



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Consultation Report Addendum

Book 9

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: FEBRUARY 2024

Application Document Ref: 9.3

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
1 Consultation on Proposed Changes	1-1
1.1. Introduction	1-1
1.2. Purpose of this Report	1-2
1.3. Report Structure	1-2
2 Consultation Process	2-1
2.1. Overview of the Consultation Process	2-1
2.2. Briefing Sessions	2-1
2.3. Leaflets and Letters	2-2
2.4. Newspaper Notices	2-2
2.5. Press Releases	2-3
2.6. Site Notice	2-3
2.7. Gatwick Airport website	2-3
3 Responses to Consultation	3-1
3.1. Overview of Consultation Feedback	3-1
4 The Applicant's Response to Consultation Feedback	4-1
4.1. Analysis of Consultation Feedback	4-1
4.2. GAL's Response to Consultation Feedback	4-2
4.3. Response Tables	4-2
5 Conclusion	5-1
6 References	6-1
7 Glossary	7-1

Appendices

Appendix A: Meeting Slides

Appendix B: Summary Notes

Appendix C: Template copy of the Consultation Letter

Appendix D: Consultation Leaflet

Appendix E: Copies of Newspaper Notices

Appendix F: Copies of Press Releases

Appendix G: Consultation Site Notices

Appendix H: Consultation Responses (redacted)

Executive Summary

A **Consultation Report** [APP-218 to APP-244] was submitted by Gatwick Airport Limited as part of an application for a development consent order under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 for the proposed Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project, accepted for Examination on 03 August 2023.

This **Consultation Report Addendum** supports a formal request to change the application, as accepted, relating to three proposed changes. The changes are described in detail in the **Change Application Report** (Doc Ref. 9.2) but in summary comprise:

- Project Change 1 – Extension to the design parameters for the North Terminal International Departure Lounge proposed southern extension;
- Project Change 2 – Reduction in height of the proposed replacement Central Area Recycling Enclosure (CARE) facility and change in the purpose of the CARE facility;
- Project Change 3 – Revision to the proposed water treatment works.

The proposed changes were identified through continued refinement of the Project proposals, including having regard to feedback received from stakeholders.

The Applicant carried out non-statutory consultation on the proposed changes between 13 December 2023 and 21 January 2024. The purpose of this report is to set out the activities carried out as part of the non-statutory consultation stage, the feedback received and how the feedback has been duly considered prior to making this formal change request.

1 Consultation on Proposed Changes

1.1. Introduction

- 1.1.1 Gatwick Airport Limited (“GAL” or the “Applicant”) submitted an application for a development consent order (the “Application”) under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 for the proposed Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project (the “Project” or the “NRP”). The Application was subsequently accepted for Examination by the Planning Inspectorate (on behalf of the Secretary of State) on 03 August 2023.
- 1.1.2 Since the submission of the Application, the Applicant has continued to refine the Project proposals including having regard to feedback received from stakeholders. Through this work, the Applicant identified three proposed changes to the Project, which are the subject of this formal Change Request and detailed in full in the **Change Application Report** (Doc Ref. 9.2).
- 1.1.3 In the process of identifying and addressing changes to the Application, the Applicant has considered the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note Sixteen: Requests to change applications after they have been accepted for examination (“Advice Note Sixteen”) (Version 3 March 2023¹) and the Planning Act 2008: Guidance for the examination of applications for development consent².
- 1.1.4 The Applicant notified the Examining Authority of the three proposed changes to the application (the Change Notification) on 27 November 2023. The notification comprised a **Covering Letter** [AS-112] and **Notification of Proposed Project Changes Report** [AS-113] (“the Notification Report”). The **Notification Report** put forward the Applicant’s proposed consultation approach and indicative programme, for the Examining Authority’s consideration.
- 1.1.5 The Examining Authority set out its advice on the procedural implications of the three proposed changes and the scale and nature of the proposed consultation approach in its **Procedural Decision** [PD-008] dated 04 December 2023. Within the **Procedural Decision**, the ExA confirmed that the Applicant’s proposed scope of consultation activities “*provides an appropriate basis for the non-statutory consultation*”.
- 1.1.6 The Applicant has followed its proposed consultation approach in the Notification Report and has also taken account of the advice given within the **Procedural Decision**, in that:

¹ <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/advice-note-16/>

² https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a80dfeae5274a2e8ab52a7a/examinations_guidance-final_for_publication.pdf

- The Applicant extended the length of the consultation period to provide additional time for the Christmas / New Year holding period, in response to the ExA's advice. The Applicant subsequently carried out non-statutory consultation on the proposed changes between 13 December 2023 and 21 January 2024, and which is detailed further in this **Consultation Report Addendum**; and
- The Applicant reviewed the extent of residents and businesses to be sent a copy of the consultation leaflet to ensure it was satisfied that the area was sufficiently broad to capture appropriate consultees in relation to the proposed changes. A total of 3,151 leaflets were sent to residents and businesses, as described within this **Consultation Report Addendum**.

1.2. Purpose of this Report

1.2.1 The purpose of this report is to describe the non-statutory consultation carried out by Gatwick Airport Limited on the proposed Project changes and to demonstrate how the Applicant has had regard to the consultation feedback received.

1.2.2 This report has been prepared in accordance with Advice Note Sixteen, namely Items 6B and 7 of Figure 2b, in that it:

- confirms who has been consulted on the proposed changes;
- explains why they have been consulted;
- sets out the consultation activities that were undertaken;
- copies of all consultation responses; and
- sets out the Applicant's consideration of the content of the consultation responses received.

1.3. Report Structure

1.3.1 The remainder of this **Consultation Report Addendum** is structured as follows:

- **Section 2: Consultation Process** – details the consultation activities that were carried out by the Applicant before and during the non-statutory consultation stage.
- **Section 3: Responses to Consultation** – explains the consultation responses that were received.
- **Section 4: Applicant's Response to Consultation** – sets out the Applicant's response to the consultation feedback and demonstrates how the Applicant has had regard to the feedback received.
- **Section 5: Conclusion** – sets out the conclusions of this report.

2 Consultation Process

2.1. Overview of the Consultation Process

- 2.1.1 The Applicant carried out non-statutory consultation on the proposed changes to ensure that all persons who may be affected by the proposed changes were made aware of the changes and had the opportunity to provide comments in advance of this Change Application.
- 2.1.2 Owing to geographical nature of the proposed changes, the consultation was primarily aimed at prescribed consultees, relevant local authorities and landowners/those with an interest in the land related to the proposed changes under sections 42(a) to (d) of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant also consulted members of the public.
- 2.1.3 The consultation was carried out between 13 December 2023 and 21 January 2024, totalling a period of 40 days to provide an allowance for bank holidays and in response to the ExA's **Procedural Decision** [[PD-008](#)] dated 04 December 2023.
- 2.1.4 Various consultation activities were carried out before and during the consultation period to inform stakeholders and the public on the proposed changes, and to advertise the consultation itself. Details of the consultation activities are set out below, with copies of the relevant material provided in **Appendices A to F**.

2.2. Briefing Sessions

- 2.2.1 The Applicant held a briefing session on the proposed changes with 10 local authorities on 5th December 2023, being a week before the start of consultation. The session was attended by Crawley Borough Council, West Sussex County Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Surrey County Council, Mole Valley District Council, Tandridge District Council, Mid Sussex District Council, Horsham District Council, East Sussex County Council and Kent County Council.
- 2.2.2 A separate briefing session was also held with Parish / Town Councils shortly following the start of consultation on 18th December 2023, attended by Charlwood Parish Council, Horley Town Council and Salfords & Sidlow Parish Council.
- 2.2.3 Other Parish Councils/Groups were also invited to the briefing session but did not attend, namely Capel Parish Council, Leigh Parsh Council and Newdigate Parish Councils and the Neighbourhood Plan Groups of Pound Hill, Langley Green and

Forge Hill. The summary notes were shared with these Parish Councils/Groups after the session took place.

- 2.2.4 The meeting slides and summary notes of the Parish / Town Council briefing session were shared with GATCOM (the Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee) who also had a separate dedicated briefing.
- 2.2.5 A copy of the meeting slides is contained at **Appendix A** and the summary notes of the briefing session with the Parish / Town Councils are contained in **Appendix B**.

2.3. Leaflets and Letters

- 2.3.1 A letter and consultation leaflet was sent to local authorities, landowners/those with an interest in the land related to the proposed changes and prescribed consultees under section 42(a) to (d) of the Planning Act 2008. **Appendix C** contains a template copy of the letter and **Appendix D** contains the consultation leaflet.
- 2.3.2 The consultation leaflet (**Appendix D**) was also sent directly to residents and businesses in close proximity to the land subject to the proposed changes, outside of the Order Limits. A total of 3,151 leaflets were sent to residents and businesses.

2.4. Newspaper Notices

- 2.4.1 The consultation was advertised through national and local news. Details of each newspaper notice is contained in **Table 1** and a copy of each newspaper notice is contained in **Appendix E**.

Table 1: Details on Newspaper Notices

Newspaper	Publication Dates
Crawley and Horley Observer	13 December 2023 ³ 20 December 2023
West Sussex County Times	14 December 2023 21 December 2023

³ The notice was scheduled to appear in the Crawley and Horley Observer on 13 December 2023, however due to a printing error it was not published in the hard copy of the paper on this date. The notice was however, published on the online version of the Crawley and Horley Observer on 13 December 2023. The notice was published both online and in print form on 20 December 2023.

Surrey Mirror	14 December 2023 ⁴ 21 December 2023
Kent and Sussex Courier	15 December 2023 22 December 2023
The Times	11 December 2023 ⁵
The London Gazette	11 December 2023

2.5. Press Releases

2.5.1 GAL also published a series of press releases on its media centre website (<https://www.mediacentre.gatwickairport.com/news/>) to further advertise the consultation. The press releases were published on 7th December 2023, 13th December and 15th January 2024.

2.5.2 Copies of the press releases are contained in **Appendix F**.

2.6. Site Notice

2.6.1 Three site notices were erected on Radford Road and Steers Lane, to the south of the land subject to Project Change 3 (revision to the proposed water treatment works) to further advertise the consultation to residents and businesses in close proximity.

2.6.2 Site notices were not erected adjacent to the locations subject to Project Changes 1 and 2 as these areas are considered to be enclosed within the airport boundary and therefore site notices could not be readily reviewed by surrounding residents and businesses in these locations.

2.6.3 The site notices were maintained throughout the consultation period.

2.6.4 A copy of the site notice is contained in **Appendix G**.

2.7. Gatwick Airport website

2.7.1 The consultation material was published on Gatwick Airport's Project website (gatwickairport.com/northern-runway) and provided the link to the online feedback form.

⁴ Dates are printed on alternative pages in the Surrey Mirror newspaper and was not listed on the page displaying the notice, as an alternative page. A copy of the front page of the newspaper is included in Appendix E to confirm the publication date.

⁵ This newspaper notice was published on an undated page. A copy of the front page of the newspaper has been provided to confirm the publication date.

3 Responses to Consultation

3.1. Overview of Consultation Feedback

3.1.1 Parties could respond to the consultation by:

- Completing the online consultation questionnaire on Gatwick Airport’s Project website (gatwickairport.com/northern-runway);
- Emailing comments or feedback to Gatwick Airport’s consultation email address (community@gatwickairport.com);
- Posting a response to Gatwick Airport (Northern Runway Project Team, Destinations Place, South Terminal, Gatwick Airport, West Sussex, RH6 0NP).

3.1.2 Overall, there were 107 responses to the consultation received during the consultation period via the following mechanisms:

- 87 responses via the online consultation questionnaire;
- 20 responses via email; and
- No responses were received via post.

3.1.3 Two late submissions have been received following the close of consultation, but both responses have been accepted by the Applicant and taken into account in the Change Application.

- On 24th January 2024, a late submission was received from Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council via email and was accepted by the Applicant.
- On 9th February 2024, a late submission was received from a member of the public via post and was accepted by the Applicant.

3.1.4 **Appendix H** contains a copy of all consultation responses received.

3.1.5 The categories of respondents are shown in **Table 2**.

Table 2: Consultation Respondents

Type of Respondent	Number of Respondents
Members of the Public / Individuals	91
Local Authorities	6
Prescribed Consultees (excluding LAs)	9

Interest Groups and other Local Organisations	3
Total	109

3.1.6 The following local authorities responded to the consultation:

- Crawley Borough Council;
- East Sussex County Council;
- Horsham District Council;
- Mole Valley District Council;
- Cheshire West and Chester Borough Council; and
- West Sussex County Council.

3.1.7 The following statutory consultees (previously consulted under section 56 (a) of the Planning Act 2008) responded to the consultation:

- Atkins Telecoms (on behalf of Vodafone Limited);
- BUUK Infrastructure;
- Historic England;
- Horley Town Council;
- Natural England;
- The Canal and River Trust;
- The Coal Authority;
- The Health and Safety Executive; and
- UK Health Security Agency.

3.1.8 Other non-statutory consultees and interest groups also responded to the consultation:

- GATCOM;
- Salfords and Sidlow Parish Council; and
- Nutfield Conservation Society.

4 The Applicant’s Response to Consultation Feedback

4.1. Analysis of Consultation Feedback

- 4.1.1 The consultation invited any views on the proposed changes and requested that respondents provided reasons for their views and whether the views relate to Project Changes 1, 2, or 3, or a combination of the changes. All respondents answered this question.
- 4.1.2 The consultation question was deliberately drafted as an ‘open-ended’ question, as opposed to a closed question which would only allow quantitative analysis. The open-ended question allowed respondents to provide unconstrained, detailed responses on the proposed changes. This provided the Applicant with a deeper insight into respondent’s views than would have been provided through a closed question.
- 4.1.3 Respondents were asked to confirm if their responses related to Project Changes 1, 2 or 3, or a combination of the changes. The number of responses made against each subject matter are set out in **Table 3**. Where more than one comment is made on a proposed change or a general comment, these are counted separately, i.e. in most cases, each respondent made more than one comment.

Table 3: Responses per Subject Matter

Subject Matter of the Response	Number of Comments
General Comments (not relating to any of the Project Changes)	56
Project Changes 1, 2 and 3	19
Project Change 1	68
Project Change 2	105
Project Change 3	105

- 4.1.4 As demonstrated by **Table 3**, the majority of respondents commented on Project Changes 2 and 3, however a reasonable number of comments were also provided on Project Change 1.

4.1.5 The Applicant has reviewed and considered each consultation response received prior to the submission of this Change Application, described in further detail below.

4.2. GAL's Response to Consultation Feedback

4.2.1 Each response has been reviewed and fully considered by the Applicant and relevant members of the Project Team. A systematic approach was followed to analyse the responses to the consultation, through which responses were analysed at a sentence-by-sentence level.

- Each response was reviewed and assigned against the relevant subject matter (e.g. if the comment was being made against a specific Project Change, a combination of the proposed changes or the Project more generally).
- The responses were then assigned a category based on the topic and corresponding to the EIA topics, where relevant, e.g. traffic and transport, water environment, air quality, etc. and shared with the relevant topic expert and GAL topic lead.
- Topic experts and GAL leads were asked to consider each comment and provide a response and / or highlight where further work or changes to the Project Change(s) are required as a result of the comment.

4.2.2 Having considered all of the consultation feedback received, no changes were identified to the proposed changes or deemed necessary, and therefore the Change Application has been prepared on the basis of the changes originally proposed as part of the notification process.

4.2.3 In some instances, further information was requested by respondents on a Project Change. This additional information was either provided during the consultation process or is contained within this report or the Change Application. For instance, at the briefing session held with Parish / Town Councils on 18th December 2023 (described in Section 2 of this report), a number of queries were raised during the meeting and subsequently via email. The Applicant subsequently provided a summary note of the meeting and which included a response to each queries (contained in **Appendix B**). Where further information has been requested, this is set out in the response tables (described below).

4.3. Response Tables

4.3.1 **Tables 4 and 5** set out the consultation feedback received and the Applicant's response to each comment or issue. **Table 4** relates to responses received by members of the public or individuals, comprising 91 responses in total. **Table 5**

relates to responses received by local authorities, prescribed consultees and interest groups, totalling 18 responses.

- 4.3.2 To avoid repetition, the table sets out the number of times that the particular comment or issue has been raised by a respondent rather than repeating the comment/issue.

Table 4: Responses received by members of the public or individuals

Summary of Comment / Issue	No. of times comment / issue has been raised	The Applicant's response
General comments and/or comments related to Project Changes 1 to 3		
Comment expressing concern that the Applicant is putting forward another amendment to the Project.	1	<p>Since submission of the Application, the Applicant has continued to refine the Project proposals including having regard to feedback from stakeholders. The proposed changes (Changes 1 to 3) are the outcome of this work.</p> <p>To clarify, these changes are the first changes that have been put forward by the Applicant since acceptance of the Application.</p>
Comments expressing concerns for the Project not related to the Project changes.	34	<p>The purpose of the consultation was to seek views on the proposed changes to inform the Change Application. Comments not relating to the proposed changes are therefore outside the remit of this consultation.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has reviewed the comments against the Relevant Representations received and the consultation feedback has been captured within the RRs which the Applicant is in the</p>

		process of responding to, for submission at Deadline 1.
Comments expressing support for the Project not related to the Project changes.	13	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
Comments expressing support for the proposed changes.	3	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the proposed changes.
Comment welcoming consultation on the Project/proposed changes.	1	Noted.
Comment raising concerns that the consultation was not sufficient in that all those who have made RRs should have been consulted.	1	<p>The Notification Report [AS-113] put forward the Applicant’s proposed approach to consultation which involved consulting the relevant Local Authorities, landowners/those with an interest in the land relating to the proposed changes and prescribed consultees under sections 42(a) to (d) of the Planning Act 2008. The Applicant also consulted members of the public through advertising the change consultation through various means and sending a copy of the consultation leaflet to residents and businesses in close proximity to the land subject to the proposed changes. This is in line with the approach put forward in the Notification Report.</p> <p>The ExA’s Procedural Decision [PD-008] dated 04 December 2023 confirmed that the Applicant’s proposed scope of consultation activities provided an “<i>appropriate basis for non-statutory consultation</i>”.</p>

		The Consultation Report Addendum and its appendices contain further detail on the consultation activities that were undertaken by the Applicant, carried out in line with the Notification Report's proposed consultation approach.
Neutral comment on the Project, not specific to the proposed changes.	3	Noted.
Comments objecting to the proposed changes in general.	4	Noted. The Applicant has taken account of consultation feedback received and provided a response in this Consultation Report Addendum.
Comments related to Project Change 1: Extension to the design parameters for the North Terminal International Departure Lounge (NT IDL) proposed southern extension		
Comment objecting to Project Change 1 to extend the southern side of the runway by 70m.	1	The proposed change does not entail runway changes.
Comment raising concern that the increased roof space will increase rain water.	1	Whilst the design parameters for the NT IDL southern extension are proposed to be increased under Project Change 1 (i.e. the envelope within which development can be carried out), the extension itself would still have a maximum floorspace of 12,600m ² and occupy space over Levels 10, 20 and 30 as set out in the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1) and the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) (Doc Ref. 2.1).

		As such, the maximum roof space of the proposed southern extension is unchanged from that assessed in the ES. The increased impermeable area that results from the Project has been assessed and reported in ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-147]. The Project includes additional storage and attenuation within the drainage network to ensure no increase in peak runoff rates and consequently no increase in flood risk to other parties.
Comment expressing support for the proposed change.	5	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the proposed change.
Comments seeking further detail on what “general circulation space” entails.	1	<p>The general circulation space entails open space linking the retail, catering and other outlets (such as family areas and prayer rooms) that would be within the IDL extension, and also includes seating and meeting areas. Figure 55 of the Design and Access Statement: Volume 3 [APP-255] provides an indicative cross-section of the proposed southern extension.</p> <p>The circulation space is a key part of providing a high-quality passenger experience to enable staff and passengers to move through and utilise the departure lounges and their facilities.</p>
Comments requesting space within the IDL for disabled persons to wait for their assistance.	1	The detailed design of the IDL southern extension is to be secured by Requirement 4 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1), to provide the layout, siting, scale and external appearance for approval by the relevant planning authority which would be Crawley Borough Council in this instance. Under

		Requirement 4, the detailed design must be in accordance with the Design Principles contained in the Design and Access Statement: Volume 5 [APP-257] and in which the design of the Terminal Buildings must ensure accessibility for all (under Design Principle DBF2).
Comments querying how the construction waste will be disposed of.	2	<p>The strategy for managing waste and resources arising from construction activities is set out in the Outline Construction Resources and Waste Management Plan (oCRWMP), forming Annex 5 to ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice [APP-087]. The strategy is based on the waste hierarchy principle. Site Waste Management Plans would be prepared during detailed design that set out the specific waste that would be generated and how these wastes would be managed.</p> <p>Should the proposed change be accepted by the ExA, it would then form part of the Application and therefore the oCRWMP would be applicable to the works.</p>
Comment requesting further detail on what “increase to the design parameter” means.	1	Where elements of the Project proposals do not have a detailed design, maximum design parameters have been defined to underpin the Environmental Impact Assessment, as set out in ES Chapter 6: Approach to Environmental Assessment [APP-031] . The design parameters define the maximum extent in which the relevant elements of the proposed development could be delivered and are illustrated on the Parameter Plans (Doc Ref. 4.7).

		In the case of Project Change 1, the proposed southern extension to the NT IDL is defined by maximum height and plan parameters, and within which the proposed extension must fall within. Project Change 1 is seeking to increase these maximum parameters to provide greater design flexibility. The total size of the proposed IDL extension, which would be constructed within the design parameters, is unchanged.
Comment requesting further detail on the carbon impact of demolition waste material.	1	Within ES Appendix 16.9.1: Assessment of Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions [APP-191] this is assumed to be 0.85% of GHG emissions arising from the wider construction material embodied carbon (for those Project elements) and the expectation would be that these arisings would be proportionately similar in scale for those activities within the Change Application. As such they are expected not to be material to the assessment of GHG impact arising from the Project as a whole.
Comments raising concern that the additional lorry movements that would be generated by demolition and construction waste have not been considered.	24	The Transport Assessment [AS-079] and ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076] consider the impact of two construction scenarios (airfield and highway construction). The number of trips associated with the demolition and construction waste of the NT IDL proposed southern extension is not expected to generate traffic which would be significantly higher than the assessed construction scenarios.
Comments raising noise, climate change and air quality concerns over	23	Project Change 1 would not materially change the number of construction trips. No new significant effects or materially different significant effects compared to those

increased construction traffic impacting surrounding communities.		identified in the ES for the DCO application have been identified for noise, climate change and air quality during construction.
Comment objecting to further congestion in the NT IDL.	1	The NT IDL is proposed to be extended to the north and south to provide additional capacity within the departure lounges to accommodate additional passenger and staff arising from the NRP.
Comments relating to Project Change 2: Reduction in height of the proposed replacement CARE facility and change in its purpose		
Comments objecting to the disposal of waste off-site, as disposal on-airport produces energy for the airport and using off-site contractors will result in a bigger carbon footprint.	1	<p>The biomass boiler in the existing CARE facility processed organic waste from the terminal restaurants and domestic flights. Heat from the process was captured and used within the existing CARE facility (the heat was not used in the Airport terminals or other buildings). The biomass boiler was switched off during the COVID-19 pandemic as the volume of organic waste being generated was too low to operate effectively. The boiler has remained switched off as volume of organic waste produced at the airport remains low post-pandemic and therefore the biomass operation is not effective unless it is continually supplemented by diesel fuel to achieve sufficiently high temperatures.</p> <p>Organic waste is still collected separately at the airport and is managed off-site via anaerobic digestion. This process produces methane (that can be used to generate energy) and a digestate that can be used as a fertiliser.</p>

<p>Comments raising the need for a comprehensive plan to manage waste at the airport and not rely upon off-airport facilities.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>GAL's Second Decade of Change has set a target that by 2030 all materials used at Gatwick Airport in operations, commercial activity and construction are repurposed for beneficial use i.e. repaired, reused, donated, recycled and composted or converted to fuel for heating and transport. Waste collected at the replacement CARE facility would be managed in accordance with this target and the waste hierarchy.</p>
<p>Comments objecting to waste vehicles using local roads to remove waste from the airport.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Under Gatwick Airport's existing operations, waste materials are currently transported via the strategic road network, where possible and appropriate, to the designated off-airport waste management facilities. Project Change 2 would not materially change the routes used by waste management vehicles.</p> <p>The Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2) confirms the number of additional vehicle trips associated with the proposed change, is expected to be up to six vehicle movements (three arrivals and three departures) a day for the new CARE facility to transport waste off-airport.</p>
<p>Comments requesting clarity on how many additional vehicles would be required to remove waste from the airport.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2) confirms the number of additional vehicle trips associated with the proposed change, in that it is expected to be up to six vehicle movements (three arrivals and three departures) in total a day for the new CARE facility to transport waste off-airport.</p>
<p>Comments expressing concern regarding additional vehicles needed to remove</p>	<p>28</p>	<p>As set out above, the number of vehicle trips associated with the new CARE facility trips is expected to be very low. The additional trips would not have a perceptible effect on</p>

waste from the airport and raising the need for the re-assessment of lorry movements to and from the airport.		highway network operation and would not have a material effect on the assessment reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076].
Comments expressing concern over the carbon impact of additional lorry movements to remove waste material.	1	The Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2) confirms the number of additional vehicle trips associated with the proposed change, in that it is expected to be up to six vehicle movements (three arrivals and three departures) a day for the new CARE facility to transport waste off-airport. This change is small in scale and considered unlikely to materially impact the total emissions reported in the wider GHG assessment, contained in ES Appendix 16.9.2: Assessment of Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Airport Buildings and Ground Operations [APP-192].
Comment expressing support for the project change, particularly due to improved visual impacts and reduction in air pollution close to residential areas.	28	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the proposed change.
Comment raising concerns that not all passengers would comply with putting waste in the correct receptacle, therefore impacting efficiency of the proposal.	1	Gatwick Airport has a comprehensive system in place to manage waste arising from the airport, within initiatives for recycling and reuse in line with its Second Decade of Change target. The replacement CARE facility, subject to Project Change 2, would become a waste sorting facility only. This would mean that any waste placed in the incorrect receptacles would be reassigned

		through the waste sorting process within the CARE facility.
Comments querying where the waste would be taken off-airport.	2	Waste from Gatwick Airport is taken to off-airport waste management facilities, which hold the appropriate planning consent and environmental permits. These facilities are reviewed on a regular basis. Project 2 Change would not lead to a change in this approach.
Comments expressing concern that the existing incinerator is in place.	1	The purpose of Project Change 2 is to remove the food waste to energy plant within the existing CARE facility from the replacement facility.
Comments raising concern over the noise impact of the proposed change.	1	No new significant effects or materially different significant effects compared to those identified in the ES for the DCO application have been identified for noise during construction or operation for Project Change 2.
Comments related to Project Change 3: Revision to the proposed water treatment works		
Comments expressing support for the project change.	8	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the proposed change.
Comments querying public access and raising concern about vandalism and illegal entry to the site.	2	GAL currently allow permissive access to the Biodiversity Area where the proposed constructed wetland (reed bed) system would be located. It is proposed that, following completion of the construction, permissive access to the area around the constructed wetland would be available and that fencing around the perimeter of the reed beds and

		the blowers would be provided to control public access around the area.
Comments querying what happens during extreme flood events, in that excess rain water could enter the River Mole before it was cleaned.	4	The proposed constructed wetland (reed bed) system would discharge to the Gatwick Stream which joins with the River Mole around 3km further downstream. The reed beds would be operated so as to keep the levels of the existing pollution lagoons low and provide additional capacity in the existing system in addition to the new capacity provided by NRP. In an extreme flood event polluted waters would be held within the drainage system and would not be discharged to the River Mole.
Comments raising concern that the system relies on nature to remove anti-freeze chemicals, instead of a filtration system.	1	The system proposed is an engineered wetland designed for the purpose. It is proven technology and has been used successfully elsewhere, including at another airport in the UK, for many years. The system provides for the testing of the cleaned water at its outfall. In the event that the discharge standard is not met, the water would be directed back to the pollution lagoons to be recirculated for further treatment.
Comments querying if the reed bed system will remove de-icing fluid, oil and other contaminants from the airfield.	1	The purpose of the constructed wetland (reed bed) system is to deal with the de-icing chemicals used on the aircraft and runway surfaces. All fuel spills and leakages are managed carefully on site with spill kits and if required sweepers. The drainage system has oil interceptors at many locations. Other activities where wastewater is generated are managed under strict conditions with the resulting effluent being managed in accordance with environmental regulations.

<p>Comments expressing concern over traffic volumes on Balcombe Road when the equipment is in use.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The equipment is considered to have relatively low routine maintenance requirements due to few mechanical moving parts. It is expected that monthly site inspections would take place during the summer months and weekly inspections would take place during the winter months. This is set out in the Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2). This level of activity is not expected to have a perceptible impact on Balcombe Road.</p>
<p>Comments expressing concern over the cost cutting approach to remove the MBBR.</p>	<p>23</p>	<p>The use of reed beds is a less energy intensive process than use of an MBBR plant and was adopted following GAL reviewing how both technologies were being employed in practice elsewhere. The reed beds are of lower capital cost, are expected to provide biodiversity benefits and are overall a more sustainable solution.</p>
<p>Comments raising concern that the reed beds will not accommodate the surface water generated by the Project's construction and repositioned northern runway.</p>	<p>31</p>	<p>The Project is designed to take full account of Environment Agency recommended fluvial and rainfall allowances for climate change based on the United Kingdom Climate Projections 2018. As part of the NRP, there would be dedicated additional storage provided which would reduce surface water flood extents on airport and ensure also there is no increase in flooding off-airport. The passage of water through the aerated reed beds would allow the levels of the pollution storage lagoons to be kept low and hence provide more capacity within the drainage system.</p>
<p>Comment raising concern on the risk to human health from the</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The public health implication of Project Change 3 has been assessed. The beneficial effect to surface water quality from the de-icer</p>

reed beds and de-icer treatment process.		treatment, via the proposed constructed wetland (reed bed) system, would continue to represent an improved position. Best practice maintenance of the constructed wetlands would avoid odour effects. Furthermore, the water would be aerated, so not stagnant. Whilst there is public access in the area, the reed beds would be fenced off, so close proximity is not expected. In any case, the water level would be maintained approximately 50mm below the surface of the gravel medium, so no risk of public ingestion or dermal contact with reed bed water is anticipated. It is not considered that the reed beds would pose a risk to public health.
------------------------------------------	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Table 5: Responses received by local authorities, prescribed consultees and interest groups

Summary of Comment / Issue	No. of times comment/ issue has been raised	The Applicant's response
General comments and/or comments related to Project Changes 1 to 3		
No comments to make on the proposed changes.	6	Noted.
Request for further information on the location of each change.	2	The Applicant has provided the requested details to the two organisations and no further response has been received.

Insufficient information has been provided on the proposed changes.	5	The Applicant has accorded with guidance in the Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Sixteen ⁶ (most notably Figures 2a and 2b) which sets out the level of information that must be provided at each stage of a change request.
Comment of support for the Applicant's intention to review and refine the project proposals.	1	Noted. The Applicant welcomes this support.
Comment requesting further information on the in-combination impacts underpinning the Applicant's assessment that there would be no change or any improvement to air quality and health and wellbeing assessment outputs off-site.	1	Project Changes 1 to 3 have been reviewed to determine any new significant effects or any materially different significant effects (individually and combined) compared to those identified in the ES for the DCO application. Whilst there is likely to be a slightly improved air quality position from removal of the biomass boilers in Project Change 2, air quality effects would remain not significant for population health. No new or materially different significant effects have been identified.
Comments related to Project Change 1: Extension to the design parameters for the NT IDL proposed southern extension		
Comments confirming that there are no concerns or comments on the proposed change.	4	Noted.
Comment querying how the change could impact the layout and	1	At this stage, there is not a detailed design of the visual appearance and layout of the proposed terminal extension. Instead, the

⁶ <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-and-advice/advice-notes/advice-note-16/>

visual appearance of the terminal.		detailed design of the IDL southern extension is to be secured by Requirement 4 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1), to provide the layout, siting, scale and external appearance for approval by the relevant local planning authority which would be Crawley Borough Council in this instance.
Comment supporting the improvement to the passenger experience.	1	Noted. The Applicant welcomes this support.
Comment raising concerns over increased waste volumes that could potentially be generated.	1	Project Change 1 is not envisaged to lead to an increase in waste volumes. The strategy for managing waste and resources arising from construction activities is set out in the oCRWMP , forming Annex 5 to ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice [APP-087].
Comments relating to Project Change 2: Reduction in height of the proposed replacement CARE facility and change in its purpose		
Comment confirming no objection to the proposed change in principle.	1	Noted.
Comments querying where the waste would be taken off-airport.	4	Waste from Gatwick Airport is taken to off-site waste management facilities, which hold the appropriate planning consent and environmental permits. These facilities are reviewed on a regular basis. Project Change 2 would not lead to a change in this approach.
Comments requesting further information on	5	The Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2) confirms the number of additional vehicle

the traffic impacts of the change.		trips associated with the proposed change, in that it is expected to be up to six vehicle movements (three arrivals and three departures) a day for the new CARE facility to transport waste off-airport.
Comments requesting a separate assessment of the highway impacts of the change, or querying how this will be taken into account in the Transport Assessment.	2	As set out above, the number of vehicle trips associated with the new CARE facility trips is expected to be very low. The additional trips would not have a perceptible effect on highway network operation and would not have a material effect on the assessment reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076] and the Transport Assessment [AS-079]
Comment querying the likely vehicles to be used to transport waste and what routes will be used.	1	Waste materials are currently transported via the strategic road network, where possible and appropriate, to the designated waste management facilities. Project Change 2 would not materially change the routes used by waste management vehicles.
Comment querying if the change in construction sequencing will alter the overall number of construction vehicles and/or change the likely busiest period of construction traffic.	1	The demolition of the existing CARE facility and construction of the replacement CARE facility would take place during 2024-2029. The removal of the biomass boilers and the associated flue proposed under Project Change 2 would not increase the construction activities or impact the busiest period of construction traffic.
Comments seeking assurance that the waste vehicles will use the strategic road	2	Waste materials are currently transported via the strategic road network, where possible and appropriate, to the designated waste management facilities. Project Change 2

<p>network and not use local roads.</p>		<p>would not materially change the routes used by waste management vehicles.</p> <p>The Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2) confirms the number of additional vehicle trips associated with the proposed change, in that it is expected to be up to six vehicle movements (three arrivals and three departures) a day for the new CARE facility to transport waste off-airport.</p>
<p>Comments requesting further information on the air quality impacts of additional traffic movements.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The volume of vehicle trips associated with the proposed CARE facility is expected to be very small, in the region of six additional vehicle movements per day.</p> <p>The air quality impacts for this level of trip generation can be screened out and considered as having an insignificant effect on air quality in line with the IAQM EPUK guidance screening criteria. Therefore, there would not be any new or materially different significant effects for air quality.</p>
<p>Comments expressing concern over the carbon impact of additional lorry movements to remove waste material.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2) confirms the number of additional vehicle trips associated with the proposed change, in that it is expected to be up to six vehicle movements (three arrivals and three departures) a day for the new CARE facility to transport waste off-airport. This change is small in scale and considered unlikely to materially impact the total emissions reported in the wider GHG assessment, contained in ES Appendix 16.9.2: Assessment of Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Airport Buildings and Ground Operations [APP-192].</p>

<p>Comments expressing support for the positive visual impact and positive impact on odour/local air quality as a result of the change.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes the support for the proposed change.</p>
<p>Comments querying the impact of the proposed change on the airport's sustainability strategy, given the loss of an energy-from-waste facility.</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The biomass boiler in the existing CARE facility processed organic waste from the terminal restaurants and domestic flights. Heat from the process was captured and used within the existing CARE facility (the heat was not used in the Airport terminals or other buildings). The biomass boiler was switched off during the COVID-19 pandemic as the volume of organic waste being generated was too low to operate effectively. The boiler has remained switched off as the volume of organic waste produced at the airport remains low post-pandemic and therefore the biomass operation is not effective.</p> <p>Organic waste is still collected separately at the airport and is managed off-site via anaerobic digestion. This process produces methane (this can be used to generate energy) and a digestate that can be used as a fertiliser.</p>
<p>Comment requesting an estimate of greenhouse gas emissions associated with the airport's entire waste management cycle.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>This response relates to Gatwick Airport's waste management cycle as a whole and is not specific to Project Change 2. Notwithstanding this, a response is provided below.</p> <p>The GHG impact of Gatwick Airport's approach to waste management across the</p>

		<p>airport is set out in its annual reporting. The most recent information on corporate sustainability reporting across the airport is available for 2022 at:</p> <p>https://www.gatwickairport.com/on/demandware.static/-/Sites-Gatwick-Library/default/dw7600eaeae/images/Corporate-PDFs/Sustainability/Decade%20of%20Change%20Performance%20Summary%202022%20-%20September%20Update.pdf</p> <p>Gatwick Airport has not historically separately reported emissions related solely to waste management, as these have been aggregated with other operational emissions in historic reporting of GHG emissions.</p>
<p>Comment requesting a Waste and Resource Strategy for the airport.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The strategy for managing waste and resources arising from construction activities is set out in the oCRWMP, forming Annex 5 to ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice [APP-087]. In respect of operation, the airport has existing systems and strategies in place to manage waste and resources arising from the airport's operation.</p>
<p>Comment asking how the Applicant will ensure that waste is managed in line with the waste hierarchy.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>GAL's Second Decade of Change has set a target that by 2030 all materials used at Gatwick in operations, commercial activity and construction are repurposed for beneficial use i.e. repaired, reused, donated, recycled and composted or converted to fuel for heating and transport. Waste collected at the CARE facility would be managed in accordance with this target and the waste hierarchy.</p>

Comment querying what sorting technologies will be used.	1	The preferred sorting technologies within the replacement CARE facility would be confirmed at the detailed design stage.
Comment requesting that the use of rail to move waste is considered, instead of HGVs.	1	Under Gatwick Airport's existing operations, waste materials are currently transported via the strategic road network, where possible and appropriate, to the designated off-airport waste management facilities.
Comments related to Project Change 3: Revision to the proposed water treatment		
Comments expressing support for the proposed change.	2	Noted. The Applicant welcomes the support for the proposed change.
Comment requesting further detail on the construction arrangements for the proposed change, including the depth of excavation and changes in ground levels.	1	The proposed constructed wetland (reed bed) system is a highly beneficial intervention and would assist with increasing the capacity of the airport's surface water storage hence reducing flood risk. The reed bed areas would be formed by profiling the existing ground, detail design would determine the detailed methodology including depth of excavation. The construction works are anticipated to be one year duration. A temporary access road would be created to allow access of the public highway and the establishment of temporary site offices and associated storage and lay down areas. It is anticipated that the new access road would then be established to provide suitable access during the construction phase. In parallel with the construction works all necessary finishing works in the surrounding area would be undertaken, including all permanent fencing, forming the permanent arrangements for on

		going maintenance and operations, access final surfacing, permanent security arrangements, closure of any temporary public rights of way route and reverting to permanent route.
Comments requesting further drainage details, including how it would connect to the wider drainage infrastructure, compliance with the SuDS principles, and impacts on the wider drainage strategy.	2	The constructed wetland (reed bed) system would be connected to Gatwick Airport's existing surface water storage lagoons. The water would pass through them and, providing it meets the standards of the discharge consent, would then be discharged to the Gatwick Stream in normal operation. The reed beds are a highly beneficial intervention in context of SuDS systems and would assist with increasing the capacity of Gatwick Airport's surface water storage hence reducing flood risk.
Comment requesting further information on pollution risks to nearby watercourses.	2	There are no pollution risks to nearby watercourses from the constructed wetland (reed bed) system. The level of water within the reed beds would be monitored automatically, and would not be fed with water from the pollution storage lagoons when water exceeds the design level. The quality the water being discharged from the reed beds to the Gatwick Stream would be continually monitored and if of insufficient quality to meet Environment Agency requirements would be recirculated for further treatment.
Comment querying if there would be a risk to human health from the reed bed water or odour.	1	The public health implication of the Project change has been assessed, including in relation to odour and reed bed water quality. The beneficial effect to surface water quality from the de-icer treatment, via the proposed constructed wetland (reed bed) system,

		would continue to represent an improved position. Best practice maintenance of the constructed wetlands would avoid odour effects. Furthermore, the water would be aerated, so not stagnant. Whilst there is public access in the area, the reed beds would be fenced off, so close proximity is not expected. In any case, the water level would be maintained approximately 50mm below the surface of the gravel medium, so no risk of public ingestion or dermal contact with reed bed water is anticipated. It is not considered that the reed beds would pose a risk to public health.
Comment requested an assessment of odour of the reed beds.	1	Following best practice maintenance of the reed beds as set out in the Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2), there would be no odour emissions. Therefore, there would be no significant odour effects associated with the facility and no further mitigation for odour would be required.
Comments requesting further information on the effectiveness of the reed bed technology to remove contaminants and how water quality is controlled and monitored.	4	The purpose of the constructed wetland (reed bed) system is to deal with the de-icing chemicals used on the aircraft and runway surfaces. They are expected to be highly effective based on experience elsewhere. All fuel spills and leakages are managed carefully on site with spill kits and if required sweepers. The drainage system has oil interceptors at many locations. Other activities where wastewater is generated are managed under strict conditions with the resulting effluent being managed in accordance with environmental regulations.
Comments requesting further information on	2	The reed beds use an aerobic process and would not generate odour in normal operation

<p>measures to control potential odour and the noise from the 'blowers'.</p>		<p>as explained in the Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2).</p> <p>The blowers would be some way distant from the nearest local properties and are expected to be quiet in operation. They would have acoustic hoods and be enclosed by acoustic fencing.</p>
<p>Comments requesting further information on the current biodiversity value of the area, the extent of tree and habitat loss (including TPO trees), impact on biodiversity and where any mitigation, compensation or enhancement could be provided and what management arrangements would be.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>No tree removal is anticipated to accommodate the constructed wetland (reed bed) system, the associated construction compound or construction activities and no TPO trees would be affected (based on 2014 data contained in Gatwick R2: Updated Scheme Design for Airports Commission (May 2014)⁷, subject to update following response from Crawley Borough Council). Where possible construction activities and operational development within root protection zones would be avoided. Any construction activities or temporary access within or near root protection zones would be undertaken in accordance with best practice in BS:5837: Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction, to minimise effects.</p> <p>The change in habitat type associated with Project Change 3 would be addressed in a revised ES Appendix 9.9.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [APP-136], should the change be accepted by the ExA. Similarly, details of management would be set out in a revised ES Appendix 8.8.1: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan</p>

⁷ [21 Appendix A13 Place.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#)

		[APP-113 to APP-116] should the change be accepted.
Comments requesting detail on how much new biodiversity habitat could be provided given the contaminated condition of the water and that the nearby lagoons are netted to deter birds.	2	<p>The area of Project Change 3 forms part of the Gatwick Land East of the Railway Biodiversity Area. The loss of grassland due to the proposed water treatment works in the ES would be mitigated by the Environmental Area to the West of the River Mole. The loss of grassland to create the constructed wetland (reed bed) system would be minor adverse in the medium term until grassland within the Environmental Area to the West of the River Mole matures, after which the effect would be beneficial as the area created is larger than the area lost to the constructed wetland system. The creation of reed beds would be a beneficial effect, once mature.</p> <p>The change in habitat type associated with Project Change 3 would be addressed in a revised ES Appendix 9.9.2: Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [APP-136], should the change be accepted by the ExA.</p> <p>It is common for reed beds to be used for water filtration purposes and once established, provide a significant resource for a range of smaller nesting birds such as reed bunting.</p>
Comments seeking clarity that the new habitat would be supported from an aerodrome safeguarding perspective.	2	<p>Gatwick Airport is acutely aware of the necessary airport safeguarding requirements and the proposal for the constructed wetland (reed bed) system has been discussed with Airport Safeguarding specialists to ensure that their design and ongoing management would be acceptable.</p> <p>It should also be recognised that the reed beds are designed not to have water above the level of the planting media the reeds were</p>

		established within – i.e. they are not ponds which would have the inherent risk of attracting waterfowl.
Comment requesting confirmation where the associated reed bed equipment and construction compound would be located, and how the compound would be accessed.	3	The updated ES Project Description Figures (Doc Ref. 5.2) submitted as part of the Change Application show the location of the water treatment works (on Figure 5.2.1e) and the associated temporary contractor compound (on Figure 5.2.1f). In addition, illustrative sketches of the proposed constructed wetland (reed bed) system are provided in the Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2).
Comment requesting clarity on the number of associated construction vehicle movements.	1	The Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2) confirms that during the peak construction period, there would be approximately one to two HGV movements an hour. This level of vehicle trips would not change the conclusions of the assessments in the Application, contained in the Transport Assessment [AS-079] and ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076].
Comment querying if the construction would take place when other construction activity associated with the NRP is at a higher level than is forecast to be during 2027-2028.	1	The Change Application Report (Doc Ref. 9.2) sets out that the water treatment works would be constructed from 2025 to 2026 to provide the constructed wetland (reed bed) system. Although construction would take place earlier than assumed in the Application, the level of vehicle trips associated with construction would not change the effects identified in the ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076] for the airfield construction scenario (2024 to 2029).
Comment requesting information on the	1	A revised photomontage has been prepared for ES Viewpoint 11 at the public right of way

<p>visual impact of the associated reed bed equipment and construction compound.</p>		<p>360/1Sy immediately east of the WTW site. The wireline photomontage illustrates the maximum parameters for the cabin and storage unit, blowers and parts of the reed bed structures. The development would be clearly visible from this location however, due to the relatively low level and semi natural nature of the development and the partly developed nature of the existing situation, visual effects are not considered to be significant, ranging from moderate adverse in 2024 to 2032, reducing to minor adverse in 2033 to 2038 and beyond when landscape mitigation is mature. The temporary construction compound would be relatively well screened from public locations by hedgerows, trees and foreground activities.</p> <p>The traveller's site and rear gardens of residential properties on Radford Road are located to the south of the WTW site. A mature belt of woodland approximately 25m wide would heavily filter and screen views of the low level development and any temporary construction activities.</p>
<p>Comment requesting information on any materials or soil to be removed from the site and where it would be taken.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>As set out in ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice [APP-082] (paragraph 5.5.11), a Materials Management Plan would be prepared for the management of non-hazardous excavated soil. Site Waste Management Plans would be prepared for other waste materials from the construction process. Waste would be transported to appropriately permitted waste management facilities. The selection of the preferred waste management facilities would be made post consent.</p>

<p>Comment raising concerns on odour and noise impacting the amenity of nearby occupiers.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Following best practice maintenance of the reed beds, there would be no odour emissions. Noise modelling has been undertaken to determine appropriate mitigation measures for noise during both construction and operation which have been adopted as part of the proposed project change. No new or materially different significant effects have been identified, including air quality (for odour) and noise.</p>
<p>Comment raising concern that the use of the site could impact the ability to expand the Crawley Sewage Treatment Works and requesting confirmation that Thames Water was consulted on the proposed change.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>GAL has been meeting with Thames Water over several years, and they have not indicated that the area to the east of the existing Crawley Wastewater Treatment Works would be required. Notwithstanding this, there would still remain over 1ha of available space on GAL's landholding, directly adjacent to the Crawley works, which could be available if required.</p>
<p>Comment questioning whether reed beds are capable of effectively handling de-icer contaminants.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The treatment process is well-proven and in use at several airports including at Heathrow Airport for several years.</p> <p>Water would only be discharged if the quality meets the required discharge consent put in place by the Environment Agency.</p>
<p>Comment querying the day-to-day operation of the facility and how many staff will be required.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The reed beds and associated equipment will be inspected at regular intervals in accordance with Operational & Maintenance requirements. The water quality of the reed beds would be monitored constantly with data (and any alarm states) visible in the Airport's 24hr operational control rooms.</p>

5 Conclusion

- 5.1.1 The Applicant has carried out non-statutory consultation in line with the approach set out in the **Notification Report** [[AS-113](#)] and followed the advice in the ExA's **Procedural Decision** [[PD-008](#)] dated 04 December 2023. Within the Procedural Decision, the ExA confirmed that the Applicant's proposed scope of consultation activities *"provides an appropriate basis for the non-statutory consultation"*.
- 5.1.2 The consultation process has been effective and productive, and we are grateful to those that have given time and effort to be involved in the process and submit a response.
- 5.1.3 Mixed feedback has been received to the consultation, including support for the proposed changes, requests for further information or raising matters of concern. The Applicant has fully considered all responses received and followed the systematic process described in this report. No fundamental issues have been raised that would lead GAL to not move forward with the formal change request. Additionally, no changes have been identified to the three proposed Project Changes as a result of the consultation feedback and therefore the Change Application has been prepared on the basis of the changes originally proposed as part of the notification process.
- 5.1.4 In some instances, further information was requested by respondents on a particular Project Change. This additional information has either been provided during the consultation process or is contained within this report and the Change Application.
- 5.1.5 This report demonstrates that the Applicant has thoroughly considered the consultation feedback received and sets out the Applicant's response to each comment/issue raised in consultation.

6 References

Planning Inspectorate (March 2023). Advice Note Sixteen: Requests to change applications after they have been accepted for examination (Version 3).

7 Glossary

Term	Description
DCO	Development Consent Order
GAL	Gatwick Airport Limited
NRP	Northern Runway Project