



# Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

The Applicant's Response to Matters Raised at Open Floor Hearings 1 and 2

**Book 10**

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: MARCH 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.9.1

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Applicant's Response to OFH1 and OFH2	1

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document contains the Applicant's written responses to matters raised at Open Floor Hearings 1 and 2 (OFH1 and OFH2) held on 28 February 2024.
- 1.1.2 The Open Floor Hearings were attended by members of the Applicant team and the Applicant is grateful to all those interested parties that participated and provided their comments. The purpose of this note is to either provide signposting to where the matters raised have been separately addressed by the Applicant as part of their submissions at Deadline 1, or to provide a response to any new points that were raised.

## 2 The Applicant's Response to Matters raised at OFH1 and OFH2

- 2.1.1 Tables 1 and 2 contains the Applicant's written responses to comments made by Interested Parties during the Open Floor Hearings 1 and 2. Table 1 relates to OFH1 and Table 2 relates to OFH2.
- 2.1.2 The tables reflect the order of speakers on the day. In some cases, the order of speakers did not reflect the detailed **Agendas for OFH1 and OFH2** [\[EV2-002\]](#) and therefore reference numbers have been given to each speaker corresponding to the Examining Authority's (ExA) detailed agendas

**Table 1: Applicant's Response to Matters raised at OFH1**

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
<b>OFH1 Session 1</b>		
1	Marie Killip on behalf of Mole Valley District Council	
a	<p>While it is accepted that the examining authority has found the legislative requirements for pre-application consultation to have been met, the legislation is technical and to comply with the requirements, says nothing about the efficacy of consultation and whether it has been meaningful and successful. The council does not believe the applicant's efforts achieved this, and the process and quality of the scheme has been impacted as a result. The council does not feel that the applicant has approached consultation in a way which recognises the concerns and uncertainty of a project of this scale and that which it has caused within the community, and the steps merely taken have been to meet the basic requirements of consultation and not to gain actual valid feedback. Main concerns can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ insufficient economic case for the expansion.</li> <li>▪ Insufficient consideration of noise impacts, management and mitigation,</li> </ul>	<p>Matters agreed and not agreed between the Applicant and Mole Valley District Council are set out in the relevant <b>Statement of Common Ground</b> (Doc Ref. 10.1.6) submitted at Deadline 1.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ insufficient consideration of air quality impacts, management or mitigation,</li> <li>▪ an overreliance on the benefits of untested future technology.</li> <li>▪ Insufficient consideration and provision of additional public transport or initiatives that will encourage and secure modal shift, including bus and rail concerns over the cumulative impacts of wider airspace change.</li> <li>▪ Concerns regarding the tranquillity assessments for landscape, including the Surry Hills National Landscape, which is currently undergoing a boundary review and if the Secretary of State agrees, will be notably expanded, and</li> <li>▪ concerns regarding the quality and deliverability of the economic skills and business strategy.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, consider that the efforts present bare minimum of the NSIP process, and opposes the application.</p>	
2	Ellen Gilbert on behalf of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
3	Sally Pavey on behalf of CAGNE	
a – General	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider the negatives of this new runway application are insurmountable, and a lack of true,</li> </ul>	The Applicant's response to CAGNE's Relevant Representation <a href="#">[RR-0556]</a> is provided in Section 3.24 of the <b>Relevant</b>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>transparent consultation. The airport impacts on residents up to a 30 mile radius, who are seeking tranquillity in their home and gardens, and to sleep at night.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nothing has changed since the Airport Commission report found against Gatwick's new runway.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1. We would also direct CAGNE to the following additional responses in the RR Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 3.56 regarding the safety of the M23 and its relationship to the Project.</li> <li>▪ Section 3.2 regarding rail capacity.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.19 on landscape, townscape and visual matters including tranquillity.</li> </ul> <p>In respect of funding, the Applicant is in discussions with the local authorities regarding funding provisions to be captured within a draft Section 106 Agreement (to be submitted at Deadline 2). It should however be noted that the Applicant will be responsible for funding the supporting infrastructure set out under the Project and not the local authorities.</p>
<p>b – Noise and Vibration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The noise envelope offers no assurances other than that noise will increase and does not offer any true compensation.</li> <li>▪ The impact of modernisation of airspace is not included in the noise envelope.</li> </ul>	
<p>c – Traffic and Transport</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lack of surface transport is Achilles heel</li> <li>▪ Transport provision remains an issue, with only one single railway line that cannot be expanded.</li> <li>▪ The M23 is a SMART motorway and dangerous.</li> </ul>	
<p>d – Socio-economics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Any suggested economic benefits must be questioned as the Applicant is a major exporter of UK residents to overseas.</li> <li>▪ The Applicant's business model seems totally reliant upon cheap flights, which could disappear as aviation passes on the cost of greener fuel.</li> <li>▪ Crawley Borough Council has declared a housing emergency, so where will the workers afford to live.</li> </ul>	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not enough financial support provided to the Local Authorities to meet the negative created by the airport.</li> </ul>	
e – Project Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where will waste be transported?</li> <li>Where is the new sewage site and how much water will these rivers have to deal with?</li> </ul>	<p>As explained in the <b>Change Application Report</b> <a href="#">[AS-139]</a> and in respect of Project Change 2, the biomass boiler in the existing CARE facility has not been in use since 2019. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, the volumes of organic waste being generated at the airport were too low without a continual supplement of a secondary fuel source, which does not align with GAL's sustainability objectives. As such, since 2020, food waste has been sent off-site for anaerobic digestion to energy recovery facilities in Newhaven and Chineham, being the closest facilities that offer the treatment process that is required. This approach to waste management would not change in principle as a result of Project Change 2.</p> <p>In respect of CAGNE's second point on the Project Changes, Project Changes 1 to 3 do not involve a new sewage site.</p>
4	Mike Gregory on behalf of Mole Valley Chamber of Commerce	
a	Reporting findings from Chamber of Commerce survey, where the majority of members and other local	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>businesses are in favour of the application for three main reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase in footfall to local area, benefitting shops and amenities;</li> <li>▪ Increase in people using hotels and hospitality places where major losses have been made over last few years due to the poor footfall from the pandemic; and</li> <li>▪ Local businesses being able to travel to a greater number of countries from Gatwick allowing them to trade, so increasing their revenues. Local areas of interest will benefit from the proposal.</li> </ul> <p>The majority of businesses do not find aircraft noise to be an issue.</p>	
5	Anna Christie on behalf of Sussex Chamber of Commerce, also representing Surrey Chamber	
a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supportive of the growth and expansion plan, which is a low impact plan maximising the use of the existing runway.</li> <li>▪ Recent train station upgrade was sourced locally, and future development will continue to support local growth and jobs.</li> <li>▪ The Chamber of Commerce is a critical friend to the Applicant to ensure environmental concerns are reviewed and business is sourced locally.</li> </ul>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.



Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ During pandemic, airport facilitated distribution of PPE.</li> <li>▪ The Proposal will help global trade from the UK, increase imported workers, and increase tourism. 14,000 job opportunities, injecting £1B into the local area every year.</li> <li>▪ The Airport is also a key partner of Institute of Technology in Crawley.</li> <li>▪ The Employment Skills and Business Strategy goes above and beyond.</li> </ul>	
6	Richard M Lavender on behalf of Kent Invicta Chamber of Commerce	
a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fully support the proposed development due to improved resilience, and giving job security to the existing workforce.</li> <li>▪ Modern technology has enabled aircraft industry and engine manufacturers to produce quieter and more efficient and greener aircraft, and this will be improved on as time passes.</li> <li>▪ Gatwick Airport has faced and improved many environmental issues over recent years and reduce their carbon footprint considerably.</li> <li>▪ Fully support the current development.</li> </ul>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
7	Gavin Stewart on behalf of Brighton and Hove Economic Partnership	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With an estimated increase of 13 million passengers at the end of the forecast period of the northern runway development, which is equivalent to around about a 20% uplift over the baseline, foresee a significant uptick in visitor spend supporting our tourism and heritage assets, as well as the hotel, restaurant and retail sectors in the city.</li> <li>▪ Estimates of average spend of inbound visitors to the UK of £848 per person equates to an economic boost to Brighton and Hove of over £110 million. Keen to work with the airport to facilitate this.</li> <li>▪ BHEP supports sustainable growth at the airport, and supports the mitigation outlined in the application.</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant's response to <b>Brighton and Hove Economic Partnership's Relevant Representation [RR-0525]</b> is also provided in <b>Section 3.10 of the Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
8	Sally Pavey on behalf of Nicola Peel, The Willows Lakeside Retreat	
a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Project's noise and tranquillity effects near the South Downs National Park are unacceptable, and it is rare to see blue skies without airplane trails. This has effects on our mental health and wellbeing.</li> <li>▪ Also concerned with the carbon and climate issues: What happens when prices go up due to carbon taxes, and we have large volume infrastructure? Is it fair that the 1% who can afford to fly pump CO<sub>2</sub></li> </ul>	<p>Matters raised by The Willows Lakeside Retreat are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.19 concerning landscape, townscape and visual resources; Section 4.17 on health and wellbeing; and Section 4.25 on socio-economic and economics.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	into the air? Risk of continuing to build capacity, when prices will go up and there will be no more cheap flights.	
9	Jane Shufflebotham	
a – General	Proposal may seem like economic progress but oppose on the basis of profoundly damaging to the environment, to wildlife and nature, and will only exacerbate global warming at a time when the resources of the planet are being stretched to the max.	<p>The case for the Project is set out in the <b>Needs Case</b> [APP-250] and <b>Planning Statement</b> [APP-245], with the planning balance set out in Section 9 of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>Other matters raised by Jane Shufflebotham are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.13 on ecology and nature conservation;</li> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration;</li> <li>▪ Section 4.6 on climate change; and</li> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> </ul> <p>In respect of point e, the Project provides for a comprehensive development including required works to terminals, new roads and any other infrastructure. The Project proposals are described and illustrated through the <b>Design and Access Statement (Volumes 1 to 5)</b> [APP-253 to APP-257].</p>
b – Ecology and nature conservation	Development poses significant harm to the environment, wildlife, and nature.	
c – Noise and vibration	Additional flights annually contribute to noise pollution and disruption to nearby communities and wildlife habitats including birds which are vulnerable to aircraft collisions.	
d – GHG	More flights would result in increased fuel consumption and emissions, further contributing to climate change/exacerbating global warming.	
e – Design	The proposal creates the need for expanded terminals, roads, car parks, and commercial facilities compounds the environmental impact. The Applicant	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	has neglected to address required upgrades of terminals, which will need new roads and other infrastructure.	On point f, these matters are outside the scope of the Project.
f – General	We must prioritise and invest in sustainable alternatives that minimise harm to the environment, such as investing in public transport, improving existing infrastructure, and promoting telecommuting and remote working options.	
10	Edward Richards	
a	As local resident that owns small farm, with a host of rescued animals, he has put a number of the projects on hold, because they want to maintain their ancient woodland and act in an environmentally sound fashion. They can see no similar efforts being made by the Project.	<p>No areas of Ancient Woodland are included within the Order Limits. Existing areas of Ancient Woodland at the Gatwick estate (outside of the Order Limits) are already subject to ongoing management by the GAL Environment Team.</p> <p>In respect of acting in an ‘environmental sound fashion’, GAL is committed to work towards a sustainable future irrespective of the Project. GAL publishes its ‘Decade of Change’ document setting out how the airport is working towards its commitment to a sustainable Gatwick, with the latest being the ‘Second Decade of Change’<sup>1</sup> working up to 2030. Each year GAL publishes a report on its progress against its Decade of Change goals.</p>

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.gatwickairport.com/on/demandware.static/-/Sites-Gatwick-Library/default/dw10c8906f/images/Corporate-PDFs/Sustainability/Second\\_Decade\\_of\\_change\\_policy\\_to\\_2030.pdf](https://www.gatwickairport.com/on/demandware.static/-/Sites-Gatwick-Library/default/dw10c8906f/images/Corporate-PDFs/Sustainability/Second_Decade_of_change_policy_to_2030.pdf)

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
11	Patricia Routledge	
a – General	Considers that using the emergency runway is a cheap and inadequate strategy to move smaller aircraft off the main runway. This is the first part of the Applicant's overall plan.	The Project proposes to make best use of Gatwick Airport's existing northern runway, in line with Government policy. Please refer to <b>Section 6</b> of the <b>Planning Statement</b> [APP-245] for further detail on the planning policy context of the application.
b – Socio-economics	There are large numbers of holiday makers bypassing local airports, taking advantage of cheap flights. Easyjet pulled out of Southend Airport because cheaper and more convenient to fly out of Gatwick. Expansion driven by commercial interests with support from influential companies, raising questions about the overall impact on the community and environment.	Matters raised by Patricia Routledge are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.17 on health and wellbeing.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration matters.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economic and economic matters.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.27 on the water environment.</li> </ul>
c – Water environment	Poor infrastructure subject to flooding and drainage problems.	
d – Noise and vibration	Proposal overlooks increase in noise and number of low-flying arriving aircraft. Disruption of residents' sleep due to airport operations and transatlantic flights. No consideration is being given to those living beneath the flight path. Residents cannot open the windows in the summer because of the noise. All additional aircraft from this proposal will land on the main runway, including larger aircraft.	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
12	Kevin O'Reilly on behalf of One Resourcing Ltd	
a	<p>The proposal holds immense promise for the local community and the local job market. It will be a catalyst for economic growth and new opportunities for businesses and entrepreneurs across various sectors, and also at a range of skill levels.</p> <p>Exciting prospect for local communities to pursue opportunities in exciting industries. Encouraged to work together to produce thriving communities for generations to come.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
13	Robert Alfred Routledge	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
14	Charlie Cooper on behalf of BP Installations	
a	<p>The proposal is a fantastic opportunity for local businesses and employers. The Applicant plays a huge part in the local community, and future develop at Gatwick gives local businesses the ability to plan organically.</p> <p>New buildings required to support the additional passengers will be filled with new businesses, which will need to be supplied by local communities.</p> <p>The Applicant has been ambitious in its carbon and sustainability plans, and is sure that any new builds</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	taking place will be efficient. Benefits will far outweigh any impacts.	
15	Dr Roger Hood	
a	<p>Three points made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The future air passenger demand is unproven;</li> <li>▪ The local congestion will be intolerable; and</li> <li>▪ Any new runway will cause significant environmental damage.</li> </ul> <p>Future air passenger demand is untested: demand increases as GDP grows, but UK GDP is flatlining, so the Applicant's assumptions of economic growth must be questioned. Predicted 75mil passengers by 2038 is inflated. The Applicant's assumption of passenger growth needs to be examined as passenger numbers and predictions seem exaggerated. London has more air capacity than it needs, particularly in the south-east. Runway development should be increased elsewhere in the UK. London has five international airports, exceeding the southeast's capacity.</p> <p>The Proposal will cause congestion and misery for 20 miles around Gatwick for the next 20 years. Busier roads, and higher housing demand pushing prices sky high. Extra 30 tonne truck every day for the next 14</p>	<p>Matters raised by Dr Roger Hood are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.5 on capacity and operations.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> </ul> <p>In respect of the third point on the Project's impact on the environment, the application is accompanied by an <b>Environmental Statement (ES)</b> <a href="#">[APP-026]</a> to <a href="#">[APP-046]</a> which presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment of the Project. The ES presents the identification and assessment of significant environmental effects likely to arise from the Project, covering a range of environmental topics to ensure a comprehensive topic-by-topic environmental assessment of the Project's impacts.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>years, then freight volume increased forever by increased operations.</p> <p>Burden of all infrastructure is born by the local residents.</p> <p>Doubling the airport's size will strain local infrastructure, affecting roads, housing, schools, hospitals, and water systems.</p> <p>Burden of infrastructure costs will fall on residents.</p>	
<b>OFH1 Session 2</b>		
16	Cllr Malcolm Fillmore on behalf of Rusper Parish Council	
a – Noise and Vibration	<p>Rusper Parish is immediately adjacent to the airport, planes overhead therefore fly low over the Parish. Concerns about increased noise especially during night time, from significantly increased number of movements.</p> <p>Opposed to project due to noise and environmental pollution, and adverse impacts on infrastructure issues. Whilst the overall levels of aircraft noise have improved in recent years with technology and the removal of older generation jets, noise is still causing unacceptable disturbance to residents, particularly in the night period.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response to <b>Rusper Parish Council's Relevant Representation [RR-3960]</b> is provided in <b>Section 3.68</b> of the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1. We would also direct Rusper Parish Council to the following additional responses in the RR Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> </ul> <p>With regards to mitigation, all necessary controls and mitigation measures relied upon in the Environmental Impact Assessment to avoid, reduce and if possible offset significant impacts of the Project have been</p>
b – Socio-economics	While the expansion aims to promote job creation, the local area has low unemployment figures.	



Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
c – Mitigation	<p>Potential housing expansion is a significant issue, exacerbated by a long-term critical water shortage in the area.</p> <p>High percentage of Gatwick travel will be by private vehicle.</p> <p>If the DCO is granted, want alleviation on local communities and include restrictions on night flights. Also seeking commitments for funding to local communities for mitigation of effects, including measures to deter the use of local roads as rat runs.</p> <p>There should also be an expansion of double and triple glazing funding and other noise alleviation measures.</p> <p>Gatwick's 2023 5 year infrastructure plan, allocated £590m allocated to this project, but does not specify as to how it will be spent.</p> <p>With any cost overruns, project managers look for peripheral savings, which are often found in the offerings to local communities.</p>	<p>identified. The mitigation will then be translated into clear and enforceable controls; either via requirements in the DCO, obligations in a new DCO Section 106 Agreement or other consenting regimes. The mitigation measures and how they are proposed to be secured are compiled in <b>ES Appendix 5.2.3: Mitigation Route Map</b> <a href="#">[APP-078]</a>.</p>
17	Chris Hyde on behalf of Surrey Climate Commission	
a - GHG	<p>Opposed to Gatwick Airport expansion due to environmental concerns and contribution to climate change through increased GHG emissions.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Surrey Climate Commission are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>UK Climate Change Committee recommend no net expansion of UK airports to ensure aviation can achieve the required pathway for UK aviation emissions. It is further noted that no airport expansion should proceed until a UK wide capacity management framework is in place to annually assess and, if required, control CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and non CO<sub>2</sub> effects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.3 on air quality.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.13 on ecology and nature conservation.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.27 on the water environment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>B – General</b></p>	<p>Additional concerns include economic assessment, noise and flight impacts, water, ecology, air quality, and construction impacts.</p>	
<p><b>C – Traffic and Transport</b></p>	<p>Needs to be a focus on surface access and transport, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the need to assess additional transport journeys against national targets/ climate strategies;</li> <li>▪ Higher targets for public transport, clarity on parking strategy and active travel proposals; and</li> <li>▪ Greater investment in public transport connections including rail;</li> </ul> <p>Surface access concerns: impact of additional journeys is significant. About 45% of surrey emissions come from ground-based transport. Concerned that the Proposal does not seek to prevent car transport.</p>	
<p>18</p>	<p>James Watkins on behalf of London Chamber of Commerce and Industry</p>	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
a	<p>Application is critical for London, as London is dependent on aviation.</p> <p>Without action, demand will soon outstrip supply. Air connectivity is critical for London to be competitive on the world stage.</p> <p>Airport has been a huge local employer (18% of Crawley).</p> <p>Would not support application if Gatwick had not made commitments for carbon net zero by 2030, and commitment that they are seeking to enhance biodiversity and habitats on the airport estate and commit to zero use of herbicides by 2030.. Application is a well balanced approach, use of existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Aviation sector must be allowed to grow, while also moving towards a greener future as businesses transition to net zero. London is the gateway for investment into the UK.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>
19	<p>Dan Osborn on behalf of CPRE Sussex</p>	
a – General	<p>Economic benefit is not the only consideration. Social and environmental considerations should be given equal weight.</p> <p>Nature of the proposal is not making the best of current facilities; it is a re-build of the airport.</p>	<p>Matters raised by CPRE Sussex are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> </ul>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
b – GHG	<p>It is not just local effects. One of the most important question is whether it is possible to deliver net zero / jet zero in context of proposal. New technology and greener aviation fuels are in their infancy, and not reducing greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Airport has taken steps for airports being more climate friendly, but not the airlines themselves.</p> <p>Residents of Sussex are already experiencing impacts of climate change. 40 degree days in the UK have occurred 20-30 years earlier than expected.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.17 on health and wellbeing.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> </ul>
c – Health and Wellbeing	<p>Gatwick is tending to attract older aircraft which has fuel and noise concerns for residents. Already difficult for people in certain parts of flight paths to get a good night's sleep.</p>	
20	<b>Mike Shorer on behalf of Newhaven Enterprise Zone</b>	
a	<p>Supportive of the plans for positive impacts for the region of Newhaven. More tourism, more jobs, and benefits to the local supply chains.</p> <p>Key objective is good growth, so also supportive of environmental initiatives proposed by the Applicant.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
21	<b>Sally Brown on behalf of Gatwick Diamond Business</b>	
a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Family and community has benefited from employment opportunities that Gatwick Airport brings.</li> </ul>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Applicant has been a proactive member of the Gatwick Diamond Business (GDB) through their engagement with our various media channels, including our business magazine with articles and updates, and keeping local business people informed on the latest airport news. Also through GDBs educational seminar programme, providing speakers to cover presentations around procurement processes and opportunities, and through their headline sponsorship of the Gatwick Diamond Business Awards.</li> <li>▪ GDB has seen a huge improvement over the last 13 years in the Applicant's efforts to engage with the businesses in the area.</li> <li>▪ Value the initiatives like the new STEM centre, and engagement with the Sussex and Surrey Institute of Technology to inspire local children and students to consider airport related careers, and have demonstrated they are open to engaging and collaborating with innovative companies outside of the airport.</li> <li>▪ Meet on a regular basis with London Gatwick External Engagement and Economic Partnerships teams to share current news and discuss potential</li> </ul>	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>opportunities. As a result of these conversations, we have received some valuable introductions. For example, JetBlue, Delta airlines, and Air India all promoting new routes out of Gatwick, and with these routes providing opportunities to further expand business relations, explore new opportunities and help attract inward investment back into the area leading to economic growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Acknowledge concerns of congestion and changes to infrastructure, noise and air pollution and the environmental impact. We will continue to press the airport on these issues on behalf of our members and the local community, and hold them to account on minimising these impacts. We will also continue to encourage focus on increasing local spend.</li> </ul>	
22	Matt Saunders on behalf of Storm 12 Ltd	
a	<p>Storm 12 provides Gatwick with all sorts of marketing services. We are very much in support, as a business, of the expansion at Gatwick Airport as we can understand the positive impact it can deliver for our business.</p> <p>Family connections overseas are also facilitated by Gatwick Airport, a benefit of accessible air transport.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
23	Francis Guidera	
a	<p>Wholeheartedly support the plan of Gatwick that Gatwick Airport has submitted, as do thousands of Crawley residents, providing a very sensible solution to an existential problem – the need for greater aircraft capacity in the South east.</p> <p>A plan to enable Gatwick to grow its business, which is crucial for this area and its economic stability and which will provide increased employment opportunities for generations to come. There is a symbiotic relationship with the community.</p> <p>Gatwick must get its second runway. Demand will increase, and the planes will need to take off from somewhere. Current proposal is within the footprint of the existing airport, so is a positive compared to building a new runway at another airport on neighbouring greenfields.</p> <p>Over the decades, our local road network has improved to handle greater traffic volume and Gatwick train station has reopened officially last November, having spent 250 million on expansion and upgrades. They are doing what they need to do to keep pace with the increasing demand.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>The people who will benefit from this expansion are not here – they are in classrooms and colleges around the region. They will be the local people who will have increased job opportunities thanks to the sensible, forward thinking decision makers who could see why a second runway at Gatwick was always going to be the best solution for the southeast growing air transport industry and Crawley's growing population.</p>	
24	Tracey Pearson	
a	<p>Expansion in turn would cause a growing demand for a diverse range of skills, from passenger services to maintenance professionals, security officers and baggage handlers, to name just a few.</p> <p>Local recruitment companies would play a vital role in bridging the gap between the increase in job opportunities and the skilled workforce within the community.</p> <p>Development of northern runway enables the development of ancillary businesses around the airport. This would also benefit existing businesses like Red Sky.</p> <p>Benefits the overall wellbeing and resilience of the local community.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>



Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
25	Benefits far outweigh the risks, particularly when the proposal is to utilise a runway which is already there. David Gill, AQ Construction Services Limited	
a	Local resident who has worked at Gatwick Airport for 35 years. Has also experienced the benefits to our local town parallel to the steady growth at Gatwick over the years, with excellent facilities and transport links. The expansion can only enhance the town and the surrounding areas, which have recently accommodated a new school with 1,500 pupils at Beaumont, as well as an ongoing project within a five mile area of 7,000 to 8,000 new homes. Not actively supporting the proposal for personal or work reasons, as will be retired, but believes it is a positive benefit for the local community for the long term.	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
59	Stephen Clarke on behalf of No Airport Expansion	
a – Climate change	Concerned that there is no planned Issue Specific Hearing for impacts of climate change. Consider that this project will materially impact UK Government's ability to meet its legally binding targets under the Climate Change Act 2008.	Matters raised by No Airport Expansion are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>Section 4.21 on Need and Forecasting.</li> </ul>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>Climate Change Committee recommended that no airport expansion should proceed until a UK wide capacity management framework is in place. Jet Zero will not be sufficient on its own. All efforts to reduce emissions will be overwhelmed by the increase in the number of flights. Net zero airports do not include the carbon from the planes, which is well over 90% of the carbon impact.</p>	<p>The topic of future Issue Specific Hearings will be determined by the ExA and therefore the Applicant has no comment to make on this point.</p>
27	Simon Matthews on behalf of Matthews Associates UK Limited	
a	<p>The Proposal is important for business. Benefits of economic development. The airport is an economic leader in the region.</p> <p>Three major benefits to Matthews Associates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As an SME business the ability to travel easily and inexpensively to potential clients, both domestically and internationally, is important – considerably widening the field of operation, providing additional business opportunities within the UK, but also potential to secure overseas clients.</li> <li>▪ Positive economic benefits of having such an airport within the south-east region, creating prosperity for businesses and individuals alike. The presence of Gatwick is of undeniable</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p> <p>In respect of rail, Section 4.26 of the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1 provides the Applicant's response to rail capacity and the application proposals in relation to railway works, which have been raised in Relevant Representations.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>economic benefit to the region. An expanded, more efficient airport can only further enhance these already proven economic factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wider benefits of potential increase in inbound tourism to the southeast region as Gatwick destination map continues to grow.</li> </ul> <p>Also request that the Applicant consider upgrading the North Downs rail line.</p>	
<b>OFH1 Session 3</b>		
28	Ianthe Cox on behalf of Buckland Parish Council	
a – Traffic and Transport	<p>While local people accept the benefits of having an airport in the area and have grown used to aircraft noise and busy roads, any further increase to the current levels of traffic, both in the air and on the surface, are not acceptable to the majority of the village. The A25 is frequently inundated at current levels. The infrastructure cannot sustain further increases in traffic. Increase in rail traffic will have a marked increase in road traffic due to road crossing delays and greater environmental effects.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response to <b>Buckland Parish Council's Relevant Representation [RR-0547]</b> is provided in Section 3.14 of the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, which reflects its verbal submissions made at OFH1.</p>
b – Noise and Vibration	<p>Buckland villagers also suffer from road traffic noise at night. There is a fair amount of public documentation on this subject, as it is believed to have a detrimental effect on health and welfare. Gatwick night flights have</p>	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>been steadily increasing since 2014 and while diminished during the pandemic, they are now back at 2019 levels. It is understood that a further increase of 70% is proposed.</p> <p>Departing aircraft from Heathrow frequently overfly Buckland at below 7000ft. The proposed airspace changes for arrivals and departures from Gatwick and the South East also further threaten the Buckland area.</p>	
<p>c – Water Environment</p>	<p>Buckland can also experience the effects of flooding at the Beechworth Bridge, which is the principal north south rural corridor. Serious flooding and locally increased level of road traffic diverting through the village on the A25.</p>	
<p>d – Climate change, ecology and GHG</p>	<p>Buckland Parish Council endeavours to encourage the village to adopt green policies to avert the effects of climate change.</p> <p>The Parish Council are also aware that the River Mole is subject to pollution and any further pollution would endanger these policies and the wildlife.</p> <p>This area is stated as one of outstanding natural beauty and a further expansion on the airport, encouraging road and air traffic will potentially push</p>	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions and pollutions to an unacceptable environmental level.	
e – Economics	Questioning the veracity of the economic benefits of the proposal.	
29	Morag Warrack on behalf of Horsham Trafalgar Neighbourhood Council	
a	<p>The cumulative effect nationally and globally of flying is massive. Concerns over global warming and global impacts in relation to airport. The government is not listening to its own advisers who consistently say no to airport expansion in the UK.</p> <p>Waste from increased population identified as problem, proposed Gatwick incinerator provided solution to manage waste on-site, but the current system with the change application is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>The expansion of UK airports goes against government advice and threatens communities under flight paths. Maps showing these new preferred routes are designed to hide their real impact on the communities as they fly over. The fact that respite routes need to be designed in speaks volumes.</p> <p>Already in West Sussex has declared a dangerously low water table. Sewage is also being poured legally and illegally into our rivers. Where will the water come from for these millions of travellers?</p>	<p>The Applicant's response to <b>Horsham Trafalgar Neighbourhood Council's Relevant Representation [RR-1743]</b> is provided in Section 3.46 of the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>As explained in the <b>Change Application Report [AS-139]</b> and in respect of Project Change 2, the biomass boiler in the existing CARE facility has not been in use since 2019. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, the volumes of organic waste being generated at the airport were too low without a continual supplement of a secondary fuel source, which does not align with GAL's sustainability objectives. As such, since 2020, food waste has been send-off site for anaerobic digestion to energy recovery facilities in Newhaven and Chinham, being the closest facilities that offer the treatment process that is required. This approach to waste</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>Alleviate pressure on housing, transport, schools, and hospitals on local communities.</p> <p>The status quo at Gatwick should be maintained, and more clarity is needed on how the invested money will be spent.</p>	<p>management would not change in principle as a result of Project Change 2.</p> <p>In respect of funding, the Applicant is in discussions with the local authorities regarding funding provisions to be captured within a draft Section 106 Agreement (to be submitted at Deadline 2). It should however be noted that the Applicant will be responsible for funding the supporting infrastructure set out under the Project and not the local authorities.</p>
30	Jeremy Taylor on behalf of Growing Gatwick Facebook Group	
a	<p>Supports the proposal on the basis of economic benefits and growth for region and country, employment, new routes, greater competition, inbound tourism, increase in infrastructure investment, wider operational reliance, matching demand for air travel. Upgrade of the fleet has and will have noise benefits. New routes to new destinations and greater frequencies to existing destinations for leisure and business travel, including domestic destinations where rail isn't an option, such as Jersey. This brings greater competition and so will be of benefit to consumers. The industry is highly motivated to minimise fuel burn and is exploring alternatives and more green fuels</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	such as sustainable aviation fuel and eventually, we need to see whether hydrogen is a viable alternative for flight.	
31	Wendy Bell on behalf of Crawley Town Centre BID Co Ltd	
a	<p>In favour of the proposal, encouraging greater prosperity at town centre due to employment, and flow on effects, with higher salaries, and air crews staying in town. Of the local 2023 visitor economy, over 60% of the spend in Crawley town centre was by people from outside of the area. Other high streets are dying, but Crawley is resilient. This would be further improved by the Proposal.</p> <p>Also supportive of further opportunities, such as local STEM centre to train for careers in aviation or adjacent.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
32	Michele Augousti on behalf of Institute of Directors - Sussex	
a	<p>Gatwick Airport stands as a beacon of connectivity, serving as a vital hub for both domestic and international travel. The addition of the northern runway heralds a new era of economic prosperity, which benefits um with benefits that extend far beyond the confines of the airport itself.</p> <p>The Proposal represents a significant boost to the local economy. The expansion of Gatwick will create</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>thousands of new jobs, ranging from construction workers to airport staff, bolstering employment opportunities and driving down unemployment rates in our communities.</p> <p>Initiatives such as carbon offsetting and renewable energy integration ensures that economic progress goes hand in hand with environmental responsibility, paving the way for a greener future.</p>	
33	<b>Fran Downton on behalf of Tourism South East</b>	
a	<p>Gatwick Airport represents not just the tourism sector, but is a fundamental contributor towards the economic stability, employment and community cohesiveness within the region. The southeast visitor economy was worth £12 billion in 2019.</p> <p>Tourism numbers are down 21% on 2019 numbers. Need to build towards a long term sustainable future. Sector is constantly working to find new ways to mitigate the effects of tourism, and Gatwick is leading the way in this regard.</p> <p>The development can only bring local and regional economic prosperity.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>
34	<b>Anne Ackord on behalf of Brighton and Hove Tourism Alliance</b>	
a	<p>Support the proposal, but also want to see Brighton and Hove receive more attention. More should be</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>



Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>done to promote south of Gatwick, not just London. A percentage of visitors will visit Brighton and Hove, which will be welcome.</p> <p>Hospitality sector has been significantly impacted since Covid.</p> <p>Development is an opportunity which should be embraced.</p>	
35	Cllr Jonathan Essex	
a	<p>Gatwick's planned growth has significant impacts that are not effectively recognised in the DCO application. Gatwick air pollution, flooding and traffic models haven't been shared, so the Environment Agency and National Highways have refused to comment on them. Now the DCO has started, they should be made public.</p> <p>Joined up landscape-wide ecological assessment needed.</p> <p>Gatwick will increase road traffic by one third, no bus infrastructure and no investment in rail.</p> <p>The increase in flights will lead to more noise with no plans to limit noise or ban night flights.</p> <p>Air pollution modelling has a poor fit to the monitoring data.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Cllr Jonathan Essex are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.3 on air quality.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.6 on climate change.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.13 on ecology and nature conservation.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.21 on need and forecasting.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.27 on water environment, including a response on water supply.</li> </ul>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>Concerns about the water supply, increased sewage and surface water, air pollution, flooding, traffic model and climate change listed.</p> <p>Short runway design life underplays the climate impacts of flooding.</p> <p>No clarity as to where the Applicant plans to get its extra water supply from, or the impact of increasing sewage and surface water from the airport being pumped into Horley and Crawley sewage works.</p> <p>Airport hypes the jobs benefit and excludes the economic impact of extracting tourism from the UK economy.</p> <p>Climate effects are belittled by discounting future emissions in line with the UK's Jet Zero strategy, by offsetting by omitting the impact of contrails, which the UK Climate Change Committee say will triple global warming, overlooking flights that arrive, not just flights that leave the airport, which will be created at the time of Gatwick growth.</p> <p>The UK must limit the demand for flying, as called for by the UK's official climate change advisers.</p>	
36	Michael Jefford, White Rose Futures	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
a	Concerns over climate emergency and the effects contrails from planes he can see from his home. Why are we still flying in a climate emergency? Issues with deception within the air travel industry, including taxing on aviation fuel, misleading offset claims and lack of scalable fuel alternatives.	Matters raised by Michael Jefford are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 3.56.
37	<b>Chew Ming Ling on behalf of May Chew and Associates</b>	
a	Clients are concerned that the information is not available on the application, and how their clients' land will be affected by the proposal.	The ExA provided a verbal response to May Chew and Associates in the hearing. The Applicant has no further comment to add.
38	<b>Nick Broom on behalf of PVL UK Ltd</b>	
a	Support the proposal, as to servicing their air freight needs, and local procurement and economic benefits. Enables business to access the Middle East and European markets. Ability to ship to nearby airport significantly reduces carbon footprint.	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
39	<b>Rai Bhanot, Gatwick Turret Guest House</b>	
a	Firmly believes that the expansion of Gatwick runway is not only crucial for the airport's growth, but also for the livelihoods of the people and the community it serves, particularly here in the south-east of England. The expansion of the runway presents a unique opportunity to revitalise the local economy, creating a multitude of new jobs and fostering a renewed sense	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>of hope and prosperity for the people in our community.</p> <p>The second runway expansion at Gatwick Airport is not about bricks and concrete – it's about rebuilding lives, restoring economic stability, and fostering a thriving community.</p>	
40	<b>Shrina Kotadia on behalf of Dynamic Beauty</b>	
a	<p>Multicultural and diverse society has built up around Gatwick, enabled by Gatwick. Great benefits to the local economy. Over 70% of clients are tied to Gatwick Airport in some way.</p> <p>Has previously had concerns about parking spaces on Gatwick Road, but the proposed bus network alleviates this.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
41	<b>Councillor Victoria Chester</b>	
a	<p>Local people of Horley have been sold a story, when jobs earmarked for the Borough is only in the hundreds. Unemployment rates are already low.</p> <p>Airports are increasingly automated now, with lower end wages falling by quarter in recent decades, and most of these new jobs will provide incomes nowhere near enough to afford the average house in Horley.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Cllr Victoria Chester are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.27 on water environment.</li> </ul>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>Proposal will result in greater traffic congestion, noise pollution, roads damage. More potholes, and nuisance parking which is already a huge problem in the area. Increased risk of flooding, water shortages, sewage overflows.</p> <p>Horley Works are at capacity now, frequently spilling raw sewage onto public land, plus all the many other impacts of an airport trying to double its size to that of Heathrow.</p>	
<b>OFH1 Session 4</b>		
42	Paul Curry on behalf of Speldhurst Parish Council	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
43	Richard Cox on behalf of Burgess Hill Business Parks Association	
a	<p>The airport attracts large companies and high-tech fields to the region, and also because Mid-Sussex is an attractive place to live.</p> <p>Need an airport that shares that vision of a sustainable future. Association members are overwhelmingly in support of the Proposal.</p> <p>Members recognise the importance of having an international airport less than 20 miles away. It is an important multiplier for the local economy, and provides many jobs in businesses that are part of the</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	supply chain, not only for Gatwick Airport itself, but all the businesses that serve the airport.	
44	<b>Kieren Walters on behalf of Prospect Union</b>	
a	<p>Airspace on the south east is now full, due to failure to deliver extra capacity. Proposals such as this can relieve some of the pressure.</p> <p>Two issues to raise relating to capacity and resilience, and skills and workforce:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently the airport is having to operate too many flights, with too little infrastructure. Results in disruptions being difficult to respond to and manage (for example, adverse weather conditions).</li> <li>50% of jobs created by the Proposal will be semi-skilled, or skilled. Gatwick is addressing aging demographic of workers, with its STEM centre. Aviation is a highly productive sector of the economy, the average worker's GVA being 6% higher than the average across the whole economy.</li> </ul>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
45	<b>Cait Hewitt on behalf of Aviation Environment Federation</b>	
a	All eight member groups are opposed to the Proposal, for three reasons:	The Applicant's response to the <b>Aviation Environment Federation's Relevant Representation [RR-0407]</b> is provided in Section 3.5 of the <b>Relevant</b>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concerns with the proposed examination schedule not including an issue-specific hearing on climate change.</li> <li>▪ Opposes the expansion due to the high risk of significant emissions increases, larger than all previous airport expansions since net-zero legislation in the UK</li> <li>▪ Considers that current policy measures alone are insufficient to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050. The Applicant is wrong to rely on current policy measures alone to reduce emissions to net zero by 2050.</li> </ul> <p>If the airport feels confident in the government's climate change approach, then it should agree to a binding set of annual emissions caps in line, at least with the CO<sub>2</sub> trajectory that it has modelled. This may be a novel approach in planning terms, but one that we understand to be deliverable, and that mirrors the way that noise from aircraft is often capped with reference to maximum exposure thresholds.</p>	<p><b>Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, which reflects its verbal submissions made at OFH1.</p> <p>The topic of future Issue Specific Hearings will be determined by the ExA and therefore the Applicant has no comment to make on this point.</p>
46	Polyvios Polyviou on behalf of Business LDN	
a	London's airports play a vital role in enhancing international connectivity. Investments from the private sector, such as this one for Gatwick Airport, bringing	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>the existing second runway into routine use should be seized with both hands.</p> <p>London and the south-east remain the gateway for the UK to the world.</p> <p>Sustainable aviation expansion in London and South East is beneficial for the UK as a whole. In 2019, for example, airports in the region accounted for 78% of all outbound airfreight.</p>	
47	Spencer Copping on behalf of Reigate Business Guild and WS Planning and Architecture	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
48	Claudia Fisher	
a	<p>Strongly oppose the application of the Northern Runway at Gatwick Airport. Application is in fact for a new runway, not an upgrade, and therefore does not comply with government aviation policy.</p> <p>Reason for objections, include increased aircraft noise, decline in air quality, lack of affordable housing, insecure low paid jobs, increase road traffic congestion and puts a strain on limited rail infrastructure and environment.</p> <p>Expansion poses risks of flooding, excess sewage entering rivers and concerns about water supply.</p> <p>In a climate emergency, a new runway would inevitably add a significant amount of carbon and</p>	<p>Matters raised by Claudia Fisher are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.3 on air quality.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.27 on water environment, including a response on water supply.</li> </ul>



Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	greenhouse gases. The government's own independent climate advisers have been crystal clear that building any new runways at all would be fundamentally incompatible with meeting the UK's climate change commitments.	
49	Jackie Macey	
a – GHG	In 2019, the government declared a climate emergency. Emissions from international and domestic aviation amount to approximately 8% of the UK's total emissions, which is significant. There are also further emissions associated with aviation activities which are difficult to quantify so the reality is therefore that aviation emissions amount to significantly more than 8% of UK emissions. The answer to this is to reduce how much we are flying, not expanding airports.	Matters raised by Jackie Macey are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases and Section 4.21 on need and forecasting.
50	Rory Lillington on behalf of British Airways plc and International Airlines Group	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
51	Paul Chandler	
a	Proposal is based on greed, and enables a large increase in emissions. It does not take account of the carbon emissions produced by those flights. Too heavily reliant on future technology.	Matters raised by Paul Chandler are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases and Section 4.21 on need and

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
		forecasting, including a response on the reliance on future technology.
52	<b>Nigel Dean on behalf of Roffey Park Institute</b>	
a	<p>The Institute benefits hugely from its close location to the airport, attracting many overseas clients to world renowned education and learning facilities, and the businesses that serve the airport. Our current 5-year plan includes expanding our international reach across Europe and the Middle East, and this development would help assist in those goals.</p> <p>Positive impact on the local vicinity and across the south east. Welcome the plans to mitigate the effects of the proposal.</p> <p>As chairman of the Roffey Park Environmental Group, have looked at this process in detail and are impressed with the environmental impact reduction plans put forward.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
53	<b>Paul Burr on behalf of Quickshift UK Ltd</b>	
a	<p>Supports the proposal. An improved airport will mitigate business losses from Brexit. Many people have built their lives around the airport. It influences businesses who set up in the area, and provides the infrastructure for air freight.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	Cannot stop progress, it is up to the Applicant to find ways to mitigate environmental impacts it causes.	
54	Ben Benatt	
a – GHG	<p>Climate impacts are one of many issues with the proposal, but it is the biggest issue which needs to be considered.</p> <p>Not having an ISH in the first round on climate is not acceptable.</p> <p>One flight to New York emits more carbon than 56 countries around the world. If a rich country like the UK cannot reduce luxury flying, how can we expect anyone else to do anything.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Ben Benatt are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases and Section 4.21 on need and forecasting.</p> <p>The topic of future Issue Specific Hearings will be determined by the ExA and therefore the Applicant has no comment to make on this point.</p>
OFH2 - 2	Peter Barclay on behalf of GACC	
a	<p>Not opposing the economic success of the airport provided that is not achieved at the expense of the environment and people impacted by its operations. 4,813 representations were made on the Proposal, 83% opposed.</p> <p>Throughout the DCO examination, intend to present arguments which cover challenges on climate change, carbon and other emissions, economic and employment claims, noise, air pollution, local transport, roads, housing, water and sewage impacts, and many others.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response to the <b>GACC's Relevant Representation [RR-1493]</b> is provided in Section 3.36 of the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The Applicant will respond to any future submissions made by GACC on the topics listed.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
OFH2 - 3	Finlay Asher on behalf of Safe Landing	
a	<p>Listening in to the discussion, there is a clear divide between those concerned for the environment, and those who want the economic growth.</p> <p>Assumption of growth being good for workers is true in the short term, but not if we have a climate clash which results in forced reduction in flying, and an over capacity in the industry showing a poor return on investment.</p> <p>Two examples of how the crash is coming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Economic impacts of international aviation emissions will be included in carbon budgets in the mid 2030s. Currently flights are very under-priced – we carbon offset with a few dollars per tonne of CO<sub>2</sub>. In the future, offsetting will be multiple hundreds of dollars for carbon offsetting. Costs will drastically increase, and we will have to limit how much we fly. Alternative fuels will simply not be ready on the scale required in time.</li> <li>▪ Technology is not coming fast enough. Zero emission aircraft are a future reality, but they are very different vehicles. Much smaller, with different ranges. Existing runway and ground infrastructure, including that proposed, would not be appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p>Matters raised by Safe Landing are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases and Section 4.21 on need and forecasting.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	Oppose on the basis of business as usual expansion. Would support a more advanced design which accounted for future aircraft styles.	
OFH2 - 4	Anna Hughes on behalf of Flight Free UK	
a – Socio-economics	<p>Opposes the application. Doubt as to whether the jobs provided by the application are the jobs we want. Focus needs to be on green jobs. Tourism airports facilitates outside of the up exceeds that which it brings in.</p> <p>Airports also take more from the region than they bring. In 2019, overseas visitors to the UK spent £28.4 billion, while UK residents spent £62.3 billion abroad.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Flight Free UK are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.3 on air quality.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.6 on climate change.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> </ul>
b – Climate change	<p>Jet Zero is flawed, in its reliance on sustainable aviation fuel. Zero emissions planes are over 30 years away. Offsetting schemes are ineffective. Aviation cannot continue to grow with demand, if we are going to meet our emissions targets.</p> <p>No new technology is coming to fix this. Reductions in emissions are cancelled out by increased volume of flights. The only way to reliably constrain emissions growth of aviation is to fly less.</p>	
C- Air quality	Air pollution is barely mentioned in the consultation documents but must be considered. A study published just yesterday by the think tank environment,	

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	Transport and Environment Surrey, shows that planes from London's six airports expose people in the city to the equivalent of 3.23 million cars worth of nitrogen oxides and particulate matter every year.	
OFH2 - 12	Jill Sutcliffe	
a	Concerned about climate change, and considers the answer to climate issues is to fly less frequently, less far, and not to build any extra capacity in this way. Also agrees that an issues specific hearing should be held for climate change.	<p>Matters raised by Jill Sutcliffe are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases and Section 4.21 on need and forecasting.</p> <p>The topic of future Issue Specific Hearings will be determined by the ExA and therefore the Applicant has no comment to make on this point.</p>

**Table 2: Applicant's Response to Matters raised at OFH2**

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
<b>OFH2 Session 1</b>		
1	Ian Gurling on behalf of Warnham Parish Council	
a	The Parish Council has a mandate to oppose to expansion at Gatwick Airport.	The Applicant's response to <b>Warnham Parish Council's Relevant Representation [RR-4751]</b> is provided in <b>Section 3.89</b> of the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>Main concerns relate to aircraft noise increase and new flight paths from two runway airspace, waste management, localised decline in air quality due to increase in traffic, shortage of affordable housing, healthcare provision, school places and amenities generally and climate change due to the increase in flight movements desired.</p> <p>In the 2018 Gatwick Masterplan, Warnham Parish Council would not be included in the noise envelope offered for this new runway. The Parish Council would not be in the insulation or compensation area and yet our Parish will be significantly impacted by continuous aircraft noise, day and night.</p> <p>FASI-S should be included in this process, as at present this is kept a secret from residents to the full scale of Gatwick growth.</p> <p>When we finished, the Gatwick Noise Management Board has been dominated by noise groups that seek to move arrivals over those closer to the runway.</p> <p>No research has been evidenced to the impact of two runway increase will have on our parish.</p> <p>We are very concerned by the potential increase in waste proposed to change the incinerator to a waste sorting facility. The consultation did not detail increase</p>	<p>(Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1. We would also direct Warnham Parish Council to the following additional responses in the RR Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.3 on air quality.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.6 on climate change.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant would also make the following additional comments in response to Warnham Parish Council's verbal submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ FASI-S is not required (nor is any other airspace change) to enable dual runway operations at Gatwick. When the likely outcome of the FASI-South airspace is known then the noise impacts of that change will be assessed as part of that process. Further details of FASI-South and the approach are set out in <b>ES Chapter 6: Approach to Environmental Assessment</b> [<a href="#">APP-031</a>].</li> </ul>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>in lorry movements, however we have not obtained details from reading the GATCOM Steering Group report.</p> <p>We are concerned that climate change is not included in the hearings nor the decline in air quality.</p> <p>We cannot reach Gatwick by public transport.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ As explained in the <b>Change Application Report [AS-139]</b> and in respect of Project Change 2, the biomass boiler in the existing CARE facility has not been in use since 2019. As a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, the volumes of organic waste being generated at the airport were too low without a continual supplement of a secondary fuel source, which does not align with GAL's sustainability objectives. As such, since 2020, food waste has been sent-off site for anaerobic digestion to energy recovery facilities in Newhaven and Chinham, being the closest facilities that offer the treatment process that is required. This approach to waste management would not change in principle as a result of Project Change 2.</li> <li>▪ The topic of future Issue Specific Hearings will be determined by the ExA and therefore the Applicant has no comment to make on this point.</li> </ul>
2	Peter Barclay on behalf of GACC	
a	[Spoke during OFH1, and therefore covered in Table 1]	
3	Finlay Asher on behalf of Safe Landing	
a	[Spoke during OFH1, and therefore covered in Table 1]	
4	Anna Hughes on behalf of Flight Free UK	



Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
a	[Spoke during OFH1, and therefore covered in Table 1]	
5	Paul Rolfe on behalf of Chichester College Group	
a	<p>Long and sustained partnership with Gatwick Airport. We have worked collaboratively to ensure skills are delivered, not only aligned to the current and future needs of the airport, but for many businesses in their supply chain.</p> <p>The airport has supported careers and recruitment fairs, airport visits for students, expert masterclasses and student work experience opportunities.</p> <p>We are proud to have Gatwick Airport as one of our first employer partners for our Sussex and Surrey Institute of Technology.</p> <p>The expansion of the airport will create job opportunities, enhance connectivity, opening doors to other education related opportunities.</p> <p>We benefit from the airport as a major employer and economic driver, providing countless job opportunities and ultimately contributing to the sustainability of our local economy. By expanding its capacity, Gatwick can continue to play a pivotal role in driving economic growth, creating jobs and fostering prosperity.</p> <p>We acknowledge concerns raised regarding environmental impacts and sustainability however we</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	believe Gatwick Airport has committed to mitigation these concerns through responsible planning.	
6	Richard Plant (in place of Katherine Glass), SHW Property and Chairman of Develop Croydon Forum	
a	<p>Major developments such as the northern runway are essential. It is well known that air transport is a catalyst for economic development, with better connectivity.</p> <p>Airports play a crucial role in providing easy access to market suppliers and skilled labour, and airports often stimulate real estate development in their surrounding areas. Airports also drive innovation and technology adoption. Investments in airport infrastructure often lead to development in new technologies and solutions to enhance efficiency, safety and sustainability.</p> <p>It is estimated that the northern runway could bring an additional economic value of £63.5 million and 906 jobs, just to Croydon in less than a decade, while the benefit to the wider regional economy could be as much as £1 billion a year.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
7	Matthew Collins	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
8	Adrian Heath	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
9	Cllr Helyn Clack	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
10	Stephen Clarke	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
11	Cllr Catherine Baart, Surrey County Council	
a	<p>There is nothing wrong with the fact that Gatwick Airport wants to expand to make money, but it is not taking that responsibility seriously. Some examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The airport is situated in an area of water stress, yet the airport proposes nothing about water neutrality or reducing water demand.</li> <li>▪ Capacity at Horley Works is already so far exceeded that sewage simply overwhelms the works. Gatwick Airport has not engaged with Thames Water sufficiently on how to avoid further sewage pollution.</li> <li>▪ Gatwick Airport is built on the floodplain and yet it does not know what the flooding impact downstream will be.</li> <li>▪ Gatwick will generate more traffic on already congested local roads.</li> <li>▪ Gatwick will take up more than its current share of the national carbon budget, making it harder for the UK to meet its legally binding carbon targets.</li> </ul>	<p>Matters raised by Cllr Catherine Baart are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.27 on water environment, including a response on water supply.</li> </ul> <p>We would also direct the Cllr Catherine Baart to the suite of <b>Statements of Common Ground</b> (Doc Ref. 10.1.1 to 10.1.17) submitted at Deadline 1 which provide further detail on the position of engagement and agreement between the Applicant and other parties, including Thames Water.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gatwick is not taking enough responsibility for the impacts of its expansion.</li> </ul>	
12	Jill Sutcliffe	
a	[Spoke during OFH1, and therefore covered in Table 1]	
13	Maarten Hoffman on behalf of Platinum Media Group	
a	<p>Every business in the UK has the right to grow and indeed this is expected by the UK Government in tax receipts and employment contributions are no different.</p> <p>The airport is already one the largest employers in the region.</p> <p>Gatwick has come up with the use of its emergency runway and little works needs to be done to bring this to fruition. It's a stroke of genius that should be applauded. A simple task to create a further 14,000 jobs in the region and inject £2.2 billion into the south-east economy.</p> <p>The entire plan is privately funded, with no taxpayers money required.</p> <p>The airport has gone to extraordinary lengths to mitigate pollution and the Second Decade of Change report notes that the airline will be net zero long before the 2040 target.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	The region's businesses are ready to do their bit and we urgently need the UK Government to agree to the project.	
14	<b>John Blewett</b>	
a	<p>Object to the second runway, principally on climate change impacts.</p> <p>Aviation is responsible for 2-3% of carbon emissions. Even short haul flight produces more emissions than the average person in Uganda or Somalia produces in a year.</p> <p>Aviation emissions are not included in UK emission budgets.</p> <p>We need a specific hearing on climate change issues. Air pollution is another issue.</p> <p>Noise pollution.</p> <p>Light pollution has a long term impact on nocturnal animals. Noise pollution also has an effect and stressed animals.</p> <p>We are at a crossroads in humanity with the decisions that we make at this time. What is the use of the economy if it effects people's mental health.</p>	<p>Matters raised by John Blewett are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.6 on climate change.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.14 on ecology and nature conservation.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</li> </ul> <p>The topic of future Issue Specific Hearings will be determined by the ExA and therefore the Applicant has no comment to make on this point.</p>
15	<b>Tim North on behalf of Holiday Extras Ltd</b>	
a	The current DCO application is anticipated to provide 80.2mppa by 2047, yet it is only expected to provide	Matters raised by Holidays Extras Ltd are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2)

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>an additional 1,100 on-airport passenger car parking spaces in its entire duration.</p> <p>GAL have limited influence on the wide range of factors related to long-term airport related car parking and GAL has little control over external stakeholders involved in public transport provisions.</p> <p>Improvements in the strategic road network can result in unintended consequences in attracting less sustainable modes of access to the airport, especially given a lack of evidence which indicates restricting on-airport car parking can lead to an increase public transport modes.</p> <p>The application pays no regard to choice, involving on and off airport car parking and no account of unauthorised off-airport car parking.</p> <p>The approach to airport-related car parking is outdated.</p>	<p>submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.26 on traffic and transport covering the Project's approach to car parking provisions.</p>
16	Jacqueline Phillips	
a	<p>Opposed to the Project for the sake of the planet.</p> <p>The proposed airport expansion at this time of climate crisis is insane. Aviation is a difficult sector to decarbonize.</p> <p>The ability to procure sustainable aviation fuel on the scale envisaged is highly debatable.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Jacqueline Phillips are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.21 on need and forecasting.</li> </ul>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>There is limited sustainable waste available to make SAFS.</p> <p>Overreliance on unproven technologies delays climate action and a rush into technological fixes often just replace one problem with another.</p> <p>The Climate Change Committee makes clear that airport expansion is incompatible with meeting climate commitments.</p> <p>We need to reduce demand for highly polluting industries like aviation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> </ul>
17	Mark Anthony Vallance	
a	[Did not speak]	n/a
-	Brett North, Gatwick Diamond Initiative	
a	<p>The northern runway project is an important catalyst to drive a new era of prosperity for our communities. This project heralds a gateway to secure prosperity for future economic resilience, sustainability in the face of contemporary and future economic challenges.</p> <p>The Project will deliver jobs in a region that has pockets of deprivation and unemployment.</p> <p>The Project is a catalyst to inspire further investment and alleviate these pressing issues.</p> <p>The expansion of the airport is more than just physical structures and a potential catalyst for regional</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	transformation, promising to enhance our economic resilience and international connectivity.	
-	Lisa Scott, Charlwood Parish Council	
a	<p>We are in a climate emergency. Gatwick Airport itself made a new UK temperature record in 2022 of over 40 degrees.</p> <p>We are now experiencing the wettest February on record.</p> <p>Request that the application is refused. It is out of line with the Government's own independent climate advice.</p> <p>There is no need for expansion. Employment is no compensation for poor health.</p> <p>If the application is approved, we request to be part of the s106 Agreement. Our parish is located in the immediate proximity to the airport.</p> <p>Our residents are expected to suffer ill health and reduce lifespans in the name of cheap travel.</p> <p>On noise pollution, a report into the link between noise pollution and cardiovascular disease was published this week.</p> <p>We want to have at least no night flights and at least no takeoffs between 2330 and 0630. Compensation to residents should be more creative.</p>	<p>The Applicant's response to <b>Charlwood Parish Council's Relevant Representation [RR-0697]</b> is provided in Section 3.18 of the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1. We would also direct Charlwood Parish Council to the following additional responses in the RR Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.2 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.3 on air quality.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.8 on construction.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.17 on health and wellbeing.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> </ul>



Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
	<p>Concerned by the lack of ambulances. Our residents are impacted by road congestion generated by the airport. We require funding for local pavements. For the construction phase, there is little in the way of HGV monitoring control for dust. We require HGV routes to be controlled and all vehicles directed away from rural roads. Temporary construction labour would have a negative impact on our housing stock and community.</p>	
-	Mr Tyson Davies	
a	<p>Disruption of building the project. It is not an existing runway, it is a taxiway. A public inquiry decided that Heathrow Airport was the obvious choice for expansion, why is this being disregarded? There is no need for extra flights. You cannot get a unit at Manor Royal due to the airport being here. It stops other companies coming in and investing in the area so we ended up with low value jobs. Who is going to pay for the M23 to be expanded? We need another railway line into London like Heathrow. It is going to impact local people massively.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Tyson Davies are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</li> </ul>

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
-	Karen Dukes	
a	<p>Qualified experts cannot make sense of the Gatwick economics in the DCO application.</p> <p>The project is going to have a significant impact.</p> <p>Gatwick is not going to meet any costs of the damage they are doing.</p> <p>The Government's net zero targets are likely to not be met.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Karen Dukes are addressed in the <b>Relevant Representations Report</b> (Doc Ref. 10.2) submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Section 4.16 on greenhouse gases.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.24 on planning and policy.</li> <li>▪ Section 4.25 on socio-economics and economics.</li> </ul>