COVID-19 pandemic will have a limited influence on passenger traffic related to the Project in the long run.	N
	Comments that the assumed passenger growth has been front-loaded, having the effect of bringing forward the benefits, which potentially changes the economic appraisal.	Economic impact estimates for a scenario that assumes slower / lower passenger growth at Gatwick are also provided in the assessment. 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 the ICF forecasts as inputs to the sensitivity analysis.	Y
	Comments that the projected growth is almost double the rate of forecast national growth, suggesting a substantial increase in market share at the expense of other airports.	Whilst the expansion of Gatwick under the NR program will permit Gatwick's traffic to outgrow the national demand forecast projections it should be considered that other airports are operating at their planning caps (e.g., Heathrow, Luton). This means that wider demand growth across the London market can be captured by Gatwick.	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting this would need to be accounted for by displacement allowances in the economic assessment.	Market share gains assumed at Gatwick are relatively small in the context of the wider London market, historically Gatwick has averaged around 26% of onboard demand and only in the Northern Runway scenario does this increase to 32% in the peak year.	
	Requests for the refresh of the socio-economic studies to provide a breakdown of the economic impacts on neighbouring counties.	Subject to data availability, the socio-economic information and data that feed within the assessment and the baseline assessment is presented in a local authority level as well as in a county level.	N
Housing	Comments that the new proposals do not address previous concerns about most of the demand for housing being concentrated in the Northern West Sussex Housing Market.	The Study Area in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3 is based on the Labour Market Area (LMA) which is based on Census information and Gatwick Passholder data on where existing employees live/travel to work from. Additional clarification has been included in the ES Appendix 17.9.3 (Section 1) which sets out the origin of the Study Area and justification for its use. Notwithstanding, ES Appendix 17.9.3 does consider impacts at a Housing Market Area (HMA) level, i.e., including for the North West Sussex HMA and does not identify any labour/housing shortfalls for this area as a result of the Project. Outputs for individual local authorities are also presented for information purposes (as Appendices)	N
	Comments that housing growth generated by the proposals should be included in the housing trajectory modelling.	The housing trajectories used are based on the most recently available, published position of each local authority. These trajectories give a future baseline (in terms of anticipated levels of housing, population and labour force growth). These outcomes have been compared with the housing demand which would be generated based on economic forecasts (from Cambridge Econometrics) plus the Project, to identify any potential shortfalls. Housing demands associated with the Project are therefore implicit within the analysis.	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that Gatwick’s statement that no additional housing would be required suggests economic benefits will be accrued outside of the region.	<p>ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3 compares the future baseline (in terms of expected levels of housing growth – based on local authority published trajectories – and the level of population and labour supply growth that this would support) with the scale of housing demand that is likely to be associated with the Project. This has not found there are likely to be any significant effects in housing terms across any of the relevant geographies, as set out within the ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>This is a different and separate assessment of the economic benefits of the scheme.</p>	N
	Comments that the Project would have an adverse effect on the cost of housing and result in the children of residents moving away, destroying the benefits of extended families.	GAL recognises that the Project could potentially 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
	Comments suggesting housing affordability should be considered and include types and tenures for new workers.	Following these comments additional analysis has been included in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) which assesses the potential need for affordable housing associated with the Project’s operational employment.	Y

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		This includes analysis of how the potential affordable housing demands of the Project compare with recent delivery of affordable housing, local evidence of current affordable housing need, local plan policies for affordable housing and pipeline supply.	
	Requests for Gatwick to work with local authorities to identify the best location for any short-term temporary accommodation for construction workers and to consider how their social and health needs would be met.	Following these comments additional analysis has been included in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (Doc Ref. 5.3) to assess the potential demand for housing during the construction phase, including looking at capacity within the private rented sector and other forms of short-term/temporary accommodation.	Y
House prices	Concern that the proposals might impact the price of houses and if so, how will Gatwick compensate homeowners.	<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 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>The issue of flightpath changes and their likely impacts are considered within ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1), together with the</p>	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		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	

e. Carbon and Climate Change

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Emissions	Concerns raised that Project would increase emissions and that the short-term economic gains would be outweighed by the long-term environmental consequences.	<p>Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) presents the GHG assessment results and comparison of GHG estimates against UK carbon budgets. 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.</p> <p>Section 16.12 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) and Table 16.12.1 summarises the residual effects of the assessment and significance of the project in terms of GHG emissions.</p> <p>The Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1) presents the conclusions on the overall planning balance when the scheme has been weighed-up against the relevant policies and environmental assessment outcomes. The economic gains will be long-term.</p>	N
	Comments that carbon trading schemes are not an appropriate method to alleviate emissions.	Section 16.2 of the 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.	N
	Comments suggesting the Project would add over 1 million tonnes of extra carbon a year, plus other greenhouse gases, soot, and vapours.	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. GHG assessment results from the Project have been contextualised against UK carbon budgets. Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) presents the GHG assessment results and contextualises GHG estimates against UK carbon budgets.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the reasoning behind exclusion of non-CO2 impacts/radiative forcing from the assessment.	
	Comments suggesting the most polluting aircraft should be banned from the airport and non-CO2 effects (such as contrails) should be addressed in the ES.	Currently there is still scientific uncertainty on the contributions of non-carbon effects and any resultant government policy implications. Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) addresses these points in more detail.	N
	Comments that the trade-off between emissions from steeper take-offs versus greater noise pollution from a shallower descent could become an issue.	The NRP does not affect aircraft ascent procedures.	N
	Comments suggesting the Project should be phased and linked to thresholds for meeting carbon reduction commitments in line with net zero targets.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.6: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) 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). The CAP has also been developed in the context of the Government commitments on a national scale, for instance the Jet Zero Strategy's goal to achieve net zero UK aviation emissions by 2050 and the Transport Decarbonisation Plan.	N
	Comments suggesting net zero for emissions within Gatwick's control should be reached by 2035.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.6: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) seeks to reduce GAL-controlled emissions as much as possible by 2030 and remove any residual emissions to achieve net zero carbon emissions by	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>2030 for Scopes 1 and 2. Gatwick is committed to the CAP and its outcomes through the terms of the DCO. To achieve this, Gatwick will build on the process of continuous improvement, which is already in place at the airport, and bring specific and additional investments to ensure that the target commitments are achieved.</p> <p>This change to accelerate its net zero commitment from 2040 to 2030 was a decision made by Gatwick as part of its wider sustainability aspirations.</p>	
	Comments that increased carbon emissions from construction should be considered.	See Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) presents the assessment methodology, including the scope of the assessment and reasoning behind any inclusions and exclusions within the assessment. Construction emissions are part of the overall assessment.	N
	Comments that the Project would directly contradict efforts to reach net zero.	<p>The assessment of GHG impact in ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) has been carried out in line with the current policy framework and best practice guidance for assessments in the UK, including Jet Zero. See Section 16.9 presents the assessment of effects for the GHG assessment results and comparison of GHG estimates against UK carbon budgets.</p> <p>Section 16.12 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) and Table 16.12.1 summarises the residual effects of the assessment and significance of the project in terms of GHG emissions.</p> <p>The Project would not contradict efforts to reach net zero. The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.6: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out Gatwick's commitment to achieve net zero by 2030 for GAL Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions. The CAP has been developed in the context of the Government's commitments, taking full account of the up-to-date government</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>policy and setting the commitments Gatwick makes to ensure it plays its part in full in meeting the expectations required of Gatwick as an airport.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is noted that paragraph 5.82 of the Airport National Policy Statement, being an important and relevant consideration for the NRP, states 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>. Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) contains a comparison of the project emissions against UK Carbon Budgets and concludes in paragraph 16.9.96 that the Project is not so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets, including Carbon Budgets.</p>	
	<p>Comments that proposals rely on future low-emission technology which is not guaranteed to be effective.</p>	<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 (ES Appendix 5.3.6: 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</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		airlines on the use of low emission technologies. The CAP is clear, however, that Gatwick commits to clear outcomes in each of the focus areas.	
Carbon	Concern about the impacts of cutting down mature trees on carbon absorption and carbon sequestration.	Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) reports on emissions arising from land use change associated with the Project, including the release of carbon stored in trees. However, the construction of new or replacement areas of habitat are expected to sequester an equivalent amount of carbon over the first 30 years of the Project's existence. The net balance of land use change emissions (losses and gains) is not expected to change materially (less than 1%).	N
Jet Zero	Comments that increase in flight numbers should not be permitted unless there is evidence that Jet Zero can be achieved.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.6: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) commits GAL to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030 for Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions. Gatwick is committed to the CAP and its outcomes through the terms of the DCO. The Carbon Action Plan has been developed in the context of the Government commitments through the Jet Zero Strategy's goal to achieve net zero UK aviation emissions by 2050.	N
	Comments that although Jet Zero includes capacity growth at Gatwick, it is not an 'in principle' acceptance of the Project. Also, that it is not a roadmap to net zero due to its reliance on technological development and carbon off-setting.	The Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1) considers the position of the Project in the context of Jet Zero.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the application of Jet Zero updated national demand projections are misleading.	The Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1) considers the position of the Project in the context of Jet Zero.	N
	<p>Concerns raised about Gatwick's forecast conformity with Government's 'High Ambition' scenario as the most likely outcome for aviation emissions. Requests for inclusion in the assessments of other scenarios where reductions are much lower.</p> <p>Comments that even with this scenario, the aviation sector will be reliant on other sectors to offset carbon emissions.</p>	<p>In ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1), paragraph 16.4.55, it is explained that the modelling of future emissions from aviation have been modelled based on the assumptions adopted for the UK aviation industry contained within the Jet Zero High Ambition scenario, because this is the scenario adopted by UK Government as part of their future trajectory commitment.</p> <p>Within Jet Zero, aviation is acknowledged as being a hard to abate sector, and it is recognised that removals will be required to meet the UK's net zero target.</p>	N
Climate costs and carbon values	Concerns raised about the accuracy of the predicted climate costs.	Oxera uses inputs from Arup on the estimated change in GHG emissions attributable to the Project. Following Government guidance, the assessment monetises these emissions using carbon values published by the Government. The estimated carbon costs are therefore accurate to the extent that they reflect the estimated emissions and are monetised following government guidance.	Y
	Requests for further consultation on assessments that have used accurate carbon values.	Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the GHG assessment methodology, whilst ES Appendices 16.9.1, 16.9.2, 16.9.3 and 16.9.4 set out the carbon factors adopted and their sources. Table 16-6 'Summary of Consultation for record of Topic Working Group (TWG) engagement on methodology.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that calculation of the financial cost of emissions resulting from the expansion is incorrect and does not follow government guidance.	<p>Oxera uses inputs from Arup on the estimated change in GHG emissions attributable to the Project. Following government guidance, we monetise these emissions using carbon values published by the government. 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. 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 as part of the DCO submission.</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> <p>We acknowledge that aviation would have further impacts on climate, known as non-CO2 effects. 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>	Y
Carbon	Comments that aviation is responsible for 5% of global warming and that the Project would lead to further environmental damage.	Section 16.9 Paragraph 16.9.96 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) concludes that for decision-making purposes (reflecting the guidance contained in the Airport National Policy Statement) the Project is not so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets, including Carbon Budgets.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Sustainability has been a key part of Gatwick’s transformation since 2009. Gatwick Airport continues to work towards being more sustainable, including its goal to reach net zero for direct emissions before 2030.</p> <p>Gatwick Airport published the second Decade of Change sustainability policy in 2021. This takes Gatwick up to 2030 and builds on the success of the first Decade of Change strategy that run from 2010 to 2020. Gatwick’s goal is to achieve net zero for GAL Scope 1 and 2 greenhouse gas emissions by 2030.</p> <p>The Northern Runway Project has been designed in line with Gatwick’s sustainability aspiration. Through the Project, Gatwick is proposing to strengthen its capacity to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by formalising the commitments to the second Decade of Change and build on them. This is proposed to be achieved by a range of measures to reduce carbon emissions on the airport’s four key emission sources. Gatwick’s Project commitments are set out in the Carbon Action Plan and the Surface Access Commitments, proposed to be legally secured under the DCO.</p>	
Carbon Action Plan	Comments that the plan has not been published and should be shared for consultation before the DCO submission.	<p>GAL has engaged with Local Authorities through a series of Topic Working Groups (TWG), including dedicated sessions on Carbon and Climate Change. The TWG on 12th December 2022 focused on the Carbon Action Plan, explained its purpose, how it has been prepared and talked through its role and structure on the four key airport emission sources.</p> <p>The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.6: Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) will be shared with Local Authorities on acceptance of the Application.</p>	N
	Comments suggesting Gatwick must work with stakeholders to reduce emissions.	GAL has and continues to engage with various third parties on methods to reduce its carbon emissions and its ongoing performance (see Table 16.3.4 in ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1)):	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specifically, to the NRP, Gatwick has engaged with Local Authorities through a series of Topic Working Groups (TWG), including dedicated sessions on Carbon and Climate Change. ▪ Gatwick has existing commitments under the Section 106 Agreement with local authorities to update and publish its report on the Airport and climate change and achieves this through its annual Decade of Change Performance Reports. ▪ Gatwick has achieved Level 3+ under the Airport Carbon Accreditation scheme which is a global carbon management certification programme for airports. As part of this, Gatwick provides a third-party verified carbon footprint to the ACA annually and will continue to do so (irrespective of the NRP). ▪ Under the Project’s Carbon Action Plan, Gatwick proposes to continue its annual third-party verified carbon footprint and review progress against the carbon targets every five years, in line with UK carbon budgets and Jet Zero targets and publish the resulting reports which can then be reviewed by any stakeholders. <p>There are other separate but related commitments under the NRP that will also involve third party stakeholders, such as the Surface Access Commitments and Travel Plan.</p>	
	Questions raised about how potential increases in flights in holding patterns would be addressed.	The operation of the airborne holds for arriving aircraft will not change. As with the operation of the airport today, on occasion, often at busy times or during adverse weather, it is not possible for aircraft to approach and land at Gatwick Airport without having to undertake short-term holding. This takes place in fixed race-track pattern known as a stack or hold. Gatwick has two holding stacks; one called ‘WILLO’ which is located west of Lewes and above Burgess Hill and the second, ‘TIMBA’ is located above Heathfield. The minimum altitude of	Y

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		aircraft in the stack is 7,000ft and is set to keep noise impacts on the ground as low as possible.	
Assessment and modelling	Comments that emissions modelling should be based on Gatwick specific factors.	Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) sets out the GHG assessment methodology, whilst ES Appendices 16.9.1, 16.9.2, 16.9.3 and 16.9.4 set out the carbon factors adopted and their sources.	N
	Comments that assessment of the Project against the UK Carbon Budget should examine background growth and expansion at other airports.	The assessment of GHG impact in ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) has been carried out in line with the current policy framework and best practice guidance for assessments in the UK, including Jet Zero. GHG emissions are by nature inter-related, with all activities emitting emissions and the receptor being the global atmosphere. Chapter 16 of the ES presents GHG emissions over the Project's lifetime and contextualises these with respect to the UK's and other relevant carbon budgets which itself is an assessment of inter-related effects.	N
	Comments that the assessments should include emissions from construction, freight, and passenger travel to and from Gatwick and as well as those from take-off, in-flight and landings.	Section 16.4 of ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) presents the scope of the GHG assessment, along with inclusions and exclusions.	N
Topic Working Group	Comments that the Carbon and Climate Change Topic Working Group did not take place in the last round of meetings.	Carbon and Climate Change TWGs were held on the following dates: 3rd October 2022, 7th November 2022 and 12th December 2022 (see also in Table 16.3.4 in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1)). GAL will continue discussions on this topic with local authorities as part of the discussions on Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) for NRP.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Sustainability	Comments that the Applicant should focus on helping airlines achieve their sustainability goals and improve airspace efficiency.	The Second Decade of Change (Goal 7) set outs GAL's commitment to play its part in UK aviation transition to net zero carbon and work with airlines and fuel providers to implement the Sustainable Aviation decarbonisation roadmap and interim goals. The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.6 Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3)) sets out how GAL will seek to influence third parties (that it does not have control over) such as airlines, customer behaviour and government agencies under Scope 3 to reduce their emissions. A number of measures within the CAP relate to ways in which GAL can exercise this influence on airlines.	Y

f. Traffic and transport

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
General	Comments that the proposals show a lack of understanding of regional level transport policy changes underway in County and Borough Councils.	<p>The Project reflects the aim of increasing the use of sustainable transport modes for travel to and from the Airport, alongside the provision of additional public transport services and active travel infrastructure. The Project proposes a small net increase in parking provision, which is considerably less than the proportional increase in passenger numbers.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4) notes the local authority policies relevant to the assessment and these have been considered in the Project proposals.</p>	N
	Comments suggesting the new highway infrastructure should be completed before passenger numbers are increased.	The strategic and local highway models have tested 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 northern runway opens, but that our proposed highway works will need to be in place within three years of the commencement of dual runway operations.	N
	Comments that highway assessments and proposals should consider any potential impacts from the FASI-S programme.	There are no implications for the highway or transport assessment arising from the airspace changes.	N
	Comments suggesting the programme is revised to ensure all necessary milestones are covered and there is a common understanding with stakeholders of priorities leading up to DCO submission.	GAL has continued to update the programme and engage with National Highways to ensure that National Highways is aware of current and expected activity on the Project.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the cumulative impacts of increased traffic as a result of the Project and other planned developments should be considered.	The transport modelling includes estimates of growth in non-airport related traffic, through the use of TEMPro factors in accordance with DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance and the core assessment is therefore inherently cumulative. A cumulative effects assessment has been undertaken which includes proposed developments at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and west of Ifield, using such information as is available about those developments.	N
	Comments that the consultation excluded the Airport Access Strategy and Travel Plans which were key to understanding highway assumptions and design elements.	The DCO application includes GAL's Surface Access Commitments (SAC) in ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3). These include commitments to achieving certain mode shares within a specified timescale, to measures and interventions that GAL will use to achieve those mode shares, and to a monitoring and reporting regime. In due course, GAL will develop a future ASAS, based on the SAC, which will provide further detail on how the measures and monitoring will be delivered.	N
	Comments that previous local authority feedback has not been addressed.	GAL has undertaken extensive engagement with stakeholders through Topic Working Groups and specific meetings to discuss technical matters related to the assessment. Full details on the consultation and engagement undertaken on the Project are contained in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 3.1).	Y
Road improvements	Comments that the current road structure is fit for purpose and the proposals are unnecessary.	The assessment presented in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc ref 5.1) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4) demonstrates that improvements to the highway network are necessary to accommodate the expected growth in airport-related and background traffic. The Project therefore includes the proposed highway works, which are taken into account in the assessment.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the benefits from highway improvements were transitory as new traffic would be attracted and take up spare capacity.	The strategic highway model has been used to assess the performance of the highway network both with and without the Project and the proposed highway works. The model is dynamic, in the sense that it allows traffic travelling between one location and another to be assigned to any suitable route, based on consideration of the overall cost of the journey, including the cost of delays. This means that the implications of schemes which provide additional highway capacity are taken into account in the modelling.	N
	Comments that the need for highway improvements represents a failure of the access strategy to prevent airport growth generating additional car traffic.	Analysis shows it is unrealistic to expect no increase in journeys made by car. The SAC in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3) are designed to achieve greater proportions of people travelling by sustainable transport modes in order to reduce the number of additional vehicle journeys as far as reasonably possible. The proposed highway works are a reasonable response to the need to cater for the additional traffic that GAL anticipates would arise as a result of the Project.	N
	Comments that highway changes seem intended to make it easier to travel to the airport by road.	The highway proposals form part of the Project, and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4) shows that they are necessary to cater for the forecast levels of airport-related and background traffic.	N
	National Highways requests more detailed highway designs and refined transport modelling and provides initial comments on an 'in principle basis'.	GAL has undertaken extensive engagement with National Highways about the design of the proposed highway works. National Highways has indicated the proposals are acceptable from an 'in principle design' basis. GAL continues to engage with National Highways on additional technical details of the design and highway modelling and a Statement of Common Ground between GAL and National Highways is being prepared.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that that additional land take for highway construction would have a severe impact on public rights of way and biodiversity and more work was required to minimise impacts.	<p>The effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use, and Recreation. A Public Rights of Way Strategy is provided in Appendix 19.8.1 of the ES and this includes measures to reduce impacts on users of PRow during the construction period, as far as practicable.</p> <p>Furthermore, we have conducted thorough environmental assessments based on a worst-case scenario (i.e. removal of all vegetation within the construction boundary). GAL has then developed mitigation strategies to minimise the impact of construction on biodiversity based on this scenario. We will implement these strategies to preserve the natural environment and protect the wildlife in the surrounding areas but will also try to further minimise impacts during detailed design to retain more vegetation.</p>	N
	Comments that mitigation measures must have the ability to cater for any future road enhancements to accommodate growth.	The highway proposals have been discussed in detail with National Highways and with the local highway authorities, to obtain agreement to their preliminary design. The design and the highway modelling take account of the growth in background traffic that is expected during the period covered by the assessment, s which extends to 15 years after the highway works are open to use.	N
	Comments suggesting planting within the highway boundary be provided to offset highway works impacts.	The majority of existing highway planting associated with the A23/M23 Spur would be removed as part of the surface access improvement works. A scheme of preliminary landscape proposals has been developed incorporating native woodland, scrub and grassland mixes 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 Appendix 8.8.1 of the ES and the final design will be agreed in consultation with the relevant authorities, should the DCO be granted.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that there should be an agreed landscape mitigation strategy that meets DMRB standards.	<p>A scheme of preliminary landscape proposals has been developed as part of the mitigation and enhancement strategy for the Project based on Project's highway proposals. The design takes into consideration appropriate standards contained within the DMRB.</p> <p>A draft of the scheme has been commented on by National Highways and feedback incorporated into the design.</p> <p>Details of locations of planting, species mixes and management techniques are included in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan in ES Appendix 8.8.1. The detailed landscaping design will be agreed in consultation with the relevant authorities should the DCO be granted.</p>	Y
	Requests for final designs of the changes to existing highway structures and related geotechnical works to be provided to and agreed with National Highways.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage and a range of drawings and technical reports related to aspects of the design have been prepared, including structures and geotechnics, which have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities and updated following comments received.	Y
	Comments suggesting the design, timing and phasing of traffic signals should reduce the instances of queuing on the circulatory carriageway.	Noted. The modelling undertaken for the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4) optimises the operation of the network to minimise overall delays. The traffic signal operation will be refined at the detailed design stage, following the grant of development consent.	N
	Requests for more detail on specific highway improvements and the working assumptions that underpin the designs.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage for the DCO Application. A range of drawings and technical reports have been prepared and have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities and updated following comments received.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information on the proposed deviations from standard traffic regulation orders.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage. A range of drawings and technical reports have been prepared related to aspects of the design, including for potential departures from standards, which have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities and updated following comments received.	Y
	Concerns raised and more information requested about the safety of the highway design.	The design of the highway proposals has been the subject of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, which has been shared with the relevant highway authorities. The designs were developed through a detailed engagement process with National Highways to identify initial safety considerations that influenced the eventual design solution.	Y
	Comments suggesting early discussions between National Highways and Gatwick on the proposed Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and modal split strategies would be welcomed.	The design of the highway proposals has been the subject of a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit, which has been shared with the relevant highway authorities. National Highways has also been present at Topic Working Groups where GAL has presented the proposals for surface access interventions to achieve an increase in the proportion of journeys made by sustainable transport.	Y
A23	Comments welcoming proposals for a new signal-controlled junction along the A23 and noting its phasing would be important.	Noted. The traffic signal operation will be refined at the detailed design stage, following the grant of development consent.	N
	Requests for more information about the widening of the A23 to three lanes.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage. The works are described in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1) and on the Surface Access Highways Plans – General Arrangements (Doc Ref. 4.8.1) and are also summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the no right-turn facility (on to A23 London Road for north terminal) should be clarified and agreed with local highway authorities.	The proposals for the signal-controlled arrangements on A23 London Road at North Terminal have been discussed with the relevant highway authorities as part of ongoing engagement. Engagement with the HA is summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1), ES Appendix 12.3.1 Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.3) and in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref 7.4).	N
	Requests for further details about the change to the speed limit along the A23 London Road, including plans for enforcement.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage and a range of drawings and technical reports have been prepared related to aspects of the design which have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities. The proposed change to the speed limit on A23 London Road is described in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref 5.1) and on the Traffic Regulation Plans – Speed Limits (Doc Ref 4.9.1).	Y
	Comments suggesting that the left turning lane onto the A23 London Road should not be provided to discourage traffic from moving onto local roads.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage and range of drawings and technical reports have been prepared related to aspects of the design which have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities. The proposals for the arrangements at Longbridge Roundabout and on the A23 London Road at North Terminal have been discussed with the relevant highway authorities as part of ongoing engagement.	N
	Requests for more information about the need for the widening of the A23 bridge over the River Mole and the widening of the slip road onto the A23.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage and a range of drawings and technical reports have been prepared related to aspects of the design which have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities. GAL has also shared the highway modelling outcomes with the highway authorities to show how the network is	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		expected to operate with the Project. The outcomes of the highway modelling, which demonstrate the operation of the highway network in future years without and with the Project, are included in the Transport Assessment and its associated annexes (Doc Ref 7.4).	
	Requests for more information about the construction methodology for widening of the River Mole bridge on the A23 Airport Way. Comments that there is potential for works to cause significant delay and congestion.	<p>Preliminary information about the expected sequencing of construction of the River Mole Bridge on the A23 London Road has been shared through the Surface Access Topic Working Group meetings.</p> <p>The A23 London Road Bridge replacement methodology is detailed in ES Appendix 5.3.1: Buildability Report Part B (Doc Ref 5.3). This report outlines the construction methods that will be employed to replace the bridge and ensure that the surface access improvements are delivered safely and efficiently. We understand the importance of minimizing the impact on the road users and local community and will ensure the traffic flow is maintained.</p>	Y
	Comments that the proposed noise barrier between the A23 and Riverside Garden Park would be challenging and expensive to maintain. Requests for information about how the proposed structure would be inspected and maintained.	The Project proposals were amended after the Summer 2022 Consultation. The Project proposals no longer include a noise barrier between the A23 London Road and Riverside Garden Park.	Y
	Comments suggesting that Option 7 (A23 re-routing) should be discounted as it would have a disproportionately negative impact on nearby land and residents.	This comment relates to options that were developed as part of the work prior to the Summer 2022 Consultation and support for discounting Option 7 presented at that consultation. Option 7 was not taken forward and does not form part of the Project.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that there needs to be adequate weaving space for traffic joining the A23 westbound, should they want to U-turn and travel eastbound.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage and a range of drawings and technical reports have been prepared related to aspects of the design which have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities. The proposed highway layouts and their operation have been discussed in detail as part of ongoing engagement. The works are described in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1) and on the Surface Access Highways Plans – General Arrangements (Doc Ref. 4.8.1).	Y
	Comments suggesting a noise barrier alongside the A23 to mitigate the noise from construction and operation.	<p>The Project includes noise mitigation as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alignment changes through optioneering of the road scheme design moving some traffic away from the park and residential area. ▪ The new right turn onto the A23 from the North Terminal Roundabout removes the current need for traffic wishing to turn right instead having to turn left up to the Longbridge roundabout, around it, and back down the A23, thus reducing traffic flows on this section of the A23. ▪ 1 metre noise barrier along the North Terminal roundabout flyover elevated section (facing Riverside Garden Park). ▪ 1 metre noise barrier along the South Terminal roundabout flyover elevated section, north side. <p>At the PEIR (Autumn 2021 Consultation) stage, a further noise barrier was considered adjacent to the Riverside Garden Park. Further detailed analysis using the outputs of the Strategic Traffic model for the revised scheme concluded that the package of mitigation measures summarised above was sufficient and a noise barrier along the park side was not required.</p>	N
M23	Requests for further evidence to show the extent of works to J9 on the M23 is appropriate.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage and a range of drawings and technical reports have been prepared related to aspects of the design, including that at Junction 9 of the M23, which have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The works are described in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref 5.1) and on the Surface Access Highways Plans – General Arrangements (Doc Ref. 4.8.1). GAL has also shared the highway modelling outcomes with the highway authorities to show how the network is expected to operate with the Project. The outcomes of the highway modelling, which demonstrate the operation of the highway network in future years without and with the Project, are included in the Transport Assessment and its associated annexes (Doc Ref. 7.4).	
	Concerns raised that the proposed widening of the bridge structure over Balcombe Road has the potential to impact on the delivery of access to Gatwick Green's draft strategic employment site allocation.	Proposals for Gatwick Green are not sufficiently advanced to determine what the final access solutions for that development may be. Initial discussions have been held with the landowner and developer indicating that the works associated with the bridge over Balcombe Road do not compromise the proposed development at Gatwick Green, should it come forward.	N
	Concerns raised about the visual impact of the Balcombe Road bridge, including the retaining walls and noise bunds.	<p>The M23 Spur bridge structure over Balcombe Road would be widened to the south. A retaining wall would be constructed at the toe of the embankment to the north and either side of the main carriageway as it crosses Balcombe Road. Two of the wing walls would be extended. Vegetation within the M23 Spur and Balcombe Road corridors would be removed and largely reinstated with similar native planting mixes. There would be no noise bunds constructed as part of the Project. Overall, the Balcombe Road bridge would be larger with a greater number of engineered features, compared to the existing situation.</p> <p>Visual impacts have been identified on occupiers of residential and commercial properties, occupiers of vehicles and pedestrians using footways on Balcombe Road and walkers using public rights of way in section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref.. 5.1). Whilst effects would be adverse in nature, none of the effects are considered to be significant adverse. Landscape mitigation proposals would in time reduce effects.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting temporary escape roads should be added to the M23 to transfer some traffic onto the A23 or Balcombe Road.	The assessment has not identified such measures are necessary to mitigate the impacts.	N
	Comments that improvements to the M23 are not sufficient given that most traffic comes this way.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) considers the potential effects of the Project on the operation of the M23, allowing for growth in airport-related and background traffic. The assessment concludes that it is not necessary to improve the M23 to mitigate effects from the Project, noting that National Highways has recently completed its Smart Motorway Project to increase capacity on the M23.	N
	Requests for further information on diversion routes for the M23.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1) use the strategic model to identify whether, when and where traffic may switch to other routes with the Project in place and whether any additional mitigation is required to address such changes. GAL, National Highways and the local highway authorities have established plans for diversion routes, which are used in the event of disruption or closure to parts of the network. These would be used or amended through consultation to manage any impacts during construction as effectively as possible.	N
Longbridge roundabout	Comments supporting lane widening at Longbridge roundabout.	Noted	N
	Comments supporting the retention of mature trees on Longbridge roundabout and London Road.	Noted	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting segregation of the Longbridge roundabout to North Terminal route.	GAL does not consider that segregation of a connection between Longbridge Roundabout and North Terminal can be achieved safely or in accordance with highway design standards, and such a connection would also require additional land take. GAL has shared the highway modelling outcomes with the highway authorities to show how the network is expected to operate with the Project.	N
	Comments supporting the Longbridge roundabout widening works as a way of supporting increased traffic flows going to and through the airport.	Noted	N
Access – South Terminal	Comments that proposals should provide more direct links to Gatwick station and the South Terminal via Balcombe Road, which could include bus access and cycle/pedestrian routes.	The Project's highway proposals include enhancements to active travel infrastructure, including a connection between Balcombe Road and South Terminal. The Project does not propose a bus connection between these two locations.	Y
	Comments that access to the airport should be provided via Buckingham Gate for buses, cyclists and pedestrians.	The Project's highway proposals include enhancements to active travel infrastructure, including a connection between Balcombe Road and South Terminal, but not via Buckingham Gate. The Project does not propose a bus connection between these two locations.	N
South Terminal roundabout	Concerns raised about the visual and noise impacts of the flyover on nearby properties.	There are no residential properties located in close proximity to the South Terminal Roundabout. The closest property is at number 275 Balcombe Road which lies approximately 70m north of the M23 spur and approximately 260m north-east of the centre of the South Terminal Roundabout. Visual effects on	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		occupiers of this property are assessed throughout section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1). Visual effects on residents are considered to be minor adverse throughout the construction and operational periods of the Project, which is not significant. Due to garden vegetation oblique views of the flyover would not be possible.	
	Comments that the proposals are acceptable according to National Highways.	Noted.	N
	Comments suggesting a new road for the construction compound at the South Terminal junction should be provided due to the size and length of the proposed works.	The access for construction vehicles to the South Terminal Contractor's Compound will be provided through the roundabout. The access route will be designed to meet the requirements of National Highways and will be approved by them. It is important to note that it is planned not to have any access for Heavy Good Vehicles (HGVs) from Balcombe Road into the compound to reduce the impact of construction traffic. The only access route for the HGVs to the compound will be from South Terminal Roundabout.	N
	Requests for further details about the proposed new pond associated with changes to South Terminal roundabout.	Details of the drainage design are contained in Annex 2 of the Flood Risk Assessment. An outline design has been developed for the new highways' drainage attenuation pond to the north of the South Terminal roundabout, which is commensurate with the level of detail for a planning application.	N
Access – North Terminal	Comments suggesting the North Terminal drop-off waiting area be improved, including separating access from the Short Stay Car Park to avoid confusion and long queues. Suggestions that this could be achieved	GAL's existing Airport Surface Access Strategy, and the Surface Access Commitments proposed as part of the Project (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) set out GAL's priorities and commitments for access to the airport. These promote public transport and active travel ahead of car travel, noting that drop off and pick up are the least sustainable options for airport access. Where changes to the forecourt areas	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	by re-locating the area further from the airport with access via shuttle bus.	are required to optimise these areas, amendments may be made in due course, taking account of the needs of all modes.	
North Terminal roundabout	Comments that the proposals are acceptable according to National Highways.	Noted	Y
	Requests for further detail about the construction compound off the North Terminal Roundabout.	A number of construction compounds are proposed as part of the Project. The details of the compounds are given in ES Appendix 5.3.1: Buildability Report (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that the proposed third lane to Airport Way westbound was acceptable in principle according to National Highways.	Noted	Y
	Requests for further details about the amount of impermeable area created by a third lane to Airport Way.	Airport Way drains to both the Gatwick Stream and the River Mole. There is a net increase of 1.10 Ha to the Gatwick Stream and 1.55 Ha to the River Mole as a result of the Project. These increases are mitigated through the provision of SuDS and other storage measures to attenuate runoff to ensure no increase in flood risk on receiving watercourses.	N
	Comments that proposals for the A23 and Longbridge roundabout would need to demonstrate that they can operate with the strategic road network.	The highway modelling undertaken for the assessment and reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 6 5.1) and the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) demonstrates that the highway network would operate satisfactorily with the Project. These outcomes have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities as part of ongoing engagement.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised about the left turn at the new North Terminal junction, with suggestions that it should be removed to ensure all vehicles leaving the north terminal are directed to the SRN. Comments also suggesting that the junction should be reviewed to ensure three streams of traffic can turn right at the same time.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage and a range of drawings and technical reports have been prepared related to aspects of the design which have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities. The proposals for the arrangements at the revised North Terminal junction and the new junction on the A23 London Road, including highway layout options at these locations, have been discussed with the relevant highway authorities as part of ongoing engagement.	N
	Comments supporting changes to the North Terminal roundabout, but concerns raised about the loss of vegetation, re-engineering of drainage ponds, noise barriers and earthworks.	Noted. The proposals for the arrangements at North Terminal Roundabout are considered within the relevant ES Chapters.	N
	Concerns raised about recreation, access and ecological impacts in relation to the highway design between North Terminal and the A23.	ES Appendix 19.8.2 Public Rights of Way Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides a planned approach to the management of PRoWs during the construction phase of the Project, which would reduce disruption to the users of the PRoW network, as far as possible. Impacts to ecology receptors from works in the area are considered within ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Strategic Road Network (SRN)	Comments that further work is required to understand the impacts on the SRN and to demonstrate that the designs	The highway modelling undertaken for the transport assessment identifies that the road network will continue to operate satisfactorily with the Project and the associated highway works, throughout the period assessed (which extends to	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	can be operated safely and effectively with projected growth.	15 years after the highway works are open to traffic). This is described in the Transport Assessment and its associated annexes (Doc Ref. 7.4).	
	Comments suggesting that declassification of the M23 would better reflect the nature of the road. Other comments that the rationale for making this change was not clear and that it should not result in less maintenance.	The Project does not propose the declassification of the M23, but instead proposes that the M23 Spur is reclassified as an A Road. The maintenance requirements would be a subject for National Highways as asset owner and operator but are anticipated to be similar to existing arrangements as only the classification of the road is changing (noting the proposed highway improvements will result in a change in maintenance costs, which will be agreed with National Highways).	N
	Comments that the proposed additional 250 hotel beds should not have a detrimental impact on the SRN.	The transport modelling includes the development of additional hotel accommodation which forms part of the Project and therefore the outcomes of the modelling work and the assessment presented in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) reflect the situation with the Project, including the additional hotel beds referred to.	N
	Comments that National Highways environmental performance KPIs should not be affected by the SRN works.	The proposed highway works have been developed to a preliminary design stage and have prepared a range of drawings and technical reports related to aspects of the design which have been shared with National Highways and local highway authorities. The design has evolved in conjunction with inputs from other disciplines within the Project Team (including noise, landscaping and water resources). National Highways has reviewed and commented on this material and ongoing engagement has led to further iterations where necessary.	N
	Comments that the SRN should be considered in Biodiversity Net Gain calculations and 'no net loss' achieved.	Noted. The SRN has been included in the overall BNG calculation for the Project. This demonstrates that, overall, the Project achieves a net gain of about 22%	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information on the impacts of surface water drainage on the SRN.	Reports relating to highway drainage have been prepared and shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities. Their comments have been reviewed and a response provided.	N
	Comments suggesting that mitigation measures were local, and no account had been taken of additional traffic on the wider road network, particularly the M25, A23 and the A217.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models cover not just the roads around Gatwick Airport but a wide area of south-east England. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been considered in detail to ensure that we have identified all locations where mitigation is necessary.	N
Local roads	Concerns raised that the proposals are airport focused with not enough thought on local road improvements.	A full assessment has been undertaken 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 indicate where changes in traffic on both the strategic and local road network might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been considered in detail to ensure that any locations where mitigation might be necessary have been identified.	N
	Comments that the highway proposals would not increase capacity on the local road network, resulting in more traffic and congestion. Also, that any issues on the SRN, would affect local roads that don't have the capacity to cope.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models cover not just the roads around Gatwick Airport but a wide area of south-east England. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		have been considered in detail to ensure that any locations where mitigation might be necessary have been identified.	
Traffic	Comments that although improvements may help reduce congestion, they would not be able to cater for the increases in traffic arising from increased passenger numbers.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models cover not just the roads around Gatwick Airport but a wide area of south-east England. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been considered in detail to ensure that any locations where mitigation might be necessary have been identified.	N
	Concerns raised that the updated proposals would result in an increase in traffic and congestion due to HGV, freight and airport related traffic.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models cover not just the roads around Gatwick Airport but a wide area of south-east England. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been considered in detail to ensure that any locations where mitigation might be necessary have been identified.	N
	Concerns about increased congestion on the B2036, the junction of the A22/A264, junction 6 on the M25, feeder roads to the M23 and M25; and West Park Road into Lingfield.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models cover the junctions and roadways referenced in the comment.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been considered in detail to ensure that any locations where mitigation might be necessary have been identified.	
	Requests for further engagement with local authorities to help develop construction and traffic management plans.	We have shared the indicative construction methodology and the traffic management plans with the local authorities and National Highways for their feedback and comment. We will continue to engage with local authorities during the preparation of the detailed construction traffic management plans should the DCO be granted.	N
	Comments that increased traffic congestion around the airport will lead to greater impacts on the environment.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models cover not just the roads around Gatwick Airport but a wide area of south-east England. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been considered in detail to ensure that any locations where mitigation might be necessary have been identified.	N
	Comments suggesting the highway mitigation proposals have not considered the use of sustainable modes of travel.	The assessment takes account of our Surface Access Commitments (SAC) set out in ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc ref 5.3) which will increase the proportion of journeys made by sustainable transport modes. The proposed highway works include enhancements to the infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists, providing additional or improved connections for these users.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information about proposed highway mitigation measures, including whether the current proposals would increase some journey times.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been considered in detail to ensure that any locations where mitigation might be necessary have been identified. The assessment evidences that with the highway works that form part of the Project in place, there would not be a need for additional highway works in other locations. The modelling outcomes are reported in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1) and have been shared with the surface access Topic Working Group and in specific technical meetings with National Highways and the local highway authorities.	Y
Modelling and assessments	Comments that the performance of Gatwick's highway proposals needs to be demonstrated through transport models.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The model outcomes are contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).	Y
	Comments suggesting new transport modelling is needed to reflect the revisions to highway proposals. Offers from local authorities to share their modelling.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using the Project's strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The models cover not just the roads around Gatwick Airport but a wide area of south-east England. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been considered in detail to ensure that any locations where mitigation is necessary have been identified.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The modelling outcomes have been shared with the Surface Access Topic Working Group meetings and in specific technical meetings with National Highways and the local highway authorities.	
	Requests for further information and clarification on the model's forecasting, outputs, and assumptions so that an assessment of the project could be made. Comments that previous requests for this had not been addressed.	The modelling outcomes have been shared with the surface access Topic Working Group meetings and in specific technical meetings with National Highways and the local highway authorities. Comments have been received and responses provided. The Transport Assessment annexes (Doc Ref. 7.4) include detailed technical reports on the strategic and local highway modelling and the modelling of the operation of Gatwick Airport station.	Y
	Comments suggesting that Ashdown Forest should be included in the scope of the modelling.	Ashdown Forest is included in the Fully Modelled Area in the strategic highway model and is on the boundary of the Area of Detailed Modelling. Information from the traffic model has also been used to consider the Habitats Regulations Assessment.	N
	Comments that the results of microsimulation modelling and a safety case are needed to show the changes can support future access to the airport and elsewhere.	The microsimulation models indicate that the highway proposals which form part of the Project would operate satisfactorily in the design year of 2047. The outcomes are reported in the Transport Assessment and its associated annexes (Doc Ref. 7.4)	Y
	Comments that Gatwick has not modelled the impact on the wider 'local' highway network during both the construction and operational phases.	A full assessment has been undertaken of the impacts of the Project on the surrounding road network, using our strategic and local highway models and taking account of the commitments that GAL is making to increasing the use of sustainable transport modes. The assessment includes consideration of both the construction and operational phases of the Project. The models indicate where changes in traffic might occur that could have adverse effects on pedestrians, cyclists and road users. The results of the modelling have been	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		considered in detail to ensure that any all locations where mitigation might be necessary have been identified. The modelling outcomes have been shared with the surface access Topic Working Group and in specific technical meetings with National Highways and the local highway authorities.	
	Requests that the findings of the sensitivity testing be shared with stakeholders.	GAL has undertaken several sensitivity tests, some at the request of stakeholders, and has shared the outcomes of these in Topic Working Groups and directly with National Highways and the local highway authorities.	Y
	Comments that modelling should not be used to set easily achievable targets.	The Project's SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) make commitments to achieving certain mode shares within specific timescales. These commitments have been informed by the transport modelling and represent challenging but reasonable outcomes for the Project. GAL is also keen to go beyond those mode share commitments once they have been achieved, where it is possible to do so.	N
	Comment that further assessments are needed for properties along the M23 Spur, particularly in relation to surface water attenuation, capacity of watercourses, and air quality.	<p>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. The assessment of impact is included in the Flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13: Air Quality Assessment 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 M23, and sensitive receptors are modelled here, including residential properties, schools, hospitals and care homes.</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting the modelling should incorporate and take account of the cumulative impacts of future strategic sites.	The transport modelling includes estimates of growth in non-airport related traffic, through the use of TEMPro factors in accordance with DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance and the core assessment is therefore inherently cumulative. GAL has also undertaken a cumulative effects assessment, reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 5.1) and ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships (Doc Ref. 5.1), which includes proposed developments at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and west of Ifield, using such information as is available about those developments.	N
	Comments that the proposals were designed before the 'Do Something' transport modelling was finalised.	The highway proposals were developed alongside the evolution of the transport modelling. The transport assessment includes the proposed highway works within the modelling, in their currently designed form, and therefore indicates the performance of the highway network with those proposals in place. The outcomes of the modelling have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities.	N
	Concerns raised about consulting on the proposals while modelling was still ongoing. Suggestions that further consultation would be needed.	The highway proposals were developed alongside the evolution of the transport modelling. The transport assessment now includes the proposed highway works within the modelling, in their currently designed form, and therefore indicates the performance of the highway network with those proposals in place. The outcomes of the modelling have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities.	N
	Comments suggesting modelling should be undertaken for different scenarios (including construction) for the new A23	The highway modelling considers the construction periods as part of the assessment contained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	junction as it is considered that it could result in queues back to the roundabout.		
	Comments suggesting modelling is needed to ensure that the widening of A23 London Road is appropriate for increased road traffic.	The transport assessment includes the proposed highway works within the modelling, in their currently designed form, and therefore indicates the performance of the highway network with those proposals in place. The outcomes of the modelling have been shared with National Highways and the local highway authorities.	N
	Comments that modelling should demonstrate sufficient modal shift to remove the need for increased road traffic overall.	Analysis shows it is unrealistic to expect no increase in journeys made by car. The Project's SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) are designed to achieve greater proportions of people travelling by sustainable transport modes in order to reduce the number of additional vehicle journeys as far as reasonably possible.	N
Agreements	Comments that stakeholder agreements are required on commercial matters.	Engagement with stakeholders, notably National Highways, has included commercial matters such as provision of commuted lump sums for increased maintenance of assets.	Y
	Requests for agreement with National Highways on several issues prior to DCO submission, including mitigation for strategic road network impacts, wording of any requirements in the DCO and protective provisions for assets.	GAL continues the engagement with National Highways about all aspects of the highway proposals and other elements of the Project that might affect the Strategic Road Network. A Statement of Common Ground is being prepared between GAL and National Highways, and the parties are working towards agreeing matters which are still outstanding. Engagement with stakeholders, notably National Highways has included the sharing of a number of reports and technical notes covering impacts on the SRN and design of highway mitigation. GAL has also consulted National Highways on the wording of protective provisions in the DCO.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for a Memorandum of Understanding covering how Gatwick and National Highways would work together on the Project.	A MoU has been signed with National Highways covering the collaborative working on the Project to application.	Y
	Comments that Asset Protection Agreements must be in place with Network Rail (NR) before proceeding with any design or highways construction work alongside, above or below NR infrastructure.	Discussions have been held with Network Rail regarding asset protection provisions to form the basis of agreements to be reached prior to detailed design and construction taking place.	Y
Land take	Comments that the updated highway designs require may result in additional land take.	GAL has sought to minimise the amount of land required for the highway works whilst remaining able to achieve the required highway geometry standards and to construct the works safely and efficiently.	N
Sustainable transport	Comments suggesting more information should be provided on long distance travel options to the airport.	GAL provides information about all travel choices to and from the airport on its website and through links to information provided by public transport operators and other service providers.	N
	Comments that the predicted passenger growth could not be sustainable due to Gatwick's limited public transport infrastructure.	The transport modelling is based on the demands generated by the passenger growth forecasts and assesses the ability of the transport networks to accommodate this demand, and any need for additional mitigation beyond that to which GAL is committing to as part of the design of the Project and/or in the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)). The modelling indicates that the mode share commitments being made can be achieved, as part of the predicted levels of passenger growth.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that it is unclear how the Project would improve on existing commitments to improving modal share when there are no significant new proposals in terms of sustainable transport.	The Project's SAC ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref 5.3) set out GAL's commitments and proposals in relation to additional interventions that would be provided in order to achieve the mode share commitments. These include enhancements to regional coach services and provision of additional active travel infrastructure.	Y
	Comments suggesting greater investment in public transport to support the reduction in car parking spaces.	The ability of the transport networks to accommodate the forecast demand in passenger growth has been assessed, based on achieving the mode shares to which GAL is committing. The transport assessment indicates that the surface access interventions GAL is proposing in the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) would be able to support those mode shares being delivered, and that investment in public transport beyond that would not be necessary to mitigate the effects of the Project. However, GAL will continue to work with public transport operators to explore opportunities for additional enhancements should they arise.	N
	Comments that the reasons for staff and passengers not using more sustainable modes of transport should be better understood.	GAL undertakes regular surveys of passengers and staff to understand their travel behaviour. GAL is committed to a Staff Travel Survey every two years, the data from which will inform plans to improve access to the area from surrounding communities and is reflected in the monitoring approach proposed as part of the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)).	N
	Comments that public transport improvements were mainly outside Gatwick's control and that the lack of	The Project's SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) set out GAL's commitments to additional interventions, including those for public transport. The timing of those interventions will be related to the	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	information on how and when improvements would be made negated the case for a sustainable transport policy.	<p>commitment to achieve certain mode shares within a certain timescale. While GAL does not operate the local or regional bus network, GAL has close links with the organisations that do, and continues to engage with them to explore opportunities for enhancements, including discussing the ways in which GAL may be able to support those improvements.</p> <p>GAL believes that a sustainable transport strategy for the Airport is essential, and the SAC are part of that strategy to deliver more sustainable outcomes for surface access activities.</p>	
	Comments that zero/low emission vehicles should not be included in a sustainable transport target as they do not help to reduce congestion and pressure on car parking. Suggestions that the focus should be on single occupancy car use.	The mode share commitments, set out in the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)), do not include zero/low emission vehicles in the proportions that have been set. The SAC acknowledge the need to focus on single-occupancy car use, particularly for staff journeys to work, and reducing these trips is a key part of being able to achieve the mode share commitments.	N
Mode share	Requests for further information about how the public transport mode share would be achieved and what measures would be put in place if these were not successful.	<p>The Project's SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) set out GAL's commitments to interventions and measures that will support achieving the mode share commitments. These will be developed in further detail in a future ASAS, which will articulate how GAL will implement and monitor those measures.</p> <p>The SAC also contain proposals for monitoring travel behaviour and progress on mode shares, through an annual monitoring and reporting process and engagement with the Gatwick Airport Transport Forum Steering Group.</p>	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that Gatwick needs to demonstrate that the 60% target by 2030 is achievable and provide more information about what mitigation is proposed if this target is not met.	<p>The Project's SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) set out GAL's commitments to interventions and measures that will support achieving the mode share commitments. GAL has amended the mode share commitments as a result of the further analysis undertaken since the Autumn 2021 and Summer 2022 Consultations. The modelling and assessment indicate that the mode share commitments are achievable. Where possible, GAL will seek to go beyond those commitments.</p> <p>The SAC also contain proposals for monitoring travel behaviour and progress on mode shares, through an annual monitoring and reporting process and engagement with the Gatwick Airport Transport Forum Steering Group. This process includes suggested arrangements for a situation in which the mode share commitments have not been met, anticipating that agreement would be needed on additional or different interventions.</p>	Y
	Comments that the idea that staff would use public transport in preference to cars was flawed. This is due to convenience, shift patterns and because many staff live outside the area.	GAL is aware that shift patterns and the poorer provision of public transport services in the early mornings, evenings and at weekends can limit the choice of transport options for some airport staff. Nevertheless, it is important that the share of airport staff journeys made by public transport, shared transport or active modes is improved, as part of the wider approach to more sustainable operations. GAL will continue to work with public transport operators to seek opportunities to support the introduction of additional services in the mornings and evenings and at weekends.	N
	Comments suggesting it is not possible to achieve modal shift target with the current alternatives to private car. Requests for more detail about new/upgraded services to facilitate modal shift.	The Project's SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc ref 5.3)) set out GAL's proposed interventions to provide additional sustainable transport choice for air passengers and airport staff. Information is also provided in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc ref 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment (Doc ref 7.4). These measures have been included in the assessment for the DCO application. In due course GAL will develop a new	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		ASAS based around the SAC, which will provide further detail of how the surface access interventions will be delivered.	
	Comments suggesting the target could be achieved using incentives and local road restrictions.	The transport modelling suggests that while incentives such as fare discounts will be important, the strategy also needs to include disincentives to travelling by car if it is to achieve the mode shares to which GAL is committing. Restrictions on local roads are not within GAL's control and would affect all road users, not just those accessing the Airport. GAL is therefore including pricing for parking and forecourt use in the list of measures that it will deploy as part of the SAC.	N
	Comments suggesting ambitious targets with clear metrics for each mode should be set and monitored.	The Project's SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc ref 5.3)) make commitments to achieving certain mode shares within specific timescales. These commitments have been informed by the transport modelling and represent challenging but reasonable outcomes for the Project. The SAC also set out the proposed approach to annual monitoring of travel behaviour and reporting mode share outcomes.	Y
Active travel	Requests for more information about how the new pedestrian/cycle link into Riverside Gardens Park would link to the footpath over Gatwick Stream to the airport.	The new ramped connection from A23 London Road into Riverside Garden Park, southeast of Longbridge Roundabout, would connect into the existing path through the Park. Users would use the existing path between this point and the subway under Airport Way to reach South Terminal.	Y
	Comments suggesting improvements to the existing link along the east side of the A23 instead of the proposed new link, would have limited use during the winter due to biodiversity requirements resulting in a lack of lighting.	<p>The area around the A23 is important for bat foraging and commuting. As such, no new lighting is proposed for any of the improved links to avoid impacts to bats and other nocturnal wildlife.</p> <p>The existing footway that lies on the east/north edge of the A23 carriageway would be improved/widened as part of the surface access improvements. Existing/proposed highway lighting columns effectively illuminate this path for</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		pedestrians. National Cycle Route 21 within Riverside Garden Park is currently lit and will be retained. No footpaths within Riverside Garden Park are currently lit and there is no intention to provide additional lighting. The Sussex Border Path west of the A23 is also currently not lit. This public right of way will be reinstated following the improvement works. No additional lighting is planned. Alternative lit routes are available for walkers using the park and the Sussex Border Path either by using the NCR or the link north and west of Car Park Y.	
	Comments suggesting a comprehensive Cycle and Pedestrian Access Strategy be provided to show where new access paths feed into the existing network of paths and cycle lanes. Also, that investment in cycling and walking needs to improve connections to the airport for nearby communities.	The Surface Access Highways Plans – General Arrangements (Doc Ref. 4.8.1) show the proposed changes to active travel infrastructure. These are also described in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1) and in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1). They are also referenced in ES Appendix 19.8.2 Public Rights of Way Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3). The SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) includes commitments to increase the provision of active travel facilities at Gatwick Airport, alongside the new infrastructure proposed by the Project.	N
	Comments suggesting a bridge for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Brighton Main Line.	GAL considered the options for providing a bridge over the Brighton Main Line that would accommodate cyclists as well as pedestrians, either in the location of the existing pedestrian footbridge (north of Airport Way) or alongside the Airport Way carriageway as part of the bridge widening works that are required. GAL concluded that providing a new bridge in either location was not an optimum solution. Replacing the existing bridge would have required significant ramp lengths to accommodate mounted cyclists, which would have some adverse environmental implications, and neither option would achieve better connectivity than the existing route via the subway under Airport Way.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments highlighting the poor quality of the NCR21 cycle route and suggesting that improvements should be included in the proposals.	GAL has undertaken a condition audit of NCR21 approaching and through the airport with local authority officers and will be implementing some improvements as part of its current Airport Surface Access Strategy. Conditions along the route away from the airport fall within areas maintained by local authorities.	N
	Comments suggesting Gatwick should engage with Active Travel England to help develop active travel proposals to the required quality (Gear Change and LTN 1/20 standards).	GAL has sought, and will continue to seek, to engage with Active Travel England.	N
	Concerns raised about removal of the cycle path element from the proposed ramp into Riverside Garden Park.	The Project proposes this as a shared pedestrian and cycle facility, so cyclists will be able to use the ramp.	Y
	Comments suggesting a segregated and well-lit pedestrian and cycle lane from Longbridge roundabout to the North Terminal so that hotel guests do not attempt to take luggage trolleys along London Road to access the North Terminal.	The Project proposes a segregated pedestrian and cycle path from Longbridge Roundabout along the southern side of the A23 London Road, crossing and then following the River Mole for a short distance before connecting to Perimeter Road North and Longbridge Way, to North Terminal Roundabout.	Y
	Comments suggesting improvements to the active travel route from The Crescent on the west side of the Brighton Main Line should be explored.	GAL considered the options for providing a bridge over the Brighton Main Line, connecting to The Crescent, that would accommodate cyclists as well as pedestrians, either in the location of the existing pedestrian footbridge (north of Airport Way) or alongside the Airport Way carriageway as part of the bridge widening works that are required. GAL concluded that providing a new bridge in this location was not an optimum solution as it would have required significant ramp lengths to accommodate mounted cyclists, which would have some	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		adverse environmental implications, and would not achieve better connectivity than the existing route via the subway under Airport Way.	
	Comments suggesting a new bridge for cyclists and pedestrians to link South Horley with existing infrastructure to the east of the Brighton Main Line.	GAL considered the options for providing a bridge over the Brighton Main Line, connecting to The Crescent, that would accommodate cyclists as well as pedestrians, either in the location of the existing pedestrian footbridge (north of Airport Way) or alongside the Airport Way carriageway as part of the bridge widening works that are required, GAL concluded that providing a new bridge in this location was not an optimum solution as it would have required significant ramp lengths to accommodate mounted cyclists, which would have some adverse environmental implications, and would not achieve better connectivity than the existing route via the subway under Airport Way.	N
	Comments that active travel route improvements needed to be well lit, and passageways need to be kept dry in bad weather.	Noted. The designs include consideration of lighting and drainage requirements to provide appropriate levels of lighting and dry passage.	N
	Comments that pedestrian signals on the downstream side of the crossing at Longbridge Roundabout are needed.	The proposed highway works at Longbridge Roundabout include signalled pedestrian and cycle crossings on all arms of the roundabout.	Y
	Comments that the requirement for a fence at the back of the footway by the petrol station forecourt should be assessed along with other safety requirements including design standards at segregated left turns and a review of the location of proposed guard rail installations.	Noted. GAL has developed the proposals to preliminary design stage and a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been carried out and shared with the highway authorities. GAL anticipates that as the highway designs develop to a detailed design stage, matters such as these will be addressed.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting a north-south pedestrian crossing facility on the west side of the proposed new A23 junction while the right turn is on green.	The proposed highway works in this location include a signalled pedestrian crossing on the west side of the new A23 / North Terminal junction.	Y
	Comments that construction works at the M23 Spur would significantly affect walkers using footpaths either side of the route due to removal of mature trees.	The indicative construction methodology is shown in ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report Part B (Doc Ref. 5.3). Our utmost priority is to ensure the safety and convenience of people including walkers during the construction of the surface access improvements. The alternative route will be available at all times to ensure the safety of walkers using the footpaths. These alternative routes will be clearly marked and easily accessible and maintained during the construction period.	N
	Requests for further information about timings for the closure of the Sussex Border path and Cycle Route NR21.	Information about timings for the closure of the Sussex Border path and Cycle Route NR21 is contained in ES Appendix 19.8.1 Public Rights of Way Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
Buses and coaches	Requests for more information about whether bus journey times could be affected by the modifications to Longbridge roundabout and North Terminal.	The transport modelling considers the effects of the Project on driver delay (which covers delay to all vehicles including buses) across the whole of the modelled highway network. ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc ref 5.1) and the Transport Assessment (Doc ref 7.4) identify the magnitude of impacts at junctions on the road network and consider whether these would give rise to significant adverse effects.	Y
	Comments that further discussions should be had with operators to better understand travel behaviour.	GAL will continue to engage with bus and coach operators to explore opportunities for providing new or amended services, and the ways in which GAL could support these.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that current capacity would not be able to meet demand from forecast passenger growth.	Noted. The transport modelling assumes that in a situation without the Project, GAL would make additional interventions, working with bus operators, to enhance local and regional bus and coach services to address increases in passenger demand. With the Project, GAL is committing to additional interventions to provide increased capacity and better connectivity, particularly to areas that are poorly served by rail.	N
	Comments suggesting further investment in bus services and other forms of sustainable transport.	The SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) include commitments to interventions that will enhance local bus and regional coach services, to allow GAL to achieve the mode share commitments. GAL will also be investing in improved active travel facilities at Gatwick Airport.	N
	Comments suggesting market research is required to avoid regional coach services failing.	Analysis of passenger distributions, mode shares and behaviour has been undertaken to develop the proposals for new or enhanced regional services.	N
	Comments that current bus and coach travel provision does not cover the full operating hours of the airport.	GAL is well aware that the poorer provision of public transport services in the early mornings, evenings and at weekends can limit the choice of transport options for some airport staff. GAL will continue to work with public transport operators to seek opportunities to support the introduction of additional services in the mornings and evenings and at weekends.	N
	Questions raised about whether assessments had considered current bus and coach infrastructure and how services could be improved.	Noted. The transport modelling assumes that in a situation without the Project, GAL would make additional interventions, working with bus operators, to enhance local and regional bus and coach services to address increases in passenger demand. With the Project, GAL is committing to additional	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		interventions to provide increased capacity and better connectivity, particularly to areas that are poorly served by rail.	
	Comments that additional investment should be targeted at establishing new bus services from areas not currently served as well as increasing the frequency of existing services.	Noted. The transport modelling assumes that in a situation without the Project, GAL would make additional interventions, working with bus operators, to enhance local and regional bus and coach services to address increases in passenger demand. With the Project, GAL is committing to additional interventions to provide increased capacity and better connectivity, including to areas such as Sevenoaks, Maidstone, Chatham, Royal Tunbridge Wells, and East Grinstead, which have poorer rail links to the Airport.	N
	Comments that bus service enhancements should be targeted at both employees and travellers, with buses allowed to pull up at stops at the terminals.	The Project's proposals for the local and regional bus and coach network will benefit all potential users of enhanced services. GAL has dedicated stops for local buses and regional/long distance coaches at each terminal.	N
	Comments that investment is required to develop bus services as well as bus and coach infrastructure at the airport.	The SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) include commitments to interventions that will enhance local bus and regional coach services, to allow GAL to achieve the mode share commitments. Bus and coach infrastructure allows access to both terminals. GAL continues to monitor accessibility and consider improvements (with or without the Project) where these improvements have a sound business case in terms of benefits to users and operators.	N
Rail	Concerns raised about on-train capacity.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) considers the effects of the Project in terms of passenger numbers on trains on the rail network. It assumes either current levels of service, or those which are known to be committed for the future. It identifies whether seats on trains would be fully occupied, and if so,	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		how much of the available standing capacity would be taken. The assessment concludes that the Project would not lead to unacceptable levels of crowding on rail services, and that additional services would not need to be provided.	
	Comments that current rail capacity would not be able to meet demand from new passenger growth and that improvements are constrained by lack of space and tunnel width south of East Croydon.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) considers the effects of the Project in terms of passenger numbers on trains on the rail network. It assumes either current levels of service, or those which are known to be committed for the future. It identifies whether seats on trains would be fully occupied, and if so, how much of the available standing capacity would be taken. The assessment concludes that the Project would not lead to unacceptable levels of crowding on rail services, and that additional services would not need to be provided.	N
	Comments that rail improvements are vital for supporting the move away from cars and that the ambition to improve it should be greater.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) considers the effects of the Project in terms of passenger numbers on trains on the rail network. It assumes either current levels of service, or those which are known to be committed for the future. It identifies whether seats on trains would be fully occupied, and if so, how much of the available standing capacity would be taken. The assessment concludes that the mode share commitments set out in the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) can be achieved, and that the Project would not lead to unacceptable levels of crowding on rail services, without providing additional rail services.	N
	Comments suggesting further investment in the Gatwick Express to justify its ticket price and improve the speed and regularity of the service.	The operation of Gatwick Express is a matter for Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) and the Department of Transport, and outside GAL's control. GAL however continues to work closely with GTR to promote use of rail as a sustainable mode of travel to the airport.	N
	Comments suggesting Gatwick should contribute towards rail bottlenecks, such as the flyover at Selhurst Junction.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) considers the effects of the Project in terms of passenger numbers on trains on the rail network. It assumes either current levels of service, or those which are known to be committed for the	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		future. The assessment concludes that the Project would not lead to unacceptable levels of crowding on rail services, and that additional services would not need to be provided. There is therefore no requirement for rail infrastructure improvements in order to mitigate the effects of the Project.	
	Comments suggesting further assessments and discussions about opportunities for additional provision along the Horsham and Worthing rail route.	The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) includes consideration of rail services to Horsham and Worthing. It concludes that the effects of the Project would not be significant for these services and that no additional services would be required.	N
	Comments that there is a lack of routes west from the airport into Surrey and an over reliance on the North Downs Line.	Noted. The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) includes consideration of rail services on the North Downs Line. It concludes that the effects of the Project would not be significant for these services and that no additional services would be required.	N
	Concerns raised that the connection to Gatwick from Dorking Deepdene was not being optimised and investment is needed to improve service frequency, support electrification of the Reading – Redhill line and improve accessibility.	The Project does not rely on, nor propose, enhancements at other stations nor to rail infrastructure, as the assessment indicates that no mitigation of this form is required.	N
	Comments that increasing rail capacity was impossible unless more trains were run in empty off-peak slots.	The Transport Assessment (Doc ref 7.4) considers the effects of the Project on loadings on rail services. It concludes that the Project would not lead to unacceptable levels of crowding and that additional services would not need to be provided.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting expansion of east-west services and for new rail services from Canterbury West, Redhill and Tonbridge. Suggestions that Reading trains to Gatwick should run through to Medway.	<p>The scheduling and delivery of new or amended rail services is a matter for the train operating companies working in conjunction with Network Rail.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc ref 7.4) does not include the changes suggested in these comments but demonstrates that no additional rail services are required to address the effects of the Project.</p>	N
	Comments suggesting alterations to the railway bridge should be undertaken at a time that minimises disruption for rail and airport users.	ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report Part B (Doc ref 5.3) outlines the indicative construction methodology for the Brighton Mainline bridge widening. This methodology has been shared with local authorities and Network Rail. To minimise disruption to rail and airport users, we will plan the details of the works with Network Rail.	N
	Requests for further information about plans to improve rail services.	<p>The Transport Assessment (Doc ref 7.4) considers the effects of the Project in terms of passenger numbers on trains on the rail network. It assumes either current levels of service, or those which are known to be committed for the future. It identifies whether seats on trains would be fully occupied, and if so, how much of the available standing capacity would be taken. The assessment concludes that the mode share commitments set out in the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc ref 5.3)) can be achieved, and that the Project would not lead to unacceptable levels of crowding on rail services, without providing additional rail services.</p> <p>The assessment 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
Forecourt charging	Comments that the cost of the drop off facility should not be priced so that it becomes a deterrent to use it.	GAL is committed to increasing the proportion of journeys made by sustainable transport to and from the Airport. The analysis indicates that the pricing of forecourt access and car parking is a key tool for influencing travel behaviour	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		and mode choice, and this therefore forms part of the suite of measures GAL is committing to delivering in order to achieve the mode share commitments.	
	Comments suggesting removal of the forecourt fee.	GAL is committed to increasing the proportion of journeys made by sustainable transport to and from the Airport. The analysis indicates that the pricing of forecourt access and car parking is a key tool for influencing travel behaviour and mode choice, and this therefore forms part of the suite of measures GAL is committing to delivering in order to achieve the mode share commitments.	N
Car parking	Comments supporting the reduction in the number of proposed parking spaces.	Noted.	N
	Comments that car parking should be provided on-site and monitored and mitigated as needed so that less safe off-site parking in potentially congested areas is avoided. congested areas is avoided. If these spaces are not re-provided on-site, then cars could be displaced into areas of the surrounding SRN or wider that are potentially less safe and may cause congestion.	GAL monitors the use of its car parks as a matter of course and will continue to do so with the Project. GAL agrees that parking on-airport is the best choice for those for whom driving to the airport is the only reasonable choice.	N
	Comments that any new parking proposals need to be justified, and that a Parking Strategy should be developed, including for the construction period. Also, that how	<p>The Project proposes 1,100 net additional parking spaces. This is a small proportional increase compared to the increase in the number of air passengers expected as a result of the Project.</p> <p>The transport modelling includes these proposals together with the other measures and interventions contained in the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1:</p>	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	parking proposals support modal shift need to be demonstrated.	Surface Access Commitments (Doc ref 5.3)) and explained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc ref 5.1), shows that the mode share commitments set out in the SAC can be achieved.	
	Comments that sites within the airport boundary are most suitable for airport car parking.	Noted. The car parking proposals for the Project are within the Airport boundary.	N
	Comments that the proposed level of new parking was still too high and that the Sustainable Transport Strategy should be completed before the number of parking spaces is decided.	The Project proposes 1,100 net additional parking spaces. This is a small proportional increase compared to the increase in the number of passengers expected as a result of the Project. The transport modelling includes these proposals together with the other measures and interventions contained in the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) and explained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1), shows that the mode share commitments set out in the SAC can be achieved.	N
	Comments that Gatwick's commitments to sustainable growth and mode share are incompatible with any increase in parking.	The Project proposes 1,100 net additional parking spaces as part of the Project. This is a small proportional increase compared to the increase in the number of passengers expected as a result of the Project. The transport modelling includes these proposals together with the other measures and interventions contained in and the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) and explained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1), shows that the mode share commitments set out in the SAC can be achieved.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more detail about the number and locations of existing car parking compared to the proposals.	The existing car parking provision, changes to existing sites to allow for the construction work for the Project, and additional spaces required to support the Project are explained in ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Comments that sufficient levels of safe parking should be provided and there should be recognition that travelling by car is the preferred method of travel to the airport for many people.	The Project aims to ensure that there is car parking available for those who need to travel by car or choose to do so in preference to using other modes. Nevertheless, GAL will promote measures to encourage people to change their travel behaviour when and where they are able to do so.	N
	Comments that Car Park B should be adequately maintained to reduce anti-social behaviour.	The Project would see Car Park B changed from being a car park to being an area of open recreational space connected by a footbridge to Riverside Garden Park.	N
	Requests for an updated parking strategy and more information about how the loss of 7,780 on-airport parking spaces would affect pricing and availability of parking.	The Project proposes 1,100 net additional parking spaces. This is a small proportional increase compared to the increase in the number of passengers expected as a result of the Project. The other 7,780 spaces contained in the proposals are to replace spaces that need to be relocated as a result of the Project and therefore this replacement will not affect pricing or parking capacity.	N
	Comments that the capping of Gatwick's parking related permitted development right should be considered, and future provision assessed against need.	GAL has reduced the amount of additional parking proposed for the Project in line with its commitment to increase the proportion of journeys by sustainable modes.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that future demand would need to be monitored. Suggestions that an appropriate mechanism be attached to the DCO to ensure parking is provided only as and when it is required.	<p>The SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) include proposals for monitoring travel behaviour and reporting the outcomes on an annual basis.</p> <p>GAL intends to deliver the net additional 1,100 spaces when demand requires, and will maintain a flexible approach to this to allow us to respond to variations in demand, which may also mean that we can close or reopen parking spaces to cater for seasonal demand GAL will only provide additional capacity when it is needed.</p>	Y
	Suggestions for large underground car parks near to each terminal to accommodate future airport growth.	The Project does not include underground car parks.	N
	Comments that sufficient parking infrastructure should be provided for those who have no alternative.	The Project aims to ensure that there is car parking available for those who need to travel by car or choose to do so in preference to using other modes. Nevertheless, GAL will promote measures to encourage people to change their travel behaviour when and where they are able to do so.	N
	Requests for full details of the parking baseline along with any assumptions made and suggestions that demand management should be provided.	GAL has reduced the amount of additional parking proposed for the Project in line with its commitment to increase the proportion of journeys by sustainable modes. The parking proposals are set out in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1). GAL will only provide additional capacity when it is needed.	Y
	Comments that parking pricing should be used to encourage a shift to sustainable transport modes.	Noted. The SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) include the use of parking charges as an intervention to support achieving the mode share commitments.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for details of the split between staff and passenger parking.	The Project proposes to keep airport staff car parking with the Project at or below current levels. Information on current parking spaces is contained in ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation (Doc Ref. 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).	N
	Questions raised about why MSCP4 was removed from the baseline in favour of a new car park in maintenance area 01.	GAL has reduced the amount of additional parking proposed for the Project in line with its commitment to increase the proportion of journeys by sustainable modes. MSCP4 was not required for capacity in the Future Baseline and neither site is included with the Project. GAL will only provide additional capacity when it is needed.	N
	Comments that details of the 2,500-space robotic car park had not been shared. Also that the car park should not be included in the baseline as no formal consultation on it has taken place.	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. ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation provides information on these projects.	N
Unauthorised car parking	Comments that inclusion of 3,300 parking spaces to replace unauthorised off airport parking was not supported due to concerns about over-provision.	In response to comments made by local authorities following the Summer 2022 Consultation, the Project no longer includes a parking allowance to replace unauthorised spaces removed as a result of local enforcement.	Y
	Comments that the long-term issue of unauthorised parking will not be resolved by the proposals.	The authorisation of airport car parking outside the airport boundary is a matter for the local planning authorities, as is the enforcement against unauthorised parking sites. To the extent possible, GAL will support local authorities in taking action against unauthorised operators. GAL will provide funding to support enforcement and management of unauthorised parking, as part of the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)).	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		In response to comments made by local authorities following the Summer 2022 Consultation, the Project no longer includes a parking allowance to replace unauthorised spaces removed as a result of local enforcement.	
	Comments that the proposed reduction in parking would encourage more unauthorised parking and worsen congestion.	In response to comments made by local authorities following the Summer 2022 consultation the Project no longer includes a parking allowance to replace unauthorised spaces removed as a result of local enforcement. The Project does not propose to reduce the number of car parking spaces at the Airport and instead anticipates a net increase of 1,100 parking spaces.	N
	Comments that the continued operation of unauthorised parking in off-airport locations undermined Gatwick's ability to achieve its sustainable transport mode share.	The authorisation of airport car parking outside the airport boundary is a matter for the local planning authorities, as is the enforcement against unauthorised parking sites. To the extent possible, GAL will support local authorities in taking action against unauthorised operators. GAL will provide funding to support enforcement, as part of the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)). In response to comments made by local authorities following the Summer 2022 Consultation, the Project no longer includes a parking allowance to replace unauthorised spaces removed as a result of local enforcement.	N
	Suggestions for GAL to make an annual funding contribution, as part of DCO S106 towards, towards enforcement of unauthorised off-airport parking.	The authorisation of airport car parking outside the airport boundary is a matter for the local planning authorities, as is the enforcement against unauthorised parking sites. To the extent possible, GAL will support local authorities in taking action against unauthorised operators. GAL will provide funding to support enforcement, as part of the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)).	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the Project should not include unauthorised off-site parking need in the assessments. Suggestions for use of growth in passenger numbers only to calculate need.	In response to comments made by local authorities following our Summer 2022 Consultation, the Project no longer includes a parking allowance to replace unauthorised spaces removed as a result of local enforcement.	Y
	Questions raised about how established unauthorised sites could be removed and on street parking dealt with.	The authorisation of airport car parking outside the airport boundary is a matter for the local planning authorities, as is the enforcement against unauthorised parking sites. To the extent possible, GAL will support local authorities in taking action against unauthorised operators. GAL will provide funding to support enforcement, as part of the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)).	N
	Comments that Gatwick's parking is expensive and encourages off-site parking.	The pricing of car parking is a key tool to help GAL achieve its mode share commitments. Parking tariffs on and off site are market-driven and reflect the overall capacity available, both on the airport and from off-airport providers.	N
	Comments suggesting Gatwick should fund a Planning Enforcement Officer to help deal with unauthorised off-site parking.	The enforcement against unauthorised parking sites is a matter for the local planning authorities. To the extent possible, GAL will support local authorities in taking action against unauthorised operators. GAL will provide funding to support enforcement, as part of the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)).	Y
	Concerns raised that the proposals would result in an increase in unauthorised and illegal parking in streets as well as and rat running on local roads.	GAL has carefully considered the amount of car parking that it believes is required to meet demand with the Project, with the aim of keeping the increase in parking provision to a minimum. With the measures that GAL is proposing to increase sustainable transport use, the provision we are proposing is considered appropriate.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The enforcement against unauthorised parking sites is a matter for the local planning authorities. To the extent possible, GAL will support local authorities in taking action against unauthorised operators. GAL will provide funding to support enforcement, as part of the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)).	
Car park design	Requests for more information about the heights of the car parks and distances to the terminals.	<p>Full detail on the car parking provision is contained in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3).</p> <p>Multi-storey car parks are generally located close to the terminals. Where new multi-storey car parks are proposed on existing surface car park sites, their maximum extents are provided in three dimensions on the Works Plans (Doc Ref. 4.5) and Parameter Plans (Doc Ref. 4.7).</p>	N
	Comments welcoming removal of the multi-storey car park from Pentagon Field and questions raised about soil deposition as well as its future use and appearance.	Noted. The material sent to pentagon field will be used to create a platform up to 4 meters with 1:3 side slopes.	N
	Comments welcoming removal of the decking for Car Park X.	Noted.	N
	Requests for more information about the reduction in capacity of the North Terminal long stay car park in favour of maintenance area 01 as well as the proposed design.	Decked parking on MA1 is no longer included in the proposals for the Project. Additional capacity to support growth has been minimised following the Summer 2022 Consultation.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments supporting the reduced car parking proposals and robotic parking as well as use of decked car parks, which were supported as a way of reducing land take.	Noted.	N
	Comments supporting the proposed replacement of Car Park B with open space linking to Riverside Garden Park.	Noted.	N
	Comments suggesting that multi-storey car parks are located in close proximity to each other to minimise land take and potential visual impacts.	Multi-storey car parks are generally located close to the terminals. Where new multi-storey car parks are proposed on existing surface car park sites, their maximum extents in three dimensions are provided in three dimensions on the Works Plans (Doc Ref. 4.5) and Parameter Plans (Doc Ref. 4.7).	N
Taxis	Comments suggesting taxi facilities should be provided, including a waiting area to prevent taxis waiting in local roads and littering.	GAL already provides a dedicated on-airport taxi waiting area and up to 2 hours free waiting in long stay car parks for pick up.	N
Electric vehicles	Comments that electric vehicles should not be classed as sustainable transport but as a sub-set of cars.	The Project's mode share commitments do not include electric vehicles within the definition of 'sustainable transport modes', and other highway modelling makes no distinction between electric and non-electric vehicles, so is therefore not excluding electric vehicles from the consideration of the performance of the highway network. GAL will continue to pursue initiatives to increase the proportion of electric vehicles used to travel to, from and within the Airport.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that there are insufficient car parking spaces with electric vehicle charging points.	GAL is increasing the availability of electric vehicle charging points for passengers and staff in line with its Decade of Change strategy and current Airport Surface Access Strategy. A new electric vehicle charging station operated by Gridserve will open on the airport in 2023.	N
	Comments suggesting that more charging points across the area would be beneficial for airport staff and the community.	GAL is increasing the availability of electric vehicle charging points for passengers and staff in line with its Decade of Change strategy and current Airport Surface Access Strategy. A new electric vehicle charging station operated by Gridserve will open on the airport in 2023.	N

g. Noise and vibration

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
General	<p>Concerns raised about increased flights and airport ground operations will increase noise levels and impact the quality of life/sleep in the local communities.</p>	<p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration of the ES with its accompanying 10 appendices provides a full assessment of the noise impacts expected from the increased numbers of flights and activity on the ground, following the appropriate methodology. For those most affected a Noise Insulation Scheme is proposed.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers how the Project's noise effects are likely to influence population health. Significant changes in population health outcomes are not expected. The conclusion takes into account the mitigation set out in the ES noise assessment (Chapter 14), including the Noise Insulation Scheme.</p>	Y
Traffic noise	<p>Concerns raised over the impact of noise from increased roads users and construction traffic.</p>	<p>Chapter 14 of the ES provides with its accompanying appendices provides a full assessment of the noise impacts expected from the increased road traffic and construction. The highways scheme includes a number of mitigation measures that will ensure traffic noise increases are not significant. The construction noise assessment model's mitigation is key areas and commits to a number of mitigation measures to minimise noise disturbance, but some residual effects are expected.</p>	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information about mitigation of traffic noise impacts, particularly in Horley, Crawley and Charlwood.	For the construction phase, routing of construction traffic will avoid Charlwood and minor roads and noise impacts are not predicted. The highway scheme has been developed to incorporate noise mitigation measures. The new right turn onto the A23 from the North Terminal Roundabout removes the current need for traffic wishing to turn right instead having to turn left up to the Longbridge roundabout, around it, and back down the A23, thus reducing traffic flows on this section of the A23. The speed limit on the A23 in this area will be reduced from 50 to 40mph which will also reduce traffic noise. 1m high noise barriers have been included along the North Terminal roundabout flyover elevated section (facing Riverside Garden Park) and along the South Terminal roundabout flyover elevated section, north side. As a result, noise level changes will be small and will not result in significant noise impacts.	N
	Requests for more information on the size and form of the noise barriers on the proposed flyover, including whether wind turbulence effects on them have been considered.	Appendix 14.9.4 of the ES provides the results of detailed modelling of road traffic noise barrier on the north and south terminal flyovers. The noise barrier design will be subject to further development at the detailed design stage, should the DCO be granted. This will take account of site-specific characteristics such as wind loading.	Y
	Comments that the effectiveness of noise barriers at different heights should be tested to measure the impact on land take.	In consultation with local authority environmental health departments in summer 2022 and through the Noise Topic Working Groups, sensitivity tests on the heights of noise barriers were carried and shared, before being adopted within the design of the highways scheme.	Y
	Requests for more information about the noise impacts of the proposed light controlled junction between the North Terminal and the eastbound carriageway of the A23 opposite Riverside Gardens.	The introduction of this junction will be accompanied by a reduction in the speed limit on the A23 from 50 to 40mph. Whilst the acceleration of vehicles away from the junction may increase noise levels for some vehicles, traffic speeds will be reduced considerably and lead to overall reductions in noise levels. ES Appendix 14.9.4: Road Traffic Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides details.	N

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the proposed 40mph would result in a significant reduction in noise and may mean that the noise barriers next to riverside Garden Park are not necessary.	Further detailed noise modelling showed that this noise barrier could be removed, in part because of the speed reduction, but also because traffic flows on the A23 will be reduced by the introduction of the new right turn out of the North Terminal and the movement of some traffic away from the park. ES Appendix 14.9.4: Road Traffic Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3) gives details of the road traffic noise modelling and results.	Y
	Comments that the proposals should result in an improvement over the 2019 noise levels for the sensitive receptors at Longbridge roundabout.	Noise levels in this area in 2032 with the Project are expected to be very similar to in 2019. There is no requirement for the Project to reduce noise levels from the 2019 baseline. Baseline noise levels are expected to increase slightly from 2019 to 2029 when the effect of the Project is predicted to reduce noise levels slightly. ES Appendix 14.9.4 (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides the details.	Y
Aircraft noise	Concerns raised that additional flights would have a negative impact on the quality of life of residents.	<p>The ES 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 affect by aircraft noise the increases will be small in the day and very small at night. 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.</p> <p>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</p>	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>up, and an average healthy person awakens about 20 times a night for various reasons not connected with noise.</p> <p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers how the Project's noise effects are likely to influence population health. Significant changes in population health outcomes are not expected. The conclusion takes into account the mitigation set out in the ES noise assessment (ES Chapter 14 (Doc Ref. 5.1)), including the Noise Insulation Scheme.</p>	
	Comments that noise should be limited regardless of the Project.	Noted.	N
	Comments that communities to the east of the airport have not been considered.	The assessment of noise impacts considers all areas of potential noise impact equally (e.g. mapping noise across this area) and details of noise changes are set out in Section 14.9 of ES Chapter 14 . Lingfield is chosen as one of the Community Representative Locations for detailed analysis. However, because the northern runway will be used for departures only, and on approximately 75% of the year this area of concern is overflown by arrivals which will not be moved by the northern runway, the noise changes are smaller in this area.	N
	Comments that it is unrealistic to say that residents who are not currently overflown would not be overflown after the airport has expanded.	The existing northern runway centreline is located some 198 metres north of the main runway centreline. The Project would increase the difference between the two runway centrelines by 12 metres. The existing northern runway is currently only used when the main runway is unavailable; for example, due to maintenance work at night. In the 2019 summer season (16 June to 15 September), the northern runway was used by 1,292 flights. From January to November 2022, the northern runway was used on 160 days by over 9,500 flights due to a major resurfacing programme on the main runway. The Project would make alterations to the existing northern runway, resulting in increased use of this runway using the same flight paths offset 12 metres to the north.	N

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information about the frequency of aircraft engine ground running.	Section 14.9 of the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) details the locations and numbers of engine tests.	N
Noise envelope	Concerns raised about the proposed noise envelope, including that the process is not compliant with government policy or Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) guidelines and that it should be comprehensive and examine all options from a first principles basis.	GAL formed a Noise Envelope Group (NEG) in May 2022 to seek further views on the noise envelope to guide the 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. 12 two-hour meetings were held between 26 May and 11 October 2022. These were structured around four themes drawn from the PEIR consultation response and CA1129 guidance. ES Appendix 14.9.8: The Noise Envelope Group Output Report (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3) give an account of the consultation undertaken.	Y
	Comments that the previous consultation did not give Gatwick a mandate to go forward with noise envelopes.		
	Comments suggesting the noise envelope does not cover the areas that are impacted today.	This was discussed in detail in consultation and the metrics to be used in the Noise Envelope are the Lowest Observable Effect Level for day and night as defined by government policy.	Y
	Comments that the noise envelope is not described in enough detail.	Full detail is provided in the ES taking on board the views expressed by consultees on the outline provided in the PEIR. See ES Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 14.9.5 Air Noise Envelope Background (Doc Ref 5.3).	Y
	Comments that without a cap on aircraft movements, the noise envelope offers local residents no respite from aircraft noise unless planes get quieter.	A cap would not ensure respite. Planes are expected to get quieter, as discussed in the ES, see ES Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 14.9.5 Air Noise Envelope Background (Doc Ref 5.3). A cap of 386,000 commercial Air Traffic Movement per year has been included.	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the noise envelope is too narrow.	Noted.	N
	Comments suggesting feedback from the previous consultation should be addressed through the Noise Envelope Group. Also, that terms of reference for the group should be defined.	Terms of reference were produced, and the Noise Envelope Group subsequently met 12 times in summer 2022.	Y
	Comments that the noise envelope should be subject to periodic independent scrutiny, monitoring and review which includes consultation with key stakeholders.	Noted, independent scrutiny and review and a review process have been included see ES Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3).	Y
	Comments that the envelope process does not follow best practice set out in CAP1129 or draw from good practice at other airports.	Following our consultation in summer 2022 we are confident that CAP 1129 guidance has been followed. ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope (Doc Ref. 5.3) provides details. We have also considered proposals by other airports.	Y
	Concern that the noise envelope group is not independent as it is led by Gatwick employees and supporters.	Noted.	N
Noise mitigation	Comments suggesting a review of noise mitigation for the CARE facility and including the engine testing area.	Noise impacts from the CARE facility are assessed in the ES and mitigation is proposed to ensure it does not create noise impacts by ensuring the detailed design accommodates noise control measure to meet the stated noise limits at the nearest noise sensitive receptor.	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the new location of the north-west noise bund was not clear.	The design of the bund had been progressed to ensure it provides noise mitigation, and further details are proved in the ES.	Y
	Comments that the new bund should be more noise absorbent.	Where possible the bund will be vegetated.	Y
CARE facility	Comments that the number and routing of vehicles to/from the CARE facility should be identified and consideration given to a covered loading area.	The option selected for the CARE facility following consultation was largely driven by its location. Its relative proximity to the terminals where the bulk of the airport's waste originates was a key factor, reducing the journey time and therefore journey frequency for deliveries. Total vehicle movements were assessed in the ES, which include those relating to the CARE facility, and the request for a covered loading dock is noted.	N
	Requests for more information about the potential noise from extraction fans.	Noise impacts from the CARE facility are assessed in the ES and mitigation is proposed to ensure it does not create noise impacts, by ensuring the detailed design accommodates noise control measure to meet the stated noise limits at the nearest noise sensitive receptor.	Y
	Comments that the facility should not operate at night.	Recycling activities are continuous. Waste is collected from retail and catering outlets at the end of the operational day and taken to the CARE facility for sorting and processing. Similarly, waste from inbound aircraft is collected right through to the end of the daily schedule.	N
	Comments that the facility should be restricted to Gatwick waste only.	GAL has no intention of processing waste other than its own.	N
Construction noise	Concerns raised about the impact of overnight construction noise on local residents.	Section 14.9 of the ES Chapter 14 reports a detailed assessment of construction noise, mitigation measures to minimise effects and monitoring through the Code of Construction Practice .	Y

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Consultation	Comments that it was disappointing that Gatwick would not fund a noise consultant to advise its consultees.	Noted.	N
	Comments that it was difficult to make an informed response on the noise envelope as detailed information was not available.	The principle of the Noise Envelope including the proposed limits were clearly given in the PIER, and a great deal of further comment from stakeholders was taken on board through the Noise Envelope Group consultation in summer 2022.	Y
	Comments that the outputs for the noise chapters of the ES have not been provided.	Air noise contours were provided to local authorities within the noise Topic Working Group in February 2023.	Y
	Requests for more information about the noise impacts on local communities.	The ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its 7 appendices provide more detail.	Y

h. Air quality

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
General	Concerns raised about the air quality within the vicinity of properties, including from emissions of NOX, particulates and dust from construction.	<p>Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1 Air Quality Assessment Methodology.</p> <p>For the construction dust assessment, all construction elements have been assessed. For the assessment of construction traffic emissions, the peak construction traffic flows were modelled using emissions and backgrounds from the first full year of airfield construction (2024) and highways construction (2029). Construction mitigation measures (including any monitoring recommended) would follow best practice IAQM guidance and would be implemented through the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p>	N
	Comments suggesting provision of greater air quality mitigation at Dovenby Hall office.	<p>The assessment has included Dovenby Hall (receptor ID EHO_75) as a receptor.</p> <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. 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 at Dovenby Hall office as a result of the Project. The Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p> <p>Actions to improve air quality in the future are included in ES Appendix 5.3.8 Carbon Action Plan and ES Appendix 5.3.7 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3). The assessment in Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1)</p>	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice.	
	Comments that increased car parking would increase air pollution from vehicles and affect the ability of the airport to reach carbon neutrality.	<p>As set out in Gatwick’s Northern Runway Airspace Change Proposal (ACP-2019-81), the Project will not require changes to the airspace arrangements at Gatwick (https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=205). It is sufficient to support the increase in flights anticipated by the Project.</p> <p>Information relating to the assumed usage of Gatwick’s standard instrument departures is provided in ES Appendix 14.9.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>Issues around congestion in the airspace around London are well understood and were identified in the Government paper ‘Upgrading UK Airspace: Strategic Rationale’; the strategy to address the deficiencies in the UK airspace infrastructure are addressed in the Government-led programme for airspace modernisation which is set out in CAP 1711 ‘Airspace Modernisation Strategy 2023-2040’. This programme is distinct from Gatwick’s Northern Runway project.</p> <p>The air quality assessment for the ES considers the changes to emissions as a result of car park provisions in both the construction and operational scenarios. 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.</p> <p>The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues are presented and discussed in Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) of the ES and corresponding appendices. The assessment in Section 13.9 of Chapter 13 details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice.</p>	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Air pollution	Concerns raised about the proposed increase in flights, in congested airspace, and worsening air pollution.	All areas of interest, sensitive receptors and AQMAs were examined and have been taken into account in the air quality assessment in the ES. The ES includes an assessment of compliance with limit values. The assessment has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project. The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues are presented and discussed in Chapter 13: Airt Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) of the ES and corresponding appendices.	N
Traffic pollution	Comments suggesting a Clean Air Order to encourage less air pollution local roads.	A Clean Air Order is not considered necessary as the 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. The assessment in Section 13.9 of Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1) details commitments made to mitigate air quality impacts following best practice. Actions being taken to reduce emissions to air from surface access and airside activity are included in the ES Appendix 5.3.7 Surface Access Commitments and ES Appendix 5.3.8 Carbon Action Plan (both Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that widening the SRN and increasing traffic would worsen air pollution.	The air quality assessment considered all roads from the ES traffic modelling. The wider study area used in the assessment includes all roads in the 11 km by 10 km domain plus the modelled Affected Road Network outside this area, which includes all roads in the traffic modelling that exceed the guidance screening criteria. The 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. 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.	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting traffic flows and emissions should be assessed in relation to health impacts and damage costs compared to a neutral air quality benchmark rather than an assessment of significance.	<p>The Project is NSIP under the Planning Act 2008 (UK Government, 2008). The assessment of effects is in accordance with the corresponding Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (UK Government, 2017) and the ANPS and NNNPS applicable to such a scale/type of project. The ES assessment has been undertaken based on best available information, for assessing the likely significant effects on air quality from the Project.</p> <p>Throughout the assessment reasonable assumptions have been made to address the uncertainties providing a robust, conservative approach. Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in ES Appendix 13.4.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N
	Comments suggesting further detailed air quality assessment be undertaken using the updated traffic model and mode share targets once work on ASAS is complete.	The air quality assessment is based on the updated ES traffic modelling. Details on traffic models and highways updates are provided in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
CARE facility	Air quality modelling must demonstrate it has accounted for the CARE Facility.	The pollutants assessed in the ES have been expanded to take 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

i. Landscape, townscape and visual resources

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Visual impact	Concerns raised about the visual impact of the proposals, particularly the increased number of highways structures and loss of vegetation (trees, hedges etc) alongside the M23 that provides visual screening and privacy.	<p>The M23 Spur bridge structure over Balcombe Road would be widened to the south, wing walls would be extended, and a retaining wall constructed at the toe of the embankment to the north. Vegetation within the M23 Spur and Balcombe Road corridors would be removed and largely reinstated with similar native planting mixes. Overall, the Balcombe Road bridge would be larger with a greater number of engineered features, compared to the existing situation. Visual impacts have been identified on occupiers of residential and commercial properties, occupiers of vehicles and pedestrians using footways on Balcombe Road and walkers using public rights of way in section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1). Whilst effects would be adverse in nature, none of the effects are considered to be significant adverse. Landscape planting proposals would, in time, reduce effects as the road corridor is returned to a similar character to the existing situation.</p> <p>The closest residential property is at number 275 Balcombe Road which lies approximately 70m north of the M23 spur. Visual effects on occupiers of this property are assessed throughout section 8.9 of the ES. Visual effects on residents are considered to be minor adverse throughout the construction and operational periods of the Project, which is not significant.</p> <p>The hedgerow with mature oak trees which lies north of the Sussex Border Path, north of the M23 Spur would be retained. This landscape feature would continue to provide an important element in the local landscape and an effective screen to heavily filter or totally screen views of the M23 Spur and traffic in views gained by receptors in the landscape to the north.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		East of the South Terminal Roundabout and Balcombe Road the M23 Spur would be widened to the south. The carriageway and flyover would move closer to commercial receptors at the Amadeus Building and Schlumberger House. Existing vegetation would be removed and then largely reinstated with native woodland, scrub and meadow grassland. Overall, the junction would be larger with a greater number of engineered features, compared to the existing situation. Visual effects on occupiers of commercial properties are considered to be minor adverse throughout the construction and operational periods of the Project, which is not significant.	
	Comments suggesting landscape and ecology mitigation at Longbridge Roundabout, London Road, Riverside Garden Park and at Church Meadow by planting trees.	<p>There are various areas for proposed environmental mitigation included within the Project. This includes:</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>Native woodland species mixes are proposed as part of the mitigation and enhancement strategy for the Project. Details of locations of planting, species</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		mixes and management techniques are included in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan at ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
	Comments that additional land for new car parks appears to displace green spaces.	Previous iterations of the Project had car parking located on Pentagon Field. This has now been removed from the Project. As such, there are no new car parks proposed on green space. Indeed, the Project removes car parking to create new green space (Car Park B).	Y
Vegetation	Comments that a minimum 10m tree line should be retained, and the remaining tree and vegetation cover be dense enough to reduce the visual and noise effects west of the River Mole at Longbridge Roundabout.	A triangular strip of woodland approximately 5m to 20m wide would be retained west of the River Mole and east of the Longbridge Roundabout. Mature trees and woodland vegetation within this area and further existing trees and woodland east of the River Mole would combine to screen or filter views of the road and traffic from residential properties on the edge of Horley. A strip of replacement native woodland and scrub would be established east of the Longbridge Roundabout to largely reinstate vegetation removed to construct the Project. In the long term, when planting has established, the level of visibility of the road and traffic would be similar to the existing situation. Visual effects on residential receptors in Horley are assessed throughout section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).	Y
	Concerns raised about permanent vegetation removal along London Road (and encroaching on Riverside Garden Park) due to the highway improvements. Also, that the new access ramp would encroach into public open space.	The removal of a strip of vegetation on the edge of the A23 eastbound carriageway and Riverside Garden Park to accommodate a widened footway, safety barrier and earthworks would enable more open views of the surface access improvements on the A23. Filtered views through trees and shrubs would continue to be gained by receptors in most locations within the park. Views from the informal path which lies parallel to the A23 would be opened up due to vegetation removal, enabling relatively open, near views of the footpath ramp extending into the park and the A23 improvements. Initially before mitigation planting has matured, depending on the location of receptors within the park and proximity to the A23 effects would range from negligible to major	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>adverse, which would be significant in places. In time when new planting has established and matured visual effects would reduce to neutral to moderate adverse, which is not significant.</p> <p>Visual effects on receptors in Riverside Garden Park and Horley are assessed throughout section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	
	Comments suggesting considerable planting of semi-mature trees as works to the A23 London Road will reduce the amount of mature tree screening.	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). Detailed landscape proposals will be agreed in consultation with the relevant authorities should the DCO be granted.	N
Photos and viewpoints	Comments that winter photos are needed to fully understand the visual impact of the proposals.	Winter photography has been undertaken for all viewpoint locations within Chapter 8 of the ES and has formed the basis for the preparation of photomontages. The winter photography is contained in ES Figures 8.4.5 to 8.4.37 (Doc Ref. 5.2).	N
	Comments that photomontages should be produced for key representative viewpoints for the construction phase as well as for operations.	Photomontages have been prepared for all representative viewpoints within ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) of the ES. The images include mass model representations of key permanent elements of the Project and the temporary elements of the five contractors' construction compounds.	Y
	Queries raised about the Highway Design Change 2 – South Terminal Roundabout and whether existing publicly accessible viewpoints around	There are no residential properties located in close proximity to the South Terminal Roundabout. The closest property is at number 275 Balcombe Road which lies approximately 70m north of the M23 spur and approximately 260m north-east of the centre of the South Terminal Roundabout. Visual effects on	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Balcombe Road suitably cover the likely change in views for residential properties.	<p>occupiers of this property are assessed throughout section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8. The visual effects on residents are considered to be minor adverse throughout the construction and operational periods of the Project, which is not significant. Due to garden vegetation oblique views of the flyover would not be possible.</p> <p>Viewpoint 8 is located on public right of way 362a east of Horley and is orientated towards South Terminal Roundabout. Removal of the highway planting would enable open views of the South Terminal roundabout and flyover visible at a higher level, including views of moving traffic using the flyover. Lighting would be visible in place of existing columns on the A23 and against the backdrop of lighting at the airport. Initially walkers would experience a moderate adverse effect which would not be significant. When new planting matures effects would range from moderate to minor adverse, depending on the season and foliage cover.</p>	
	Comments suggesting that Candidate Viewpoints 1a and 1b, located on PRowS FP368 & 381 should be assessed in full within the LVIA and photomontages.	Candidate viewpoints in these locations north of the M23 Spur were included for consideration within the LTVIA of the Summer 2022 Consultation. These changes in this location were not taken forward to the ES stage, therefore viewpoints 1a and 1b were not considered to be required for the LTVIA. Candidate viewpoint photography not taken through the ES process has been included in ES Appendix 8.6.2 (Doc Ref. 5.2).	N
	Requests for further information about updated Zones of Theoretical Visibility.	The PEIR (Autumn 2021 Consultation) established a 5km radius study area for the LTVIA based on the results of the ZTV and field surveys undertaken. Following feedback received during the 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.	Y

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<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 Airport in the existing view and the likely barely perceptible change in view as a 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>	
CARE facility	Comments that the CARE building and biomass boiler flue would likely form a discordant feature in the landscape.	<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>The Design and Access Statement (ES Doc Ref 7.3) has been prepared to provide design quality control without being too restrictive for future design stages development. The DAS includes design principles which development that is subject to further approvals will need to comply with. The principles have been generated based on policy, legislation and guidance.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the High Weald AONB should be involved in the work to assess and mitigate the impacts of the proposals.	<p>The LTVIA in 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. This forms the basis for the LTVIA. The ZTV shows almost no overlap with the landscape of the High Weald in the AONB (ES Figures 8.4.1 and 8.4.2 (Doc Ref. 5.2)), indicating a very low potential for adverse influence over landscape character as a result of the Project.</p> <p>No significant impacts have been identified within the ES for the High Weald AONB or views from it as a result of the Project and no significant effects on the perception of tranquillity within the AONB as a result of an increase in overflying aircraft.</p> <p>Consultation and engagement with High Weald AONB in 2021 included general approach to LTVIA, methodology, tranquillity assessment and potential for mitigation/compensation.</p>	N
Use of excavated spoil	Comments that excavated materials should be used for bunding to reduce the need for removing excavated material from site.	The excavated material will be reused wherever practicable to reduce the need for removing of the excavated material from site. The details are given in Construction Materials Management Plan.	N
	Comments suggesting excavated material could be used to and assist with ground noise mitigation and provide visual screening of the airfield.	The environmental mitigation area at land east of Museum Field includes a flood compensation area linked to the River Mole. Excavated spoil will be used to create a 6m high earth bund. Scrub planting and grassland mixes would be established to benefit biodiversity and provide an attractive area of new publicly accessible green space.	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for further details about where spoil (not used for landscaping) is to be placed.	The excavated material will be reused within the project where practical and the excess material will be placed in Pentagon Field and send to registered disposal areas for reuse somewhere else. Further information on where excavated material will be placed is given in Construction Materials Management Plan.	N
Heritage	Comments that there is potential for less than substantial harm to the significance of one grade II* listed building (the Charlwood Park Farmhouse) and a small number of grade II listed buildings on the periphery of the airport.	The assessment of impacts on above ground heritage assets 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
	Comments that there is potential for far-reaching impacts to the setting of heritage assets as a result of changes in the noise profile and disturbance from expanded airport operations.	The assessment of impacts on above ground heritage assets as a result of changes within their setting is presented within Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1) 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.	N
	Comments that there is potential for harm to the significance of a scheduled monument (Thunderfield Castle mediaeval moated site) by changes to the local road network in its close settings.	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

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that there is the possibility of direct or indirect impacts to currently unidentified built heritage assets.	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.	N
	Comments that the introduction of a flyover may result in more visual and aural intrusion into the setting of nearby heritage assets than would be the case with the earlier proposals, but it is likely to remain less than substantial harm.	Noted.	N
	Comments that some aspects of the updated scheme (i.e. the M23 Spur, Airport Way, and North Terminal Roundabout, A23 London Road) are unlikely to result in more harm than the previous scheme proposals.	Noted.	N
	Comments that there is potential for harm to the setting of the Church Road, Horley Conservation Area from the proposed widening of the A23 bridge over the river Mole, but this was unlikely to be significant.	Noted.	N
Archaeology	Comments that there is potential for less than substantial harm to a number of undesignated archaeological heritage	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.	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	assets in areas to the east of the existing airport.		
	Comments that the proposed additional land take for the A23 Brighton Road proposals may have the potential for impacts on as-yet unidentified archaeology.	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
	Comment suggesting that an archaeological review of the new proposed land-take is needed, as well as an assessment of the impact of the proposed noise barriers.	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). The assessment of impacts on above ground heritage assets as a result of changes within their setting is presented within Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1). This includes impacts arising from the proposed noise barriers required for highways improvements.	N
Continuing discussions	Comments that discussions with Historic England on how best to understand the potential impacts on heritage assets and what mitigation might be appropriate would be welcomed.	Noted – there has been a full programme of dialogue with Historic England regarding likely impacts and potential mitigation, which is detailed in the ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Noise barriers	Comments supporting measures that are considered sensible, such as adding noise barriers on the side of A23.	Appendix 14.9.4 of the ES provides the results of detailed modelling of road traffic noise mitigation including the noise barrier options considered in consultation with highways and local planning authorities in summer 2022. The Project includes noise mitigation as follows: Alignment changes through optioneering of the road scheme design moving some traffic away from the Park and residential area. The new right turn onto the A23 from the North	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Terminal Roundabout removes the current need for traffic wishing to turn right instead having to turn left up to the Longbridge roundabout, around it, and back down the A23, thus reducing traffic flows on this section of the A23. 1 metre noise barrier along the North Terminal roundabout flyover elevated section (facing Riverside Garden Park). 1 metre noise barrier along the South Terminal roundabout flyover elevated section, north side. A speed reduction from 50 to 40mph. With these measures in place a further noise barrier adjacent to the Park Is not required.	
	Requests for more noise mitigation (barriers) along the M23 Spur boundary adjacent to Dovenby Hall, at dwellings closest to the A23, and at Longbridge Roundabout.	Road traffic noise barriers are not required here to avoid traffic noise impacts.	N
PRoW and footpaths	Concerns raised about the adverse impact on PRoW 367 as well as the long-term impact on the landscape and recreational use.	PRoW 367 forms a continuation of PRoW 368 as part of the Sussex Border Path north of the M23 Spur. This location is represented by viewpoint 25 in ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1). Existing highway planting would be removed during construction activities and replaced with native tree and shrub planting. The existing mature hedgerow and mature oak trees would be retained. Effects on walkers using this path are considered to be minor adverse. East of Balcombe Road the M23 Spur bridge structure over Balcombe Road would be widened to the south, wing walls would be extended, and a retaining wall constructed at the toe of the embankment to the north. Vegetation within the M23 Spur and Balcombe Road corridors would be removed and largely reinstated with similar native planting mixes, whilst the hedgerow and mature oak trees would be retained. Visual impacts have been identified on occupiers of residential and commercial properties, occupiers of vehicles and pedestrians using footways on Balcombe Road and walkers using public rights of way in section 8.9 of the ES. Whilst effects would be adverse in	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		nature, none of the effects are considered to be significant adverse. Landscape planting proposals would, in time, reduce effects as the road corridor is returned to a similar character to the existing situation.	
Light	Concerns raised about light pollution from vehicle headlights	Night time effects on visual receptors as a result of the surface access improvements are considered within section 8.9 of the ES. Removal of highway vegetation during the construction period would reveal more open views of the road, traffic and headlights at night. The change in the night time view compared to the existing situation would generally result in minor adverse effects for walkers, occupiers of residential and commercial properties and occupiers of vehicles, which is not significant. In time, when new tree and shrub planting has matured, night time views of traffic would be similar to the existing situation.	N

j. Ecology and nature conservation

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments that it is unclear where the impacts on ecology would be located or what the type and severity of habitat impacts would be.	Details of impacts to habitats are set out in Section 9.9 of Chapter 9 of the ES. These are visualised in Figures 2.1-2.6 of ES Appendix 9.9.2 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3) showing habitat loss/gain through the various phases of the development.	N
	Comments that the proposals include a considerable loss of vegetation within the highway boundary and other habitat changes but that the consultation concluded there were no new or materially different significant effects.	These losses of habitat (primarily woodland) had already been identified as a significant adverse effect in the PEIR. As such, the proposed changes would not alter the significance of the effect.	N
	Concerns raised over the loss of green areas and recreational spaces, such as Riverside Garden Park.	<p>The effects of the Project on areas of public open space are assessed in Chapter 19 of the ES – Agriculture and Recreation. The areas of public open space permanently affected include approximately 1.03ha 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.</p> <p>The following areas of replacement open space would be created as part of the Project close to the areas permanently 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 	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>connected to Riverside Garden Park by the provision of a new pedestrian walkway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
	Comments suggesting improvements to connectivity are needed, along with enhanced habitats within and near to the project boundary.	The Project includes habitat creation that is designed to improve overall connectivity across the GAL estate. The principles underpinning this are set out in the Ecology Strategy located in the LEMP.	N
	Comments welcoming the removal of proposed parking adjacent to Lower Picketts Wood.	Noted.	N
	Comments supporting changes to the highway design to increase natural light into water courses.	Noted.	N
	Comments that the removal or reduction in the size of the Flood Compensation Areas would affect the overall ecological benefits.	The removal of the FCA from east of the Gatwick Stream means that the overall area of temporary habitat loss is reduced. Works in this area had the potential to affect a variety of species (including great crested newts and reptiles) that will not now be impacted. As such, this area can continue to be managed by the Gatwick Greenspace Partnership for biodiversity benefit.	N
	Comments that tree felling must be minimised and is not always necessary to accommodate highway works.	All vegetation planted as part of the original A23 London Road scheme would be removed to accommodate the construction activities for the surface access improvements. Some trees within adjacent areas (Longbridge Roundabout,	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Riverside Garden Park, Balcombe Road, Gatwick Airport) would also need to be removed to accommodate either infrastructure and earthworks associated with the improvements or the temporary construction activities. Where high quality trees lie near the edge of the construction activity area, every effort will be made to retain trees and appropriate protective barriers would be erected and best practice arboricultural methods adopted. A tree retention/loss drawing is included in the Outline LEMP at ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
	Comments that replacement planting for the loss of the mature trees would still lead to a loss of biodiversity, carbon sequestration, natural screening and amenity.	<p>The loss of mature woodland and long period necessary for it to re-establish is acknowledged within Chapter 9 of the ES with the adverse impact predicted to be of long-term duration.</p> <p>The removal of a strip of vegetation on the edge of the A23 eastbound carriageway and Riverside Garden Park to accommodate a widened footway, safety barrier and earthworks would enable more open views of the surface access improvements on the A23. Filtered views through trees and shrubs would continue to be gained by receptors in most locations within the park. Views from the informal path which lies parallel to the A23 would be opened up due to vegetation removal, enabling relatively open, near views of the footpath ramp extending into the park and the A23 improvements. Initially before mitigation planting has matured, depending on the location of receptors within the park and proximity to the A23 effects would range from negligible to major adverse, which would be significant in places. In time when new planting has established and matured visual effects would reduce to neutral to moderate adverse, which is not significant.</p> <p>Visual effects on receptors in Riverside Garden Park and Horley are assessed throughout section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that Buckland was within the AONB and the pollution effects were of concern for wildlife and the environment.	The Project includes a variety of control measures to ensure that pollution is prevented, as set out in the CoCP.	N
	Comment suggesting the bridge widening over the river Mole and highway widening along Woodroyd Avenue could disrupt local ecological networks.	The works in these locations includes the removal of areas of vegetation that will have a short-term impact on connectivity. However, the Project has sought to retain as much vegetation as possible to ensure that the effects of these works are minimised. Opportunities to further retain vegetation will be sought during detailed design.	N
	Comments that Balcombe Bridge widening would result in a significant loss of hedgerow and vegetation.	The M23 Spur bridge structure over Balcombe Road would be widened to the south, wing walls would be extended, and a retaining wall constructed at the toe of the embankment to the north. Vegetation within the M23 Spur and Balcombe Road corridors would be removed and largely reinstated with similar native planting mixes. The hedgerow with mature oak trees which lies north of the Sussex Border Path, north of the M23 Spur would be retained. This landscape feature would continue to provide an important element in the local landscape and an effective screen to heavily filter or totally screen views of the M23 Spur and traffic in views gained by receptors in the landscape to the north. Overall, the Balcombe Road bridge would be larger with a greater number of engineered features, compared to the existing situation. Whilst adverse effects on landscape character and visual receptors have been identified, none of these are considered to be significant.	N
	Comments that there would be a significant reduction in ecological value of the Riverside area and loss of amenity and natural screening to residents.	Although there would be vegetation removal along the edge of Riverside Garden Park, this would only constitute a very small area of the overall ecological resource within the Park. As such, any impacts to the Park are considered to be of no more than minor adverse which is not significant.	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>The removal of a strip of vegetation on the edge of the A23 eastbound carriageway and Riverside Garden Park to accommodate a widened footway, footpath ramp, safety barrier and earthworks would enable occupiers of one residential property to gain more open views of the surface access improvements on the A23. Initially before mitigation planting has matured, effects would be major adverse, which would be significant. In time when new planting has established and matured visual effects would reduce to minor adverse, which is not significant.</p> <p>Visual effects on receptors in Riverside Garden Park and Horley are assessed throughout section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	
	<p>Concerns raised about the loss of mature vegetation between the A23 London Road and Riverside Garden Park due to the highway improvement changes.</p>	<p>The removal of a strip of vegetation on the edge of the A23 eastbound carriageway at the interface with Riverside Garden Park would be required to accommodate a widened footway and ramp, safety barrier and earthworks as part of the surface access improvements. A narrow strip of native woodland edge planting would be established on the edge of the park and some intermittent scrub planting to integrate the road corridor with the park in the long term. Minor adverse effects are predicted on this townscape character area, which is not significant.</p> <p>Effects on the Horley Townscape Character Area at Riverside Garden Park are assessed throughout section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>	N
	<p>Comments that the revised highway proposals do not appear to be</p>	<p>Full details of the ecology surveys and impact assessment that has been completed to support the Project are provided in Chapter 9 of the ES.</p>	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	accompanied by any ecological information.		
	Comments supporting the enhanced natural habitat on Museum Field as part of River Mole flood alleviation plans.	Noted.	N
	Comments supporting the proposed change to create further natural green space on land south of Church Meadows.	Noted.	N
	Comments that the temporary contractors' compound could impact the southern pond, including by damaging trees and established vegetation as well as the contours of the Conservation Area landscape.	The proposed attenuation feature north of Longbridge Roundabout would be constructed after the contractor's compound has been removed, therefore there is no conflict. The existing trees and hedgerow north of the roundabout would be removed to accommodate the surface access improvements. New native trees, shrubs, grassland and wetland habitats would be established to create a new/replacement area of public open space linked to Church Meadows via a new footbridge over the River Mole. Small areas of land within the Church Road Conservation Area would require minor remodelling to accommodate the footbridge and widened Brighton Road bridge. Contours would be returned to similar levels to the existing situation.	N
Pentagon Field	Concerns raised about the likelihood of significant damage to ecology and landscaping around Pentagon Field and the treatment works with no mitigation proposed for nearby residents.	Existing hedgerows, trees and woodland around the edges of Pentagon Field would be retained within the Project. The deposition of spoil over a large part of the field would require the removal of two oak trees, one of which is dying/dead, the other is mature and in good condition. The pasture field would be reinstated resulting in minimal change to the character of the land and no impact on the visual amenity of nearby residents. (See Viewpoint 9 and photomontages at ES	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>Figures 8.9.33 and 8.9.36 and Viewpoint 10 and photomontages at ES Figures 8.9.37 to 8.9.40 (Doc Ref. 5.2)).</p> <p>The new wastewater treatment works would not be located near to residential properties. Removal of some native trees and shrubs would be required to accommodate the development. Effects on the visual amenity of walkers using PRow 360/1Sy Tinsley Green and effects on landscape character are assessed throughout section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1). No significant effects have been identified as a result of the treatment works.</p>	
Mitigation	<p>Comments suggesting consideration of nature-based enhancements to the Gatwick Stream and Museum Field as well as provision of a long-term enhancement plan for the river Mole.</p>	<p>Both the Gatwick Stream and River Mole are included within the existing GAL biodiversity management strategies. The Ecology Strategy for the NRP seeks to build on this through the strengthening of the corridors associated with these areas. Both features are integral to the overall Decade of Change biodiversity goals.</p>	N
	<p>Comments that archaeology needed to be considered when designing ecological mitigation.</p>	<p>The nature, extent and date of buried archaeological remains within the Project site boundary have been defined through a series of desk and field-based studies agreed with the relevant stakeholders. The ecology mitigation and associated habitat creation has accounted for any archaeology constraints identified to date.</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 County Landscape Character Assessments and 8.6.2 Additional Candidate Viewpoint Photography (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N
	<p>Comments suggesting proposals should include a commitment to significant re-planting and construction of a natural</p>	<p>The removal of a strip of vegetation on the edge of the A23 eastbound carriageway at the interface with Riverside Garden Park would be required to accommodate a widened footway and ramp, safety barrier and earthworks as</p>	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	bund along the A23 London Road (which could serve as noise mitigation and ecological enhancement).	<p>part of the surface access improvements. A narrow strip of native woodland edge planting would be established on the edge of the park and some intermittent scrub planting to integrate the road corridor with the park in the long term. No earth bund has been proposed due to the further encroachment into the park and vegetation removal that this would lead to. Minor adverse effects are predicted on this townscape character area, which is not significant.</p> <p>Effects on the Horley Townscape Character Area at Riverside Garden Park are assessed throughout section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 8.1).</p>	
Biodiversity	Comments suggesting the loss of mature trees with no replacement planting and does not demonstrate a 10% net increase in biodiversity.	<p>Details of replacement planting along the highway are provided within the LEMP. The planting plan has been developed to replace as much of the woodland habitat lost as possible.</p> <p>BNG for the project is described in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1) and ES Appendix 9.9.2 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3). 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 that the DCO application includes a high-quality approach to mitigating ecological effects and enhancing biodiversity, whilst meeting all legal and policy requirements.</p>	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that failure to commit to a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain was contrary to a Decade of Change goal.	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 that the DCO application includes a high-quality approach to mitigating ecological effects and enhancing biodiversity, whilst meeting all legal and policy requirements. The NRP would fit into and contribute to achieving GAL's Decade of Change goal.	N
	Requests for more information about the new areas of habitat creation and Biodiversity Net Gain.	Details of the new habitat are provided in the LEMP. This includes information with respect to habitat creation, management and monitoring. Details with respect to the provision of BNG are provided in ES Appendix 9.9.2 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
Documents	Comments that Table 3.1.2 Analysis of Significant Effects was confusing and contradictory.	The Highway Improvement Changes and Project Update consultation document was prepared in September 2022. Appendix 4 of the updated PEI includes 10 tables for individual environmental elements. Table 3.1.2. provides an analysis of likely significant effects on landscape, townscape and visual resources compared to the PEIR. The table focuses on a number of design changes to the highway design and grades them from Good to Unworkable. The table is divided into the seven component parts of the surface access scheme. The table identifies any new or materially different significant effects as a result of the highway changes, the change in design, baseline condition update, new significant effects or materially different significant effects in assessment years 2029, 2032 and 2038 and any further mitigation planned. The table forms part	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		of the environmental element of a clear and transparent assessment process to inform consultees and stakeholders.	
Further information	Requests for more detail about the potential impacts on Horleyland Wood as a result of the Project changes, including in relation to the proposed on-site water management.	As set out in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation (Doc Ref. 5.1), no works are proposed near to Horleyland Wood that could impact the wood, including with respect to changes in on-site water management. As such, the ES concludes no change with respect to the significance of effects.	N
	Requests for more details about the heights of the noise barriers and their impact on tree loss.	Noise barriers along the edge of the A23 London Road and Riverside Garden Park no longer form part of the Project.	N
Livestock	Concerns raised about the impact of the proposals on livestock.	Livestock are not considered as an ecological receptor within the ES.	N
Animal habitats	Concerns raised about the loss of animal habitat and impacts on local wildlife, including for specific species such as buzzards.	The impact on fauna is considered within Chapter 9 of the ES. The Project will ensure the delivery of substantial new areas of habitat that will benefit buzzards, including the meadow grassland within the Brook Farm area. This will improve the area of habitat for small mammals that in turn will create additional foraging habitat for buzzards.	N

k. Land and recreation

Theme: Land and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Impacts	Concerns raised about the impacts of noise on the tranquillity of the South Downs National Park (SDNP).	ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes an assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity within the SDNP based on four representative locations. 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. The effects are considered to be minor adverse, which is not significant.	N
	Comments that the impact of highway works on some residential properties could be life changing. Requests for more detail about the proposed mitigation for this.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers how the Project's highway improvements and changes to traffic flows and volumes are likely to influence health at a population level. The assessment is informed by the ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1) assessment, which provides supporting data and analysis for individual receptors.	N
	Requests for more clarity about whether the A23 works would require more land from Riverside Garden Park.	<p>The effects of the Project on areas of public 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 Meadow 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 close to the areas permanently 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 	N

Theme: Land and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>connected to Riverside Garden Park by the provision of a new pedestrian walkway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
Land management	Questions raised about whether members of the public would be able to access the wider area of flood storage compensation.	There would be access available to approximately 17 ha 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 and access would be available from the western bank of the River Mole into this area.	N
	Queries about which bodies would be responsible for managing the flood storage areas land.	The land on which the floodplain compensation areas would be constructed would remain within the ownership of GAL.	N
Footpaths and cycle lanes	Comments that users of the Sussex Border footpath would incur a temporary 500m detour, but it is unclear how long this will last. Suggestions for these proposals to be revisited.	The Outline Public Rights of Way Management Strategy at Appendix 19.8.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3) identifies the approximate anticipated durations of temporary closures and diversions of PRoW associated with particular construction activities during the construction period.	N
	Comments that the temporary closure of National Cycle Way 21 would have a significant effect and appropriate mitigation is required.	The temporary effects on NCR21 are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use, and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1). The effect of the construction on this section of the NCR21 is assessed to be of temporary short term Moderate Adverse significance which is significant in EIA terms. Measures to manage the temporary effects on NCR 21 during construction are provided in the Public Rights of Way Management Strategy at ES Appendix 19.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

Theme: Land and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Questions raised about when the Public Rights of Way Strategy would be available.	The Outline Public Rights of Way Management Strategy is provided as Appendix 19.8.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3) to ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use, and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N

I. Health and wellbeing

Theme: Health and wellbeing			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Noise	Concerns raised about the impacts of increased noise on the quality of life for residents.	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers how the Project's noise effects are likely to influence population health. Significant changes in population health outcomes are not expected. The assessment is informed by the noise assessment in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1), which provides supporting data and analysis for individual receptors. The health conclusion takes into account the mitigation set out in the ES noise assessment, including the Noise Insulation Scheme in ES Appendix 14.9.10 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
Local health services	Comments that the extent of issues with access to health services for Crawley-based airport employees should be explored.	There has been constructive engagement with West Sussex Integrated Care Board on this issue to progress the suggested collaboration. This is discussed in ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) in the section on changes to local healthcare capacity.	N
Noise	Concerns raised over the impact of noise on mental health.	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 ES Chapter 18 considers how the Project's noise effects are likely to influence population health, including mental health outcomes. Significant changes in population health outcomes are not expected. The health conclusion takes into account the mitigation set out in the noise assessment in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1), including the Noise Insulation Scheme in ES Appendix 14.9.10 (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N

m. Major accidents and disasters

Theme: Major accidents and disasters			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Emergency runway	Concerns raised that there would be no emergency runway during the construction process.	The airport will at all times operate in compliance with the rules and regulations of the CAA to ensure its safe operation. Many airports operate with just a single runway.	N
CARE Facility	Comments that fire protection measures are required for the CARE Facility.	The CARE facility will be designed to meet all relevant fire safety and building control standards.	N
Safety	Concerns raised that expansion of the airport will increase the risk of accidents and loss of life. Also, that the airport will not be able to manage the proposed increase in air traffic safely.	These issues are dealt with in detail in the MAAD Appendix.	Y
	Comments that use of the emergency runway at Gatwick for routine operations could be dangerous.	The airport will at all times operate in compliance with the rules and regulations of the CAA to ensure its safe operation. The CAA will be providing a letter of No Obvious Impediment.	N

n. Law and order

Theme: Law and order			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting that two runways would not be compliant with the Environment Act regarding BNG, air quality, carbon and climate change.	Legislation that is relevant to the Project proposals and the assessment approach is considered within the relevant aspect of the DCO Application material. Each ES Chapter contains a 'Legislation and Policy' section setting out the key legislation relevant to the specific environmental topic.	N
	Comments that there is an on-going need to investigate planning breaches where unauthorised off-airport parking is in operation.	<p>The number of proposed parking spaces was reduced since the statutory consultation in Autumn 2021 in response to comments received. In particular, the Project does not include a specific allowance to relocate unauthorised off-airport parking within the airport. Instead, the number of additional parking spaces proposed is limited to reflect the modelled effects of the enhanced non-car mode share commitments.</p> <p>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.</p>	Y

o. Hazards

Theme: Hazards			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
General	Comments that the Project is within the consultation zones of two Major Accidents Sites, however the Health and Safety Executive would not advise against the plans.	Consideration has been given to the potential extent and nature of impacts arising from these sites, and a high-level risk assessment has been prepared as part of the PEIR (see Appendix 5.3.4: Major Accidents and Disasters, in Table 5.1.1: Safety and Environmental Risk Assessment). The assessment has not identified any new or intolerable risks.	N
	Comments that a Hazardous Substances Consent would probably be required.	The list of other consents and licences required to construct and operate the Project, outside of the DCO and Section 106 Agreement, are reported in the List of Other Consents and Licences (Doc Ref. 7.5).	N
	Comments noting that there are no explosives in the vicinity.	Noted.	N

p. Existing infrastructure

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments suggesting that all reasonable measures should be taken to ensure existing railway and utility infrastructure is properly protected prior to implementation of DCO works.	Measures to protect the existing railway and utility infrastructure will be agreed and implemented with the appropriate owners.	N
	Comments that relocation of existing apparatus should be at the sole cost of Gatwick Airport.	Discussions are underway with infrastructure owners and providers the agree the apportionment of costs between infrastructure owners and GAL.	N
	Comments that some water infrastructure assets appear to be unmapped or incorrectly located.	Liaison has been undertaken with Thames Water to confirm the location of their assets that could be affected by the Project. If there are infrastructure assets that are unmapped and incorrectly located, these will be corrected during the preliminary and detailed design stage.	N
	Comments that further assessments will be needed to determine the most appropriate sewage strategy.	ES Chapter 11: Water Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1) includes an assessment of the impacts to Gatwick wastewater network and concludes there would be no environmentally significant effect. Gatwick awaits Thames Water's assessment of the impact on their wider network. To date, no concerns have been raised by Thames Water on the impact to their infrastructure.	N
Existing infrastructure	Comments that the airport's existing infrastructure cannot cope with the impact of the proposals.	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	N

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		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.	
	Comments that the passenger experience might decrease as a result of the expansion, for example wait times/delays etc.	Capacity assessments that underpin our development proposals have been based on maintaining all current service standards such as queue times at security for >95% of the time, 95% pier service for embarkation/disembarkation.	N

q. Construction

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Traffic	Comments that the impact of construction on the SRN would need to be shown to be manageable. Also, that plans must provide methodology, phasing and overall approach (including microsimulation modelling).	<p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) includes scenarios that cover the periods of airfield and highway construction, using the strategic transport models, and therefore includes the impact of these construction activities on the SRN. This information has been shared with National Highways, the local highway authorities and other stakeholders.</p> <p>The indicative methodology for the surface access improvements works is detailed in ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report Part B (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	N
	Requests for further information on the re-routing of traffic during bridge and road alterations.	The indicative methodology for the surface access improvements works is detailed in ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report Part B (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments that the temporary construction access route along Woodroyd Avenue is unsuitable and will be disruptive to residents.	<p>We understand the concerns of the residents regarding the potential impact of the construction vehicles on the access to the garages. We are committed to minimising this impact and to ensure that access remains open for the residents using the garages. The site attendance will manage the access to the garages at all times. We do not anticipate a significant number of construction vehicles, and we will work with the car park owners to arrange the access time in a way that minimises disruption to their daily routines.</p> <p>Further detail on construction measures is contained in the suite of ES Appendices 5.3.2 including the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan and Code of Construction Practice, both contained in Doc Ref 5.3.</p>	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the Method of Construction Statement should extend outside the airport perimeter to ensure any vehicles related to construction are encouraged not to use country lanes.	ES Appendix 5.3.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) identifies the construction vehicle routes, including those outside the airport boundary. It minimises the use of country lanes.	N
Construction phasing	Comments supporting a Construction Phasing Plan, which should be provided as part of the DCO.	Noted. The construction phasing is set out in ES Appendix 5.3.3 Indicative Construction Sequencing (Doc Ref. 5.3) and also illustrated through a series of drawings in the Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3).	N
Construction strategy	Comments that a Construction Strategy considering construction traffic, noise and dust emissions is required.	Noted. The construction details are contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice and ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Reports Parts A and B (Doc Ref. 5.3). The CoCP is driven by the ES assessment which included consideration of the Project's construction traffic, noise and dust emissions.	N
Construction Travel Plan	Requests for a review of the Construction Travel Plan prior to DCO submission.	Active travel infrastructure was discussed in a Topic Working Group meeting in June 2022. The Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan is contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2 .	N
	Comments that the Construction Travel Plan should reflect Gatwick's previous approach to construction and include truck movements.	Noted. The Project's approach to construction traffic is contained in the ES Appendix 5.3.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3); and the approach to the movement of construction workers is contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2 comprising the Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan .	N

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Rail freight	Comments that a rail freight head should be established in the sidings to the south of Gatwick station to allow delivery of construction materials and removal of spoil.	This has been considered but is not considered practical. The Project does not propose to construct a rail head for the delivery of construction materials and removal of spoil.	N
Employment	Comments welcoming the more detailed analysis of construction employment given the number of large construction projects in the South East.	Noted.	N
Outstanding requests	Comments that additional information requested in response to the Autumn 21 Consultation by National Highways has yet to be provided.	GAL has continued to engage with National Highways and the local highway authorities since the Summer 2022 consultation. GAL has shared the outcomes of its modelling with these stakeholders, together with other information (including design-related information) as it has become available.	Y

r. Approach to EIA

Theme: Approach to EIA			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting that the Applicant should undertake a full and detailed environmental impact assessment as soon as possible and share it with relevant stakeholders before the DCO submission.	A detailed Environmental Statement is being prepared to support the DCO submission. This is being developed in the light of stakeholder comments, including those made through the Technical Working Group process.	N

s. Mitigation

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Land use	Comments suggesting that the existing car park land offered in mitigation for the loss of land at Riverside Garden Park is not of comparable quality or in a suitable location.	<p>An area of approximately 1.03ha of Riverside Garden Park would be permanently affected by the Project. An area of approximately 1.47ha 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.</p> <p>The area to be provided comprises two parcels of land that are located closest to the eastern edge of the existing Riverside Garden Park. The area of replacement open space would be in excess of the area that is permanently lost. The provision of the new pedestrian link provides a continuity of connection between the existing and replacement area of public open space. It would also provide a direct link from the new footway link across the replacement open space to the Sussex Border Path that runs north/south along the western edge of the London to Brighton railway line in this location.</p>	N
	Comments that mitigation design needs to bring together ecological, landscape and recreation mitigation.	<p>The mitigation design includes a range of interlinked measures. Key elements of the mitigation package 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: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preparation of a Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) 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. 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>	
Traffic	Comments supporting the Construction Traffic Management Plan and measures to reduce through traffic in sensitive locations and along the A22.	<p>Our construction methodology and outline construction traffic management plan aim to minimise the impact of construction traffic in sensitive locations and along the A23.</p> <p>We will also work closely with the local authorities to implement temporary traffic management measures, such as lane closures and diversions, as required.</p>	N
	Requests for further information about the increase of impermeable area associated with the proposed third lane on Airport Way and how it would be mitigated.	Airport Way drains to both the Gatwick Stream and the River Mole. There is a net increase of 1.10 Ha to the Gatwick Stream and 1.55 Ha to the River Mole as a result of the Project. These increases are mitigated through the provision of SuDS and other storage measures to attenuate runoff to ensure no increase in flood risk on receiving watercourses.	N
Engagement	Request that sufficient time needs to be allowed for effective engagement with key stakeholders as mitigation	The timescales for the Examination process are set by the Planning Inspectorate, GAL is working with stakeholders in advance of the Examination as part of the ongoing engagement with stakeholders.	Y

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	measures and development are finalised.		
Noise	Comments that the Applicant should provide a grant scheme for double/triple glazing for local residents.	The proposed noise insulation scheme provides this.	N
	Comments suggesting the Project should consider a cap on the number of flights including at night.	GAL has considered carefully how to control the environmental effects arising from the project including air noise. A cap on total annual air traffic movements has been included as part of a range of proposed control measures. As a regulated airport Gatwick is already subject to Government control of the number of flights allowed in the night quota period and the project does not propose an increase to the current limits. Government consults on this matter regularly and Gatwick will remain subject to whatever regime changes arise from this process.	Y

t. Airspace and overflights

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Flight paths	Comments that it is misleading to say there are no new flight paths as airspace modernisation is being designed based on a two-runway airport. Also, that the Project should be slowed to allow alignment with the FASI-South programme rather than being scoped out of it.	<p>The Northern Runway Project is not dependent upon changes to the London Terminal Manoeuvring Area (LTMA) airspace that may come as a result of the Government / Civil Aviation Authority co-sponsored airspace modernisation programme or Gatwick's complementary Future Airspace Strategy Implementation - South (FASI-S) airspace change project. The airspace modernisation programme is required to take account of forecast growth as is set out in the UK Airspace Change Masterplan Iteration 2.</p> <p>The timeline for the FASI-South programme is outside of Gatwick's control. Given the fundamental nature of this complex, multi-stakeholder programme it is not practical, or necessary, to align Gatwick's DCO process with the airspace modernisation programme.</p>	Y
	Comments that any new flight paths should be seen in the context of flight paths for Gatwick, Heathrow, Farnborough, Shoreham and Goodwood as well as low level military training flights.	The 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. (https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?PID=205)	Y
	Comments that consideration should be given to the interaction between the growth of the airport and airspace changes as well as the growth in activity at other airports across the South of England.	<p>This matter is beyond the scope of Gatwick's Northern Runway Project DCO.</p> <p>The Government / Civil Aviation Authority co-sponsored airspace modernisation programme sets out the requirement, as part of the UK Airspace Change Masterplan, to provide detail on design trade-offs between interdependent airspace change proposals and how they might be resolved; and to create a</p>	Y

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>methodology for calculating cumulative impacts, and cumulative assessment of interdependent airspace change proposal design choices.</p> <p>The Gatwick Future Airspace Strategy Implementation - South (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 well as through the process set out in the UK Airspace Change Masterplan.</p>	
	Requests for more information about how the Project will alter the use of flight paths, to ensure stakeholders, including members of the public, are fully aware of the impacts.	<p>The 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. (https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=205) The dual runway would be operated using existing, published airspace procedures. The assumed SID usage is provided in ES Appendix 14.9.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>	Y
	Current GPS-guided flight paths cause flights to follow the exact path every time, instead of allowing some flexibility for approach to the airport from either side of the flight path beacon. They comment that this leads to systematic disruption for specific residents and areas.	<p>The 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. (https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=205)</p> <p>Flight procedures that use the Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS) are in place already at Gatwick for many instrument flight procedures, but in particular for many of the airport's departure procedures. The dual runway would be operated using existing, published airspace procedures whether these be GNSS or of a conventional navigation design.</p>	Y
WIZAD	Comments that significantly greater use of WIZAD will be required to achieve the suggested hourly movement rates	In the future traffic forecast the use of the WIZAD (Route 9) Standard Instrument Departure (SID) is based on the current airspace route structure and operated in accordance with existing restrictions and requirements.	Y

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	with and without the use of the Emergency runway. Also, that this would potentially be required to be assessed against the CAP1616 process for airspace change and aligned with FASI-South.	<p>The forecast for the increased use of WIZAD over time is based on the assumption that the London Terminal Manoeuvring Area (LTMA) airspace becomes increasing congested, due to the growth of air traffic across all of the London airports. The WIZAD SID is a tactical routing allocated by air traffic control to alleviate airspace congestion and may be offered at a late stage of taxiing.</p> <p>The forecast also assumes that the LTMA airspace has not been modernised as a result of the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation - South (FASI-S) project which will re-design the LTMA to accommodate the future demand/growth of all London airports.</p> <p>Gatwick has already completed Northern Runway Project Airspace Change Proposal process (ACP-2019-81). This makes clear that no changes to SIDs or ATC procedures relating to SID utilisation are required as part of the Northern Runway Project. https://airspacechange.caa.co.uk/PublicProposalArea?pID=205</p>	
	Concerns raised about the increased use of the WIZAD SID1 due to increased overflight of Horsham District.	<p>In the future traffic forecast the use of the WIZAD (Route 9) Standard Instrument Departure (SID) is based on the current airspace route structure and operated in accordance with existing restrictions and requirements.</p> <p>A shift of 8% of westerly Gatwick departures onto the currently little used WIZAD (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 Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling (Doc Re. 5.3).</p> <p>The forecast for the increased use of WIZAD over time is based on the assumption that the London Terminal Manoeuvring Area (LTMA) airspace</p>	Y

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>becomes increasing congested, due to the growth of air traffic across all of the London airports. The WIZAD SID is a tactical routing allocated by air traffic control to alleviate airspace congestion and may be offered at a late stage of taxiing.</p> <p>The forecast also assumes that the LTMA airspace has not been modernised as a result of the Future Airspace Strategy Implementation - South (FASI-S) project which will re-design the LTMA to accommodate the future demand/growth of all London airports.</p>	
On the ground	Pilots should be trained to not run airplane engines excessively while on the ground, and that they should be penalised for breaching these requirements	<p>Gatwick has strict controls and enforced limits - through our Section 106 agreement - on the number of engine tests that can take place in a 6-month period; these restrictions are monitored and reported.</p> <p>Gatwick works with its air traffic control (ATC) provider to cut down the amount of time that aircraft wait to take off, or are taxiing, so that the engines aren't running for longer than necessary.</p> <p>Gatwick provides guidance to its airline partners to encourage the use of single or reduced engine taxi and holding to help reduce associated environmental impacts of fuel burn and noise.</p> <p>Gatwick provides fixed electrical ground power units (FEGPs) to remove the need to keep aircraft APUs running when on stand. There are targets for FEGP availability on stands which must be greater than 99%.</p> <p>GAL discourage pilots using reverse thrust (a way of slowing aircraft down once they have landed) on landing between 23:00 and 06:00, except in the interests of safety.</p>	Y

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Ground operations in the airport should be limited to sociable hours, and that flights should stop at 10:00 p.m. and not resume until the morning, to limit the impact of noise on local residents.	Whilst the use of the northern runway is expected to stop at 2300 and begin at 0600 (unless the main runway is out of use as per current practice) the Project is not expected to change the current airport operating hours.	N

u. Water and flood risk

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Water resources and management	Comments that the Project will place greater pressure on limited water resources in an area which is already subject to Natural England's Water Neutrality Policy.	Gatwick is supplied water by Sutton and East Surrey Water whose sources of water are outside the Southern Water Sussex North supply zone that is subject to Natural England's water neutrality policy. Ongoing consultation with SESW has not indicated any impediments to their ability to meet the Project's water demand.	N
	Concern about the water management proposals as reducing flood protection measures would increase the risk of significant flooding in the local area.	The fluvial flood risk mitigation measures for the Project were reduced in scale as a result of an update of the Environment Agency's guidance on the consideration of climate change for flood risk assessments in July 2021. As a result, the previously proposed Gatwick Stream floodplain compensation area could be removed. This updated guidance followed by the Project reflects the current Environment Agency guidance, which is based on UKCP18. The Project does not increase flood risk to other parties.	N
Water treatment plant	Comments that the proposed additional water treatment plant provides an opportunity to improve the quality of water being discharged into the Gatwick Stream and River Mole.	The proposed water treatment plant has been sized to mitigate the impacts of the Project and ensure it does not have a deleterious impact on the water quality of receiving watercourses due to potential increased de-icer use.	N
	Requests for further details about de-icer and contaminated runoff at Rolls Farm due to the proposed treatment works.	The new treatment works would be designed to receive flows from the long-term storage lagoons that contain runoff contaminated with de-icer. It would treat a flow of up to 100l/s and discharge the unpolluted runoff to the Gatwick Stream.	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for more information on the new treatment works and the Water Management Plan.	<p>The design of the treatment works is at a preliminary stage commensurate with a planning application. Further details will become available through the detailed design process and would be subject to post-DCO consenting requirements of the relevant party.</p> <p>The management of water resources during construction is set out in ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 1: Water Management Plan (Doc Ref 5.3).</p>	N
	Comments suggesting all water run-off from the airport should be sent through a water treatment plant.	Gatwick Airport complies with existing discharge permits set by the Environment Agency that allow discharge of runoff to the River Mole when of sufficient quality not to propose a pollution risk. Such permits would continue to apply during the operational phase of the Project as recorded in the List of Other Consents and Licenses (Doc Ref 7.5).	N
	Comments that Crawley Sewage Treatment Plant is already at capacity and that additional treatment plant capacity is required prior to any passenger increase to reduce the potential for contamination of the River Mole.	The Project proposes to increase flows to Crawley STW to reduce pressure on Horley STW. 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
Drainage and balancing ponds	Requests for more information about when the works compound drainage pond will be constructed and how it could alter the compound's layout.	Temporary drainage for construction works will be developed during the detailed design phase of the Project. This is covered in ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 1: Water Management Plan (Doc Ref 5.3).	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments expressing disappointment that two balancing ponds are required.	The balancing ponds are part of the highways surface water mitigation proposals to ensure no increase in peak runoff to receiving watercourses and consequently no increase to flood risk downstream.	N
Assessment	Requests for more information about whether Gatwick is using Central Allowance or Upper End Allowance.	The consideration of the predicted impact of climate change on flood risk for the Project is set out in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3). In accordance with current Environment Agency guidance for fluvial flood risk, the impact assessment and mitigation design has been based on the Higher Central allowance. Further sensitivity analysis has been undertaken based on the Upper End allowance as a Credible Maximum Scenario in accordance with Environment Agency guidance Flood Risk Allowances: Climate Change Allowances, Environment Agency, May 2022).	N
	Comments that the Project should not simply be seeking to comply with minimum requirements.	The Project provides mitigation measures to comply with the relevant National Policy Statements.	N
River Mole	Requests for more information about downstream flood risk.	Full details of the impact of the Project on flood risk are included in the ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3). The Project will not increase flood risk downstream.	N
	Suggestions that reducing/preventing water discharge into the River Mole could be achieved by building greater capacity for the storage of contaminated water.	The Project will increase its capacity to store runoff to mitigate flood risk and water quality impacts through the construction of additional attenuation and storage within the existing airfield drainage network which would include a tank beneath Car Park Y of up to 32,000m ³ and a new treatment works at Rolls Farm that would treat up to 100l/s thereby increasing the capacity of the long-term storage lagoons that store contaminated runoff.	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for confirmation that the concept design for Museum Field compensation storage area will connect to the River Mole but will not have a detrimental effect on geomorphology of the watercourse bed.	The Museum Field floodplain compensation area will be connected to the River Mole. As stated in ES Chapter 11: Water Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1) Section 11.9, the works would not have an environmentally significant effect on the River Mole. Gatwick has committed to monitoring of the connection location to determine if there are any changes to sediment transport in the river as a result of the works.	N
	More detail is required on proposed works to the currently culverted section of the River Mole which runs underneath the main runway.	Further information has been provided through ongoing liaison with the Environment Agency, which is included in the updated ES.	Y
	Concern that adding wastewater to the River Mole would increase the chance of homes flooding and impact the biodiversity of the river. Comment that the Applicant should provide a full record of flood discharge events over the past 10 years.	<p>The additional wastewater produced by the Project would be sent to the existing Thames Water network and treated at Crawley STW, subject to the completion of Thames Water impact study.</p> <p>Discharges from the STW are agreed with the Environment Agency and would ensure no flood risk or water quality impacts.</p> <p>ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3) includes a summary of flood history in the vicinity of Gatwick based on information from the Environment Agency and Local Planning Authorities.</p>	N
Drainage	Requests for more information about the impact of foul and surface drainage changes on downstream communities.	<p>The Project includes measures to ensure there is no increase in flood risk to other parties. Further information is included in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>The impact of the Project on foul and surface water drainage is reported in ES Chapter 11: Water Environment (Doc Ref. 5.1) which is supported by ES</p>	Y

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment Annexes 1 and 3 (Doc Ref. 5.3) and ES Appendix 11.9.7 Wastewater Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3).	
	Requests for more detail regarding drainage impacts associated with highways proposals.	The highways improvements surface water drainage strategy 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. Further details are included in Annex 3 of the Flood Risk Assessment: Surface Access Highways Surface Water Drainage Strategy.	Y
	Comments that modelling of the airport drainage network shows that some of the previously proposed flood compensation areas can be reduced in size, and two can be removed entirely.	The update of the Environment Agency's guidance on the incorporation of the predicted impacts of climate change in July 2021 meant that the Project could remove the previously proposed Gatwick Stream floodplain compensation area. With the FCA removed the Project continues not to increase flood risk to other parties.	Y
	Requests for further information on the location of the planned highways runoff flood storage facility.	The highways improvements surface water drainage strategy 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. Further details are included in Annex 3 of the Flood Risk Assessment: Surface Access Highways Surface Water Drainage Strategy.	N
Construction	Requests for a Construction Phase Plan for the management of surface water during construction.	ES Appendix 5.3.2 CoCP Annex 1: Water Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) summarises how water resources would be managed during construction. Further details will be developed during the detailed design phase of the Project.	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Flood risk	Concerns that potential flood risk from increased surface water runoff, which is unlikely to be solved by creating a new attenuation pond northeast of Junction 9 and existing flood risk due to a lack capacity at the existing attenuation pond northwest of Junction 9.	The highways improvements surface water drainage strategy includes a number of measures to intercept, store, attenuate and treat runoff from the carriageway prior to discharge to receiving watercourses. These measures will ensure there is no increase in peak runoff rates to receiving watercourses and consequently no increase in flood risk including an allowance for the predicted impacts of climate change for the lifetime of the Project.	Y

v. Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology

Theme: Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a	None	<i>None</i>	-

w. Sustainability assessment

Theme: Sustainability assessment			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Sustainable transport	Questions raised over why a safe cycle path is not proposed within the South Terminal roundabout.	We do not anticipate a need for cyclists to travel through South Terminal Roundabout. Alternative routes will be available westwards from South Terminal, via the subway under Airport Way and the route through Riverside Garden Park; to the east the M23 Spur would be reclassified as an A road but would only provide a route to M23 Junction 9.	N
	Comments that the proposals have missed several opportunities to enhance sustainable modes of travel, such as shared travel.	Our SACs include commitments to increasing the proportion of journeys made by sustainable travel modes, including the use of car sharing by employees, increasing public transport mode share and the use of company-provided shared transport. This includes a commitment to fund new and enhanced bus and coach services in our SACs.	N
	Comments that the proposals have not incorporated sufficient additional measures to make using sustainable modes of transport a more attractive option for staff and passengers than using the private car.	Our highway proposals include the provision of a number of new or enhanced routes for pedestrians and cyclists. Our SACs also set out commitments to a number of other measures which will provide additional public transport services, encourage walking and cycling, discourage single-occupancy car use and provide further incentives for using public transport.	N
	Comments that mode share targets should be met before construction can commence on car parks.	Our mode share commitments are based around the delivery of all of the measures and interventions set out in our SACs and included in our transport modelling. Our assessment shows that the mode share commitments can be achieved with the modest increase in parking that we propose. Some new parking provision is required throughout the construction programme in order to meet our Section 106 commitments once existing car parks are lost to construction sites.	N

Theme: Sustainability assessment			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Car parking	Comments that the most sustainable strategy is to provide new parking on-site.	All the net additional car parking which we propose, along with replacement car parks for those lost during construction will be on the airport and not at off-airport locations.	N
CARE facility	Comments suggesting that food waste separation and disposal by composting should be built into the building design.	Food waste is segregated in the current facility, and this will continue in the new location. The existing biomass boiler was installed to manage this organic material but technology to improve the recycling of waste is developing all the time and GAL will incorporate the best current thinking in its final designs, for example, exploration of anaerobic digestion as an alternative solution for organic matter.	N

x. Geology and ground conditions

Theme: Geology and ground conditions			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a	None	<i>None</i>	-

y. Cumulative effects

Theme: Cumulative effects			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Assessment	Comments that land West of Ifield has should be included in the core scenario transport modelling.	In developing our modelling for the DCO application, we updated the Uncertainty Log which identifies known development and infrastructure schemes and classifies them by degree of certainty that they will be delivered. In line with DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance, our core scenario includes schemes classified as 'near certain' or 'more than likely'. Development west of Ifield does not yet have this level of certainty and therefore has not been included in the core scenario. However, our future year models include the expected growth in background traffic arising from population and employment growth, through the use of TEMPPro factors, and therefore is inherently cumulative. Nevertheless, given the proximity of this development to the Airport, we have explicitly included it in the cumulative effects assessment reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
	Comments that land west of Kilnwood Vale should be included as part of the assessment.	In developing our modelling for the DCO application, we updated the Uncertainty Log which identifies known development and infrastructure schemes and classifies them by degree of certainty that they will be delivered. In line with DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance, our core scenario includes schemes classified as 'near certain' or 'more than likely'. Development west of Kilnwood Vale does not yet have this level of certainty and therefore has not been included in the core scenario. However, our future year models include the expected growth in background traffic arising from population and employment growth, through the use of TEMPPro factors, and therefore is inherently cumulative.	N
	Comments that sensitivity testing should be undertaken as part of the traffic modelling to assess the	In developing our modelling for the DCO application, we updated the Uncertainty Log which identifies known development and infrastructure schemes and classifies them by degree of certainty that they will be delivered. In line with DfT	N

Theme: Cumulative effects			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	cumulative impacts of 10,000 new homes at West of Crawley.	Transport Appraisal Guidance, our core scenario includes schemes classified as 'near certain' or 'more than likely'. Development west of Ifield does not yet have this level of certainty and therefore has not been included in the core scenario. However, our future year models include the expected growth in background traffic arising from population and employment growth, through the use of TEMPro factors, and therefore is inherently cumulative. Nevertheless, given the proximity of this development to the Airport, we have explicitly included it in the cumulative effects assessment reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1).	
	Further assessment should be undertaken to understand the cumulative impacts on Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green, Local Plans and other commitments surrounding the Project boundary.	Our modelling includes estimates of growth in non-airport related traffic, through the use of TEMPro factors in accordance with DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance and our core assessment is therefore inherently cumulative. We have also undertaken a cumulative effects assessment in which we have included proposed developments at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and west of Ifield, using such information as is available about those developments.	N

z. Consultation

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments that the consultation period was too short for the complexity of the proposals.	<p>The Applicant considered that a 28-day consultation was sufficient to allow stakeholders and members of the public to review and comment on the proposals due to the discrete changes proposed to elements of the highway design and the limited number of more general project updates.</p> <p>However, during consultation with the local authorities on the proposed approach to the targeted consultation, requests were made for a longer consultation period and the Applicant extended it to six weeks in response.</p>	Y
	Comments that consultation and community engagement have been insufficient, particularly in relation to changes to Longbridge roundabout and Riverside Garden Park.	<p>The targeted statutory element of the consultation related to the changes to highway design proposals, including in relation to Longbridge roundabout and Riverside Garden Park. A targeted consultation zone (see Figure 6.1 in Section 6 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1)) was defined taking account of Noise Important Areas for road noise (as recognised by National Highways and local highway authorities) located close to the A23 London Road and Airport Way, and other areas potentially impacted by the highways proposals.</p> <p>Consultation letters were sent to the targeted, statutory consultees who were considered to be directly affected by the changes to the highway improvement works on 13 June 2022. A Consultation Newsletter was delivered in hard copy to all homes and businesses within the zone.</p> <p>A press release was issued to local and national media outlets on 26 May 2022 announcing the consultation. A second press release was issued to announce the start of the consultation (14 June 2022) and a third on 13 July 2022 to maintain awareness of the consultation.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>A wide-ranging advertising campaign also ran across the region from 26 May 2022 until close of the consultation on 27 July 2022. Methods used to promote the consultation included radio, digital audio, social media and the local newspapers.</p> <p>The Applicant identified seven hard-to-reach organisations based within the targeted consultation zone. Each organisation was emailed to advise them of the consultation, and subsequently sent a poster providing details. The Consultation Document and Newsletter were also available in alternative formats and languages on request.</p> <p>The Summer 2022 Consultation also included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ telephone surgeries enabling members of the public to request a briefing session with the Project team; ▪ a Project website including all consultation materials; ▪ access to loaned tablets loaded with consultation materials; ▪ consultation materials available on free of charge USBs; ▪ extensive advertising campaigns; ▪ hard copy documents in deposit points; and ▪ a range of ways to contact the team and provide feedback. 	
	Comments suggesting that the local authorities should be included in meetings with other statutory consultees, particularly National Highways.	<p>GAL held a series of TWGs with the local authorities and encouraged them to invite statutory consultees to attend, particularly those that GAL were finding challenging to engage. National Highways and TfL did attend the Transport TWGs in 2022 following requests from the LPAs.</p> <p>GAL has held a series of paid for pre-application meetings with statutory consultees, in particular Highway England and the Environment Agency. GAL has not invited LPAs to attend these as they were often technical in nature and</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		arranged frequently, e.g. transport modelling had a series of sessions over a number of months. This would have been resource intensive for LPAs to attend in addition to TWGs and their BAU responsibilities. The outcomes of how the project has evolved following these discussions with statutory consultees has always been reported back to LPAs through the TWGs.	
	Requests for further consultation prior to DCO submission and when more detail is available, particularly for the Carbon Action Plan, Employment, Skills and Business Strategy, Travel Plan, biodiversity enhancements and the noise envelope.	GAL released a suite of draft documents to the Gatwick Officer Group of local authorities. The full set of documents will be made available on acceptance of the DCO.	N
	Comments that there was limited availability for council officer and member briefings.	The Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out the full range of informal engagement and formal consultation that has taken place with council officers and members, including statutory and community stakeholders.	N
	Comments that consultation should not have taken place because there is not enough evidence of the need for expansion.	The need case for the expansion of the airport was reported through the material for the two key consultation stages. In addition, the DCO Application is supported by a Needs Case document (Doc Ref. 7.2).	N
	Comments that consultation has not been sufficiently effective to satisfy the requirements of the Planning Act 2008.	Table 4.1 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out the statutory requirements for consultation, explains how the Applicant complied with each requirement and identifies where further information can be found within this Report.	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that Gatwick has not adequately or meaningfully engaged on the proposals. Concerns also raised about a lack of engagement on potential temporary and permanent compulsory acquisition of land.	The Project is committed to engaging with affected parties and where appropriate are seeking to enter into voluntary agreements with affected parties.	N
	Requests for further engagement regarding the proposals and the effects on land interests as well as more engagement with landowners in general.	The Project is committed to engaging with affected parties and where appropriate are seeking to enter into voluntary agreements with affected parties.	N
	Comments that individuals would welcome further engagement with Gatwick regarding the issues raised in their responses, in particular the minimisation of impacts of the Northern Runway Project on adjacent non-highways land.	The Project is committed to engaging with affected parties and where appropriate are seeking to enter into voluntary agreements with affected parties.	N
	Comments that there is limited time for consultation prior to DCO submission – given the number of issues still outstanding (including from the previous consultation).	<p>The DCO Application is being submitted in July 2023, circa 11 months after the close of the Summer 2022 Consultation, which is considered more than sufficient time.</p> <p>This Annex (Annex C) to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) explains how the Applicant has had regard to feedback provided in the Summer 2022 Consultation. Annex A to the Consultation Report explains how the Applicant has had regard to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the consultation was not well promoted.	<p>The Summer 2022 Consultation was promoted in a number of ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultation letters were sent to the targeted, statutory consultees who were considered to be directly affected by the changes to the highway improvement works on 13 June 2022. A Consultation Newsletter was delivered in hard copy to all homes and businesses within the zone. ▪ A press release was issued to local and national media outlets on 26 May 2022 announcing the consultation. A second press release was issued to announce the start of the consultation (14 June 2022) and a third on 13 July 2022 to maintain awareness of the consultation. ▪ A wide-ranging advertising campaign ran across the region from 26 May 2022 until close of the consultation on 27 July 2022. Methods used to promote the consultation included radio, digital audio, social media and the local newspapers. ▪ The Applicant identified seven hard-to-reach organisations based within the targeted consultation zone. Each organisation was emailed to advise them of the consultation, and subsequently sent a poster providing details. 	N
	Comments that National Highways views were prioritised over other feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation.	<p>National Highways views are particularly relevant to the Project considering the changes made to the strategic road network, which they are responsible for.</p> <p>Considerable engagement has been held with National Highways, Surrey County Council and West Sussex County Council as affected highway authorities, noting that a large amount of design and transport modelling information has been shared with each authority. Other planning authorities have been involved in Topic Working Group meetings where similar information has been shared in summary form.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the parish council was not consulted about the Longbridge roundabout.	The Council extents that cover Longbridge Roundabout are Crawley Borough Council, Charlwood Parish Council and Horley Town Council. All three of these were sent a Targeted Consultation letter on 13 th June 2022.	N
	Requests for clarity on the changes proposed to the Riverside Garden Park.	Documents provided show the documents enclosed either as printed documents or uploaded to an enclosed USB which provide details as to the changes proposed to the Riverside Garden Park.	N
	Comments that Sustrans was not consulted regarding cycle route 21.	Sustrans were contacted for comment and a meeting was requested but no response was received.	N
	Comments that the Project would continue without consideration of feedback.	Section 49(2) of the Planning Act 2008 places a requirement on the Applicant to have regard to any relevant responses received in response to consultation on the Project proposals. This Annex (Annex C) to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) explains how the Applicant has had regard to feedback provided in the Summer 2022 Consultation. Annex A to the Consultation Report explains how the Applicant has had regard to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation.	N
Information and materials	Comments that more information is needed to allow consultees to respond fully.	Detailed information on the changes to the highways proposals and the Project updates was published for consultation in the Consultation Document (see Appendix C.1), which detailed the highways proposals and Project updates. It also included information about any new or materially different environmental effects resulting from the changes to the highway improvement proposals, with key information included predominantly in the following chapters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chapter 2 – set out the design changes proposed to the highway improvements and explained the optioneering and assessment work carried out since the Autumn 2021 Consultation. It also set out the updated 	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>preliminary environmental information associated with the highway improvements changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chapter 3 – explained the other updates to the Project made since the Autumn 2021 Consultation and provided information on ongoing assessment work. ▪ Chapter 4 – summarised the next steps for the Project. 	
	Comments that there were insufficient deposit point locations for accessing hard copies of documents.	Due to the targeted nature of the Summer 2022 Consultation, three (increased from a proposal for two following feedback from the local authorities) deposit point locations were identified in or near the targeted consultation zone (see Table 6.1 of the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1)). Hard copies of the Consultation Document and Consultation Newsletter were available for members of the public to inspect. Hard copies of the consultation documents were available free of charge on request.	N
	Comments that proposals likely to impact on noise and pollution should be described in plain English.	<p>The Applicant used a range of materials, methods, and techniques to ensure that anyone with an interest in the Project could access information and provide feedback.</p> <p>The Summer 2022 Consultation Newsletter (contained in the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc Ref. 6.2) provided a non-technical overview of the proposals, which were detailed in the Consultation Document along with information about any new or materially different environmental effects resulting from the changes to the highway improvement proposals. Three, short project videos - an overview of proposals, how dual operation of the runways would work, and highway improvements – provided an alternative format for understanding the proposals.</p>	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the virtual approach excludes some members of the community.	<p>During the Summer 2022 Consultation, telephone surgeries were available, enabling members of the public to request a briefing session with the Project team. Bookings could be made through the Project website, by emailing feedback@gatwickfutureplans.com or by calling 0800 038 3486.</p> <p>Hard copies of the consultation documents were available in three deposit points in or near to the targeted consultation zone. Hard copy documents were also available free of charge on request.</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 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>	N
	Comments welcoming the inclusion of videos to depict road improvements and the dual runway operation. Suggestions that the videos should also be narrated.	Noted.	N
	Requests for more information about baseline traffic modelling, highway design and timings for occupation of land.	Through our regular surface access Topic Working Group information has been provided to a range of stakeholders regarding the modelling approach and outcomes, the proposed highway layout and our mode share commitments and surface access interventions. GAL has also engaged with National Highways and the local highway authorities about the technical detail of the modelling and proposed highway design.	Y

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the consultation documents should include information about the availability of labour.	Information on the supply of labour was set out in the PEIR Chapter 16: Socio-Economic in Section 16.6 and the labour market effects of the scheme in Section 16.9. The consultation material is contained in the suite of Consultation Report Appendices (Doc Ref. 6.2).	N
	Comments that the materials were misleading in terms of noise levels, job creation and effects on residents.	The information included in the consultation materials was an accurate reflection of the technical and environmental assessment work that had been undertaken at that time.	N
	Queries raised about how much information was made public prior to the Autumn 2021 Consultation.	Prior to the Autumn 2021 Consultation, the Applicant had consulted (18 October 2018 to 10 January 2019) on its draft Master Plan 2018. In July 2019, the Applicant published its Master Plan 2019, which included dual runway operations as a potential scenario. In August 2019, the Applicant announced it had initiated the planning process for bringing the northern runway into routine use. On 25 August 2021, the Applicant announced that consultation on its plans to bring the northern runway into routine use would start on 9 September 2021 and published its Statement of Community Consultation.	N
Topic Working Groups (TWGs)	Comments supporting the Biodiversity Working Group, but concerns raised about timing and whether input could be too late to influence Project design.	Noted. All feedback from the Biodiversity TWGs was taken into account in preparation of the DCO Application, in particular comments on BNG, HRA, ecology and drainage matters. GAL clarified to the group and local authorities that there is very prescriptive guidance around what landscaping can be planted around the airport (due to risk of bird strike) so some of the suggestions put forward were not suitable in the vicinity of the airport. GAL also advised the group and local authorities that the	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		more detailed planting plans, species mix, location details would likely be subject to the discharge of requirements (subject to approval of DCO) and therefore what they would normally expect to see in a TCPA application is different to what is included in a DCO submission.	
	Comments that it was unhelpful for TWGs to be ongoing throughout the consultation period, with particularly reference to a Transport TWG being held the day prior to the consultation closing.	GAL considered that the TWGs provided the opportunity for LPAs to raise any questions as they reviewed and responded to consultation material. GAL could also discuss any elements of the scheme in more detail should this assist the LPAs. Attendance was optional, meetings were recording and can be revisited at any time via the OneDrive resource and the TWGs are an ongoing process that continued after the consultation.	N
	Concerns raised about the sequencing of TWGs and their role in informing the Project.	Following the PEIR consultation (Autumn 2021 Consultation), GAL engaged with the GOG authorities in March and April 2022 to discuss the format of TWGs going forward. This included whether the topics covered were appropriate, who should attend, how we disseminate information and response times during the meeting cycles. This was agreed in the NRP LPA Engagement Protocol April 2022 (contained as an appendix in the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc Ref. 6.2). This document was revisited and updated in September and November 2022. Following feedback from LPAs the length of time between meeting cycles was extended from 3 to 5 weeks. The full set of meeting dates and topic agendas was also published in its entirety in the September update so that LPAs had sufficient notice and could plan resources accordingly. In some instances, sickness absence or diary clashes meant that some meetings would need to be rescheduled but again this would be in accordance with the LPA Engagement Protocol so that sufficient notice would be given of any changes.	N
Noise Envelope Group	Comments suggesting the noise envelope engagement should examine all options, metrics and limits.	The Applicant sought local technical input from local authorities on the noise and vibration assessment for the Project through the Noise TWGs. Discussions have	Y

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>helped refine many areas of the assessment and ensure local circumstances are understood.</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. 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 including noise metrics and options.</p>	
	Concerns raised about the process, including, a lack of good practice, terms of reference that do not comply with Government policy, a lack of independence, the short time period, and lack of access to information.	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 13 meetings were held between 26 May and 11 October 2022.	Y
	Requests for further consultation once there is an agreed noise envelope.	Engagement was held prior to submission of the application with the consultative committees including the Noise Topic Working Group and the Noise Management Board.	Y
	Comments that the views of some participants in the Noise Envelope Group have not been taken into account.	Within the course of the Noise Envelope Group and the subgroup meetings, GAL engaged with all stakeholders and provided responses to their suggestions. All views were given due consideration and Gatwick provided responses in the meetings to them. The Noise Envelope Group Output Report provides a written summary of the main points made, and GAL's response to them.	Y

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Land take	Comments supporting the level of additional detail provided by Gatwick on the extent of permanent and temporary land-take.	Through the development of the Project, GAL has ensured that a reasonable and proportionate approach is taken to land acquisition, ensuring that all land required is justified.	N
	Comments that the consultation materials and figures were unclear on land-take, access proposals and other impacts on landowners.	Through the development of the Project, GAL has ensured that a reasonable and proportionate approach is taken to land acquisition, ensuring that all land required is justified. The Project committed to engaging with affected parties and where appropriate are seeking to enter into voluntary agreements with affected parties.	N
	Requests for more information to justify the locations of proposed construction works.	The Buildability Report (Doc Ref. 5.3) gives detailed information and justification on the temporary land required during construction.	N

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

Theme: Need and benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
General	Comments supporting the Project due to the benefits to local passengers and for reducing pressure on Heathrow Airport.	Noted	N
	Comments that the Project is not justified, as the Airport Commission decided against it in 2015 in favour of increasing capacity at Heathrow Airport.	Since 2015 Heathrow's expansion plans have been put on hold/delayed indefinitely and Gatwick's proposals are new and a different proposition seeking to maximise the use of current infrastructure capabilities by bringing their northern runway into operation.	N
	Comments that the Project is not consistent with the 'levelling-up' agenda as it focuses development around London.	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
	Comments that the rising cost of jet fuel and related increases in the price of air	Unconstrained demand projections for the London market capture an increasing cost burden from factors including carbon costs and other costs related to flying (e.g., fuel, non-fuel costs)	N

Theme: Need and benefits			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	travel will discourage air travel in the future.		
	Comments that potential future taxes such as frequent flyer tax, a tax on fuel and VAT may discourage flying and reduce the need for the Project.	Whilst policy continues to evolve, considerations around the future cost of flying relating to sustainability charges have been considered in overall demand projections for the London market.	N
	The cost-of-living crisis and the war in Ukraine may discourage future flyers and affect demand for growth.	Factors including the cost of living/Ukraine are not considered to change the long-term underlying outlook for demand in the UK market. Growth will continue to be driven by underlying macro-economic trends supporting growth from inbound and outbound markets.	N
Other airports	Comments that investment should be put into other airports instead of increasing the capacity at Gatwick.	Many other airports are investing in their own development programs. They are generally not considered as constrained as Gatwick as they have not reached the binding limits of their airfield capabilities.	N

b. Development proposals

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Assessments	Comments that the analysis and assessments should take account of the development of Horley Business Park.	Our modelling includes estimates of growth in non-airport related traffic, through the use of TEMPro factors in accordance with DfT Transport Appraisal Guidance and our core assessment is therefore inherently cumulative. We have also undertaken a cumulative effects assessment in which we have included proposed developments at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and west of Ifield, using such information as is available about those developments.	N
Airport boundary	Concerns raised that land designated as ancient woodland should not be brought within the airport boundary due to the risk of future development.	The areas of ancient woodland around the airport have been removed from the Project boundary. All areas of such woodland will be fully protected during both construction and operation of the Project and, as such, no woodland will be brought within the airport boundary. GAL recognise the importance of these habitats and, as such, have included them within their ecology management areas to ensure their future protection and enhancement.	N
Car parks	Comments that the car park on Maintenance Area 01 has not received planning consent or been subject to adequate consultation.	Decked car parking on the MA1 site is no longer included in our proposals.	Y
Terminals	Comments suggesting modifications to terminal design including developing a Midfield Terminal and modifying the layouts and further developing the North Terminal and South Terminal.	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 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	N

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		<p>on any particular element of surface access infrastructure. It was also the option which scored best for planning, water and community criteria.</p> <p>A further 12 options were considered in determining the best location of additional pier served stands, including several 'midfield' per options. These provided no additional stand capacity and were difficult to access requiring either tunnel links which scored very poorly against sustainability criteria, or for surface vehicles to cross taxiways. Details of all the options and be found in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered (Doc. Ref. xxx).</p>	
	Comments suggesting the reliability of baggage handling facilities should be improved with the Project.	The baggage handling systems currently operate at >99% availability.	N
Airfield	Comments suggesting more taxiways should be built at the ends of the runways to reduce instances of planes crossing active runways.	The proposed design includes delivery of the end-around taxiways, but their use is still dependent on the runway operation. The operation is intended to the use the 'land and cross behind' method so the runways will not be active at the time of crossing.	N
CARE facility	Comments that its height and location may present safety concerns as well as intruding on the visual landscape.	<p>Section 8.9 of the ES 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

Theme: Development proposals			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that Gatwick is not a cargo hub so does not need this facility to be relocated.	No dedicated freighter operations are forecast under the baseline and Northern Runway scenarios.	N
	Requests for more information about the materials that would be used in the biomass boiler.	The biomass boiler would deal with airport-generated organic matter only (primarily food waste).	N

c. Forecasts

Theme: Forecast			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a			

d. Economics and socio economics

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Jobs	Comments that employment at Gatwick has been decreasing through the introduction of automation and that the new jobs will not be of any benefit to the local community.	The new employment opportunities would most likely impact on the local study area, FEMA and LMA based on the Local Impact Report prepared by Oxera (ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3)) which has been used to inform the socio-economics assessment as presented in Section 17.9. A distribution of the employment split across the various study areas and at a local authority level is provided within ES Appendix 17.6.1 Socio-Economic Data Tables - Tables 3.1.4 - and ES Appendix 17.9.2 Annex 4 (both Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Concerns raised that any news jobs would be too low paying for people to find housing in the local area.	Based on the Economic Impact Report, the new employment opportunities will relate to a variety of skill levels and occupations, which have been estimated based on the ICF's occupational categories that are expected at the Airport as presented in ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact Assessment - Annex 3 (Doc Ref. 5.3))	N
	Comments suggesting that the Project should include employment and skills training.	Gatwick is developing an Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (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. The activation of the ESBS would 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. 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	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		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.	
Supporting infrastructure	Comments that new infrastructure would be needed to support a larger Gatwick, including additional housing, education and healthcare provision, waste and recycle services, transport and water supplies.	<p>The housing demands associated with the Project have been assessed within the Population and Housing Report (PHR) which supports the conclusion within the Socio-Economic Chapter that no significant housing effects are anticipated across any of the relevant geographies. In broad terms, this is because the amount of housing expected to be delivered based on current housing trajectories (published by local authorities) are expected to provide sufficient labour to support forecast employment growth, even with the addition of the Project. Furthermore, it is anticipated that future housing supply will be greater than indicated in current trajectories, as local authorities update their local plans and for this reason the surplus labour across the Study Area is likely to be even greater than that identified in the PHR.</p> <p>In addition, based on the findings of the socio-economic assessment it is unlikely that the Project will impact on the education and health provision at a level that will require any mitigation. These findings also align with the findings of the ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>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.</p>	N
House prices	Concerns raised that the proposals might result in local house prices going	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	N

Theme: Economics and socio economics			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	down. Other comments felt that house prices might increase as a result.	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.	

e. Carbon and Climate Change

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Carbon	Concerns raised about the increases in carbon emissions from construction, vehicles, along with the loss of local trees, ecology and biodiversity which would otherwise be engaging in carbon capture and sequestration.	<p>Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) presents the GHG assessment results and comparison of GHG estimates against UK carbon budgets. 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.</p> <p>Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) reports on emissions arising from land use change associated with the Project, including the release of carbon stored in trees. However, the construction of new or replacement areas of habitat are expected to sequester an equivalent amount of carbon over the first 30 years of the Project's existence. The net balance of land use change emissions (losses and gains) is not expected to change materially (less than 1%).</p>	N
Emissions	Comments that a second runway will add more than 1 million tonnes of extra carbon a year and the Applicant does not propose realistic ways in which the increased emissions can be reduced.	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. Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) presents the GHG assessment results and compares GHG estimates against UK carbon budgets. The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.6 Carbon Action Plan (Doc Ref.5.3)) has been developed in the context of the Government commitments on a national scale, for instance the Jet Zero Strategy's goal to achieve net zero UK aviation emissions by 2050.	N
	Comments that electric vehicles should not be classed as zero emission as all vehicles have	Section 16.4 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) outlines the assessment methodology. Emissions from vehicles are assessed at the tailpipe. Consequently, electric vehicles are classed as zero emission because	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	emissions from production through to usage.	there are no emission from the tailpipe. Embodied emissions from the production of vehicles are not included.	
	Comments that the car parking proposals would increase carbon emissions, exacerbate climate change, and make it more difficult for the UK to reach its climate targets.	<p>We assume the respondent(s) is referring to carbon emissions through the cars using the car parking proposed under the NRP.</p> <p>GAL is committed to promoting and supporting passengers and staff to use sustainable modes of access to and from Gatwick and commits to achieving ambitious targets to increase sustainable transport mode share. Gatwick’s strategy to influence emissions arising surface access emission sources is captured in the Airport’s Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) 2022-2030 published in October 2022 and the Surface Access Commitments under the NRP. The ASAS sets out targets and action plans for sustainable surface access. It has been prepared in accordance with the Government’s Transport Decarbonisation Plan which sets out the Government’s strategy to achieve net zero emissions from surface transport, as part of the Government’s wider carbon budgets.</p> <p>As above, it is important to note the content of the Airport National Policy Statement, being an important and relevant consideration for the NRP, and which states at paragraph 5.82 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>. Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) contains a comparison of the project emissions against UK Carbon Budgets and concludes in paragraph 16.9.96 that the Project is not so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets, including Carbon Budgets.</p>	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting that the Applicant introduce a Clean Air Order around the airport to reduce the levels of air pollution on local roads.	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.	N
	Comments that hydrogen powered buses and planes using alternative fuels would not be sufficient to reduce impact.	<p>The Government published its Jet Zero Strategy in July 2022 containing goals to achieve net zero UK aviation emissions by 2050 and with 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 (ES Appendix 5.3.6 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 include 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 (GAL Scope 3 emissions). The CAL is clear, however, that Gatwick commits to clear outcomes in each of the four focus areas.</p>	N
Climate Change	Concerns raised that climate change may make extreme weather and flooding more likely, with the Project contributing to making it worse.	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.	N

Theme: Carbon and climate change			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting ways to reduce the impact of the proposals including, installing solar panels on buildings, adding electric vehicle charging points, using sustainable fuel.	The Carbon Action Plan (ES Appendix 5.3.6 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, Gatwick will draw from a range of measures set out in the CAP. These measures include the examples given here, namely the deployment of solar photovoltaics, the roll-out of electric vehicle recharging infrastructure and a number of measures related to the use of sustainable fuels.	N
	Comments that the Project should not be built until carbon-free air travel has been proven to work.	Paragraph 5.82 of the Airport National Policy Statement, being an important and relevant consideration for the NRP, 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> . Section 16.9 of the ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 5.1) contains a comparison of the project emissions against UK Carbon Budgets and concludes in paragraph 16.9.96 that the Project is not so significant that it would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets, including Carbon Budgets.	N

f. Traffic and transport

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
General	Comments supporting the updated proposals as likely to have a positive impact on the local road network, including by encouraging users to use the M23 Spur rather than J8 of the M26.	Noted.	N
	Concerns raised about congestion on specific roads, including the A23, M23, M25 A22, A25, A264, A217, Balcombe Road, as well as other B-roads as well as rural and country lanes.	The transport 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 effects on network operation that might require mitigation. The strategic models include the local and rural road network around the Airport 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.	N
	Concerns raised about the safety of smart motorways.	Safety on Smart Motorways is a matter for National Highways and the Department for Transport.	N
	Concerns raised about the overall necessity of the road improvements if the Project does not go ahead.	If the Project does not proceed, GAL will not deliver the highway works which form part of the Project. GAL may still progress works which are identified as part of our Capital Investment Programme; these are not dependent on the Project proceeding. Delivery of Capital Investment Programme works to the public highway would be done in discussion and agreement with the relevant highway authorities.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised that the changes to the South Terminal Roundabout fail to provide access to Horley Business Park.	Access to Horley Business Park is not included within the highway design proposals as it not part of the Project. It is also not a committed scheme at this stage and there is insufficient detail about the access requirements for that development to be considered an integrated scheme. Provision of access to the Horley Business Park site is for the developers of that site to provide, either with or without the Northern Runway Project. Given the importance of South Terminal Roundabout as an access point to the airport GAL would expect to be consulted on all such access arrangements.	N
	Comments that the 'polluter pays principle' should be applied so that Gatwick rather than the taxpayer bears the full cost burden.	We will be fully funding the proposed highway works that are required to support the Northern Runway Project. We will also be providing funding for, or direct delivery, of the measures set out in our SACs which will support our mode share commitments.	N
Assessments	Comments that assessments and transport modelling should be updated to include the catchment area of airport staff.	The transport assessment is based on transport models that cover a wide area of south-east England and also make allowance for demand that comes from beyond the extents of the model. The models therefore include the catchment for airport staff.	N
	Comments that assessments and transport modelling should be updated to consider the ability of the existing road network to accommodate traffic over a period of up to ten years after the date of registration of a planning application or the end of the relevant Local plan.	The transport assessment considers the performance of the highway network in a design year of 2047. This is 15 years after the highway works associated with the Project would be completed.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that the sustainable travel targets would not be reached as people prefer car travel, particularly following the pandemic.	The SACs set out our commitments to interventions and measures that will support achieving our mode share commitments. Our modelling and assessment indicate that our mode share commitments are achievable.	N
	Comments that the assessments of long-term parking are inadequate, on the grounds that a single day count of long-term parking would not accurately reflect unauthorised parking numbers.	The assessment of parking need is based on information available for on-airport car parks across a year. We have not included allowance for replacing unauthorised off-airport parking spaces, as discussed and agreed with stakeholders.	N
	Comments that the assessment figures related to the Hilton Hotel appear to misrepresent the nature of parking in the undercroft.	The assessment of future baseline provision, which include a multi-storey car park at the Hilton Hotel, is in accordance with available information associated with the planning application for that site.	N
	Comments that assessments should consider how passengers access the airport from on-site hotels.	Movements between on-airport hotels and the terminals do not affect the external transport networks (i.e. the public highway network or the rail and bus network).	N
	Requests for more detail on the maximum height of single and multi-storey car parks and the different types of car parks that would be offered.	The maximum heights of each car park will be shown on the relevant Parameter Plans, with further detail contained in the Design and Access Statement.	N
	Comments suggesting an analysis of illegal parking fines is provided.	The assessment of illegal parking fines in connection with GAL's forecourt charging and associated Red Routes are not relevant to the Project or its assessment.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Illegal off-airport parking is a matter for local authorities. An estimate of unauthorised off-airport parking, which would be subject to enforcement action by local planning authorities is allowed for in the assessment.	
Local roads	Comments that local roads would be turned into 'rat runs' with speeding traffic as a result of the Project.	The transport assessment is based on our strategic and local highway models. These identify the way in which traffic flows will respond to the additional demand from the Project, and the proposed highway works. The assessment uses the model outputs to identify whether, when and where the Project might give rise to significant adverse impacts that require mitigation. The modelling indicates that significant levels of traffic reassignment, and/or "rat running", is unlikely to occur.	N
	Comments that local congestion-easing measures, such as drop-down road barriers and road use permits being should be used to ensure only local residents can use local roads.	The Project does not propose to introduce restrictions on local roads. It is the responsibility of the relevant highway authority to determine if such restrictions are necessary.	N
South Terminal roundabout	Comments supporting proposed changes to the South Terminal roundabout.	Noted.	N
	Comments suggesting signage dividing A23/M23 traffic should be improved and signage for those leaving Multi-Storey Car Parks 1-3 corrected.	The proposed highway works will include all necessary signage for the revised highway layout, and this will be agreed and approved by the relevant highway authorities. GAL routinely review the signage on the Gatwick Airport estate in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Orders and against guidance from the DfT's Traffic Signs Manual and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments that traffic for the A23 southbound from the South Terminal should not first be required to join the A23 northbound.	The proposed highway works do not provide a direct connection between South Terminal and the A23 southbound. Traffic wishing to make this movement would need to depart South Terminal, travelling west to North Terminal Roundabout and then the new signal junction with the A23, to join the A23 southbound. Alternatively, traffic would need to travel via M23 Junction 9 and Junction 10 to join the A23 south of the Airport.	N
South Terminal flyover	Comments supporting the flyover as a way to solve current bottlenecks by separating airport traffic flow from local traffic flow.	Noted.	N
	Concerns expressed that elevating the road through a flyover would increase noise pollution for those within the immediate vicinity.	Both flyovers have been designed with noise barrier to prevent this.	Y
North Terminal proposals	Comments supporting the updated proposals as the junction would be less confusing.	Noted.	N
	Comments that traffic lights should be used instead of a roundabout if they would control traffic flow better.	The highway proposals include a new traffic signal junction on the A23 London Road, allowing traffic from North Terminal to turn right (eastward) onto the A23 London Road. North Terminal Roundabout is retained in a modified form and will also have traffic signal control to provide more efficient operation.	N
Longbridge roundabout	Comments supporting the updated proposals and viewing the lane widening as necessary to deal with the volume of traffic.	Noted.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised about the planned green space next to Longbridge roundabout.	The proposed highway works have been designed to minimise their impacts and to manage any ecological impacts. The proposed mitigation designs for Church Meadows are intended to enhance the extent and quality of local habitat and to create new public open space in a location accessible to nearby residential areas. Landscape designs have only reached concept stage at the moment.	N
	Comments suggesting a segregated right turn from the A23 to the A23 North at Longbridge roundabout to improve safety.	It is not possible to provide a segregated lane for this right turn movement within the available space while also creating a highway layout that would operate satisfactorily.	N
M23 slip	Comments supporting the M23 slip road proposals.	Noted.	N
Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) and Travel Plan	Requests for more information on the delivery of new infrastructure and transport services, including the timeline and budget	The SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) set out commitments to achieving certain mode shares and to the measures which GAL would implement in order to achieve them. GAL has set a commitment to reach those mode shares within three years of the new runway opening. In due course GAL will prepare a new ASAS which will contain further detail on the delivery of the interventions that are proposed, including their funding and the proposed timescales. The overall timeline for construction is given in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1)	N
	Comments supporting the updated draft Airport Surface Access Strategy, noting that it provides more detail on	Noted. The Project is also accompanied by Surface Access Commitments (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)). These SACs would form the basis of a future ASAS which GAL would develop alongside the delivery of the Project.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	the shift to sustainable transport than the Autumn 2021 Consultation.		
	Concerns raised about the lack of detail about sustainable transport and active travel in the Airport Surface Access Strategy.	The SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc ref 5.3) which accompany the DCO application set out the commitments to achieving certain mode shares, alongside commitments to intervention measures and to monitoring progress towards the mode share commitments. These include commitments related to active travel. In due course GAL will prepare a new ASAS which will contain further detail on the delivery of the interventions that are proposed, including their funding and the proposed timescales.	N
	Comments that the proposals are based on questionable assumptions about how many passengers and employees would choose to travel via sustainable means.	The Project's SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) set out GAL's commitments to mode share targets based on the range of interventions. The SAC are derived from extensive modelling work and GAL is confident that the committed mode shares can be achieved, and the assessment reflects this position.	N
Car usage	Comments that the road improvements would encourage greater car travel.	The highway improvements are necessary to cater for the volumes of traffic that are anticipated with the Project. They have been designed against the forecast traffic flows – both airport-related and background traffic – which are derived from the models which forecast the expected mode share as a result of the interventions which GAL will be making as part of the Project. They therefore allow for an increased proportion of journeys made by sustainable modes and with the interventions and commitment to achieving certain mode shares, GAL does not believe that the proportion of journeys made by car would increase.	N
Car parking	Comments supporting the reduction in additional car parking spaces, as a positive move to delivering Gatwick's sustainable transport targets.	Noted.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments supporting the removal of the car park on Pentagon Field and the decking of Car Park X.	Noted.	N
	Comments supporting the overall increase in parking spaces, including off-airport parking, on the grounds that this would provide more options for passengers (and increase the airport's income, which could be used to pay off its loans).	Noted.	N
	Comments that car parking increases should occur on-site, and that this could be done by increasing the number of floors in multi-storey car parks.	All the car parking proposals that are part of the Project are within the Airport boundary, not at off-airport locations.	N
	Comments supporting the car parking proposals on the grounds that they would preserve green space, with particular reference to the removal of Car Park B and the field by the A23 no longer being used for a car park.	Noted.	N
	Comments that Car Park B is often well-used and therefore questions why this would be removed under the current proposals.	The transfer of Car Park B to open recreational space reflects the need to balance the loss of land along the edge of Riverside Garden Park to accommodate the proposed highway improvements. The requirements are that replacement space is contiguous to the existing open space. The capacity lost	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		in Car Park B will be re-provided elsewhere, within the Airport boundary, as part of the car parking proposals.	
	Comments suggesting relocation of the 'Summer Special' car park to Car Park X's location, to make it accessible for the South Terminal as well.	The parking proposals take account of the location of sites, capacity and operational efficiency for connecting remote car parks to the terminals via shuttle buses. All sites are connected to the appropriate terminals with the option to connect between terminals via the Inter-Terminal Shuttle.	N
	Comments suggesting car parks are built underground to reduce land take.	The Project does not propose to build any underground car parking.	N
	Concerns raised that the Applicant would not provide sufficient additional car parking spaces, and had not taken into account further growth in passenger and airport employee numbers.	The proposed number of net additional car parking spaces reflects the additional car parking capacity that we believe is required, in the context of our SACs which will increase the proportion of journeys made by sustainable modes. It takes account of the expected growth in air passenger and airport staff numbers as a result of the Project.	N
	Comments that parking for hotels (Hilton and Ibis) may already be insufficient.	The Project's car parking proposals take account of existing provision, committed sites under the future baseline, sites lost due to construction activity associated with the Project and the need for a small amount (1,100 spaces) of extra capacity. It also takes account of our surface access strategy, and the mode share targets in the SACs, which will see a greater proportion of trips moving from car to sustainable modes.	N
	Comments that existing multi-storey car parks are often empty and that the condition of existing airport parking is of a poor standard and should be improved.	Existing multi-storey car parks at the airport are well used, particularly during summer months when there is some constraint on parking as a result of current supply. In the Future Baseline, an additional multi-storey car park (MSCP7, adjacent to the Hampton by Hilton hotel at North Terminal) will be provided.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The condition of all car parks is regularly monitored to ensure safety and efficient operation.	
	Comments on the need to improve passenger assistance around car parks and that sufficient disabled spaces are provided, and that the multi-decked Car Park H have step-free access for staff travelling with heavy baggage.	All car parks on the airport are designed to allow disabled access and multi-storey car parks are provided with lifts to provide step-free access for those with heavy luggage. New car parking delivered in the Future Baseline and for the Project will also be fully accessible with step-free access.	N
	A respondent feels that there is a chance that, due to a preference for electric vehicles in the future, the airport may only allow parking for electric vehicles	We recognise that the Government's current Transport Decarbonisation Strategy indicates that there will still be petrol and diesel cars operating on the highway network until at least 2050. GAL has no plans to only allow access to the airport's car parks to fully electric vehicles.	N
	Improvements to taxi facilities are suggested including designated waiting areas and free parking, on the grounds that this would discourage idling vehicles on local roads.	The Airport already provides dedicated on-airport waiting area for private hire vehicles and taxis are permitted to wait for free for 2 hours in long stay car parks whilst waiting to pick up passengers.	N
Access	Comments suggesting a designated drop-off site for local residents, such as the previous 'under the tunnel' drop-off site as well as creation of drop-off points further from the airport that are connected by shuttle bus, that would allow for longer drop-off times.	The existing arrangement at the Airport allows local residents to wait for free for 2 hours in long stay car parks to drop off passengers or whilst waiting to pick up passengers.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Car parking costs and forecourt fees	Comments suggesting increases to deter drivers. Others suggesting complete removal of charges to stop parking on local roads.	Charging for car parking is an important part of the range of measures that GAL proposes to use to increase the proportion of journeys made by sustainable transport and meet our mode share commitments. GAL will continue to apply charges for parking and forecourt use, retaining the flexibility to vary charges to respond to seasonal fluctuations in demand, or other circumstances, as appropriate.	N
	Concerns raised that charges would increase further, forcing the use of unauthorised parking.	Charging for car parking is an important part of the range of measures that GAL proposes to use to increase the proportion of journeys made by sustainable transport and meet the mode share commitments. GAL will continue to apply charges for parking and forecourt use, retaining the flexibility to vary charges to respond to seasonal fluctuations in demand, or other circumstances, as appropriate. The enforcement against unauthorised off-airport parking sites is a matter for the local authorities, although GAL will support enforcement activity to the extent we can.	N
	Comments that delays at the airport lead to high waiting charges.	Charging for forecourt access and parking is an important part of the range of measures that GAL proposes to use to increase the proportion of journeys made by sustainable transport and meet the mode share commitments. GAL will continue to apply charges for parking and forecourt use, retaining the flexibility to vary charges to respond to seasonal fluctuations in demand, or other circumstances, as appropriate.	N
	Comments that Gatwick should acknowledge it could financially gain from increasing the number of car parks.	Clearly any revenue received from car parking charges accrues to GAL. However, it also provides a revenue stream which will help GAL to invest in surface access interventions in order to achieve our mode share commitments and deliver the surface access elements of the Project. Whilst GAL is required to provide any additional car parking required to support growth in sites on-airport it	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		also has an agreement with local planning authorities to only provide as much parking as needed to support passenger demand. GAL is also committing through the SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc ref 5.3)) to reduce the proportion of passengers and staff travelling to and from the airport by car and will only build new car parks if and when they are needed.	
	Comments that there should be no charge for parking at the rail station or for blue badge holders.	Gatwick Airport has recently relocated its commuter car park for local residents wishing to park and travel by train from Gatwick Airport railway station and spaces are now provided in the South Terminal Multi-Storey car parks. Charges are at a significant discount from the normal short stay parking tariffs and are available as monthly, quarterly or annual tickets, or as a flexible ticket for 100 car park stays within a 12-month period. Charging for parking at a hub station with high frequency services to multiple destinations is consistent with the approach taken by Network Rail and Train Operating Companies throughout the UK rail network. Blue Badge spaces are available in each of the Short Stay car parks.	N
Public and sustainable transport	Concerns raised that the proposals lack service and capacity improvements to bus routes.	The SAC (ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)) include the provision of improved or enhanced regional coach services, including new services to locations which are poorly served by rail. GAL will also continue to support services on the local bus network, working in conjunction with local bus operators.	N
	Concerns raised that cycle paths and walking routes would be temporarily or permanently removed.	The Project does not propose to permanently close any cycle paths or walking routes. Where the highway works proposals would affect existing routes, GAL will provide alternatives. The works also include upgrades to existing pedestrian and cycle routes and the provision of new routes. If there is a need for routes to be closed temporarily during construction, GAL will identify alternative routes so that connections are maintained.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for additional information on the distances/times to terminals for those walking or catching buses.	Distances and walking times differ across each terminal, noting that users of the South Terminal coach stop need to cross the railway to access the terminals, but this is not the case for local buses using the stops on the A23. For walking routes to the terminals estimated walk times are signed on the main routes.	N
	Comments that public transport modelling is not based on post COVID-19 predictions.	The public transport modelling is based on a 2016 base year, forecast forward into the future through the application of known committed developments, infrastructure scheme and public transport service enhancements, together with forecasts for population and employment growth. Although travel behaviour is still evolving after the pandemic and lockdowns and our approach is based on pre-pandemic conditions, we believe this is likely to represent a conservative assessment of the effects on the public transport networks, because post-pandemic working practices are likely to include greater proportions of homeworking, leading to lower use of rail and bus services than might otherwise have been the case.	N
	Comments suggesting removal of the bus lane between Gatwick Road and the South Terminal traffic lights to improve local traffic flow.	The Project does not propose to remove this bus lane. Bus priorities are important to ensure the smooth running of public transport services that are essential for sustainable transport access to the airport.	N
	Comments suggesting bus and approved vehicle lanes are added at the North and South Terminals.	The proposed highway works have evolved through discussions with National Highways and the local highway authorities, alongside use of our transport models to determine how best to provide the required capacity for all traffic wishing to access the terminals. The proposals do not include additional bus lanes at either terminal.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting cycle lanes are added along all airport roads and from airport hotels.	The highway works proposals include new and enhanced pedestrian and cycle routes which will facilitate cycle access by both airport and non-airport users. The proposals do not include cycle lanes on other airport roads.	N
	Comments suggesting public transport to Gatwick Airport is free.	GAL cannot control public transport fares, which are set by the relevant public transport operators. GAL does however engage with the operators to explore opportunities in increase public transport use. GAL also provides airport staff with discounts for using public transport and will continue to do so.	N
	Comments suggesting increasing the number of shuttle buses from the car parks and serving North Terminal.	The frequency of shuttle buses are based on the demand profile for passengers using the car parks whilst ensuring buses do not operate almost empty and are able to access the drop off/pick up stops at terminals. Typically, car park users do not have to wait more than a few minutes for a shuttle bus.	N
	Comments welcoming improvements to bus services, cycle paths and walkways and also requesting more detail about the proposals.	Noted. Further detail of our proposals is contained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc ref 5.1) and in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).	Y
	Comments that the updated road improvement proposals would result in unacceptable losses or permanent diversions on PRow 368, and an increase in the distance of PRow 367 by a significant amount (1,300m).	The effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agriculture, Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1). An Outline Public Rights of Way Strategy is provided in ES Appendix 19.8.2 Public Rights of Way Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) and this includes measures to reduce impacts on users of PRow during the construction period, as far as practicable.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised that the road-based public transport proposals would add an additional burden to the road network.	The highway works proposals are designed to provide capacity for the traffic demand which is forecast for the future years that we have assessed. This includes demand related to the Airport together with background traffic growth over time. The highway works would provide the additional capacity necessary to ensure that the network continues to perform satisfactorily.	N
	Concerns raised that diversions would inconvenience users of the Sussex Border Path and an alternative design should be proposed.	The effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agriculture, Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1). An Outline Public Rights of Way Strategy is provided in ES Appendix 19.8.2 Public Rights of Way Management Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) and includes measures to reduce impacts on users of PRoW during the construction period, as far as practicable.	N
	Requests for more details on the clear timescales for the reinstatement of PRoWs.	The effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agriculture, Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1). A Public Rights of Way Strategy is provided in ES Appendix 19.8.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3) includes information on the likely construction activities and durations of those that are likely to affect PRoW and includes measures to reduce impacts on users of PRoW during the construction period, as far as practicable.	N
	Comments that the Applicant has assembled its plans independent of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans, Local Transport Plans and emerging land allocations.	The Project has had regard to Local Transport Plans and to Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans in preparing the highway design. GAL has also undertaken engagement with the local highway and planning authorities, and the designs have evolved as a result to include additional new and enhanced cycling and walking infrastructure within them.	Y

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Concerns raised that the proposals will result in the removal of National Cycle Route 21.	The effects on NCR 21 would be temporary for a period of approximately 12 weeks and these are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agriculture, Land Use and Recreation. ES Appendix 19.8.2 Public Rights of Way Strategy (Doc Ref. 5.3) includes measures to reduce impacts on users of PRowS, including NCR21, during the construction period as far as practicable.	N
	Comments that the plans for active travel would not be used for workers or staff due to the distances involved and timing of shift patterns.	By providing the additional active travel infrastructure, GAL will help to facilitate active travel use by those who choose to do so. GAL recognises that shift patterns mean that active travel is not a realistic choice for some airport staff. Nevertheless, GAL believes it is important that we encourage active travel use wherever possible.	N
Rail	Comments suggesting improved rail access, a tube extension, and shuttle trains to the airport at night.	The provision of rail services is a matter for Network Rail and the train operating companies, although GAL continues to engage with these organisations to explore opportunities to make rail more attractive for travel to and from Gatwick Airport. The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) shows that the Project does not need to provide additional services in order to mitigate the effects of the Project, nor additional rail infrastructure at the Airport or elsewhere.	N
	Comments suggesting the cost of the Gatwick Express should be reduced.	GAL cannot control public transport fares, which are set by the relevant public transport operators. GAL does, however, engage with the operators to explore opportunities in increase public transport use.	N
	Comments suggesting additional carriages on trains.	The provision of rail services is a matter for Network Rail and the train operating companies, although GAL continues to engage with these organisations to explore opportunities to make rail more attractive for travel to and from the Airport.	N

Theme: Traffic and transport			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) shows that the Project does not need to provide additional services, or additional carriages, in order to mitigate the effects of the Project, nor additional rail infrastructure at the Airport or elsewhere.	
	Comments supporting the Applicant's investment in Gatwick station.	The upgrades to Gatwick Airport railway station are being delivered by Network Rail, irrespective of the Project, and which will be complete in 2023.	N
	Concerns raised about the lack of suitable rail infrastructure to move passengers to the airport.	The provision of rail services is a matter for Network Rail and the train operating companies, although GAL continue to engage with these organisations to explore opportunities to make rail more attractive for travel to and from the Airport. The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) shows that the Project does not need to provide additional services, or additional carriages, in order to mitigate the effects of the Project, nor additional rail infrastructure at the Airport or elsewhere.	N
	Comments suggesting a pick-up and drop-off site should be provided at the station.	Free pick up and drop off arrangements are available in the Long Stay car park (up to 2 hours). Discounts for local residents using the drop off lanes on the forecourt to access the railway station are also available.	N
Construction	Requests for further detail on the design and delivery of temporary construction roads.	Indicative construction methodology and information on temporary haul roads are given in the ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Reports A and B (Doc Ref. 5.3).	N
	Comments suggesting additional access to the Lowfield Health roundabout from the A23 to provide flexibility in accessing construction compounds.	The information on the construction routes is given in Construction Traffic Management Plan for Materials and Workforce.	N

g. Noise and vibration

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Assessments	Comments that the proposals do not acknowledge areas currently impacted by noise pollution or changes in national airspace, including FASI-South.	<p>ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 5.1) reports the current baseline noise environment and the numbers of people above the Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Levels.</p> <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>	N
	Comments that aircraft from some airlines (EasyJet and British Airways) are perceived to be noisier.	Noted.	N
South Terminal flyover	Concerns raised that elevating the road through a flyover would increase noise pollution for those within the immediate vicinity.	The two flyovers have been designed with noise barriers to prevent this and contribute to a slight reduction in overall community road traffic noise exposure overall.	N
	Concerns raised over the effectiveness of noise barriers.	The effects of noise barriers have been modelled using the recommended noise prediction methods (Calculation of Road Traffic Noise) and required by National Highways.	N
Trees and hedgerows	Comments that there will be an increase in noise due to tree removal.	There may be a subjective effect when trees are removed and vehicles are more visible, but the objective levels of noise are not expected to reduce significantly, and in most areas vegetation and trees will regrow making any such effect temporary.	N

Theme: Noise and vibration			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Noise envelope	Comments supporting proposals to mitigate noise in and around the airport, including the noise envelope.	Noted.	N
	Comments welcoming the engagement Gatwick is undertaking to refine the proposals.	Noted.	N
	Requests for more detailed plans on monitoring and enforcement of the noise envelope.	The noise envelope has been developed and refined following consultation and details of monitoring and enforcement are provided.	N

h. Air quality

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Assessments	Comments that the air quality assessment and monitoring approach is not detailed enough and should include data on a broader range of air quality elements	<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. 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 ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology (Doc Ref. 5.3). The assessment approach and details of modelling scope have been agreed with stakeholders at the topic working groups.</p> <p>Monitoring commitments will be secured under the Section 106 Agreement to be entered in relation to the Project. Construction mitigation measures (including any monitoring recommended) would follow best practice IAQM guidance and would be implemented through the CoCP. Details of the monitoring approach are provided in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality (Doc Ref. 5.1)</p>	N
	Comments that assessment should consider increases in carbon dioxide emissions and other greenhouse gases; soot and vapours, small PM2.5 particles from aircraft tyres, other particulate matter (PM); Nitrogen Oxides (NOx) and Volatile Organic compounds (VOCs).	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
	Comments that the proposals are not aligned with the new Environment Act regarding air quality.	The air quality impacts and how they affect human health and ecological issues have been assessed in accordance with current requirements and best practice	N

Theme: Air quality			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		and details presented in Chapter 13: Air Quality of the ES and corresponding appendices.	

i. Landscape, townscape and visual resources

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Overall	Comments supporting the highway improvements with the caveat that more habitat and biodiversity provisions are placed in the immediate area around the airport.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Various areas are proposed for environmental mitigation within the Project boundary, namely:</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 environmental mitigation areas will deliver a significant net increase in attractive, biodiverse and functional public open space at Gatwick and are embedded within the Project as part of the DCO application.</p>	N
	Concerns raised that a number of walking and cycle paths would be temporarily or permanently removed,	The effects of the Project on Public Rights of Way are assessed in ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	and considering that these losses would be detrimental to those accessing the airport and to the local community, many of whom who use the routes for recreational purposes.	An Outline Public Rights of Way Strategy is provided in ES Appendix 19.8.2 (Doc Ref. 5.3) and which includes measures to reduce impacts on users of PRow during the construction period, as far as practicable.	
Designated Areas	Comments that designated areas that would become less tranquil as a result of the proposals, including Ashdown Forest and South Downs National Park	<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 High Weald, Surrey Hills and Kent Downs AONB's and South Downs National Park.</p> <p>Section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8 provides an assessment of effects on landscape and townscape character, visual amenity and the perception of tranquillity as a result of the Project. Ashdown Forest in the High Weald AONB forms a representative receptor site within Sussex where the perception of tranquillity has been assessed. The effects are considered to be minor adverse, which is not significant.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the ES also includes an assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity within the SDNP based on four representative locations. 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. The effects are considered to be minor adverse, which is not significant.</p>	N
Noise barriers	Comments that the barriers would damage the character of the local landscape and have a negative visual impact on the local area.	Noise barriers along the edge of the A23 London Road at the interface with Riverside Garden Park no longer form part of the Project.	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
PRoW and footpaths	Concerns raised about the safety of cycling and walking routes and suggesting the addition of security measures such as improved lighting or CCTV.	Cycling and walking routes within the airport are routinely monitored to ensure they are well lit and safe. Where concerns are expressed, or issues found through regular audits improvements are programmed and delivered as part of GAL's Airport Surface Access Strategy.	N
Light pollution	Concerns raised that increased operations at the airport would worsen light pollution.	Lighting proposals have been prepared, which take into account relevant guidance (see ES Appendix 5.2.2 Operational Lighting Framework (Doc Ref. 5.3)). The document provides an overarching creative and technical framework for exterior lighting associated with the Project. The framework considers sustainable development with measures to minimise adverse impacts on biodiversity, local residents and users of public rights of way and open space. The framework considers types of lighting equipment, mounting location, materiality, durability and light source to minimize disruption to safety and security. The ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Conduct (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 5.3) sets out construction phase lighting requirements. ES Appendix 5.2.2. Operational Lighting Framework (Doc Ref. 5.3) considers effects arising from lighting, taking into account the lighting framework and CoCP. Whilst there would be a change in the appearance of the airport at night as a result of an increase in development and associated light sources, no significant adverse night time effects on landscape, townscape or visual receptors have been identified in ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1).	N
Cycling	Comments suggesting cycle parking is well lit and CCTV monitored. Also, that shower facilities are nearby and e-bikes are offered to staff.	Cycling and walking routes within Gatwick Airport are routinely monitored to ensure they are well lit and safe. Where concerns are expressed, or issues found through regular audits improvements are programmed and delivered as part of GAL's Airport Surface Access Strategy. Shower and changing facilities are provided at a number of locations across the airport, for use by staff cycling	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		to work. The opportunity to make the purchase of e-bikes easier is being considered for GAL staff, alongside an option to provide lease options.	
Car parks	Comments that new car parks would lead to a loss of open space and trees, be an 'eyesore', and 'blight' the landscape and visual amenity of the area.	<p>Under the Project, decked and multi storey car parks would generally be constructed on areas of existing surface parking, resulting in a minimal loss of existing vegetation. Multi Storey Car Park 4 would be located on an area of tree and shrub planting within Gatwick Airport, which would require removal.</p> <p>Effects on landscape, townscape and visual resources are described in section 8.9 of the ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Project would result in a minimal direct effect on the urban character of the airport and would have limited influence over the surrounding landscapes and townscapes within the study area due to the developed context of the airport and the extensive mature vegetation within and around Gatwick Airport. Built form and lighting would be intensified overall and slightly increased within Gatwick Airport's urban character area.</p>	N
	Concerns raised that more car parks could lead to greater light pollution.	<p>Built form and lighting would be intensified overall as a result of new decked and multi storey car parks within Gatwick Airport's urban character area.</p> <p>The design would reflect the lighting strategy, contained in ES Appendix 5.2.2: Operational Lighting Framework (Doc Ref. 5.3). The document provides an overarching creative and technical framework for exterior lighting associated with the Project. The strategy contains measures to minimise adverse impacts on biodiversity, local residents and users of public rights of way and open space. The strategy considers types of lighting equipment, mounting location, materiality, durability and light source to minimize disruption to safety and security.</p>	N

Theme: Landscape, townscape and visual resources			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
House Building	Concerns raised about the impacts the proposals could have on further development and house building programmes along the Western side of Crawley, West of Ifield, in East Grinstead, Copthorne and other West Sussex towns.	All the strategic housing allocations comprise part of the cumulative schemes list. As stated in the cumulative assessment (Section 17.11), it can be expected that the construction activity generated by the cumulative schemes is likely to overlap to some degree with the initial construction period. 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. 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
Heritage	Comments suggesting that Gatwick should financially support the conservation of historic aircraft currently stored in the airport, specifically the cost removing the Handley Page Herald aircraft located near the fire training area.	The Handley Page Herald aircraft is no longer located at Gatwick.	N

j. Ecology and nature conservation

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Ecology general	Concerns raised about land take and the removal of hedgerows and trees.	<p>All vegetation planted as part of the original A23 London Road scheme would be removed to accommodate the construction activities for the surface access improvements. Some trees within adjacent areas (Longbridge Roundabout, Riverside Garden Park, Balcombe Road, Gatwick Airport) would also need to be removed to accommodate either infrastructure and earthworks associated with the improvements or the temporary construction activities. Where high quality trees lie near the edge of the construction activity area, every effort will be made to retain trees and appropriate protective barriers would be erected and best practice arboricultural methods adopted. A tree retention/loss drawing is included for the surface access improvement proposals in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) at ES Appendix 8.8.1 (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p> <p>The oLEMP includes a Illustrative Landscape Overview 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>The proposed environmental mitigation areas will deliver a significant net increase in attractive, biodiverse and functional public open space at Gatwick Airport and are embedded within the Project as part of the DCO application.</p>	N
	Concerns raised about the impact on local biodiversity and wildlife such as Bechstein bats, newts, deer, buzzards and purple hairstreak butterflies.	The impact of the Project on Biodiversity is considered in Chapter 9 of the ES, including on bats, newts, invertebrates and birds.	N

Theme: Ecology and nature conservation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Comments suggesting new naturally functioning wetland areas should be proposed to benefit biodiversity.	Wetland habitats, such as those at Longbridge Roundabout and north of South Terminal Roundabout, have been created as far as is practicable while still having regard to airport safeguarding. Wetland habitats can attract birds that are of a size that can threaten aircraft if involved in a strike. As such, all habitat design has been undertaken in collaboration with GAL's Safeguarding team.	N

k. Land use and recreation

Theme: Land use and recreation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO)	Comments that there is a lack of clarity on CPO, including in relation to individual properties.	The project is committed to engaging with affected parties and where appropriate are seeking to enter into voluntary agreements with affected parties.	N

I. Health and wellbeing

Theme: Health and wellbeing			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
General	Concerns raised about the impact road improvements will have on the physical and mental wellbeing of residents.	<p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing (Doc Ref. 5.1) considers how the Project's highway improvements and changes to traffic flows and volumes are likely to influence health at a population level. The assessment is informed by ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1) assessment, which provides supporting data and analysis for individual receptors. The health assessment does not expect significant population health effects to arise in relation to either physical or mental health outcomes.</p> <p>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.</p>	N

m. Major accidents and disasters

Theme: Major accidents and disasters			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Safety	Comments that the airport will not be able to manage the routine operation of two runways safely, and that the proposals make no mention of plans for accident or disaster prevention and response measures.	<p>Technical standards relating to the airfield operation and safety are managed by the CAA and the Project is fully compliant.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A letter of no impediment from the CAA is being prepared.</p>	N
	Comments that leaving the airport without an emergency runway and having two parallel operational runways at close distance would raise safety concerns.	The northern runway is not used as an emergency runway and most airports do not operate with more than a single runway. Should any of the runway need to be closed we can operate off the other runway as we do today.	N

n. Law and order

Theme: Law and order			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a			

o. Hazards

Theme: Hazards			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a			

p. Existing infrastructure

Theme: Existing infrastructure			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Development site	Comments that the safeguarding of land for R2 prevents investment in existing properties and brownfield land and could lead to deterioration of existing infrastructure.	Policy GAT2 of the CBC Local Plan 2015 requires the land to the south of the airport (known as land for R2) to be safeguarded. CBC propose including this policy in their Regulation 19 Submission Version Local Plan consultation due to start on 9 th May 2023. GAL will be making representations to the CBC Local Plan consultation and examination.	N
Runways	Comments that due to the extent of the works required to move the emergency runway further north, the Project is not aligned with government policy about the use of existing runways. Also, that the works equate to creation of a new runway and can therefore not be considered use of existing infrastructure.	<p>The Northern Runway cannot be used in its most efficient form in its current location. It therefore needs to be repositioned to meet the safety requirements of making best use this existing infrastructure. The length or width of the existing runway is not proposed to be altered.</p> <p>The Planning Statement appraises the Project against 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>	N

q. Construction

Theme: Construction			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Car park construction	Concerns raised about increased pollution from the construction of new car parks.	For the construction dust assessment, all construction elements have been assessed. For the assessment of construction traffic emissions, the peak construction traffic flows were modelled using emissions and backgrounds from the first full year of airfield construction (2024) and highways construction (2029). Details of the air quality assessment methodology are included in Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology.	N
Planning	Comments suggesting that power and other utility demands for the Construction Logistics Centre and temporary construction compounds should be considered and assessed.	Agreed	N
Mitigation	Comments that disruption to south-side businesses and occupiers should be minimised by setting a cap on the number of vehicles allowed to access the construction compound per hour, introducing monitoring and including enforcement mechanisms.	<p>Our construction methodology is designed to reduce disruption to local businesses and residents throughout the duration of the project. We understand that the construction process can be disruptive, but we are committed to mitigating this disruption as practical as possible.</p> <p>As part of our planning process, we have conducted assessments of the construction traffic in the area. We remain vigilant in monitoring the traffic flow to ensure that it operates efficiently and safely at all times.</p> <p>We have also designed our construction traffic routes in a way that avoids sensitive areas and reduce disruption to local businesses and residents. Our team will work closely with the local authorities to implement temporary traffic management measures, such as lane closures and diversions, as required. We will also ensure that our construction vehicles operate at a safe speed and adhere to all relevant traffic regulations.</p>	N

r. Approach to EIA

Theme: Approach to EIA			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Flight paths	Comment that strict adherence to the Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) unfairly impacts rural areas and can result in systematic and concentrated disruption for the overflow communities.	This comment relates to current operations. Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) at Gatwick are designated and overseen by the Secretary of State for Transport under Section 78 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982. They were designed to, where possible, avoid the overflight of built-up areas. The Project does not propose changes to the Noise Preferential Routes.	N
	Concerns raised that planes are allowed to turn late and wide when approaching or departing the airport, concentrating flying and the associated disruption on or outside the northern edge of the Noise Preferential Route corridor, rather than evenly dispersing the impact around the NPR centre line.	This comment relates to current operations. Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) at Gatwick are designated and overseen by the Secretary of State for Transport under Section 78 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982. They were designed to, where possible, avoid the overflight of built-up areas. The Project does not propose changes to Gatwick's arrival or departure routes or the Noise Preferential Routes.	N
	Comments that flights from the airport occasionally fail to adhere to the established flight paths and heights.	This comment relates to current operations. Gatwick has in place a mature and sophisticated system and process for monitoring noise and track keeping conformance and for airline flight performance improvement. This process is overseen by a sub-group of the airport's consultative committee. Flights to/from Gatwick achieve high levels of track keeping conformance (+95%). The Project does not propose changes to Gatwick's noise and track keeping conformance monitoring process.	N
	Comments that new flight paths will be likely to support the Project and details should be included.	The Northern Runway Project does not require changes to Gatwick's Standard Instrument Departures, Standard Arrivals or Instrument Approach Procedures. The dual runway would be operated using existing, published airspace procedures and in accordance with the related Gatwick Northern	N

Theme: Approach to EIA			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
		Runway Project Airspace Change Proposal (ACP-2019-81); thus no changes are required to the arrival and departure procedures of any adjacent aerodromes.	
	Comments that the flight complaints monitoring systems does not allow for the public to report poor flight behaviours.	This comment relates to current operations. Gatwick has in place a sophisticated system and process for monitoring noise and track keeping conformance. A complementary element of the system is dedicated to the receipt of, and response to, noise complaints and enquiries. The Gatwick Complaints Handling policy is published on its website. The Project does not propose changes to Gatwick's noise and track keeping conformance monitoring process.	N
	Comments that the noise from increased number of cargo planes would be a significant as they fly lower when taking off.	Very few cargo only planes utilise Gatwick today. No dedicated freighter operations are forecast under the baseline and Northern Runway scenarios.	N

s. Mitigation

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Noise	Questions raised about whether there would be noise mitigation proposed for Tunbridge Wells.	Tunbridge Wells is outside the proposed Noise Insulation Scheme.	N
	Comments suggesting expansion of noise monitoring, including establishing a noise monitoring station for Edenbridge.	This comment relates to current operations.	N
	Comments that the noise envelope process does not examine all available options and lacks a first principles approach, as it uses Gatwick's original proposal for a noise envelope as a starting point.	The Noise Envelope Group has been open to suggestions for any options and has considered various positive suggestions, in arriving at the final noise envelope.	Y
	Comments that the noise envelope engagement process does not seem like a serious attempt to achieve agreement among all relevant stakeholders regarding noise mitigation.	Further stakeholder engagement was undertaken on the developing proposals for the Noise Envelope following the Autumn 2021 Consultation. In addition, the Applicant also formed the 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 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.	Y

Theme: Mitigation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
	Requests for information about enforcement procedures if noise limits are breached.	The Noise Envelope is proposed to meet the policy requirements and follow CAA guidance. It will also include enforcement procedures if limits are breached.	Y
	Comments suggesting that the Applicant should support the development and use of zero noise planes.	Noted.	N

t. Airspace and overflights

Theme: Airspace and overflights			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a	None	N/A	-

u. Water and flood risk

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Flooding	Concerns raised about the potential for local flooding to occur, particularly the impact that this may have on local properties and downstream with the River Mole.	The Project would not increase flood risk on the Gatwick Stream or the River Mole through the provision of two floodplain compensation areas on the River Mole at Museum Field and Crawter's Brook at Car Park X combined with other measures on the airfield and highways drainage mitigation.	Y
On-site water management	Comments that the Horleyland Wood Local Wildlife Site would be affected by the changes to on-site water management.	No works are proposed near Horleyland Wood that would change the onsite water management.	N
	Questions raised about whether the Project would create additional demands on an already limited water supply in the South East.	Gatwick 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.	N
	Questions raised about Gatwick's position on water neutrality.	Gatwick 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.	N
	Requests for more information about water management arrangements affecting the course of the River Mole.	It is proposed to renaturalise an existing 300m stretch of the River Mole immediately downstream of the runway culvert. Proposals include a meandering two-stage channel to replace the current, canalised section, providing biodiversity and flood risk benefits. Further information will be available during the detailed design process, with the details to be considered and approved by the relevant decision maker.	N

Theme: Water and flood risk			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Waste water	Concerns raised about the impact of the Project on waste water management.	The Project proposes to increase flows to Crawley STW to reduce pressure on Horley STW. Gatwick has been liaising with Thames Water regarding the increase in flows as a result of the Project and currently await the result of their impact assessment that would take into account wider development proposals beyond the Gatwick's plans.	N

v. Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology

Theme: Fisheries, biodiversity and geomorphology			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a	None	N/A	-

w. Sustainability assessment

Theme: Sustainability assessment			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a	None	N/A	-

x. Geology and ground conditions

Theme: Geology and ground conditions			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a	None	N/A	-

y. Cumulative effects

Theme: Cumulative effects			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
n/a	None	N/A	-

z. Consultation

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Documents	Requests for inclusion of the sources and data used to inform the proposals.	The relevant data underpinning the Project proposals is included within the DCO Application submission.	N
	Comments that the wording in the consultation materials is vague or biased and misleading.	The Applicant approached consultation with a commitment to ensuring consultees were given the opportunity to understand and provide feedback on the proposals. The information included in the consultation materials was an accurate reflection of the technical and environmental assessment work that had been undertaken at that time.	N
	Comments that some of the 'before' and 'after' maps are unclear.	Noted. The Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3) provides diagrams showing of Gatwick Airport with and without the Project.	N
Materials	Comments describing the website and videos as being of very high quality	Noted.	N
	Comments suggesting that the video materials would be improved by adding an audio explanation.	The consultation videos were an important method of showcasing the proposals in an alternative format, proving popular with those who watched. The three, short project videos - an overview of proposals, how dual operation of the runways would work, and highway improvements – had a total of 2,795 views. The highway improvements video had an average view length of 3 minutes and 5 seconds. The dual operations video was watched for an average 59 seconds, and the overview of proposals average 1 minute and 28 seconds. Point noted regarding narration.	N

Theme: Consultation			
Topic	Summary of comments	Response	Change
Consultation	Comments that the consultation information should be provided by an independent body.	The consultation was carried out by the Applicant of the Project, in line with Section 42(1) of the Planning Act 2008 which places a duty of the Applicant to consult on the proposed application.	N
	Concerns raised that comments in response to the Autumn 2021 Consultation might be disregarded unless the responses to both the consultations are considered together.	<p>Section 49(2) of the Planning Act 2008 places a requirement on the Applicant to have regard to any relevant responses received in response to consultation on the Project proposals.</p> <p>This Annex (Annex C) to the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 6.1) explains how the Applicant has had regard to feedback provided in the Summer 2022 Consultation. Annex A to the Consultation Report explains how the Applicant has had regard to feedback from the Autumn 2021 Consultation.</p>	N