

File Name: ISH5 6th March 2024 Part 2.mp3

File Length: 01:31:22

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:08:15 - 00:00:39:10

The time is 1146. So this hearing will now resume. Um, so I think the applicant has made their position quite clear. Um, so I'd like now to invite comments from interested parties on this point. Um, but really relevant to this discussion that we've, that you just heard around the daytime. Lowell. Um. Uh, that will be helpful. Um, so I think I'll turn to the joint local authorities first, please.

00:00:42:06 - 00:01:23:12

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, for the joint local authorities. So we had approached the issue of Lowell, uh, perhaps in a slightly different way, uh, in terms of our consideration of matters. Um, and. Obviously, we will wait to see what further information comes forward from the applicant in response to a number of your questions, and we'll reserve our position as to what we say about that in the light of, uh, those, uh, further responses.

00:01:23:21 - 00:01:54:17

But I think the way we looked at it was, in a sense, taking at face value the levels that the applicant had used. We saw, particularly in the light of, uh, further guidance, uh, subsequent to, uh, the Sona report and related matters, uh, a clear need for some sensitivity testing, uh, around, uh, the approach to what an appropriate level should be.

00:01:54:21 - 00:02:19:27

And it may be helpful if I just perhaps bring in, uh, Mr. David Monk, who is, um, one of the, uh, consultant team advising, uh, the joint authorities. Uh, and he can perhaps explain the sort of sensitivity tests that he has in mind. It would be helpful to see, to get a better understanding of this issue. So if that's helpful to you.

00:02:20:19 - 00:02:22:12

Yeah. Yes. Fine. Yes. Thank you.

00:02:25:11 - 00:02:59:25

Uh. Good morning sir. Thank you. David Monk, on behalf of Horsham District Council. Um, yes. We note the information about the the laws and souls that are proposed being contained in the airport National policy statement and the assessment in the chapter 14, the environmental statement. Now that has been referred to. Um, we are familiar with the Sona report, the Sona work and uh, the additional information that is in that and also the, um, the criticisms of it as well.

00:03:00:24 - 00:03:52:15

Um, we're also aware of, in particular that, um, in terms of what a lull can be, we understand that it can be dependent upon the effect. It can be at a different threshold for different effects. If it's a health based or annoyance, based on what time of the day and what what time of the night that that occurs.

So. I know the same is true clearly for the souls as well. So whilst we understand that the airport has undertaken the testing for the airport's National Policy statement thresholds, we do consider that there is new information which is coming to light, which the applicant could take into consideration and have regard to that, and conduct some sensitivity testing to demonstrate the potential impact of that.

00:03:53:01 - 00:04:27:29

But I would say is that in addition to the work that's been carried out with the zone of work, also for the examining authority to bear in mind is that there is additional work being commissioned, um, over the course of the next, uh, I think, due to be completed in the next 12 to 18 months. Um, I think commissioned by the DFT through the Civil Aviation Authority, which will which we will hope will shed more light on this subject. But key to us is, um, the sensitivity testing around the World Health Organisation figures that have been quoted, um, particularly in relation to the night time period.

00:04:28:08 - 00:05:00:20

Um, but we know that other authorities, when they are comparing health effects, uh, across Europe using other values, are going to much lower thresholds. So we think that the that which was cited by the UK, HSA is an appropriate sensitivity test. And also the 40 d-black date um night time is also a relevant. So that's date time is irrelevant sensitivity test. Thank you. Thank you. Uh, can I invite anybody else to comment? Uh, I can see.

00:05:00:22 - 00:05:12:08

Yeah, I didn't see. That was the first hand I saw, so. Yes, please. Thank you. Um, Lloyd for Gatwick? Obviously not. Um, I wanted to say a few things about Lowell.

00:05:12:12 - 00:05:44:23

Um, so, first of all, as we've established, it derives from the survey of noise attitudes from 2014. It's therefore both old, um, and it's subject to quite significant doubt and challenge as well as limitations. Um, I won't go into what those doubts are, but but they are a number of them which are very likely to dampen down the annoyance response that derived from it. Um, it only covered, as I think you said, people who live down to a 51 DB contour. Um, and uh, there were only some 200 participants around Gatwick.

00:05:45:00 - 00:06:25:25

And finally, very importantly, I think it did not survey people, not survey attitudes in places where there had been change in noise of the sort that is proposed by this project and increase in noise. Um, there are a host of authorities who are clear that using sonar, um, lek type metrics to try and assess the reaction, the response at times of change is not an appropriate thing to do. So for example, I can. The now ex independent Civil Aviation Noise authority said that sonar should not be used, was not appropriate to be used to consider the change in noise attitudes caused by an aircraft expanding.

00:06:26:04 - 00:07:01:00

Likewise, ICA, the International Civil Aviation Authority, has been clear that exposure response relationships are not applicable. Uh, to assess the effects of a change in noise climate, for example, the opening of a new runway. So for for all of those reasons, we think it's very likely that Lowell is significantly understating the noise impacts of the airport and the project. Um, and we have two

suggestions on that. First of all, that the applicant should be asked to report noise using the limits strongly reported by the World Health Organisation in 2018.

00:07:01:02 - 00:07:33:14

So 45 DB across the day and 40dB at night. Um, those are not targets that have been adopted by the UK government, but they're likely, in our view, to, uh, to represent a much more accurate picture of noise impacts. And our second suggestion is that the, um, authority might want to talk to the CAA about the ongoing aircraft noise attitude survey and see whether that suggests so far any change in attitudes to aircraft noise. Um, so that survey has been conducted in two waves.

00:07:33:16 - 00:08:04:09

The first wave was in September last year. Um, we understand there were about 3000 responses in the Gatwick area, compared to 200 in the, uh, in the sonar. And we understand that that data is now in the hands of the CAA, may not have analysed it, assessed it to the extent it would like, but I think it would be unfortunate, to say the least, if data that that exists and that the government and the CAA have was not made available to the authority and indeed to to all of us so that it could be properly considered.

00:08:04:11 - 00:08:04:26

Thank you.

00:08:06:05 - 00:08:16:15

Thank you very much. Um. Anybody else? So, of course, these, um, cameras. I can't see you, so. Yes. Go ahead. Yeah. Ben Holcomb for Cagney.

00:08:17:02 - 00:08:59:12

Um, I think we take the same position as the local authorities and reserving any decisions until we've seen how the applicant responds at deadline one. Just one other point to bring to your attention is I would have expected aviation noise to, uh, look at both air and ground noise under that headache. And it feels as though all of the responses we've heard focus very much on the air noise. Um, and it would be if through yourselves or yourself, sir, it would be interesting to ask the question of the applicant of if the same justifications are in place for the ground noise as well as the air noise as we think they're, um, even less justified.

00:09:00:26 - 00:09:05:08

Thank you very much for that. Yes, please. I can see your hand.

00:09:07:09 - 00:09:07:24

Never.

00:09:12:26 - 00:09:50:17

Thank you, Lisa Scott parish Council. Um, I would, um, agree with, uh, Cagney's response there, that ground noise disturbance. Um, I'm speaking from the community of Oakwood, which is alongside the north side of the airport at the moment. If that runway is built 12m to the right, it will be 12m closer to the residence. It seems that there isn't data from noise coming from Hook Wood. I have requested

noise monitors to go into the Hook Wood area, but have been told that we don't suffer from noise because we're alongside the airport.

00:09:51:05 - 00:10:20:00

Um. However, my own measurements, um, would not be in line with that. I've actually recorded 90dB 83 earlier this week as peaks, so I'm requesting that those noise envelopes and positioning of the noise recorders are, um, reconsidered, and that a more extensive noise survey is actually performed so that we get, um, proper data on a wider number of recipients of that noise.

00:10:21:19 - 00:10:29:24

Thank you very much. As I can see somebody on line, actually. Uh, Steve Harrison, is it?

00:10:30:21 - 00:11:07:08

Hi. Um, so Steve Harrison just representing myself. Um, so I live at the end of the runway, pretty much. Um, I just echo what Lisa just said, just in respect of some of the levels of the aircraft noise when they're taking off. I record 85dB, 82dB from A320s and things like that when they're taking off. Um, one of my observations is that the lark measure in particular, being an average, doesn't actually really represent, um, the, the real noise and the incidence of noise that you hear.

00:11:07:18 - 00:11:35:20

So measures like the n 65 and n 60 do a little bit, but actually it's the noises that exceed certain levels that are the things that wake you up at night. Um, so it's I agree with Lisa that I'm not sure the, um, the data is as accurate as it needs to be. And certainly if I think about the noise levels in in my back garden, they're not consistent with what I see in some of the, the modeling that that's been presented.

00:11:39:14 - 00:11:58:23

Thank you very much. Anybody else online or in the room? I don't think there is. Um, so I'll just turn to the applicant and invite you to respond to what you've heard. Thank you for the applicant. Thank you sir. As far as the joint local authority's position is concerned, um, we.

00:11:58:25 - 00:11:59:21

Hear the.

00:11:59:23 - 00:12:01:04

Point, mayor, that, um.

00:12:01:15 - 00:12:32:07

Taking locals up face value. They want some sensitivity testing. We don't understand. Just to be clear that the use of the soil that we suggested is disputed as a matter of principle by the joint local authorities. And as far as any suggestion of sensitivity testing is concerned, our position is that it's simply not necessary in circumstances where Lowell has been provided for by government for the reasons that we've set out before, so it wouldn't be necessary or appropriate to do so in those circumstances.

00:12:32:26 - 00:13:20:13

A related point was made in relation to the sonar survey, and I think that all has to be sustained in context of what government is telling us to do. Um, so in a survey carried out in 2014, but if one looks at the current government position, one has zero navigation guidance in 2017 that we looked at before the break, that was taken into account explicitly when the government was setting out its overarching noise policy step in 2023. Therefore, the government's position. I'm sorry to reiterate the point, but government's position, um, which we've adopted, is that levels should be set as we have provided for those in our assessment, and it's simply not appropriate to look behind that given the position that's been expressed by by government.

00:13:20:15 - 00:13:53:20

So we do not accept the need to report to you, um, assessments based on different levels of Lowell's, uh, as has been suggested. Um, as far as growing ground noise is concerned. Um, so we're aware that this wasn't the subject of one of your questions. Perhaps the easiest way of dealing with that is they can ask Mr. Harrison or Mr. Mitchell if he has anything you want to say, but we have a summary. But obviously, these points, insofar as they've been raised and relevant representations will be responding to them. And deadline one that might be the most appropriate allocation to deal with those.

00:13:53:28 - 00:13:55:03

Those matters, I think will be.

00:13:55:05 - 00:13:58:26

But I can ask, Mr. Mitchell, is that a summary to state? Yes. Yes.

00:13:59:24 - 00:14:01:10

With regards to ground noise.

00:14:02:11 - 00:14:32:15

And sorry Steve Mitchell for the applicant with regards to ground noise. Um, yes. There is less clear guidance on the subject. Ground noise. Um, but what I would say is there is no cutoff to the noise modeling for ground noise. Um, the levels are predicted and whatever level they arise at. Um, but additionally, we look at ambient noise when we look at ground noise. And because I think we probably skipped section four, which was the character of aviation noise.

00:14:32:24 - 00:15:03:11

It is important to realise that aircraft noise is has a different character to ground noise. Um, I can elaborate if you like, but in summary, aircraft noise of course, or air noise as we call it, is a series of peaks arriving from generally above ground. Noise is a far more continuous noise made up of multiple sources. And of course, arriving from ground level. So it is assessed differently. And um, for reasons that I've just summarized.

00:15:03:28 - 00:15:29:02

Um, and it's also set in the context of ambient noise, because when we look at the properties around the perimeter of the airport, um, they are exposed to road traffic noise, and the way that ground noise is perceived is rather more similar to road traffic noise, because both are reasonably consistent or made up of multiple sources. So we do look at that in the assessment to arrive at the significance ratings for ground noise.

00:15:32:27 - 00:15:35:04

Thank you very much. Thank you. Um, so.

00:15:35:21 - 00:15:58:21

Sir Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. Can I just clarify? We do have some comments that we wanted to make about ground noise, but we hadn't thought that that was part of this element. So I'm quite happy to leave those. But it's just that if you did want to understand anything in terms of the authority's views on ground noise, we are happy to assist you on that.

00:15:59:11 - 00:16:08:07

Is on the is on the, um, I think on the agenda later on. So I think, I think summarise we will come back to it later on. Yes. Thank you.

00:16:10:17 - 00:16:25:20

So let me move on. Um. Which in effect is the item six, I think. Um, we may go back to item five, but we'll see how that plays out. Um, so I've series A series of questions now really on.

00:16:27:19 - 00:16:42:21

I'll call it the daytime soul, if you like. Um, so what the what? The applicant. Agree. The definition of the soul in relation to response exposure curves is perhaps less clear. And LOL despite despite the previous discussion.

00:16:44:15 - 00:16:48:23

The sorry, Steve Mitchell. Do you mean the numerical value of the soul?

00:16:49:16 - 00:16:52:00

So it really is the definition in policy terms.

00:16:52:02 - 00:17:07:18

I think in policy terms, the meaning of the soul is quite clear in the in the guidance. As you know, I can read it to you. It relates to. Heck yeah. I'm referring to the government guidance on noise online. Um, then.

00:17:08:06 - 00:17:12:19

You'd like to refer just to the noise policy statement for England. That would be a start if you like.

00:17:12:24 - 00:17:14:16

Oh, we could start at the beginning.

00:17:15:17 - 00:17:16:18

Just remind us. Yeah.

00:17:17:06 - 00:17:23:24

Um, yes. It's the level at which significant adverse effects on health and quality of life occur.

00:17:26:24 - 00:17:27:11

All right. Okay.

00:17:27:13 - 00:18:03:13

So if we go to the government guidance, that helps us, um, understand what that means in real terms, how does that level of noise actually affect people in their homes or wherever they are? It tells us as follows I think it is quite clear the noise causes a material change in behavior, attitudes, or other physiological response, e.g. avoiding certain activities during a period of intrusion where there's no alternative ventilation, having to keep windows closed most of the time because of the noise potential for sleep disturbance resulting in difficulty in getting to sleep, premature awakenings, and difficulty in getting back to sleep.

00:18:03:14 - 00:18:05:25

Quality of life diminishes due to change.

00:18:06:14 - 00:18:12:25

Thank you very much. Yeah, I was going to get on to that later. But you've you've jumped. You've jumped ahead of me there. So that's that's fine. I was um.

00:18:14:18 - 00:18:30:03

Um, my next question then I think is. Does aviation policy? Well, does aviation policy provide a statement as to when significant noise effects are likely? Again, using the same metric is that is there some value?

00:18:31:00 - 00:18:32:28

And policy stated.

00:18:33:25 - 00:19:10:29

So Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Um, there's no value stated, uh, with the reference to a soul. However, the definition that I just referred to does talk about closing windows for the purposes of keeping noise out. So that would suggest to me that the definition of of a soul is at that point at which the noise levels outside require windows to be closed to keep the noise out. And the APF does tell us, the policy framework tells us that the noise insulation standard for uh, that that uh, for aircraft noise during the day, the 16 hour leak is 63dB.

00:19:11:10 - 00:19:26:21

So there's a clear linkage between soul and noise insulation, which is the same linkage that's been used on other transport sources, such that we tend to see that the soul is set at the noise insulation standards, for example, for roads.

00:19:28:10 - 00:19:51:07

Thank you. So if we just go to 3.17 of the Aviation Policy Framework 2013, which I think you mentioned, um, and said we will continue to treat the 57 DB like 16 hour contours, the average level of daytime aircraft noise like marking the approximate onset of significant community annoyance. So.

00:19:54:20 - 00:19:57:11

So you're saying that that is not a soul, aren't you?

00:19:58:16 - 00:20:02:06

Yes. Sorry. What was the paragraph number? Just so I can catch up.

00:20:02:13 - 00:20:04:00

3.17. Thank you.

00:20:21:15 - 00:20:24:12

Think my. I think my vote is correct.

00:20:28:16 - 00:20:31:28

Yeah. Are you happy with that? Um. Oh, sorry. Yes, I've got it in front of me.

00:20:32:06 - 00:20:32:29

Yeah. So. Yes.

00:20:33:01 - 00:20:46:18

So. So I'm just now trying to sort of compare and contrast a bit, perhaps the morning and well before the break and now. So whereas in terms of loads, you're happy to use the concept of a community load. The souls. You don't.

00:20:48:00 - 00:21:02:07

Um, Steve Mitchell. I don't think that's the case. Um, paragraph 3.17. The second sentence is. However, this does not mean that all people within this contour, that's the 57 DB contour will experience significant adverse effects.

00:21:03:20 - 00:21:04:09

But not.

00:21:07:17 - 00:21:08:18

Not all people.

00:21:11:02 - 00:21:12:25

That's the words. Yes. Yeah. Okay.

00:21:16:06 - 00:21:22:17

So the APF goes on to say at 3.18, we will keep our policy under review in the light of any new emerging evidence, doesn't it?



00:21:24:29 - 00:21:25:14

Yes.

00:21:28:17 - 00:21:29:24

I'm just going to skip for a little bit.

00:21:32:22 - 00:21:37:17

So, uh, if we go on, then to, um.

00:21:40:09 - 00:21:57:17

I think it's in the, in the, um, uh, trying to get the reference, but the Sona looked at this, didn't it? And then the conclusion was the same percentage of respondents said by Agnes, which was the earliest survey we hardly ignored at 57 now occurs at 54. Is that correct? Yes.

00:21:59:10 - 00:22:04:08

It might be worth tuning to that big of eight on page 55. Again, I don't know if you've still got it.

00:22:04:20 - 00:22:05:22

I have, thank you.

00:22:11:09 - 00:22:15:26

That I might I might just skip through some of these questions because I think you have.

00:22:17:25 - 00:22:25:03

Okay if I go to this question, if you then go to um, AMP's 2018, um.

00:22:27:14 - 00:22:39:01

Doesn't that imply, if you like, at least imply that 54 was the new. I think it's a cumulative, significant effect to my soul. Because because you're first it doesn't it at 5.58.

00:22:40:21 - 00:22:48:03

I'm sorry. I don't have that in front of me. And that's clearly not our interpretation of that paragraph. Okay.

00:22:49:16 - 00:22:53:16

You understand my. What I'm saying is that it does refer to the 54 rather than the 57.

00:22:54:06 - 00:23:02:15

I understand it refers to a different level, but it doesn't say that's the significant observable adverse effect level to be used in environmental impact assessment.

00:23:03:02 - 00:23:05:15

Okay. Your position is quite clear. Um.

00:23:10:27 - 00:23:35:24

So you just just just to avoid, um. Spending too long on this. So your position is quite clearly that you. Uh, consider the soul is the same as the, um, I think you refer to it is the the the, um, implied by the point where you have to keep your windows closed. Is that, um, broadly speaking.

00:23:36:17 - 00:24:17:01

Yes, that's what I said. And whilst I referred back to the. APF, which of course is quite old. We do know of lots of projects and indeed regulations since then that have taken the same approach. So that, um. The soul is set at the level for sound insulation to be offered as a means of avoiding the significant adverse effect on health and quality of life. So, um, I could name lots of airport projects, which in very recent years and in recent months have used the soul set at the two values that we've used for the day and the night.

00:24:17:12 - 00:24:22:12

And as you know, examiners and inspectors, endorsements of those.

00:24:23:18 - 00:24:30:24

Thank you. So just just to recap, you're maintaining the position that it's 6360 nowadays a sole.

00:24:31:21 - 00:25:09:28

Based on the current knowledge and current guidance. Yes, from the current. We did hear from friends across the. Room from me. The Civil Aviation have an ongoing study into looking at it. Aircraft Noise Attitudes Survey do actually have someone representing them on the line. If we want to ask him about the status of that survey. I think Mr. Lloyd gave us a summary of where they'd got to with the people that have been dealt with in the first wave and that survey, which I think we all know is a difficult thing to do because of all the confounding factors that we've heard about this morning, including the rate of change of airports, etc.

00:25:10:06 - 00:25:24:21

is, um, ongoing and I understand is likely to report next year. And that will, I suspect, feed into policy and any guidance that we might get then as to where significant adverse effects on health and quality of life arise.

00:25:27:12 - 00:25:45:13

Thank you. Um, I just asked one question. Would you? Is the. Is the applicant willing to consider? I don't know. When does your, um, um, where does your receptor based scheme start at? Is it, is it, is it at 63 or is it, is it are there some discretionary schemes or are you committing to schemes that start lower than that.

00:25:45:15 - 00:25:47:24

Sorry sir. When you say schemes do you mean noise noise.

00:25:47:26 - 00:25:51:21

Insulation or receptor based mitigation or noise insulation if you want to use that term.

00:25:51:28 - 00:26:24:28

Yes. Um, we the applicant has committed to a noise insulation scheme that begins at the daytime leak 16 out of 54dB. It then progresses to an inner zone at the sole value of like 16 hour 63dB. And not forgetting the L night. Sorry, not L night. The LEC eight hour night summer season um, 9 to 55dB as a sole for nighttime. Once you enter into the Seoul Zone, we call it the Inner Zone.

00:26:25:00 - 00:26:30:19

And the noise insulation scheme is necessarily more generous for those people affected by that level.

00:26:31:22 - 00:26:41:07

Thank you. Um. I think that's all I've got on the soul under the circumstances. I'll invite any comments from interested parties.

00:26:44:25 - 00:27:05:27

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, for the joint local authorities. Again, I'll ask Mr. Monk if he wants to comment again. I think we're likely to be saying a similar thing about a need for further sensitivity work to be undertaken. We know what the applicant has said about that. Obviously, a dividing line between us. But I suspect that that's something that we will continue to press for.

00:27:16:15 - 00:27:21:00

Thank you, sir. David Monk, on behalf of Horsham District Council. Um.

00:27:23:29 - 00:27:25:24

Again, we have um.

00:27:27:02 - 00:27:57:18

In relation to the sole aspect we note stated in the NPS. Um, we also note that there's more recent work, um, which we think there should be consideration sensitivity testing against that to understand the more detailed impacts and the extent of extent of sole, particularly when you consider the effects both during the day and night periods. Um, I think at that point I'll.

00:27:58:12 - 00:28:01:24

Maybe defer to, um, there'll be more details.

00:28:01:26 - 00:28:09:03

In, I'm sure, in our local impact report, but also any follow up submissions to this? Thank you, thank you.

00:28:12:05 - 00:28:15:19

As the hand up in the room. Two hands, I think he actually.

00:28:20:21 - 00:28:55:05

Thank you sir. And my name is Stephen Rolfe South and said, hello parish Council. It's been very interesting hearing all these 16 hour leak trigger levels for when mitigation may occur. But our residents hear sound as a single event at the time and not processed into a 16 hour leak or an eight hour leak. Sound level report. They hear the instant sound when it happens, whether they're in their gardens or in their kitchens, with the windows open or shut, as the case may be.

00:28:55:07 - 00:28:57:08

Single event levels is what we hear.

00:28:57:10 - 00:29:00:28

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. It was on my hand.

00:29:05:12 - 00:29:37:09

Thank you. Lisa Scott Parish Council, and I would agree with the comments already made here, but to I hope it's the position to request this to expand the imaginative city of the insulation offers. Um, so having double glazing and insulation in the loft, um is is not helpful when you really need to open your windows at night. I draw back to 2020, when we had 40 degrees just here, and government advice was to open your windows at night and keep them closed during the day.

00:29:37:11 - 00:29:52:06

We need some more imaginative offers on the insulation scheme, for example, at a heat pump which provides an air conditioning in the nighttime and will also purify air and help to address their air quality issues. Thank you.

00:29:52:27 - 00:29:53:12

Thank you.

00:29:55:09 - 00:29:56:29

I see Hackney.

00:29:59:10 - 00:30:32:28

So if you'll forgive me. Um, I'm also chair of ward and parish council. And my deputy, um, was due to be here today, but unfortunately, work commitments has prevented. So if you allow me to remove my Cagney hat for a moment and be chair of the parish council as I received a mandate last night from our meeting, um, we have, um, serious issues with the, um, the noise contours being used by Gatwick Airport. Our parish to the north east suffers three departure routes and all of the arrivals to the west of the airport.

00:30:33:13 - 00:30:58:25

Um, as such, our residents get no respite as it is from aircraft noise. The averaging out of noise is is unacceptable. And so we would endorse noise events being a consideration. And our area is outside of any insulation or compensation currently. And with the new scheme it would not provide any for our parish residents. Thank you very much.

00:30:58:27 - 00:31:02:04

Thank you very much. Yes. Another lady.

00:31:04:17 - 00:31:06:19

Wait for the microphone. Yeah, please.

00:31:13:26 - 00:31:44:06

Hello, Pat. Routledge. Um, I'm. Was just wanted to mention about the compensation. We had spent 11 £12,000. On double glazing on our grade two listed building we're trying desperately to preserve in the area, and we had the roof, uh, redone Horsham stone. Um.

00:31:44:08 - 00:32:15:29

And they. Insulation below. It is of the top quality building standard, which I don't have an isolated price, but we spent all of this money. And then Gatwick came in with £3,000 and we can't pay you out. And what you've already done. Sorry. It's an insult. An absolute insult. We can't open the windows anywhere. Day or night because it's that gentleman said, you only need one to come in at night.

00:32:16:12 - 00:32:31:17

Fighting against the wind, screaming deceleration. Is that taking into account anywhere? Then. The. You're awake. You can't go back to sleep. And then they started all again at 530 in the morning.

00:32:33:04 - 00:33:09:03

You're lucky if you get a couple of hours. You're talking about eight hours. Oh. Gone are those days. I'm sorry. And the complaints? It's just ludicrous. I've taken to phoning up. Now, actually, when the nuisance occurs, I know that nobody's going to be listening to it at 4:00 in the morning, 3:00 in the morning, 5:00 in the morning. But I still record it then, because I'm awake, I don't leave it till the following day. I pick up the phone and do it there and then, but I have no confidence whatsoever that any notice is taken of anything.

00:33:09:05 - 00:33:09:24

Sorry.

00:33:09:28 - 00:33:13:17

Thank you, thank you. Is there anybody else?

00:33:15:03 - 00:33:16:12

And I thank you. Thank you.

00:33:18:26 - 00:33:27:14

I'm not seeing anybody online or in the room, so I'll ask the applicant to respond to those points, please. Thank you.

00:33:27:19 - 00:34:04:00

Scott. For the applicant. I'll hand over to Mr. Mitchell. We just want to adopt 3.0 and so far as looking at. So I'll mention that was made of other decisions where this issue has been considered in an airport context. I think it's section 14.2 of the is chapter 14 is the appropriate reference, where there are six airport development projects identified since 2014, adopted 63 DB over the lake 16 hour period, as well as for other points that have been raised.

00:34:04:02 - 00:34:16:09

Um, uh, there was a point raised about, um, lack and average level, I don't know, sort of given your experience, whether we need to deal with that as a, as an issue, I can ask Mr. Mitchell to explain it if it would help.

00:34:16:25 - 00:34:20:04

Well, I will ask you to respond to the point. Yes. Very well.

00:34:20:06 - 00:34:23:08

I'll hand over to Mr. Mitchell. He'll pick up other points as well. Thank you.

00:34:23:17 - 00:34:29:23

Steve Mitchell, for the applicant. Um, so if I pick up on the LEC as an average point, first of all,

00:34:31:21 - 00:35:02:12

it's it's correct. LEC is an average. But and I have to say this in the same sentence, it's a logarithmic average, which sounds mathematically complicated, but what it means in simple terms is that any peak is highly weighted in the logarithmic averaging process. And it's for that reason that it's the best indicator that we have at the moment. According to the research of annoyance from aircraft Noise. Um, we did discuss this.

00:35:02:14 - 00:35:45:09

I've discussed it in various formats, but we also discussed it with the Noise Envelope group when we were talking about what metrics would be best for the noise envelope. I can give you a reference in appendix 14 .9.9 to check that. If you turn to page 150, there's an expectation, a discussion around metrics, including LEC. Perhaps I'll leave it there, sir, because I know you're very familiar with noise metrics and the different options that we have. Um, on that point, though, of course, um, following the CCA guidance, including in Caps 1616, the environmental statement goes to quite a lot of lengths to use other metrics apart from the LEC.

00:35:45:11 - 00:36:10:12

I think those are the only noise metrics we've talked about this morning, and it would be wrong to get two hours, 20 minutes into a discussion on aircraft noise without talking about other metrics, um, such as the number above 60 at night and the number above 65 during the day, and the El Max and the different El Maxes and the overflight metrics, all of which are reported at length to describe the effects of the project in the environmental statement.

00:36:12:07 - 00:36:17:04

In accordance with the guidance that the Civil Aviation Authority published for us to use.

00:36:19:11 - 00:36:27:03

In terms of noise insulation. I would like to make one one response to that if I can, if this is the right moment to do that. Just briefly.

00:36:27:12 - 00:36:27:27

Um.

00:36:30:02 - 00:36:35:07

Can we come back to that? Possibly written questions or later hearing we can.

00:36:35:09 - 00:36:38:08

Needless to say, I want to talk about windows and ventilation.

00:36:38:15 - 00:36:41:24

Okay, but can we? I'm just keen to sort of move on now. Yeah.

00:36:44:29 - 00:37:01:07

I'll just. I'll just keep on. Um. Item six. But perhaps briefer. I'm conscious that, um, we said we try and finish it. One we might well run over until about 1:15. We will just try and keep this moving if we can. Um.

00:37:03:11 - 00:37:12:17

Night time souls. So we're still an item six. Um. Let me just try and perhaps keep the main question. Um.

00:37:14:04 - 00:37:25:04

Could you just explain the basis for the applicant's nighttime survival in terms of the aviation defined? Any key metric. How did you get the number that got?

00:37:26:14 - 00:37:29:09

Sorry. Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Um.

00:37:31:00 - 00:37:59:12

The sole value for nighttime is taken for the interim target for the night noise guidelines 2009 QA tower of 55 DB, which is described in those guidelines as the level above which adverse effects occur. Frequently, a sizable proportion of population is highly annoyed and sleep disturbed. The nighttime value is also consistent with that used on the other recent airport development projects that I think Mr. Linus just reminded us of, which those are.

00:38:04:28 - 00:38:15:08

It is. I mean, it is. It's fair to say that, um. The W.H.O. don't call that. They don't use the terminology. They don't call it a social, do they? As such.

00:38:15:25 - 00:38:16:18

Correct.

00:38:18:22 - 00:38:36:28

Um. Let me just try and do a much shorter version of what we did earlier. Um, let me go to that Sona report. But for the night time I think is cap 2161, which was also published in 2021. And it's figure four.

00:38:43:06 - 00:38:43:21

I.

00:38:53:11 - 00:38:56:18

Like a seven. Who was it?

00:38:57:09 - 00:39:03:03

Figure four actually. I'm sorry, what was the page number? Sleep disturb is a function of average summer night.

00:39:05:04 - 00:39:08:17

Um, on page 31, it's figure seven.

00:39:09:29 - 00:39:14:24

The IP 2161. Yes. Oh.

00:39:16:27 - 00:39:21:01

Though helpfully, we got different. We've got different graphs, isn't it?

00:39:23:03 - 00:39:24:20

Cap 2161.

00:39:24:22 - 00:39:25:17

Okay, I'll give you a minute.

00:39:26:09 - 00:39:27:20

July 2021.

00:39:28:00 - 00:39:29:04

Uh. That's correct. Yes.

00:39:29:10 - 00:39:30:04

What page are you on?

00:39:30:08 - 00:39:31:01

I'm on page two.

00:39:31:20 - 00:39:33:24

I'm sorry. I'm a few pages beyond that. Okay.

00:39:34:10 - 00:39:35:03

I think that's the.

00:39:35:06 - 00:39:35:27

That's the.

00:39:36:29 - 00:39:52:09



You have two summer nights. Which is the one you're going to? Yeah. Thank you. So just just just I mean, it's not really to go into great detail. So what you're saying is that you're 55, then is right at the very you know, I won't say it's off the graph, but it's, um.

00:39:53:09 - 00:39:54:06

It's, um.

00:39:54:25 - 00:39:57:18

Over to the right, I suppose. Would be fair to say.

00:39:58:26 - 00:40:05:00

Um, well, the x axis goes from 39 to 60. It does. And I think you were discussing 55.

00:40:05:02 - 00:40:34:12

Exactly. That's what I'm saying. That's what I'm saying. I'm just making an observation that that's where you've set your significant adverse adverse effect level. I think what I'm, I think that's the point I'm making is this is this obviously is specific to aviation noise. So we're looking, if you like, are called apples with apples if you like. Um, whereas obviously the W.H.O. was was not specific to aviation or it was a more general into. Well, it's an interim target, wasn't it. It wasn't, you know, that that was the nature of that figure. Yes.

00:40:36:03 - 00:40:40:06

I won't run on this point. I think it's probably best to move on. Um, well, I mean.

00:40:40:08 - 00:41:03:00

While we're looking at figure four. Yeah, if we choose, it's a it's a series of points, not a regression curve. Um, and we can see that at 55dB. Leica tower, an average summer night, the this, this particular piece of information gives us a highly sleep disturbed at about 15% ish. Yes. The population.

00:41:03:02 - 00:41:07:21

Yeah. Well, yeah, I won't draw on this. This one too much. Okay. Um.

00:41:13:00 - 00:41:20:13

I'll, um. I think I'll let other people have any comments on on the night time soul if they wish to make them before we move on.

00:41:30:21 - 00:41:46:14

Mm. Sorry, sir. Um, Michael Bedford, joint local authorities. I'll introduce, um, Mr. Monk, who I think wants to comment on. Um, so, nighttime events and how they should be appropriately considered.

00:41:50:08 - 00:42:21:22

Sir David Monk on behalf of the Horsham District Council. Thank you for highlighting figure four. The joint local authorities have noted that particular figure and the response is therein. Um, we're also aware because we've had a discussion around, um. The leaks. And as we're doing with the night

period, um, we'd like to draw on the aviation policy framework where it says that, um, the average metrics are not always indicative of the real effects, and other metrics should be used.

00:42:21:24 - 00:42:37:21

So this does have regard to the secondary metrics or what's termed as the secondary metrics such as the above. Um, but we'd also like to highlight the issue with additional awakenings. And uh, just to highlight here how that might be used in connection.

00:42:37:23 - 00:42:38:11

With.

00:42:38:13 - 00:42:43:21

Determining a nighttime. So we're aware that, uh, Heathrow, for example, um.

00:42:44:08 - 00:42:46:12

Are proposing to use.

00:42:46:14 - 00:42:57:03

A, um, threshold of one additional awakening over the 92 day summer period to define that as a soul for intervention. Um, I just really wanted to bring that to the examining authority's.

00:42:57:05 - 00:42:57:25

Attention.

00:42:57:27 - 00:43:11:04

About the importance of that, particularly in light of some of the comments from the communities earlier. Uh, previously. Thank you. Thank you very much. Anybody else would like to comment on the nighttime significant effect level?

00:43:16:01 - 00:43:21:28

I'm not seeing anything in the room online, so I'll move swiftly on. Um.

00:43:24:12 - 00:43:29:26

Still item six I, um. But for completeness and I won't go back to nighttime. Lolz. Um.

00:43:31:20 - 00:43:39:08

It did introduce. I think it's fair to say the applicant introduced the planning policy guidance. Um, and what it says in that about significant effects.

00:43:41:03 - 00:43:49:10

I was. Why why why is the applicant submitted the final block in the PG table about unacceptable. Adverse effects.

00:43:54:17 - 00:44:03:10

Uh, that's because, um, the noise policy state of England and none of the aviation guidance that we've talked about so far uses the same terminology.

00:44:04:00 - 00:44:10:00

But it is correct to say there is a description of unacceptable effects in the planning policy guidance, is there not?

00:44:10:02 - 00:44:10:23

That is correct. Yes, there.

00:44:10:25 - 00:44:12:19

Is, and you've chosen to omit it.

00:44:13:17 - 00:44:14:02

Um.

00:44:14:09 - 00:44:27:02

I think we deal with this in the table at the beginning of the year. Refer to the all the you all the same comment I just made. Okay. Uh, and we note that we don't have any populations below the value in any event.

00:44:27:13 - 00:44:32:11

So not set a level for that. I didn't even not set any level for that.

00:44:32:21 - 00:44:39:23

Uh, we looked at the Heathrow example of the levels that we used at that time, which I'm very happy to discuss now, if that's helpful.

00:44:41:06 - 00:44:47:16

No, it was well, you not set a level for it. So if you want to make written submissions about it, then that's fine. Yeah.

00:44:50:16 - 00:44:57:06

Night. Finally. Um. Um. Well. Has anybody got any comments on unacceptable adverse effect level?

00:45:01:09 - 00:45:11:04

Know I knew, right? Um, I'm going to I'm going to skip through quite a lot of things here, um, which may be defer to written questions and so on.

00:45:16:15 - 00:45:36:23

So I'm going to move to my, um, item seven. Really, we're going to move on. We're going to move away from items five and six onto my sort of third part. And perhaps we can rattle through this. Um, so there's 1 or 2 questions about about this. Um. Start with non-residential receptors.

00:45:38:20 - 00:45:43:07

All thresholds set out for all other types of receptors in the U.S. and if so, where can they be found?

00:45:47:21 - 00:45:59:26

Uh, Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Give me while I just forward a few pages in my notes, because I think that was a separate item at the very end of the agenda, and I find the right page. I'll I'll give you my response.

00:46:01:22 - 00:46:02:15

The, um.

00:46:02:24 - 00:46:03:16

I should just do it.

00:46:06:04 - 00:46:36:28

The approach to assessing noise impacts at noise sensitive non receptors is to scope the potential impacts using the assessment criteria for residential receptors, then to protect where, if potential impacts are identified, to consider each non-residential receptor on a case by case basis. So the methodology for non residential receptors is summarised in the is paragraph 14 for 76. Non-residential noise receptors include where we know what they are and so we won't give the long list.

00:46:37:13 - 00:47:09:21

Uh the criteria if you look at them for those types of receptors are invariably at or above like 16 out of 50dB. So therefore they're within one decibel of the residential lower value. So using the low value. Which may be then exceeded by decibel with an increase. It seems to me as a reasonable scoping tool to use non-residential receptors. And then when we look at assessment criteria for the change of noise relating to non-residential receptors, we see that changes of three decibels are significant.

00:47:09:23 - 00:47:14:08

So we can use that in our assessment above law. Thank you.

00:47:15:27 - 00:47:48:14

Isn't it? I think I think I follow that answer. I think that's what I've read in the. Yes. So I think that's fine. My follow up really, isn't it the way you've done that exercise. But isn't it, isn't it inevitable that some non-residential receptors will be currently beloved? LOL not using the 50 um at all. Um, which could become above the law as a result of the proposed development. So is the applicant's assessment limited to only those non-residential receptors that are already above the law? Yeah, but occasionally that's 50.

00:47:49:20 - 00:47:50:08

That's true.

00:47:50:11 - 00:48:05:16

If I could say no, it uses the with development values as a as a scoping tool. So any of the noise contours that fall above low would bring that receptor into the zone, the nonresidential receptor into the zone of of potentially needing an assessment.

00:48:05:18 - 00:48:23:19

Can I just replay that one back to you? Um. If without development. Let's talk about school this weekend so you can sort of visualize it. If it's a school that's currently outside of your threshold, but because of the expansion. Becomes inside your threshold. Are they not in scope?

00:48:25:02 - 00:48:27:15

They are in scope. That's what I tried to say in my.

00:48:27:17 - 00:48:28:03

Response, I.

00:48:28:05 - 00:49:00:06

Misunderstood. Sorry. Yes. So in applying that scoping threshold, we apply it to either the without or with development case. So it is possible that a school could be at 49, sorry, 50dB as a daytime leak and it could rise to 51. And then it would trigger the the change assessment that we do in the in the ears with regards to aircraft noise. You'll see results for 21 schools in appendix 14 .9.2 giving the predicted noise levels at those schools.

00:49:00:08 - 00:49:10:11

Yes, that's fine. I suppose the reason that non-residential noise sensitive receptors, including those categories at all in are, in all cases already exposed to aircraft noise.

00:49:12:21 - 00:49:18:06

Shouldn't they be lower? They could move from 49 to 51. But you're saying they are in scope.

00:49:19:04 - 00:49:22:24

They're already exposed to noise. It doesn't say what level are.

00:49:22:27 - 00:49:23:28

Well, paragraph.

00:49:24:00 - 00:49:29:03

It just says the scoping as I say is, is to do with the width of element level as well as the without the values.

00:49:29:07 - 00:49:40:23

That's here already, in all cases already exposed to aircraft noise in your, um, this is so I hope it looked like the same thing. I think it's, um, 14.14 .4.69.

00:49:43:11 - 00:49:53:03

Yes. It doesn't say they're already exposed to levels above the residential level. It just is that they're already exposed to aircraft noise some level. Yeah. Sorry if that wasn't clear. Okay.

00:49:54:23 - 00:49:56:15

Okay. Moving. Right. Okay. So.

00:49:58:15 - 00:50:12:09

The schools. What guidance has been used? I think you've answered the question, by the way. You basically used the threshold as the. Well 50. So you've what? You've rounded it down to 50 as a, as a threshold volume 51 or I mean, yes, the.

00:50:12:11 - 00:50:18:22

School specifically we have used the daytime 50 and that's, that's embedded in the ranch study that you may be familiar.

00:50:18:24 - 00:50:19:09

With.

00:50:19:11 - 00:50:51:09

But importantly, um, that's the. If you like this the scoping stage, we then look at the change in noise. This does bring me to a rather important point, and you will see the change in noise at the schools reported in the ES. In all cases they're small and not significant. So we're quite happy. There are no significant effect on on the schools that we've assessed. But the change in noise generally across the study area is very small, and it doesn't cross the thresholds for significance in most cases.

00:50:52:20 - 00:51:05:15

Thank you. Yes, I can I can scan those tables quite easily and see the sort of the relatively small changes that I think you're alluding to. Um. My question. Keeping on schools for a minute or two. Um.

00:51:08:01 - 00:51:09:24

I was just curious to know.

00:51:11:19 - 00:51:24:18

Whether you whether or not you considered the, um, the guidance in the Acoustic Design of Schools performance standards, which was published in 2015, which probably knows 93. It's not referenced in the ES.

00:51:26:20 - 00:51:41:18

Um, no it's not. Sorry. It's not referenced in the. Is this to say the way we've looked at schools is to look at the change. And if, if, if there is no change as a result of the project, then there can't be a significant effect as a result of the project, regardless of any design standard that's relevant for that school.

00:51:41:20 - 00:51:59:29

I think the point and it's and it plays into some of the comments I've heard, of course, is that the schools go on. You probably know this. You probably know the guidance. It sets a much shorter. Integration time, doesn't it, for the for the target of the limit. So if the upper limit value is 30 minutes.

00:52:02:26 - 00:52:22:21

So I think the point I'm driving, and I'm sure you know, what I'm driving at, is that you've set your threshold or your assessment around still these registry, these 60, these daytime leaks, but the effects will be felt or so that's clear. The guidance sets an upper limit in terms of 30 minute internal value doesn't it.

00:52:23:15 - 00:53:00:12

Um, so yes, the guidance I believe is to do with designing of a new school or many of. Well, sorry if I know you. I've visited several of the schools and carried out ambient noise surveys, and we chose, I think, 5 or 6 of those schools. I forget the number is what we call the community representative locations. There are seven in the US and um schools, of course, are accessible by roads and invariably exposed to road traffic noise. So, um, it may not be appropriate to, to assess in terms of the, the, the preferred design standards for a new school.

00:53:00:25 - 00:53:13:09

Um, when you have an existing noise environment that the school sits in at the moment. So we do feel that when we've assessed the change, albeit over 16 hours, we do pick up whether there would be a detrimental effect on that school or not.

00:53:13:11 - 00:53:24:05

So to summarize your position, if I may, um, you basically maintain your position that a noise change assessment over the 16 hour queue is sufficient.

00:53:25:03 - 00:54:02:21

I think providing that, I mean, the results are really quite conclusive. When you look at the changes. I mean, it's so nice to talk in theory. Maybe we should look at section 14.9. I'll try and find it if you like, when we talk about the changes at schools. But as I said earlier, the same with the changes in look at many of the properties affected. In fact, over 60% of the project properties affected by noise have a change of less than one decibel. Most of the schools are in that zone. So there is, um, you know, a change over 16 hours leak of one decibel is not likely to be a big change.

00:54:02:26 - 00:54:09:14

If it's averaged over 30 minutes, I'll accept it could be a higher change over 30 minutes, but it's not likely to be much higher.

00:54:11:17 - 00:54:20:15

I think. Well, I'll invite comments on, on on this sort of non-residential receptor issue from, from interested parties. Thank you.

00:54:22:01 - 00:54:32:08

Second, I just check with my team because I don't think we had a lot of comments, but obviously they've heard the debate and I'll just check whether there's anybody wants to come in on that.

00:54:34:29 - 00:54:39:12

I'm not. I'm not seeing a specific response. Thank you sir. Thank you for the opportunity.

00:54:40:22 - 00:54:46:08

I've got a couple of hands, I think. Um. Pull off the hand there. Yes there is. Thank you. Yes.

00:54:47:10 - 00:55:27:15

And how come? On behalf of Cagney, um, there's three points, uh, arising from the discussion that's been held. I think if we start at the end, it's my understanding of the EIA regulations is to provide the worst case assessment rather than just assume what it could be above the assessment that's been done that was stated with like 30 minutes of schools, um, on some assumption. Um, the second point is that there hasn't been or there isn't any night time, um, I should say lull or accompanying um, discussion around non-residential noise sensitive receptors.

00:55:27:17 - 00:56:01:25

Obviously schools are probably daytime only, but some noise sensitive receptors that aren't residential will be nighttime, um, or affected during the nighttime. And then, um, the final point is that designs of schools, there is also an LA one requirement, as well as the lark 30 minute, which is essentially, um, comparable to El Max in terms of how you might describe it. Um, so a significant change or a material change in the number of overflights would, would be something that is necessary to consider for those things.

00:56:02:13 - 00:56:16:29

Um, within the noise chapter, there are a number of occurrences where the lark change is quite small, but the overflight change appears quite large. And such a, um. Schools would slip between the cracks. Potentially.

00:56:19:00 - 00:56:22:15

Thank you for that. Um, there was another hand, I think, wasn't it? Yes.

00:56:23:27 - 00:57:05:09

Um. Thank you sir. Daisy Noble, counsel on behalf of Marathon Asset Management and the Holiday Inn. Um, the czar will now be aware, from what I've said in previous hearings, that discussions are taking place between the applicant and my client, including in respect of noise. And we're hopeful that those discussions will allow the issues, um, raised to be addressed amicably between the parties. I just want to draw one point at this stage to the Tsar's attention, um, in relation to this agenda item, it relates to the assessment of noise effects of the project on the Holiday Inn, which is treated as a non-residential receptor in the environmental statement.

00:57:05:17 - 00:57:15:00

Um, I'm going to hand over to Miss Eleanor Burgess, who's the UK head of building acoustics at Stantec, who's sitting to my left to address you shortly on this point.

00:57:15:22 - 00:57:19:20

Good morning, Eleanor Gerges, on behalf of Marathon Asset Management Group.

00:57:20:11 - 00:57:22:24

Um, addressing this point, I've reviewed.

00:57:22:26 - 00:57:53:26



The is Noise and Vibration, chapter 14, the Air Noise Modeling report and the Ground Noise Modeling Report. And it is apparent that our hotel, the Holiday Inn, has not been assessed as a noise sensitive receptor for the purposes of air noise and ground noise. It is surprising to me that this is the approach that has been taken, and we will provide the references to those documents in our post hearing submissions. Failure to identify the hotel as a noise sensitive receptor means that no information has been provided in the U.S.

00:57:53:28 - 00:58:30:10

on future ground noise. Additional awakenings due to air noise and construction noise levels that are likely to affect the hotel, and therefore the relative impact and the significance of this can not be readily assessed. I would like to also just flag that our client's premises are particularly sensitive to noise. The need to provide good conditions for sleeping not only during the night, but also during the daytime. The reason for this is that they hold airline contracts to host cabin crew whilst they're having their layovers, and they're also in negotiations for further contracts.

00:58:32:13 - 00:59:20:18

As I've mentioned previously, it's not been possible to currently assess the impact. However, I have looked at the nearest no sensitive receptor that has been treated for the purposes of the air noise assessment and the assessment of additional awakenings. That location is the Barnfield Community Care Home in Holly. Results provided in tables 4.27 and 4.214 at the Air Noise Modeling report indicates that the proposed intensification of activity with the airport is predicted to result in an additional 20 nighttime events that exceed the N60 threshold, and during the daytime, that increases to 65 events that are predicted to exceed the daytime threshold.

00:59:20:20 - 00:59:49:16

Those are the threshold where significant effects or expected to occur. If the same increase is likely to occur at the Holiday Inn premises. This could obviously have a significant effect on our client's premises and their ability to maintain those cabin crew contracts. There are also risks of reputational damage associated with standard hotel patrons. However, at present we are unable to gain certainty due to the lack of information in the assessment.

00:59:51:10 - 01:00:15:12

As you will have heard, we are in discussions and engaging with Google and we're having meaningful correspondence regarding the technical noise aspects for which we welcome, and we are very grateful for receiving information that helps to clarify the likely impact. We will review this information and will include it as part of our be written representations. Thank you.

01:00:16:01 - 01:00:21:19

Thank you very much. I see we have. Is it Councillor Lockwood online please?

01:00:24:26 - 01:00:28:05

The house. The Lockwood, are you there? Yes. Thank you.

01:00:28:21 - 01:01:00:27

I have something else to speak a bit further on in the agenda, but I just want to flag up one thing where you're talking about schools within the, uh, flightpath, uh, of the ILS, and towards Lingfield,

there is a, um, an educational establishment, which is a 24 hour establishment. Uh, Saint Piers Young Epilepsy is a residential school for children with, uh, learning difficulties and medical conditions, and nighttime noise is an issue there. Um, so I just wanted to point out that not all schools only operate during the day.

01:01:00:29 - 01:01:01:18

Thank you.

01:01:02:00 - 01:01:08:22

That's very helpful. Thank you. Is there anything else before I ask the applicant to come back on those points? Yes. No.

01:01:10:24 - 01:01:15:04

I assume it's due to a legacy. Hand from Councilor Lockwood. Um.

01:01:17:24 - 01:01:21:28

Just scanning. Um, the applicant likes to respond to any of those points, please.

01:01:22:04 - 01:01:59:09

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. I'll keep this very brief. I just wanted to say that there is a noise insulation scheme being offered for schools, specifically as part of this project. Um, necessarily it depends on the school design and this, that and the other. But the threshold value is set as a daytime value. Uh, I suspect to to Council Lockwood's point, if there was a nighttime problem, it would be identified by that daytime value. But I accept we may need to look at that. But the principle is that we do take schools and noise seriously, because we're aware of the effect that aircraft noise can have on on learning.

01:01:59:13 - 01:02:06:29

That's the reason why we've offered the noise insulation scheme for schools if the aircraft noise is affecting the learning.

01:02:09:16 - 01:02:27:14

Okay. Um, moving on then. As I said, I think at the start I'm going to cover a few items in this, um, uh, item seven. I will just try and keep going and keep them quite brief. Um, it's coming back to ground noise and air noise. And I think we had some discussions earlier, so, um.

01:02:32:23 - 01:02:49:08

And the applicant just justifies the way it's dealt with in ES, as there's no reliable means of quantitatively assessing the overall noise effect resulting from different noise sources. The IRS considers the overall effect of noise from from ground and combined sources qualitatively. That's correct, isn't it?

01:02:50:26 - 01:02:51:26

Yes. That's correct.

01:02:53:27 - 01:03:00:18

But in the case of air noise and ground noise, the metrics and thresholds are the same, aren't they? As set out in the U.S., as I understand it.

01:03:01:17 - 01:03:07:09

Steve made sure the. Yes, the leak noise values are the same. Um.

01:03:07:28 - 01:03:08:22

So.

01:03:11:09 - 01:03:24:08

I suppose what I'm trying to get out there is. If the premises is adversely affected by both. And you've done it the way you've done it could, when both of the effects were added together, become a significant effect.

01:03:25:14 - 01:04:04:26

Steve Mitchell. Yes, I would like to respond to that because I think we have considered that, um, the qualitative assessment looks at four aspects of it, which I perhaps I won't rehearse. I go straight to the one that you've talked about. What if there could be a cumulative noise level from both those kinds of aircraft noise and ground noise that took us above the sole value? Um, in fact, if you look at the distribution of the significant effects from ground noise and you compare that with, sorry, I mean, geographically where they are, you find those are have to be, of course, close to the airport boundary because they're affected by ground noise significantly.

01:04:04:28 - 01:04:36:14

They are either immediately to the north or immediately to the south of the airport. Um, conversely, the significant adverse effects on residential properties, I'm sorry, and on other properties because of air noise, are invariably under the flight paths to the east and the west. And what we find is there are no noise sensitive properties. Immediately off the end of the runway. I take Mr. Johnson's point. There are properties slightly further away, or he would say close to the airport, but we find there are no properties.

01:04:36:22 - 01:05:07:25

And I think it's because of safety reasons that close to the end of the runway. So the overlap of where you could have a significant air noise and a significant ground noise effect doesn't really arise because of the distribution of properties. And there is one exception, and it's called Westfield Place, and it's on Charnwood Road just to the south of Charnwood, which is affected by both and has been identified as a top priority for sound insulation under the inner noise insulation scheme. And finally, in terms of um.

01:05:09:14 - 01:05:38:29

If we should get if the noise level should turn out to be different to what was modeled and assessed in the U.S., we do have a position in the Noise Insulation Scheme document where we say we make it clear that with regards to ground noise, we will measure ground noise. If we think this this has happened, and we will then look at the total noise level to see if it would qualify for the noise insulation scheme. And we do list the two locations to the north and the south of the airport, where that is most likely.

01:05:39:08 - 01:05:54:03

Thank you. Um, that's quite a narrow point, unless anybody wants to comment on that, I, I was inclined to move on. Unless the German authorities want to tease out any points around. I have got a hand there, actually. From Cagney. Yes.

01:05:55:11 - 01:06:27:10

And welcome on behalf of Cagney. Um, it's just on the comparison or inspection of noise contours or noise levels between air and ground noise. So the air noise uses the average mode split over both runway directions for the 92 summer day period, as has been done at many other airport applications. Ground noise assessment uses 100% modes, where it looks at aircraft all taking off in one direction and then aircraft all taking off in the other direction as two separate scenarios.

01:06:27:27 - 01:07:01:17

Um. This means that you can't directly compare any, um, receptors that are affected by both because they're two different scenarios, but air and ground noise. Um, there's also no contours for ground noise, so it's even harder to visualize, um, have to go through and pick specific locations and then see if there are any marrying up between all of the assessments. Um, and then finally the wind noise corrections within the ground noise model as detailed within the appendix.

01:07:01:19 - 01:07:32:09

Um, for ground noise modeling. It suggests that they only look at the corrections are only on the basis of easterly and westerly winds. There's no times when northerly or southerly winds are taken into account, as would be expected using the worst case assumptions under ISO 9613. Um, as is normally used, which is a um specification that looks at the attenuation of sound over distance and I can provide a full reference. Um, which means that.

01:07:33:15 - 01:07:39:27

It's not necessarily a worst case assumption for these ground noise conditions already, so there's potential that those effects are being minimized.

01:07:41:27 - 01:07:53:12

I thank you. Thank you. Um. Would the applicant like to respond on any of those? Oh, sorry, I missed somebody. So that's one more hand. Two more hands. Sorry.

01:07:56:21 - 01:08:24:03

This is Scott Charles Parish Council and apologies. I draw back again to the community in Oakwood, particularly along Povey Cross Road, which would be 12m closer to the new runway. And my understanding is that there are no noise monitoring devices in that area. So where are the applicant's figures coming from to state that there's no impact of noise there? I'd like to see that data provided. Thank you.

01:08:25:08 - 01:08:28:07

And there was another hand over there. Yes.

01:08:32:14 - 01:09:02:02

Thank you again, sir. Stephen Rolfe, South Parish Council. Some of our South has residents have noise concerns as they believe they are under the route for Bend Plus being underneath the Heathrow stack, and may be penalised by the um joining up of these two sources of aviation noise. If any site visits are being made, they'd appreciate if they could be included on that itinerary. Thank you.

01:09:02:24 - 01:09:03:24

Thank you very much. Thank you.

01:09:06:03 - 01:09:06:23

I think that.

01:09:06:25 - 01:09:07:11

Was.

01:09:07:25 - 01:09:09:20

Nope. One more. Thank you.

01:09:10:21 - 01:09:26:08

Uh, thank you sir. Um, Daisy noble, on behalf of Marathon Asset Management and the Holiday Inn. Um, given that we were discussing matters to do with ground noise, I'd just like to make one very brief point at this stage. Um, and I'm going to hand over to Mr. Burgess from Stantec to briefly address you on that.

01:09:27:04 - 01:10:08:25

I'm gonna go just on behalf of Marathon Asset Management Group. To echo the points just raised there about the ground noise and representative locations, and there are no representative locations in close proximity to the Holiday Inn premises. The nearest locations being locations six and seven, are over half kilometre and over 700m away from the Holiday Inn premises, neither of which have acoustic climates that are representative of the conditions at the Holiday Inn. As any model is very sensitive to the level of data and the quality of information that's put into the model, where that model doesn't have accurate data that forms the basis of the baseline and hasn't been verified as such.

01:10:08:27 - 01:10:24:23

This has potential implications for the relative impact for all future projections. Without understanding how realistic therefore the predictions are. In the context of the Holiday Inn, we are unable to assess the impact at the Holiday Inn itself.

01:10:25:09 - 01:10:26:06

Thank you. Thank you.

01:10:29:01 - 01:10:30:17

If the video is no more.

01:10:32:09 - 01:10:38:12

I would ask the applicant to respond. Briefly if you could turn your those points.

01:10:41:24 - 01:11:04:02

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Um, with regards to the Holiday Inn, I'm. I'm pleased that Ellie acknowledged that we're in a helpful dialogue of exchange of information. And we have been for for some weeks. Um. I would just point out that the last point that the nearest receptor assessed to the Holiday Inn is some distance away.

01:11:06:08 - 01:11:36:23

Is not quite accurate. The Gatwick Park Hotel, Park hospital, I'm sorry, which is on the far side, the Gatwick Park Hospital, which is on the far side of the Holiday Inn car park, is specifically addressed in the Noise Assessment appendix 14.9 9.3 um, a number of points that have been made around the Holiday Inns representation this morning, I don't agree with and I think are slightly out of date compared with the information we've provided more recently, but I won't go into that.

01:11:36:25 - 01:11:41:08

I don't think it's helpful. We are having an ongoing discussion with them and I think that will be productive.

01:11:46:01 - 01:12:06:19

Thank you very much. Um, if anybody wants to, obviously people can make written representations and written submissions. Um. In due course to the. Yeah. Um, I think I will literally ask one or most two more questions because of the time. Um. I'd like to say we'd try and finish by 1:00.

01:12:08:16 - 01:12:21:13

I think, um, perhaps, as I said, the other things that we can't do today will generally be written questions or subsequent hearings. There are other things I know you want to talk about, um, which we'll get we'll come back to, um.

01:12:25:19 - 01:12:48:16

I think I'll just go to what was on the original, I think, agenda item 7.3 about the baseline and reasonable worst case assumptions. So I think, as I said, this is perhaps worthwhile just talking about a little bit. Um, so could the applicant tell us what the Amps has to say about baseline with regard to noise?

01:13:03:29 - 01:13:05:26

Let's go. Just bear with us a moment.

01:13:06:03 - 01:13:28:00

That's fine. Yeah. That's fine. Yeah. But maybe I can help you. It's not supposed to be. It's not a memory test. I mean, 5.58. Um, the noise mitigation measures should ensure the impact of aircraft noise is limited and where possible, reduce compared to the 2013 baseline assessed by the Airports Commission. Now understand context. We've been talking about, um.

01:13:29:18 - 01:13:30:15

So.

01:13:32:21 - 01:13:35:18

I'm. Well what what's your what's your what are your what's your response to that.

01:13:36:24 - 01:14:06:02

So I think that's a reference effectively to be through. Because obviously you'll be aware that the MPs um was primarily intended to have effect in relation to the preferred scheme at Heathrow. So we'd interpreted 5.58 as meaning the approach that should be taken in the event that the Heathrow Runway three proposals came forward. It doesn't set out the process by which the baseline needs to be considered for the purpose of any other project that comes forward. Um, having regard to the airport.

01:14:08:04 - 01:14:10:15

That's that's that's quite clear. Um.

01:14:12:00 - 01:14:16:21

I'm going to invite comments from others on on this point of baseline, I think then.

01:14:18:11 - 01:14:21:02

It's the appropriate year for doing that for me. Thank you.

01:14:21:28 - 01:14:59:05

Sir Michael Bedford from the joint local authorities. So this agenda item seven, which moves obviously on from the issue of appropriate thresholds, which we've obviously explored, um, can't be addressed without getting into the adequacy or otherwise of the modelling that the applicant has put forward as part of the noise assessment. That is, um, a very large topic and one that can't really be, as it were, summarised in just a couple of short points.

01:14:59:07 - 01:15:31:26

So so if it was convenient to what I was envisaging, we would do, because we do have a significant number of concerns about some of the modelling inputs, is that in our post hearing submission as well as in our local impact report, we will be setting out our concerns about that modelling. You're already aware from is one that we have some concerns about the baseline scenarios from a demand point of view you're aware from is H4.

01:15:31:28 - 01:16:04:13

We have concerns about the surface transport assessments and baseline. They obviously link into what you should appropriately assume for the noise, but our concerns go wider than simply issues about how you formulate the appropriate baseline. They also go to the fleet mix and whether the fleet mix is up to date. That's a there's a whole series of issues where we don't share at the moment the applicant's approach. So if we set those out, that will hopefully help frame your further written questions on this and indeed any further topic.

01:16:04:15 - 01:16:09:18

But I say I don't easily think that I can encapsulate the points in just a matter of moments.

01:16:10:20 - 01:16:16:27

That's that's. That's helpful. Thank you. Has anybody else got any comments on on, uh, the baseline.

01:16:18:23 - 01:16:22:06

Um, I'll start with the gentleman to to my right.

01:16:22:29 - 01:16:53:12

Thanks. Um, Charles Lloyd from Gatwick. Obviously not potentially a similar comment on the baseline. We are not confident that Gatwick air traffic movements and passenger volumes baselines the traffic it said it could achieve without the project is achievable. And if those baseline conditions are not achieved, then the environmental and noise effects of the project will have been understated consistently throughout the environmental statement. So we think that there needs to be an exercise through which the airport demonstrates that those baseline volumes can reasonably be achieved.

01:16:54:21 - 01:17:00:11

Thank you. And I saw oh, can I come to Cagney the Cagney. Want to say something on this.

01:17:02:24 - 01:17:40:05

I, Ben Holcomb, on behalf of Cagney, I think we echo the local authority's comments that there's an extensive list of things that we'd expect to see in the environmental statement from the noise chapter that we haven't seen so far. Um, and we can set those all out. Uh, the next deadline potentially, or even further, if further evidence comes from the applicant. Um, there are some things that are worth flagging at this stage, just as very high level summaries. Um, and one overlays the existing noise insulation scheme, which is a baseline, um, compared to the future one, some residents will have a worsening effect.

01:17:40:16 - 01:18:00:18

Um, where there due to lack of options or a lowering of money available. Um, and then the other, um, the figures available to look at these baselines are all on. Um, low resolution backgrounds, and it would be highly useful if there were higher resolution OS mapping underneath to actually compare these.

01:18:04:26 - 01:18:05:19

Yes, please.

01:18:05:21 - 01:18:37:09

Um, Daisy noble, on behalf of Marathon Asset Management and the Holiday Inn, um, I just wish to make one point in relation to baseline, and it's the point that I referred to yesterday in ish for about the future baseline for the purposes of assessing road traffic noise effects. Um, so very briefly, to just summarize what I said yesterday. Um, the road traffic data has been taken in the ES from 2016, and that's the basis on which the future projections for the with and without scheme traffic numbers, um, have been based.

01:18:37:17 - 01:19:14:03

Um, the applicant's post-Covid traffic assessment indicates that traffic numbers have fallen significantly since 2016 to 2023. So that means that reduced traffic numbers are now expected in the future. Baseline. Um, the applicant hasn't reflected that in the road traffic baseline position in the assessment. And that means that effectively the future baseline position, um, will overestimate the



noise levels without the project and thereby indicate that there's a smaller, uh, magnitude of change, um, between the without the project and with the project scenarios.

01:19:14:09 - 01:19:41:10

Um, we have carried out, um, acoustic surveys at the Holiday Inn premises last year, and that does support the conclusion that the road traffic noise levels are now materially lower than those, um, assumed in the ES. So, um, I won't go any further on that point, will develop it in our written submissions. I would just ask that the Xa give consideration as to whether to request an acoustic update from the applicant consequent upon the changes in traffic levels.

01:19:41:24 - 01:19:51:16

Thank you very much. There's one hand up. Oh, there's one more in the room if you can be patient, Mr. Harrison. Yes. One more. One of them is, uh. Yes, I can see. Yes.

01:19:53:22 - 01:19:54:07

Thank you, Sir.

01:19:54:18 - 01:19:55:12

Malcolm Fillmore.

01:19:55:14 - 01:19:56:26

Rutherford parish council.

01:19:57:05 - 01:20:49:24

Um, I had hoped that there would be some discussion on item 7.2 on the agenda, but, um, I understand the time because our concerns very much relate to the frequency of night movements and the, uh, the additional night movements that are likely to occur. Uh, if the second one way is accepted. I'd like to draw the attention of, uh, the inspectors to the fact that, in comparison, between 2019 and the current year, 2023/24, we have seen notwithstanding that 23 is about 90% of the levels of 2019, the number of night movements, both, uh, during the whole night movement and also during the core night period has increased proportionately disproportionately.

01:20:50:02 - 01:21:12:28

And I think it is a matter that is of considerable concern. But of course, that is likely to become even more of a of an issue, uh, if they're able to, uh, increase in the total number of movements. I do, uh, monitor this, uh, these, these figures. And I'm happy to share that monitoring with you, if that's of any assistance.

01:21:13:11 - 01:21:17:27

Thank you. Thank you very much. Um, I think we've got Mr. Harrison online.

01:21:20:12 - 01:21:57:17

I thank you. Yeah. So, Steve Harrison, just representing myself. Um, I guess maybe it's the wrong point to raise it, but with regard to the base case or the reasonable worst case of whatever it is, the mix of aircraft and sort of future developments is, is pretty key to to the assumptions being made. I guess I wonder to what extent airlines have been, um, surveyed or asked about their intentions to invest in, in

technology and new aircraft. I guess that that's one question. Um, but also, I would have anticipated maybe the worst case is that aircraft mix stays as it is right now.

01:21:57:19 - 01:22:08:24

And so what does that actually do to noise levels. And it would be really helpful to see that in terms of if the project progressed, because that that's potentially the the worst it could get. Thank you.

01:22:09:26 - 01:22:17:07

Thank you very much. Now, thank you for your contribution. Um, anybody else in the room? I can't see anybody. Um.

01:22:18:25 - 01:22:19:15

But the applicant.

01:22:20:00 - 01:22:21:19

Wish to respond to some of those points.

01:22:21:21 - 01:22:57:05

Scott Lannister applicant. Um. Two points. First one, there's a number of the points that we've heard matters of detail beyond what Mr. Bedford had indicated. We recognize from submissions that we made as part of the relevant representations. So we propose to deal with those, um, uh, a deadline, while insofar as they have been raised in relevant representations. Second point, just as far as Mr. Bedford raised points about the modelling, I just want to be clear. We took his point to relate to the way in which the forecasts had been, um, developed, as opposed to the way that the noise modelling had been carried out.

01:22:57:13 - 01:23:06:06

And we're just keen to confirm that the concerns that he's referring to were about the four. We weren't sure if it was about the noise modelling as well. I just wanted to confirm that.

01:23:07:18 - 01:23:27:20

Now there are separate concerns relating to those other topics that should be dealt with. It is H1 and H4, but we also have concerns about the specifics of the noise modeling, which I say we were hoping that there would be some opportunities to air some of those, but they're quite detailed. So therefore we will make sure that we set out what those concerns are.

01:23:28:12 - 01:23:34:26

That's good Scott, for the applicant. That's understood. They appear in the LA. We can look at the impact report. We can respond accordingly.

01:23:38:23 - 01:23:39:14

Nobody else.

01:23:39:16 - 01:23:40:29

Oh, sorry, Mr. Mitchell.

01:23:41:03 - 01:24:19:09

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Um, we did hear one comment. I think it was from Cagney, um, referring to the existing noise insulation scheme and the proposed noise insulation scheme. Um, he pointed out an inconsistency. We are, uh, we have continued to consult with local authorities on the noise insulation scheme, and we are, uh, going to issue an updated annex spelling out the details of how the scheme will be implemented at that point will be addressed in that update. Um, if I could just turn to the Holiday Inn point about post-Covid traffic flows being lower than pre-COVID.

01:24:19:22 - 01:24:51:22

Um, I think, sir, you'll be aware that there is a post Covid environmental report in progress, and I can confirm that the traffic noise changes as a result of the post Covid will be included in that report. We won't give any more indications to what I expected to say. And finally, I think it was Mr. Fillmore at. Forgive me if I have your name wrong for Russell. I was concerned about the number of night flights increasing, and he gave some some figures on it.

01:24:52:06 - 01:25:25:18

Um, as we've heard earlier, the night flights are controlled by the DFT. Night flight restrictions at the airport is under because of the um designated status of Gatwick Airport. Um, the two cut to the chase. Number of night flights increasing in the noise assessment, which is the summer season, 92 day um average um, in the very worst year is an increase of 12 night flights, um, across the eight hour night from 125 to 137.

01:25:26:02 - 01:26:01:17

The reference for that is is table 14 .7.1. That's about a 10% increase in eight hour night flights. Um, and I would just contrast that, if I may, very quickly against some other projects where much bigger increases in night flights are possible because of the lack of regulation under night flights. And one example would be the Luton case, where the night flight increases certainly more than 40%. That is not the case for this airport, because the regulation that we're under, the night time increase is about 10%.

01:26:01:23 - 01:26:09:25

And while I'm at it, the daytime increase, which is the 16 hour increase in the worst noise impacted year, is 19% increase.

01:26:13:08 - 01:26:15:28

Thank you. No, thank you very much. Um.

01:26:18:11 - 01:26:45:27

As I think we've probably seen this morning or this afternoon. Um, there is a great deal to go through here. Um. We tried to focus on some of the bigger points. I know you want to talk about noise envelopes or envelopes. Um. We may well do that. Um, so at this point, I think it's going to be sensible to hand over to my colleague, Mr. Hockley, to do his best to summarise any action points. Thank you very much.

01:26:48:11 - 01:26:50:03

Thank you. Doctor. Um, there.

01:26:50:05 - 01:26:52:09

Are a number of action points, mainly.

01:26:52:11 - 01:26:53:01

But not.

01:26:53:03 - 01:27:06:24

Solely for the applicant. Um, given the technical nature of them, I think it's best that we double check them first. So I'm not going to read them out now. Um, but we will double check them and publish them on the project web page as soon as possible.

01:27:09:00 - 01:27:31:17

Uh, Scotland. So that's absolutely fine. Can I just check, given the timing of this hearing in relation to deadline one? We would be uncomfortable with any, um, actions that require us to respond by deadline. One other than those where we've specifically said we'd be responding to relevant representations. I just want to make that clear. Obviously, we're aware there'll be further deadlines where we'll submit that information. Just wanted to check that with you before we finish.

01:27:31:19 - 01:27:43:12

Yeah, that's fair enough. That's understood obviously. Um, we'll as part of that review, we'll check the deadlines. And obviously if there's something, as you said, that you, you were going to respond to anyway, then we'll leave those in for one. Otherwise we'll push them to two.

01:27:43:14 - 01:27:44:05

Very grateful sir.

01:27:44:07 - 01:27:45:08

Thank you. Thank you.

01:27:46:27 - 01:27:50:12

Okay. Thank you. I'll now hand back to Doctor Brewer for any other business.

01:27:52:05 - 01:28:02:24

Well, I haven't got anything else unless anybody else has got anything else they want to desperately raise. I do have a hand. Yes. Okay. I've got two hands. I'll again, I'll go from this gentleman here first.

01:28:04:16 - 01:28:23:17

Thanks. Charles Lloyd from Gatwick. Obviously not. Um, I mean, a very helpful, interesting session this morning. I think we do feel that there are quite a number of major topics that there has not been any opportunity to discuss, in which I would include in particular, the noise envelope and night flights where I think we've just skimmed the surface. So I guess we would be keen on there being a further issue specific hearing at which those could be addressed.

01:28:23:20 - 01:28:25:18

Thank you for that. Making that clear. Thank you.

01:28:27:06 - 01:28:45:15

Cagney and hokum for Cagney. It's just to double check deadlines for when the written questions arising out of this might come, as well as the deadline sort of secondary to the deadline. One question from the applicant. You're expecting those to be answered by the deadline one or at provided at deadline one.

01:28:47:24 - 01:28:48:10

I'll.

01:28:48:12 - 01:28:52:07

I'll let the applicant respond to that if they can at this point.

01:28:53:13 - 01:29:07:03

I'm sorry. The point is, will the examining authority be making those written questions from the agenda that we've not covered? Uh, where they be moving those points into written questions to be answered by deadline one or to be responded to beyond deadline one.

01:29:08:24 - 01:29:28:06

I'll just hand over to Mr. Mr. Gleason, just to clarify these points around timing. Thank you. So the timetable for, uh, examining the authority's written questions is that we will produce those by Thursday, 28th of March. So it's still some way off. And the reason one of the reasons why.

01:29:29:01 - 01:29:54:00

Uh, we've identified that date is because that gives us the opportunity to include in those questions, um, issues that come out from the Lear Lear's and written representations. So it's some way off. But clearly, there is this opportunity deadline one, uh, to submit all representations, written representations based on oil submissions today.

01:29:54:25 - 01:29:57:09

That's clear. It sounds like a very sensible approach. Thank you. Thank you.

01:30:01:15 - 01:30:07:06

Um, I don't think there's anything else, so I will now hand back again to Mr. Gleason. Thank you.

01:30:07:16 - 01:30:37:21

Thank you sir. I'll move to close the hearing. Can I remind everyone that the timetable for this examination requires that parties provide any post, hearing documents on or before deadline one which is Tuesday, 12th of March. Can I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspector's website as soon as practicable after this meeting? Thank you very much for attending today and for your participation, and indeed for the same.

01:30:37:23 - 01:31:12:06

Over the last week we found all the contributions to be very informative. Will certainly help us in moving forwards through the examination. Just to confirm, um, time reserved for continuation of issues. Specific hearings 1 to 5 this afternoon is not now required, and therefore there will be no

further meetings this afternoon with plenty of other things to continue with. So on that note, the time is now 1:17, and this issue specific hearing five is now closed.

01:31:12:08 - 01:31:13:02

Thank you very much.