

File Name: ISH1 29th February 2024 Part 3.mp3

File Length: 01:14:36

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:16 - 00:00:21:21

Okay. Good afternoon everybody. Now 2:00 and the hearing is resumed. Um. Will recommence, um, from where we left off. So we're on agenda item five. Need and future demand. Um, and we moved on to questions regarding future demand forecasts.

00:00:26:14 - 00:00:51:25

So, um, the first questions. Um, as previously to the applicant, please. Um, so if we could look at the future demand forecasts and start off with the top level forecasts. Um. I note the data book details further government forecasts from the consultation on, um, sustainable aviation Fuels dating from April 2023. Is there any update on those forecasts following that consultation, please?

00:00:52:17 - 00:01:17:25

Scotland. I have asked Mr. Walker to pick up that point. Proposal on behalf of the applicant, said a jet zero 23 the staff the one year on documentation. They're the latest ones released from the DFT Jet Zero modeling framework. And we do understand that they, when we last discussed with them in the topic that they would be in the process of providing some updated forecasts sometime in 2024. Um, but that was several months ago, so I don't have any further updates on timeline for you.

00:01:18:07 - 00:01:21:29

Okay. Thank you. So those latest ones are the April 23rd ones, latest ones available?

00:01:22:01 - 00:01:24:03

Yeah. That's correct. In terms of the government output.

00:01:24:16 - 00:01:35:04

Thank you for that. Um, those forecasts uh, included some new forecasts, assuming growth of 1.74% between 2025 and 2040.

00:01:37:08 - 00:02:01:23

Um, and by 2040 expected 29%, compared to 32 compared to 31% in the jet zero. Um stated by yourselves to be immaterial in the context of a capacity constrained market. I just wondered if there was a pattern here that, um, jet zero was lower than the 2017 forecasts, and then the 2023, 2023 forecasts were then lower than jet zero.

00:02:04:11 - 00:02:20:24

A walker on behalf of the applicant. So for the deadline one submission, we have provided an update because the 2023 ones came too late for the original application. So in our next deadline, you will see the latest update in relation to the wider outlook for the London market and potential implications.

00:02:22:13 - 00:02:29:23

Okay. Thank you. See? See you. You don't see any part in, um, of the forecast decreasing each time they bring out new forecast. In essence.

00:02:29:29 - 00:02:59:06

Sorry. Yeah. So, yeah, the latest ones have decreased. Um, in terms of the drivers behind that, a lot of that we understand was driven some of the longer term economic indicators that I use. Um, we do also note that some of the inputs they use dated, I think from the OECD from the November 22nd edition. Um, I think some of the longer term economic projections have actually improved modestly since then, but I'm conscious it's one of a number of assumptions going into the model. So I wouldn't want to kind of prejudice the direction of travel, uh, where they'll be heading next.

00:02:59:21 - 00:03:00:27

Okay. Thank you for that.

00:03:05:20 - 00:03:29:22

Long term outlook on those forecasts. Um, appears fairly consistent with other recent forecasts. Um, but the short term outlook is different. Um, with a 2025 predicted demand, I think of 304 million um passengers as compared to jet 032 5 million. Um, I appreciate their not your forecast, obviously, but, um, do you, um, have any knowledge on the reasons for that?

00:03:30:22 - 00:04:08:19

Rob Walker for the applicant. So in terms of the what we might turn the relatively short term projection and latest jet theory, um, my understanding would relate to, uh, Covid recovery profiles being captured, um, more in the latest, uh, output, obviously, the ones prepared in 22, 2022 that have been some lead time. I'm conscious in 2022, the aviation market was still, in terms of the trajectory of recovery was much more uncertain then. Um, and I'm also conscious some of the since 2022, this means some of the challenges that you touched on around supply side of the, the industry, for example, the Max groundings in terms of, uh, you know, new aircraft deliveries and so forth.

00:04:09:27 - 00:04:10:12

Thank you.

00:04:13:28 - 00:04:35:27

I know that, uh, one of the aims of the proposal is to enhance capacity to meet demand. Um. Allowing greater competition and, as you say, enabling a more efficient distribution of takeoff and landing slots. Um, but ultimately, won't the proposal just add to peak time usage? Um, well, the same slots that are in demand now still be in demand with two runways in operation.

00:04:38:15 - 00:05:08:16

Rob Walker for the applicant. So in terms of the growth of the northern runway, I think we'll come on to the quantum and how it's delivered later. But in terms of the increase, it's about sort of 15 movements an hour, certainly in the peak hours. Um, in terms of the demand manifesting itself for the runway. Yes. As you touched on, it's very likely to be similar demand profiles that we have today. The

profile of the runway assumed in the future is essentially uplifting. What we have today, reflecting some of the nuances around base, the way based aircraft, long haul flying patterns and so forth.

00:05:08:25 - 00:05:26:01

Um, but yeah, very comparable sort of overall structure in terms of the demand patterns. And it's not material enough to change the underlying 900 plus movements a day that we can facilitate. Already the incremental is a relatively small percentage versus a completely new independent runway.

00:05:28:08 - 00:05:39:22

Okay. Thank you for that. Um, do the northern runway project forecast contain the same assumptions regarding, um, upgrading and larger aircraft, etc. and so on. As a baseline.

00:05:40:08 - 00:05:59:26

Rapporteur for the applicant and very comparable. We've worked within the main airline groupings. Um, and building on that, you'll see at the total level they come out very comparable. The main differences will be some minor, you know, airline mix changes within the short haul and long haul criteria. So you'll see minor seats per ATM and low factor differences in the outputs.

00:06:02:18 - 00:06:18:00

Thank you. And then in terms of, um, fleet mix. Um, your forecast, um, predict a fairly rapid growth in next generation aircraft. Um, could you provide more details on that growth? And are all those next generation aircraft or they'll be cold sea aircraft.

00:06:19:20 - 00:06:56:02

Proposal for the applicant in terms of the next generation transitions. Um, we can certainly provide further detail in terms of the performance to today. I think it's about 23% of movements at Gatwick are operated by, um, next generation aircraft. Um, and in terms of the split, certainly we saw some strong transition initially with the likes of, um, some seven, eight, seven from the likes of Norse, uh, Norwegian operating certainly the more recent transitions being driven by the narrowbody fleet. So that's the especially the easyJet's, the Wizz Air coming in at scale and their fleet programs that you see that they're planning across their wider network.

00:06:56:04 - 00:07:03:29

That's now been reflected at Gatwick operations. So there's ramp up in not just the short haul but also the widebody aircraft coming through as well.

00:07:06:12 - 00:07:12:24

Okay. Thank you for that. So not all the next gen aircraft are okay to see. Some are larger in effect or both.

00:07:12:26 - 00:07:27:21

Yeah that's that's correct. Yeah. So some of the the future we look at say some of the future growth that I think Jonathan's talked on will no doubt be touched on in due course. A lot of the incremental flying has been coming in on the next generation aircraft seven, eight, seven A350s and so forth.

00:07:28:14 - 00:08:03:06

Thank you. Yeah. Understand? Um, a question now for, uh, local authorities, please, joint local authorities. Um, and this is, um, uh, there's a common theme in the relevant representations submitted by the local authorities that says the level of increase in capacity attainable for the project has been overstated. And as a consequence, levels of usage and the demand forecasts have been overstated. Um, and I think you state that the methodology by which these forecasts have been derived is not robust, in your view, even if the underpinning assumptions as a capacity attainable with two runways in use is correct.

00:08:03:08 - 00:08:05:04

I wonder if you could expand on that for me, please?

00:08:08:25 - 00:08:53:27

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities first. And then I'll bring in Miss Condon to provide some flesh on the bones. There is a methodological disagreement, I think, at the moment between the applicants and the local authorities as to, in particular, the extent to which a, um, assessment of future growth should be primarily derived from looking at a macro economic model and then, as it were, top down, distributing that to the, um, particularly the airports that are capable of absorbing that growth.

00:08:54:20 - 00:09:38:00

As opposed to building up from a bottom up basis of looking simply at the individual airport and its aspirations. Um, and although we recognize that the applicant has included some top down modeling as, as it were, an attempt to sense check what it's done, primarily it's forecasts are built from the bottom up basis, and that we don't think is a robust way of modeling. When you are looking so far into the future to 2047, and in terms of building up an appropriate model for a development of this scale.

00:09:38:02 - 00:09:43:12

So that's the kind of the high level point. Then perhaps if I asked Miss Condon if she wants to add any further detail.

00:09:45:05 - 00:10:24:08

Who is Congdon for the joint local authorities? I think Mr. Bedford sort of summarized it very well. Fundamentally, I think the problem is that. We've got forecasts in a document that was part of appendix 4.3.1 to the year, which it was sent to me originally as the Markets and Pipelines report. And it's very much a subjective view of how many frequencies the airport might be able to attract a particular markets. And the problem I've always had with that is it's very difficult to relate that back to the underlying scale of the market, and which other airports in the London system might be competing for a share of that market.

00:10:24:10 - 00:10:54:26

So you ask this morning, sir, about Stansted and could it develop long-haul with no easy way of testing? Whether or not Stansted might actually take a greater or lesser share of that. So it's fundamentally that it's very, very difficult to actually interrogate that markets and pipelines forecast and verify it in any structured way. And in my experience in forecasting for airports, which is fairly extensive. You would normally only use that sort of approach over a 5 to 10 year period.

00:10:54:28 - 00:11:33:14

Now that's actually what the applicant's done. It's used it to forecast to 2032 and then in some manner extrapolated from that to 38 and 47. But again, we don't know how and on what basis. So it would be more usual to present something that was based on a catchment area type model and market share type model. Now, in fairness to Gal, one of the documents that I believe they're going to submit to you at D1 that I've seen a draft of. Does some element of that modelling? Um, I think it's fair to say that having seen that document, I'm still not yet satisfied that I buy these forecasts in their entirety.

00:11:33:16 - 00:11:37:28

But perhaps we can come back to you at deadline two when we've got that document formally in play.

00:11:39:12 - 00:11:42:07

Thank you. That'd be useful. Uh, Mr. Linus or.

00:11:42:24 - 00:12:19:25

Uh, Scott. I'll ask Mr. Pollack to deal with this first and then onto Mr. Walker. But perhaps the introductory point is to say that we have done bottom up and top down. But you will see more details about the deadline one. The important point to note is that essentially, they come up with the same answer to the question as far as future growth and capacity is concerned. Um, we don't accept at this stage that the top down approach that we've taken is somehow deficient. But clearly that's something which is in discussion with, um, York Aviation and will be further details about provided at deadline one.

00:12:19:27 - 00:12:25:08

But in that context, Mr. Pollard, Jonathan Pollard for the applicant.

00:12:25:11 - 00:12:27:21

Um, yeah. I think there's two points that I'd like to make. I think the first.

00:12:27:23 - 00:12:28:15

One is.

00:12:28:17 - 00:12:29:24

This broader sort of.

00:12:29:26 - 00:12:50:14

Question mark on the legitimacy of the demand, uh, fulfilling the what is effectively going to 69 movements an hour. I think I'll make quite precise reference to figure 5.33 on page five, 44 in the needs case. And what this shows is the extent of oversubscription for slots in summer 20. Sorry, could.

00:12:50:16 - 00:12:52:19

You just give me the referring to again.

00:12:52:21 - 00:12:58:17

So it's a figure 5.33 and it's on page 5.44.

00:13:10:06 - 00:13:10:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:13:11:00 - 00:14:03:15

And so the reason I would argue, I think this chart is quite compelling is that's looking at summer 20 so nearly four years ago. And what that's highlighting is the extent of over demand for slots at Gatwick. Um, and what I'd like you to, to draw your attention to is I can see 12 hours where there was if we allocated all of the demand that presented itself for slots, we'd have had 12 hours where we saw more than 60 movements and one further than that. There were four hours that were more than 70 movements. So given there's a broader question mark on when we look at sort of 2047, which is quite some time away, is there sufficient demand to fulfil 69 movements per hour? I would point us to the fact that even in summer, 24 years ago, the total sum of demand that expressed itself for capacity at Gatwick saw in many hours north of 60 movements per hour and in for north of seven.

00:14:03:29 - 00:14:34:22

So I think that's that's quite a key point. I think the second point, I'd say just in response to the points around Stansted not having been tested fairly, I think I would probably take a slightly different view. Um, I think there are examples of long haul services that have commenced at Stansted, um, and haven't remained. Um, I think a good example would be Air India. I think they operated a service to Amritsar for a short period of time. Um, and that was unable to sustain itself at Stansted. That service is now operating at Gatwick with um, very uh, sizeable load factors.

00:14:35:05 - 00:14:47:00

Um, and I think that's one of a number of examples that I think would perhaps challenge that position, that Stansted, as one example, um, has never been tested in its capability for to fulfil long haul at scale.

00:14:50:07 - 00:14:51:17

Thank you. It's going to.

00:14:53:07 - 00:15:31:01

If I can just sort of respond quickly. I mean, we're not saying there isn't demand for North Runway. That's not part of the case that I'm putting on behalf of the joint local authorities. What we're saying is we can't at the moment validate the level of that demand. And what we need to do is validate that level of demand in order to ensure that the benefits and harms are properly assessed. So we're not disputing that there is a demand. But at the moment we don't consider that the forecasts have been produced in a way that enables the robustness of those that level of demand to be tested and refined.

00:15:31:03 - 00:16:06:15

So it's not that we're challenging the blunt now in terms of Stansted. I think, you know, to be fair to Stansted, there's also cases of long haul services starting at Gatwick for a period and then ceasing so and the airports are at different stages of their maturity as well. So I think you know. You've got to be fair. And we've got to say looking 22, 23 years out, which is what this these forecasts do. What might the position be over that period of time? And what I haven't yet seen is a dynamic model that enables us to validate and test that.

00:16:09:24 - 00:16:11:13

Thank you. The applicant, Rob.

00:16:11:15 - 00:16:43:29

Walker, for the applicant. I think when you see the deadline one submission, you'll see a lot of these points answered in that. I'd just like to make the further point that we find the sort of bottom up nature to forecasting and top down to be complementary to each other. Um, certainly for Gatwick, it's very important to understand its future potential throughput from a bottom up perspective. Other airports when we're considering the top down model allocation approach. They have much more pre-defined planning caps. You know, it's very black and white of what is the planning cap at Stansted in the future, the 43 million recently permitted.

00:16:44:01 - 00:17:05:28

What's the planning cap at Luton? Historically it's 18 million. There's no kind of grey line around. What's the peak spreading, what's the load factor, what the fleet sizes are, which is why we need to make sure we do the bottom up perspective to understand the throughput. And then also modelling that from a top down perspective. Um, so you'll see that in the deadline one submission again capturing the latest jet zero forecast outlook for demand.

00:17:07:24 - 00:17:27:06

Thank you for that. Um. That was all the questions that I had on a future demand forecast, um, methodology. But obviously we've already been to the local authorities. So if there's any anybody else who wishes to make any comments on the future demand forecasts, uh, please raise your hand. Yes, Mr. Osborne.

00:17:28:19 - 00:17:48:27

Thank you. Uh, Dan Osborne, CPR Sussex. And can I just ask in relation to the last point made by the applicant? Is 2020 a good year to use as a kind of comparative year? Because that was in the middle of the Covid situation with lockdown and everything else. Do you have the applicant have a reason for using 2020?

00:17:50:00 - 00:17:50:15

The applicant.

00:17:50:20 - 00:18:17:24

Jonathan Pollard for the applicant. So I referenced 2020 because that was what was in the needs case submission. But your point is very valid. I would argue that, um, given that it was a year that was impacted by the Covid recovery, and despite that, we saw the extent of oversubscription that presented itself. If you look at that same picture for summer 24, which is the season we're about to go into, you see exactly the same characteristics significantly higher total sum of demand relative to capacity.

00:18:18:19 - 00:18:43:06

Purple. If I could just add for the the Summer 20 outlook that's the demand pre the season starting. So the season starts summer in about the last Saturday in March it starts. Um and essentially that would be when essentially Covid was starting in 2020. So the applicants actually happen. The process starts

November essentially October or November the year before. So the demand you're seeing is what airlines are applying. Well before Covid had had become a thing.

00:18:45:15 - 00:18:51:15

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Osborne. Um, did anyone else wish to raise anything on the future demand forecasts?

00:18:54:04 - 00:18:56:05

Yes. Uh. Councillor. Essex.

00:18:58:09 - 00:19:29:16

You councillor S6, on behalf of GAC, I wanted to what extent the the additional costs associated with shift to alternative fuels has been factored into the economic forecast of demand in the future, and where that's set out in the documents for both the future baseline case and also the project case for future dates in the future. And also, um, there has been reference today to the notion of a busy day and how that presumably relates to the busiest days in terms of both the peak and the extended off peak times.

00:19:29:21 - 00:19:53:03

Um, this may be already in the documents, but I wonder if if it is, you can point us to where or if not, you might provide indications of the, um, the extent to which a busy day is bigger than today and how that's reflected in not just the increase in runway capacity, but an increase in terminal and land capacity provided in the plan set forward. Thank you.

00:19:55:08 - 00:19:56:24

Thank you. Councillor Essex.

00:19:58:10 - 00:19:59:02

Mr. Linus.

00:20:02:00 - 00:20:04:04

Hotline workers going to pick up the phone.

00:20:04:21 - 00:20:43:04

But if the applicant just knows, um, in reverse order. Um, so yeah, we can certainly provide more detail on the busy day. A lot of that is what, um, feeds into some of the the LEC noise period modeling. Um, so that focus on the busier time of the year. So there's there's already some outputs relating to aircraft movements there. Um, but we can share more detail there. The one in terms of the, the staff potentially mentioned, uh, sustainable aviation fuels. So in terms of as I mentioned, we've adopted the kind of governance trajectory around the profile demand of flying in the future within that that does capture, uh, things relating to the cost of flying, whether it's ETS caused the cost of carbon and so forth.

00:20:43:06 - 00:20:52:19

I'm conscious that obviously there's been a SAF consultation going on with the government, so I expect some of that to feed into the next, uh, update in terms of the iteration of their forecasts.



00:20:56:14 - 00:20:57:07

Thank you, Mr. Walker.

00:20:59:08 - 00:21:01:00

Stress. I'll just come back to you briefly.

00:21:04:14 - 00:21:39:07

Thank you. I'm a same name as before. Um, in terms of the increase in the busy days, it possible to provide an indication as to what the increase in terminal capacity is over the current baseline in terms of what the utilization is now and what it will be in the future, and how much that is to support the baseline condition and how much is to support the project case. Because I'm struggling to understand how the increase in runway capacity relates to the increase in busy day numbers and how that relates to the space you need both on the, um, the the runway and on the land side.

00:21:39:12 - 00:21:46:12

Um, noting the Easyjet comments and how all of these constraints either enable or constrain demand in the future. Thank you.

00:21:48:29 - 00:21:49:14

Thank you.

00:21:52:00 - 00:21:53:05

Uh, Mr. Walker or.

00:21:55:08 - 00:21:55:26

Mr. Linus.

00:21:57:12 - 00:22:04:07

The last applicant. I think we need to take that one away, sir, and follow up. And if we can, that deadline one.

00:22:05:03 - 00:22:13:02

Okay. Thank you for that. Thank you. Um, and on the left hand side. Malcolm. I'm here for the rest of the parish council, but, uh.

00:22:13:21 - 00:22:51:05

More generally, I'm puzzled a little bit by this seeming reliance on the over demand for slots in 2020 and apparently also in 2024. I mean, it just seemed to me that, you know, if an airline thinks that there's going to be a shortage of slots available overall, they're going to they're going to request more than they actually want in order to ensure that they get what they need. And if they do get more than they actually need, they also are aware that these are quite valuable things that they can then sell on to other people.

00:22:51:07 - 00:23:10:14

So I to me, the fact that there's an over demand for slots is. Logical and quite normal, and I would expect that to be the case. Times the reliance on that text to suggest that demand is actually significantly higher. I'm puzzled about.

00:23:11:27 - 00:23:15:27

Thank you, Councillor Fillmore. The applicant would like to respond on that point.

00:23:35:29 - 00:24:18:27

Jonathan Pollard on behalf of the applicant. Um, I think the reality is that the they are genuine requests for slots. Um, that knowing the carriers that have requested them at Gatwick in particular, we know with confidence that they have the fleet capability to operate them if granted. I think it is a fair comment to say that across Europe, you will see airlines typically file for a sum total of slots that is perhaps overall greater than they could deliver if they were granted every single slot. But what I then draw attention to is that we can recognise carriers, if granted all of their opportunity at Gatwick when they've also filed for other slots elsewhere, will prioritise whatever they're allocated at Gatwick and that is driven by the profitability of the catchment.

00:24:18:29 - 00:24:49:27

So it is well documented that certainly certain airlines and their operation at Gatwick is more profitable than any other location in Europe. And so it follows that if they've, uh, filed for extensive slots at Gatwick under the destinations, and let's say that they've been given all of those slots they filed for, if they're then faced with a choice for prioritizing which ones they actually use. That is where, um, we would certainly feel very comfortable that they will operate those slots at Gatwick, given the profitability of the opportunity, um, that the airport presents.

00:24:52:11 - 00:25:06:11

Thank you for that. Can I? Could I just ask you refer then to, um, that it was well documented that, um, the routes are more profitable from Gatwick. Is there any chance we could, um, you could submit some details for those documents? The deadline one, for instance.

00:25:07:01 - 00:25:20:25

Jonathan Pollard, on behalf of the applicant. Yes. We'll have a look at what we can share within reasonable commercial sensitivities. But there's certainly, uh, publicly referenced statements from particular carriers that will endorse the point that I've made. But we'll follow up in deadline one. Thank you for that.

00:25:23:06 - 00:25:29:25

Um. Anyone else in the room for, uh, the future demand forecasts or anybody online?

00:25:32:24 - 00:25:34:07

Uh, no. What'd I say? Yes, Mr. Golden.

00:25:34:22 - 00:26:24:01

But Louise Congdon for the joint local authorities. Just a point we haven't really touched on. But you alluded to it in your question earlier was about, we say even if the capacity assessment was right, we're concerned about the forecasts. I thought it might just be worth alerting you to the point on the

capacity. It's a particular point, not so much around the 69. In perfect conditions, when you have an even split of arriving and departing movements. The key concern that we have is around the ability of airlines like Easyjet and other similar low cost carriers, who base a lot of aircraft at the airport, being able to get their first departures away in the morning, and whether or not that can be delivered with the two runways within acceptable levels of delay, particularly cross referring again to the Easyjet representation.

00:26:24:03 - 00:26:37:00

So that's an area that we've been probing with the applicant and are still seeking further information from them to help us understand whether or not that that early morning departure wave can be handled. So.

00:26:38:24 - 00:27:04:02

That then goes to the overall extent to which there might be an increase in base aircraft, which is part of the case that's asserted in the UN forecast data book. So we haven't covered that today, but I think it's an important area to probe, perhaps in the hearing. We're certainly seeking further clarification from the applicant to enable us to give a reasoned view about whether or not we think the total capacity uplift can be delivered or not.

00:27:05:27 - 00:27:07:23

Thank you, Mr. Cunningham. Mr. Lyness.

00:27:08:06 - 00:27:23:02

Scotland applicant. Um, yes. This is obviously a matter that is the subject of ongoing discussions and see more information on this as the deadlines progress. There's one that I've missed Forbes or had anything to add on the point for the moment anyway.

00:27:24:25 - 00:27:58:16

Do you want to pose for the applicant? Yeah, just to say there is a lot more detail in the paper to come at deadline one, but that will show the the first wave. Um. Taxi time departure. Taxi time is lower than currently experienced in 2018 on average. And also the holding times as well, which make up part of that departure taxi time. So there's a benefit across the whole day in terms of performance on the departure side of things and on the arrivals, there is a slight increase in taxi time, but that's offset by the reduction in airborne holding.

00:27:58:18 - 00:28:10:07

So overall it performs better. Um, and in that first wave in particular, there is benefits to departures and um, across the whole day as well as in that first wave.

00:28:12:00 - 00:28:15:03

Thank you. Uh, yes, Miss Pavey.

00:28:16:00 - 00:28:28:26

Thank you very much. Uh, Sally Pavey for Cagney. May I just ask? Um, the applicant has just made a statement. Could could that be referenced, please, to which documents that she was reading from? Is it one that we have available to us or not?

00:28:29:04 - 00:28:32:02

I believe it was a document to be submitted at deadline. One. Is that correct?

00:28:33:06 - 00:28:34:23

Scott. The applicant? That's right.

00:28:35:17 - 00:28:36:18

Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

00:28:38:06 - 00:28:38:21

Thank you.

00:28:40:07 - 00:28:44:02

Okay. Uh, yeah. Councilor Essex, just briefly, and then we'll move on. Thank you.

00:28:47:00 - 00:28:51:00

Thank you. This this does link demand to climate change. And I know that if you could.

00:28:51:02 - 00:28:52:12

Just say your name again, please. Sorry.

00:28:52:22 - 00:29:13:11

Councillor Essex have you modeled the impact of the policy in of policy framework constraints from 2038 when international aviation is included in the UK's sixth carbon budget? And please can you share or at least or at least carry out and share sensitivity analysis to how you expect that will constrain overall demand and how that will impact on the demand forecast for Gatwick, please.

00:29:15:16 - 00:29:16:06

Thank you.

00:29:22:17 - 00:29:44:25

Proposal for the applicant. So we've obviously used the government. Trajectory in terms of their forecast. So it's based on their assumptions around the future policy. I'm conscious that when you touched on is one of many kind of policies, um, in terms of the wider carbon carbon budget, EU, ETS, UK, ETS, Corsia as well. So there's various assumptions that need to be considered, especially when you start forecasting such a long term.

00:29:47:05 - 00:30:05:13

Okay. Thank you for that. Um, if we could move on now to, um, logistics and, uh, technical details of the operation of the potential runways. Um, and the first question I have on this subject is, is there a technical reason why the northern runway would not be used for arrivals?

00:30:07:18 - 00:30:11:10

Scotland. Applicant must ask Mr. Sinclair to pick up that point, please.

00:30:15:24 - 00:30:40:05

Andy Sinclair on behalf of the applicant. And just to confirm that Gatwick has two runways today. Um, they are used for both arrivals and departures, but they are used independently. The main runway is instrumented with something called an instrument landing system, and we have different types of runway approach procedures to the northern runway.

00:30:42:02 - 00:30:54:09

Yes, I think I asked that question earlier. It's more about your proposed northern runway. At the moment it is only proposed to be used for departures. Is there a technical reason why it couldn't be used for arrivals?

00:30:58:12 - 00:31:33:08

At the same time as the main runway. So the so the. I guess the point here is that the airspace does not change as a result of the project. So the runways are not sufficiently separated to allow um, approaches to both runways, if you like, simultaneously with departures. To give you the example, um, the departure routes are still treated as if aircraft are departing from a single runway, which is why no airspace change is required.

00:31:33:10 - 00:31:54:17

So today we have standard instrument departure routes on the main runway and the northern runway. But they are in essence the same routes. So it's to do with a separation of aircraft or departures. It's treated as if we have a single runway and an arrivals. That's exactly the same. You couldn't simultaneously approach both runways.

00:31:57:23 - 00:31:58:23

Yes, sir. Miss Forbes.

00:31:59:15 - 00:32:30:00

John Forbes for the applicant. Also to add to that, um, on our main mode of operation, which is in 26 direction of operation, um, we have the taxiway system, which we're using to hold departing aircraft as well. And due to the runway safety zones in that area, we would have to keep that clear if we were also using it for arrivals as well. And we need that capability to hold departures in that area. So there's also an element of the runway safety zones when arriving on the northern runway.

00:32:31:01 - 00:32:48:26

Okay. Thank you. So in essence, you're saying that the project, um, obviously would change things in terms of that you you would be able to use another runway more than you do now because you'd be able to simultaneously, but that they would still be considered a single runway for departures. Is that correct?

00:32:49:27 - 00:33:04:23

Andy Sinclair for the applicant? Absolutely, in a way. But, um, if it would help, I could explain the concept of single runway versus dual runway operation on the ground to give you an idea of the difference and why that is, uh, the way it is.

00:33:06:05 - 00:33:10:06

So. Yeah. Did your runway end? Under the proposed project? Yes, please. Yeah.

00:33:10:08 - 00:33:45:21

So. So right now, if you use a single runway, um, an aircraft can be cleared to depart off that runway. But when an aircraft is cleared to the part of that runway, uh, no other aircraft can use that until the departing aircraft is lifted and on its way. Um, and following one of departure routes at that point, um, uh, the air traffic controller, the air controller at Gatwick would be able to clear an approaching aircraft to land or a subsequent departure to line up on that runway.

00:33:46:15 - 00:34:19:10

The tulle runway will operate in a much more efficient way. So when we talk to things like resilience, we will be able to use dependent the runways dependently in a very different way to the way it operates today. So, um, for example, if I had a or sorry, if the air traffic controller in the tower, the air controller had an aircraft on approach, it would be the air traffic controller would be able to line up a departing aircraft on the northern runway ready for departure.

00:34:19:25 - 00:34:54:25

The arriving aircraft lands and touches down, and as soon as that aircraft is under control, the aircraft on the northern runway that's lined up and ready to go can be cleared for departure. And that is a much more efficient way of using the runway. If you imagine the time between when the aircraft on final approach was cleared to land, and that could be as close as 25 seconds from touchdown, but could be much further out to the point it's safely out of the way to allow an aircraft to line up. And even then the aircraft lining up can't still take off on that on that single runway.

00:34:54:27 - 00:35:13:28

All of that unused time can now be utilized, which is why we create this increasing level of efficiency. Nevertheless, the aircraft departing, whether it's on runway two six left the main runway or runway two six right, the northern runway would follow the same instrumented departure.

00:35:16:03 - 00:35:26:05

Thank you. Yeah. That's useful. Um, would, um, any potential airspace changes affect the situation about arrivals for the dual runway project?

00:35:29:20 - 00:36:03:01

Andy Sinclair for the applicant. Um, we do not need, um, an airspace change as part of the northern runway project. We have already, um, initiated, um, an airspace change with the CAA to confirm that was the case. And that was several years ago. We've included that in our documentation. Any future airspace changes would not. Change the fundamental that two closely spaced runways could not be used for approach at the same time, and going back to the point that, uh, uh, Mrs.

00:36:03:03 - 00:36:14:16

Forbes made as well, there's there are fundamental elements of ground infrastructure that would be impacted if we if we there was to be some technology change in the dim, distant future.

00:36:15:02 - 00:36:36:00

Thank you, Mr. Sinclair. Um, I did notice I had Mrs. Pavey. Um, I've just got a few more questions to ask. Um, and then I will. I will come back to you on on this area. Thank you. Um, similar question. It may well be a similar answer about the proposed northern runway. Um, is that why is it restricted to code C aircraft only, and could that also be altered in the future?

00:36:38:23 - 00:36:44:09

Andy Sinclair for the applicant just to confirm that for the northern runway code C.

00:36:44:16 - 00:36:45:19

Yes, yes.

00:36:46:01 - 00:37:20:16

Um, so, so just to be clear, as the northern runway is operated today, um, when we're working in single runway mode, the northern runway, if we weren't using the main runway in a in a future scenario, could accommodate those aircraft beyond code C. One of the benefits of the Gatwick operation and some of the reasons that we deliver the efficiencies we can, uh, one of the reasons we are the busiest single runway airport, um, in the world on a, on an hourly basis is because of our fleet mix and the fact we have lots of medium aircraft.

00:37:20:18 - 00:38:01:22

So there's no benefit to us to put larger aircraft on the northern runway. Hence the the reason for using it for code C aircraft when we start to depart aircraft. Um. The medium aircraft departing medium medium we can keep separation down to. I talked about 60s previously to allow, uh, three nautical miles separation um, in the airspace around Gatwick. Once you start to depart larger aircraft, those separations between departures, departures necessarily increase, um, usually for reasons of what's called wake turbulence.

00:38:01:24 - 00:38:10:26

So a big aircraft departing um, would create, um, wake vortices behind it. We don't want to depart medium aircraft behind that without safe separation.

00:38:11:27 - 00:38:27:29

Okay. Thank you. But. So is there a is there a technical reason? You've just explained why you don't need an open runway for aircraft login code C. Is there a technical reason? Could the northern runway handle planes larger than. Cozzi.

00:38:40:15 - 00:39:16:15

Andy Sinclair for the applicant. So we've not analysed that in detail. But as we previously mentioned, there's potential that flying a large aircraft on departure from that runway impacts the ground infrastructure again. So the areas where we hold and in a previous answer this morning, I talked about the optimization of both the ground infrastructure and how the air traffic control controller uses that ground infrastructure. We have holding areas which allow, if you like, the the ground controller, to cherry pick and optimize that pre-departure sequence.

00:39:17:08 - 00:39:27:14

The jet blast on that northern runway goes into one of those areas which would affect the ground operation. So that would be, if you like, a reason why we would not wish to do that.

00:39:30:12 - 00:39:34:24

Okay. Thank you. Um, so you do not wish to do that, but it could be done.

00:39:37:02 - 00:40:23:03

Andy Sinclair for the applicant. And just to be, you know, be really clear about the optimization, how critical that is. I briefly described how the main runway would operate, but part of the way we achieve the level of capacity that we're talking about is that pre-departure optimization. So in a way, we would be tying a hand behind our back, if you like, by removing our our ability to pre-departure sequence in the most effective way. And, and maybe if I explain why that's so important again it's because, um, if we're sending aircraft out on different standard instrument departures, that's when we can introduce the 62nd separation and the three nautical miles in the other star of the London terminal airspace.

00:40:23:18 - 00:40:36:22

Um, if we are not so effective in that pre-departure sequence, you have to increase the amount of separation between those departures. And that has a consequent knock on effect to your runway throughput capacity.

00:40:39:05 - 00:40:57:00

Okay. Thank you. Um, yeah, I'll move on from that point now. Um. As an aside on a similar level, is there a minimum two runway separation distance between two runways? Um, that would mean that two runways could be used at the same time for arrivals.

00:41:01:27 - 00:41:08:01

Andy Sinclair for the applicant. I do not know the answer to that question, but we will find out and come back to you.

00:41:08:21 - 00:41:09:06

Thank you.

00:41:19:26 - 00:41:34:04

Uh, one question back on the the data book. Um, the data book states that long haul traffic is predicted to continue taking share away from short haul markets. Um, I wondered how that was possible with slot constraint.

00:41:36:21 - 00:42:22:18

Role for the applicant. I think one good example is if we look, um, pre 2019, um, in terms of how Gatwick share was uh, increasing in that period, um, we'd seen some of the base carriers, uh, switching their short haul operations over the long haul operations. So, you know, taking their short haul, adjusting their portfolio and then operating a widebody long haul flight. We saw that with the likes of Norwegian and British Airways adding incremental widebodies, um, to the airport as well. Um, as Jonathan touched on earlier, in terms of the potential for slot trading as well, also incremental, uh, new runway capacity, when that is allocated by slot coordinators, they do take into account what we terms or secondary criteria, which will take into account the airport's network.



00:42:22:20 - 00:42:39:01

So looking to benefit the airport network rather than, say, just adding incremental on what they may already have. Also aircraft size season length for some of the secondary criteria that slot coordinators will use to allocate capacity and they're all typically in favour of long haul operators.

00:42:40:24 - 00:42:41:21

Thank you. Yeah.

00:42:43:10 - 00:42:45:14

Um, your, uh.

00:42:47:03 - 00:43:07:00

Mr. Sinclair, one of your answers earlier? Um, yeah. Said that, you know, you don't need northern runway for coats aircraft and so assumed a larger aircraft would continue to use the existing runway. Um, has that been accounted for in the forecast in terms of the knock on effect on other assessments and noise and air quality and so on?

00:43:12:01 - 00:43:24:27

Yeah, absolutely. In the forecast, the the movements of the larger aircraft flying longer distance, that's all captured, that's fed through to the noise impacts, the other outputs that you're talking about, whether it's surface access, emissions, etc..

00:43:26:00 - 00:43:37:01

Thank you for that clarification. Okay. That's the end of the questions I had were on logistics. Um. Miss Pavey. Was there anything you wish to raise this moment?

00:43:38:06 - 00:43:38:22

Thank you.

00:43:39:04 - 00:43:45:17

Thank you sir. Um, Sally Pavey for Cagney. No, the questions were answered during the conversation. Thank you very much.

00:43:45:26 - 00:43:49:29

Thank you for that. Uh, Mr. Bedford or Miss Compton?

00:43:51:17 - 00:43:52:02

Thank you.

00:43:52:14 - 00:43:54:07

Thank you sir. Up.

00:43:57:04 - 00:44:15:03

We did briefly want to comment, um, on, uh. Airspace change, but I know you've got that as your very next item. It was just that it came up in part of those answers. So I'm quite happy to leave that. And I'll just check whether Miss Condon had anything on logistics leaving aside airspace change, because that's the next item.

00:44:17:06 - 00:44:57:13

Please Congdon for the joint local authorities. Just a sort of clarification. I think we heard Mr. Sinclair talking then about 60s between departures, the importance of optimization, the Charlie box, the holding area he talked about that actually is exactly why we have some concerns, because from our discussions with Google, the modeling that they've undertaken, I don't believe or I've not seen evidence to justify that they have properly modeled the effect of that optimization. And so they've assumed a separation is achievable between movements on average, 60s if they're following different routes, 106 seconds, I believe, if they're following the same route.

00:44:57:22 - 00:45:16:22

But the problem is we don't know whether or not that process of optimization is going to mean that aircraft are going to be held on the ground, and that prima facie may link to easyJet's concerns about the deliverability of the throughput off the runway. So again, we're asking for more evidence and analysis on that to help us verify it.

00:45:18:14 - 00:45:19:18

Thank you, Mr. Condon.

00:45:21:06 - 00:45:22:21

Um, and when the applicants.

00:45:23:20 - 00:45:25:21

Scotland. Miss Forbes can pick that up.

00:45:27:25 - 00:46:05:29

Miss hopes for the applicant. Um, so, yeah, with the modeling, uh, we did originally submit, um, modeling results based on a certain assumption. And during the consultation, Louise requested some alterations to these assumptions based on, um, more pessimistic views of future performance based on what we can currently achieve versus compared to with the new initiatives we have coming through. So we have provided those results in the updated paper, which will come through on deadline one. Um, but as part of that, in the simulation modeling we've done through fast time simulation, we have included all ground delays in the model.

00:46:06:01 - 00:46:39:03

And actually what we're saying is, um, there is an element in that model of it cannot optimize as well as the ground control is currently due because they factor in the full queue. And looking at the sequencing of the full queue, and they do efficiency as well as fairness in their optimization. So they look to balance some of those elements a lot better than actually the simulation work can do. So the simulation does show the full picture of delays. But what we also provided evidence of in the paper is that they can also be improved on.

00:46:39:05 - 00:47:12:18

So that is in the simulation showing the worst case in terms of delays, um, from what's been modeled. And then we've illustrated how that can be improved. And we try and balance between efficiency and fairness in those other models and replicate more the controller process at Gatwick. And as Mr. Sinclair said, there is a real focus on optimization at Gatwick and that's how we deliver the 55 currently. And we plan to focus on that and, um, support new initiatives going forward on looking at optimized um sequencing as well.

00:47:12:20 - 00:47:16:11

So we don't see any doubt in how we can sequence in the future.

00:47:18:07 - 00:47:20:11

Thank you, Miss Forbes.

00:47:21:29 - 00:47:56:29

Become a conduit for the joint local authorities, I think, um, obviously, um, you know, I've been describing. Some of the things that were discussed in the working group a couple of weeks ago with them. Um, and what is going to be in the paper? Um, the difficulty I have is in that meeting, I asked for quite a bit more information to be provided. I don't know from what I've heard today, whether that further information is going to be in the paper when it is submitted at D1, or whether we still need to have that discussion and get that additional information, because at the moment, I would like to be able to say it's all fine, it all works fine and I'm happy.

00:47:57:01 - 00:48:00:10

But at the moment I haven't got the answers to some of the questions I asked.

00:48:02:13 - 00:48:03:22

Thank you. Miss Colton was a.

00:48:05:07 - 00:48:06:12

Applicant like to come back at all.

00:48:06:24 - 00:48:15:07

Just to say John Rhodes on behalf of the applicant. That information will be available at D1 and if we can get it to you sooner. Um, we'll do that, but it'll certainly be in the D1 paper.

00:48:17:13 - 00:48:30:29

Thank you for that clarification. Okay. If we can now move on to, um, airspace, please. Um, and I believe we have the CAA, uh, Civil Aviation Authority on line. Um, so I have a quick question to them, please.

00:48:34:09 - 00:48:34:24

Uh.

00:48:35:09 - 00:48:37:21

Uh, good morning, sir. Jones I'm here for the CAA.

00:48:38:06 - 00:48:50:05

Good afternoon. Uh, uh, just a quick question. If you. Could you explain to the examination, uh, the current situation regarding airspace changes in the southeast and, uh, faci s process, please.

00:48:51:15 - 00:49:31:15

Um, so I think I can start with our position in respect of, um, our view and whether this, this constitutes a space requires an HCP, um, in respect to these proposals. And then I do have, um, uh, Mr. French here, uh, from the CIA. And he'll be able provide any additional detail on, on that. Um, so I think the starting point for us is, is the position is, as we've put in our relevant representation, uh, we agree, uh, with, uh, Gao that there's not going to be, uh, there's no requirement here for an airspace change proposal that, um, it's at a level zero, uh, because there wouldn't be any alteration in the relevant traffic patterns.

00:49:31:24 - 00:49:54:26

Uh, the only requirement is that there's going to be a need, uh, um, after works, uh, to amend the aeronautical information publication. Um, and so that's in respect of this particular proposal, um, and you ask more generally regarding what's going on in the, in the southeast, you know, and at this point, I think I'll bring in, uh, Mr. French, but we may also need to, um, to go back to you if you require further detail on that.

00:49:55:15 - 00:49:58:15

Okay. Thank you. Yes. Uh, yeah. Mr. French, please. Thank you.

00:50:00:25 - 00:50:05:06

Uh, afternoon. Uh, grand French for the seat, the CIA. Um.

00:50:07:06 - 00:50:23:21

Uh, so again, this there's not much further update, I think, than we put in our relevant representation that, um, airspace modernization is a government policy, and it's being progressed through, uh, Acog the airspace change optimization group, um,

00:50:25:06 - 00:50:37:20

uh, airspace change in the southeast. They have set out, um, some plans for how that will progress. It's probably still too early to say how that will change. Um, routes in the southeast.

00:50:40:11 - 00:50:53:07

Thank you. Could you just explain to me, um. Um, and I, I think we heard from, uh, Mrs. Sinclair on the applicant side earlier. Um, some of this reasoning. But why? Um, the proposal wouldn't affect traffic patterns.

00:50:55:19 - 00:51:24:09

Um, it wouldn't affect, um, airspace routes, uh, because, um, as, uh, Mr. Sinclair has said, the, um, uh, the northern runway would only be used or has only tended to be used for departures, and those departures would join the already existing, uh, standard instrument departure routes, um, uh, as soon as possible. So, um, you know, within a very short space of leaving the runway.

00:51:26:24 - 00:51:34:04

Okay. Thank you for that. That's useful. Um, Mr. Bedford, you referred to airspace previously.

00:51:34:27 - 00:52:14:27

Thank you. Sir. Michael Bedford, the joint local authorities. Thus, we don't seek to dispute the regulatory position. Um, we accept, obviously, that this has been a matter that has been raised and cleared with the Civil Aviation Authority, so we are not seeking to say that they are wrong or that there is a regulatory requirement for an airspace change. I think our concern is simply that if the, um, applicant's forecasts, particularly in the longer term for the growth in traffic, are to be achieved.

00:52:15:03 - 00:52:40:00

Realistically, we think that there is likely to be in future a need for an airspace change for all of those movements to be accommodated. So that's our concern that, uh, for the applicant's case, in terms of its overall growth to be achievable, we think there may be a need for an airspace change. Now, I'll just ask Miss Condon then to provide as a reason why we think that is likely to be the case.

00:52:42:16 - 00:53:36:02

Louise Condon for the joint local authorities. I mean, I think it goes from discussions. I mean, some people will know I've been involved in the Luton DCO and Mr. French and the CIA, and I've had many discussions on this. Um, I think we're aware that that the airspace of the south east of England is very congested and therefore for any or all of the airports to grow airspace needs modernising. And that is government policy that it should be so and I leave it at that point. But I think where it's material here and it goes back to the conversation and the point I just made is if there is en route congestion, particularly to the north of Gatwick, because of broader airspace congestion issues not directly caused by the north runway or directly of itself related to the north runway operation, but that congestion could give rise to aircraft having to use alternative departure routes and to use a technical term.

00:53:36:04 - 00:54:04:00

One of them is called Wizard Sid, which flies to the south of the airfield over quite a lot of communities. And it's possible that if there was congestion in the en route airspace, that there might need to be greater use of Wizard Sid. And, you know, one of the outstanding areas that we've been trying to grapple with is trying to understand the circumstances under which there might need to be more use of that departure route and what the implications would then be for the noise assessment.

00:54:07:01 - 00:54:13:15

Thank you, Miss Covington. Um, I don't like the applicant side. Respond on that matter.

00:54:13:17 - 00:54:16:02

Scott Lyons for the applicant. Mr. Sinclair can do that, please.

00:54:18:21 - 00:54:49:09

Thank you, sir. Uh, Andy Sinclair for the applicant. Um, just to be clear. Um, following on from what Mr. French said about airspace modernization, it is a government sponsored program. We're fully involved. Um, and, uh, we are working together with other airport sponsors in the London airspace.

Um, I think Wisconsin's, uh, picked up on a couple of really important points. Uh, one is that airspace modernization will inevitably make the London airspace operation much more efficient.

00:54:49:11 - 00:55:10:22

And as a result of that, the Gatwick operation. Um, so it is important for the future of Gatwick and all the other airports in the southeast of the UK that that is, is taken forward. We have always been clear, though, that we do not need airspace modernisation in order to deliver the throughput capacity that we've included as part of the project. Um.

00:55:13:06 - 00:55:51:28

Part of the reason for that, compared to, I think Miss Condon referred to the, um, the northern part of the London Terminal Maneuvering area. In some ways, Gatwick is quite fortunate. It's located in the southern part of the London terminal manoeuvring area, and when you go to the south of the airport, essentially, um, you're moving almost within 50 or 60 miles into French airspace as you cross the flight information region boundary. So we don't necessarily suffer. With the same degree of complexity, um, or the same degree of congestion that you might experience to the north of the airport.

00:55:53:17 - 00:56:24:11

Um, as part of our submission, we talked about the wizard Sid, uh, standard instrument departure route, because that is not a route that can be flight planned, um, by an airline. So normally Wizard would be, uh, flown by an aircraft, um, or offered to the pilot very late in the process. So it could be a, um, uh, on with the ground controller coming up to the holding point these days, normally that is offered if there's bad weather.

00:56:24:13 - 00:56:34:25

So CBS or thunderstorms, if thunderstorms are to the north of the airfield, um, you wouldn't want to fly aircraft through a thunderstorm. So the aircraft are offered a southerly turn.

00:56:36:14 - 00:57:10:05

So in 2023, for example, 49 aircraft flew the Wizard route. One of the things we did do in our application, anticipating that if airspace modernization wasn't progressed as quickly as it might have done, was that, um, Wizard might be used more in the future on that basis. And there were two things that we did as a as a result of that one, we wanted to conduct an environmental assessment, which will come on to next week, I presume, when we have the hearing on noise.

00:57:10:24 - 00:57:52:18

But but just to be clear, because this has been raised several times, Wizard does not in and of itself increase the capacity of the airport. I think there was some discussion that we could offer a wizard departure route as an alternative to what we call our route for standard instrument departure. So there it's a route to the north of the airport. The reason that it doesn't increase capacity is because whilst those um, routes are initially separated and you may have been able to offer 60s or the three nautical miles between departures, those routes end up in the same piece of airspace.

00:57:52:20 - 00:58:19:11

So from a capacity perspective, and when we talk about limiting limiting capacity that is, um, responsible for limiting sector capacity in the, in the London airspace, um, it wouldn't increase our overall capacity throughput. Um. We have modeled, uh, the environmental impacts of the potential future increase in the use of wizard. And like I say, we'll come back to that next week.

00:58:21:21 - 00:58:28:03

Thank you, Mr. Sinclair. I'll just come. I'll come to you in a second, Mrs. Pavey. But, Mr. Compton, was there anything you wish to come back on that section?

00:58:28:17 - 00:58:52:25

No, I understand the capacity point. That is something we discussed. And at least we have resolution on that one. I understand, Mr. Sinclair point on that, but I think there is still this overarching concern about whether or not if airspace modernisation continues to be delayed for reasons beyond anybody in this room's control, then, um, other issues that need to be borne in mind in considering the environmental implications of increased movements at Gatwick.

00:58:53:20 - 00:58:55:19

Thank you for that. Miss Pavey.

00:58:57:07 - 00:59:38:15

Thank you, sir. Sally Pavey for. For Cagney. Um. At present, Gatwick is at stage three of the modernisation of airspace, and Acog currently conducting a survey on new areas to the south of Gatwick, which is where Wizard is and includes Wizard. Um, it does beg the question. Um, and it's a bit touching on the local authority's point is if all the arrivals are to come back on the main runway and plus all the long haul take off on the main runway, the we echo easyJet's points about delays, um, will be inevitable and more holding over over communities.

00:59:38:27 - 00:59:57:03

Um, we just wonder if the forecasts are dependent, whether or not the airspace is dependent on others, but whether the forecast and I'm sorry, I'm touching. Going back a little bit here is on upon phases being successful and being implemented. Thank you very much.

00:59:57:29 - 01:00:00:00

Thank you for that. Uh, Mr. Sinclair.

01:00:01:13 - 01:00:04:21

Thank you, sir. Andy Sinclair, um, on behalf of the applicant.

01:00:06:29 - 01:00:37:12

So, just to be clear, um, as, uh, Miss Pavia has just mentioned, we are at last through stage two of the process into something called stage three, where we start to develop our options, um, in more detail. We currently have, um, many options left on the table. And, and when you build those options together, it gives us 576 option configurations right now. So, um, as Mr.

01:00:37:14 - 01:01:00:16

French said from the CAA, we're still at a very early stage of the process in, um, as I previously mentioned, the project doesn't require it, and thus the modeling has not built in airspace modernisation, um, in order to deliver the capacity that we've set. However, airspace modernisation does include the requirements of a dual runway. Gatwick.

01:01:05:19 - 01:01:14:15

Thank you. So, uh, an answer to my question. Uh, does the modeling include the fuzzy self? Sorry if I miss her.

01:01:15:28 - 01:01:24:22

Andy Sinclair for the applicant. As I said, the modeling for the northern runway project. It did not require it to be delivered. And so the modeling does not include it.

01:01:25:22 - 01:01:27:02

Thank you for that clarification.

01:01:29:15 - 01:01:34:22

Um, before we move on. Uh, does anyone else wish to raise any comments regarding our space?

01:01:39:00 - 01:01:48:15

I'm not seeing any hands in the room or online. Um, so we'll move on to I'll just have a quick couple of quick questions about hotels. Um, if I may. Um.

01:01:50:11 - 01:01:55:21

Could you explain the rationale for the proposed hotels? I'll just let you swap over.

01:02:03:15 - 01:02:12:21

Thank you. Um, could you explain the rationale for the proposed new hotels as part of the proposal? Um, and why these would not be provided under the baseline case?

01:02:18:24 - 01:02:21:09

Thank you, sir. Andy Hunt for the applicant.

01:02:21:22 - 01:02:22:13

You'll be seeing.

01:02:22:15 - 01:02:25:22

More of me next week. I'm the lead for economics and socioeconomics.

01:02:26:21 - 01:03:04:07

Um, in terms of the kind of level of demand for hotel and provision within the application. I've been advised by Litchfield, um, and they undertook a study of existing provision at a number of spatial scales, so on airport close to the airport, but linked to the terminals by shuttle buses. Um, and then more remote, uh, in, um, within sort of five miles or reasonably well connected by rail and then between 5 and 10 miles. Um, and that study found that around, uh, 40% of demand from the airport is from passengers.



01:03:04:09 - 01:03:37:03

The airport is currently met on airport, and that translates to around 60 rooms per million passengers. Um, they undertook a survey of hotels as part of that piece of work. And as you might expect, they found that there was a very high degree of correlation. So, um, for hotels on airport, around 85% of their demand came from, uh, airport users. That relationship on the standard with declines as you move further away. So it's around 80% for those off airport but directly linked.

01:03:37:17 - 01:04:16:03

Um, and those further away, around 60%. So there's a very strong functional link of those in particular on the airport, um, between the airport's activities and the passengers, um, and the demand for those rooms. And there's also very clear passenger preference for being on the airport, but also still a significant number of passengers who are more price sensitive and less time sensitive, who are willing to travel further. And indeed, one of the things they found was that the demand off airport was stronger for three star hotels, and it was for four star hotels, indicating that kind of price sensitivity point, um, as well.

01:04:16:25 - 01:04:49:24

Um. So, um, the provision that's made within the DCO is for up to 1250 rooms on airport. Um, and looking forward to 2032 when the new runway is close to reaching its capacity of 13 million additional passengers at that point. Um, the, uh, the share of on airport provision will only vary slightly. So from around 40% down to just around 37%.

01:04:49:26 - 01:05:24:06

So the level of provision allows us to maintain that balance of on airport and off airport through to the point at which, uh, the northern runway is fully, um, uh, fully utilized. And that also includes the background growth that we're, we're forecasting. So it's not simply the, the, the NLP is taking account of the background growth up to that point as well. There will, of course, be further growth and further demand off airport. Um, and, and um, you know, that can be accommodated through traditional TCP applications.

01:05:24:13 - 01:05:42:26

Um, and there is, you know, policy support for that, both in the current um, Crawley local plan and also in the emerging local plan, where it makes clear that the airport itself is a suitable location. Um, notwithstanding the sequential test, um, and the support for those uses to support the, um, the operation of the apple.

01:05:43:28 - 01:05:59:07

Thank you. That's useful. And that's answered my next few questions as well. So that's a useful response. Um, you mentioned then some information, uh, some work that being carried out for you by Litchfield, I believe. Um, is there any chance that that could be submitted or is it commercially confidential?

01:06:00:14 - 01:06:10:21

Andy Hunt, the applicant? Yes, sir. If it's helpful, I can do a note summarizing the key points of their advice and how that's informed the master plan and how that relates to future demand.

01:06:10:28 - 01:06:12:07

That would be useful. Thank you.

01:06:12:09 - 01:06:14:00

That could be done. Okay.

01:06:17:03 - 01:06:30:29

So that concludes my questions on this agenda item. Um, and uh, that's my questions on the substantive areas of the hearing. Um, before we move on, or are there any further points anyone wishes to make? Mr. Bedford.

01:06:31:28 - 01:07:20:24

So it's more a matter that I think, uh, will be touched on tomorrow and subsequently in the written material. Um, but in relation to hotels, um, we did consider, in a sense, like you. Well, what is the rationale for that? And it's obviously would be a species of associated, uh, development. Uh, we note that the applicant has included the hotels in the application. Uh, that's clearly their choice. We don't say that they're not capable of being associated development, but we are concerned to ensure that the control documents, uh, adequately ensure both that there are adequate controls, particularly over the.

01:07:21:21 - 01:07:56:24

Question of. Carparking, but also for subsequent matters such as design and timescale for decision making. So I say those are matters that are more going to go to the control documents and how those are secured. But I say it was an issue that we were concerned about to make sure effectively that the hotels, which in due course will end up being commercial operations, no doubt operated by others than the airport and not, as it were, existing under some kind of a different regime, simply because they've been squeezed into the DCO for their authorizing consent.

01:07:57:09 - 01:08:02:21

But I say they I think they're all capable of being controlled. It's just that we will need to give some attention to that.

01:08:02:26 - 01:08:05:24

Except thank you, Mr. Bedford listed.

01:08:06:11 - 01:08:14:01

Mr. Linus has nothing to add to that. If that comes up tomorrow, we can debate it in the DCU in the wider context.

01:08:14:29 - 01:08:19:00

Thank you. Um, any more points anyone wishes to make before we move on?

01:08:20:25 - 01:08:33:04

See any hands in the room or online. Okay. Thank you. Um, so we shall move on. Um, and I'll now pass to Miss Cassidy for the action points that have been identified.

01:08:34:14 - 01:08:38:09

Thank you, Mr. Hockley. I'll read the action points as we've recorded.

01:08:38:11 - 01:09:08:11

Them and confirm with the relevant party that they're in agreement. Um, of both the action and the delivery date. Um, so the first one is for the applicant and the joint local authorities to provide additional documents in respect of their position regarding section 104, 105 and national policy statements. Uh data delivery for deadline one. I'm assuming if I don't hear anything, nods will be fine from all parties.

01:09:09:21 - 01:09:24:00

Yes, madam. Michael, for the joint local authorities, we were envisaging addressing that in our local impact report because that's also due at deadline one. So unless you separately want it as a freestanding document, that's what we.

01:09:24:07 - 01:09:48:22

Know. The only reason it's down as an action was that I think that was what was said earlier. But that's fine. In a in your lives. Fine. Um, number two is Cagney. I think you were also stating you're going to provide a similar document in respect of your position regarding section 104, 105 and, uh, National Policy statements. Is that correct?

01:09:48:28 - 01:09:50:11

Um, Odette Selby Cagney.

01:09:50:13 - 01:09:53:19

Yes. It's going to be within our representations, within the same document.

01:09:53:21 - 01:10:27:21

That's fine. The rest of the action points are aimed at the applicant and all our deadline one. So I shall just run through them. Um, applicant to provide details of case, additional case law examples in respect of making best use. I think you referenced Stansted and Manston, uh, to provide further information regarding construction works for the repositioning of the existing runway. And within that action point, you're also going to consider whether you can provide engineering cross section plans.

01:10:29:09 - 01:10:58:27

An applicant to confirm the rates of business travelers in comparison to other airports. If it helps at all. Because I can see you all scribbling. These will be published. Um, so entirely up to you. Um. Next one is to provide a detailed breakdown of passenger catchment, including north and East London, as well as the overlap. You were going to respond to Doctor Alex Chapman's comments made today and who is relevant? Rep.

01:11:01:05 - 01:11:39:26

Next one is you're going to respond to the question on funding statement. Do you want me to repeat the question or it's fine. It will be in the action notes. You're going to submit documents prepared for your creation and responses to the questions raised by York Aviation. In terms of the request by Councillor Essex, you're going to provide additional information in relation to a busy day and also to

consider the request by Councillor Essex in respect of providing information in relation to the increase in terminal capacity over baseline.

01:11:41:16 - 01:11:46:00

To provide information to Surrey. Councillor six.

01:11:49:17 - 01:11:58:22

Thank you. What my request was to compare it to current and to have that current compared firstly for base, the future baseline and secondly for the project case.

01:11:58:25 - 01:12:05:23

Thank you councillor. It's my apologies for misunderstanding. That will be recorded on the actions.

01:12:08:06 - 01:12:33:27

An applicant to provide information to support their position in relation to profitability of slots. Um, we asked a question which you said you were going to go away and, um, consider. And that question was, is there a minimum two runway separation distance that would mean two runways could be used at the same time for arrivals. And if so, what is it?

01:12:35:04 - 01:12:39:03

Sinclair. Sorry. Mr. Sinclair was just about to come back.

01:12:40:06 - 01:12:46:29

Thank you sir. Thank you ma'am. The answer to the question is 760m. So that's a completely new runway.

01:12:47:21 - 01:12:49:24

Thank you very much. Thank you.

01:12:51:17 - 01:13:09:19

The final action I have is that you're going to provide a summary note of the work undertaken by Litchfield in respect of hotels. Is that an accurate reflection of the actions in respect of what the applicant considers them to be?

01:13:11:17 - 01:13:20:02

Yeah. Is there anybody else in the room? Which has has any additional action points that you think we've missed.

01:13:22:21 - 01:13:29:23

No. Okay. Okay. In that case, thank you. And I'll now hand back to Mr. Hockley.

01:13:30:26 - 01:13:36:22

Thank you, Miss Cassini. Um, any other business news or any other business relevant to this hearing that anyone wishes to raise?

01:13:40:25 - 01:13:48:27

Seeing any hands in the room or online. So Noah Mattis, I will then pass back to Mr. Humphrey to close this meeting. Thank you.

01:13:49:29 - 01:14:22:00

Thank you, Mr. Hockley. May I remind you that timetable for this examination requires that parties provide any post, hearing documents on or before deadline one, which is Tuesday, the 12th of March, 2024. I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on Inspectorate's website as soon as practicable and after this meeting. Thank you very much for attending today and for your participation in which we have all found very helpful. Time is now 1514.

01:14:22:05 - 01:14:25:24

And this issue specific hearing one is now closed.