

**Communities Against Gatwick Noise Emissions (CAGNE)**  
**Gatwick Airport Northern Runway project DCO application**  
**PINS Reference Number: TR020005**

---

**SUBMISSIONS BY CAGNE**  
**DEADLINE 3 (19 April 2024)**

---

**Introduction**

1. These submissions respond to the Examining Authority’s question CS1.24 [PD-012] addressed to CAGNE, and also respond to the Applicant and other parties’ submissions made at Deadline 1.
  
2. Appended to these submissions (and addressed briefly below) are:
  - Appendix 1 – Other Interested Parties’ Supporting Submissions
  - Appendix 2 – Suono Noise Note Responding to the Applicant’s Post-Hearing Submissions on ISH5 and to ExA Q1 (NV 1.10)
  - Appendix 3 – Sterling Transport Consultancy Ltd Response to Deadline 1 and 2 submissions on Surface Transport

**ExQ1: CAGNE’s Response to Question CS1.24) [PD-012]**

3. The ExA asked:

*“Paragraphs 18 to 21 of CAGNE’s WR [REP1-137] consider the ANPS and the Heathrow third runway, concluding that “a proposal for a second runway at Gatwick (i.e. a proposal which would allow for dual runway operations at Gatwick) was one of the “other shortlisted schemes”” and that it is obvious that “the proposal for there to be two working runways at Gatwick (or dual runway operations) was not selected by Government as the appropriate way (or even part of the appropriate way) to meet the needs case”. The proposal considered by the Airports Commission considered a full spaced southern runway at Gatwick, as opposed to the proposal in this case. Is there therefore a distinction to be drawn between the two proposals? To your knowledge, was the Proposed Development in this case considered by the Airports Commission?”*

## Answer

4. The Northern Runway Project (“NRP”) proposes a different design to the Gatwick Second Runway Scheme (“LGW-2R”). However, the similarities between the two schemes mean that they should be treated the same way in terms of policy.
  
5. As the ExA notes in CS1.24, LGW-2R sought a new full-length runway to the south of and running parallel to the existing main runway.<sup>1</sup> The space between the two main runways would have been set at 1,045m, which would have provided room for the required supporting airport infrastructure – a new terminal building, main pier and satellite.<sup>2</sup> That configuration would have permitted simultaneous independent mixed mode operations on each runway.<sup>3</sup> It would have allowed for:
  - **Passengers:** 82 million annual passengers at the airport by 2050, and 62 million by 2040.<sup>4</sup>
  - **Movements:** 560,000 air transport movements (“ATMs”) per annum, a capacity increase of 280,000.<sup>5</sup>
  
6. Rather than providing for a new runway to the south, the NRP proposes replacing the existing emergency/standby runway through creating a new main runway to the north. That would involve: repositioning the centreline of the emergency runway 12 metres further north, reconfiguring taxiway, pier, drainage, and stand amendments (including a proposed new pier), reconfiguration of other existing airfield facilities, and extensions to both Terminals.<sup>6</sup> That would allow for two runways to operate simultaneously, with departures shared between the two runways and all arriving aircraft using the existing main runway during normal operations.<sup>7</sup> This would allow for:

---

<sup>1</sup> Airports Commission: Final Report, July 2015 [REP1-142] at §5.2

<sup>2</sup> Airports Commission: Final Report, July 2015 [REP1-142] at §5.3

<sup>3</sup> Airports Commission: Final Report, July 2015 [REP1-142] at §5.3

<sup>4</sup> Airports Commission: Final Report, July 2015 [REP1-142] at Table 6.1

<sup>5</sup> Airports Commission: Final Report, July 2015 [REP1-142] at Table 12.1

<sup>6</sup> Planning Statement [APP-245] at §1.3.5. The works would include “resurfacing” part of the runway. As submitted by the Legal Partnership Authorities at Deadline 1 [REP1-211] at pg 4, the Applicant has provided scant information regarding the “resurfacing”. The Legal Partnerships Authority asked for more detail, specifically on what the “resurfacing” works would entail (and generally on the scope of the engineering works). The Applicant provided some information in REP1-062 at §4.1.10. CAGNE does not consider that this is sufficient and requests that the Applicant is clear whether the works are resurfacing or whether they amount to a structural overlay. For example, the Applicant refers to the resurfacing of the main runway. It would be helpful for further information to be provided about that to understand whether the proposed “resurfacing” is comparable.

<sup>7</sup> Planning Statement [APP-245] at §1.3.7

- **Passengers:** the Applicant forecasts airport capacity would increase to 80.2 million passengers per annum (“mppa”) with the scheme by 2047 (c.f. 67.2 mppa without).<sup>8</sup>
  - **Movements:** the Applicant forecasts 386,000 ATMs with the NRP.<sup>9</sup>
7. Accordingly, there are evidently differences in the physical design of the two proposals. As far as CAGNE is aware, the Airports Commission did not consider the NRP option but was only asked to analyse LGW-2R.
8. However, just because the two Gatwick second runway schemes propose different designs and configuration, that does not mean that they should be treated differently in policy terms. In short, as set out in CAGNE’s Written Representations (REP1-137), both propose:
- a. Construction of a new operational runway in the South East of England, but not at Heathrow, which is where policy supports such provision.
  - b. Turning Gatwick from a single runway to a dual runway operations airport, which is not supported in policy.
  - c. Significant physical works to provide essential new supporting infrastructure for that second main runway (including works to Terminals, taxiways, piers, drainage and airfield facilities).
  - d. A stark increase in movements: both proposals would result in more than the 2% increase in ATMs anticipated by the Making Best Use (“MBU”) policy.<sup>10</sup>
  - e. A stark increase in passengers: both proposals would result in a larger increase than the 11.8mppa assumed to be possible nationally under MBU.<sup>11</sup>
9. In summary, the NRP and LGW-2R proposals take a different form and propose different physical works. However, the impact of both proposals would be to create a second simultaneous operational runway at Gatwick airport. There would be a new runway in the South East, and that would not be at Heathrow. Accordingly, despite the differences in design, the two proposals must be treated similarly in policy terms.

---

<sup>8</sup> Planning Statement [APP-245] at §3.5.17

<sup>9</sup> Planning Statement [APP-245] at §3.2.7

<sup>10</sup> Beyond the horizon – The future of UK aviation – Making best use of existing runways at §1.28

<sup>11</sup> Beyond the horizon – The future of UK aviation – Making best use of existing runways at Table 1

## **CAGNE's Response to the Applicant's Deadline 1 Representations on Policy**

10. CAGNE has reviewed the information provided by the Applicant as regards the proposed Requirements in the draft DCO [REP1-004]. Appendix 2 provides CAGNE's suggested drafting for specific requirements.
11. The Applicant has responded to CAGNE's points on policy in a number of documents submitted by Deadline 1:
  - a. REP1-048 - 10.2 Relevant Representations Report;
  - b. REP1-052 - 10.6 Needs Case Technical Appendix;
  - c. REP1-053 - 10.7 Capacity and Operations Summary Paper;
  - d. REP1-056 - Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 1: Case for the Proposed Development; and
  - e. REP1-062 - 10.9.2 The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISH 1: The Case for the Proposed Development.
12. These documents largely repeat the policy points made in the Applicant's Planning Statement and at Issue Specific Hearing 1. Accordingly, the Applicant's submissions have generally been anticipated by CAGNE, with CAGNE's responses set out in the detailed Written Representations submitted by Deadline 1. CAGNE does not repeat that material for Deadline 3 but refers the ExA back to its Deadline 1 submission found at REP1-137 §§6-65.
13. The one document submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1 that does provide some new information that goes to the CAGNE's points on policy is REP1-062. CAGNE responds to these points in turn.
14. At §§3.2.5-3.2.10 of REP1-062, the Applicant provides more information about the current operational capacity of the emergency/standby runway. The Applicant explains that the emergency/standby runway was only used by 2,800 flights in 2019, but that it is "*capable of handling approximately two thirds of the full airport schedule*", albeit that "*latent*" capacity "*is not available in the current airfield configuration*". In short, the Applicant seeks to argue that there is existing latent capacity that it simply wants to start using. However, that mischaracterises the position. As the Applicant itself recognises, the capacity does not exist currently, because significant physical

infrastructure works are required to create it. That includes removing the current emergency/standby runway and constructing a new main runway in a different position.

15. At §§3.2.11-3.2.12, the Applicant states that whilst “*it is not a central question for the purposes of planning policy*”, the works proposed would fall within the definition of operational development benefitting from permitted development rights. However, CAGNE does not agree. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Class F provides that the carrying out of works in connection with the provision of services and facilities at a relevant airport is permitted development unless it relates to “*the construction or extension of a runway*”. The Northern Runway Project (“NRP”) does propose the construction or extension of a new runway: it requires physically creating a new runway on land where one was not there previously, some 12m to the north.
16. That conclusion is reinforced by the construction details provided by the Applicant at §§4.1.3-4.1.12. The creation of a second main runway would require, *inter alia*:
  - a. construction of a new 12m strip of hardstanding to the north (requiring diversion of buried utilities, excavation to 1.5m, and laying up and installation of granular base materials);
  - b. reconstruction of the existing northern shoulder to bring this to runway standard (requiring saw cut and removal of the existing shoulder, excavation to 1.5m, laying up and installation of granular base materials);
  - c. removal of a 12m strip of hardstanding, on the southern side of the existing northern runway (requiring saw cut and removal of the southern side of the runway and placement and compaction of engineered fill in the excavated area), and return to grass by way of grading and landscaping;
  - d. resurfacing<sup>12</sup> of the repositioned northern runway involving the removal of circa 100mm of asphalt and new asphalt to be layered to c. 150-250mm; and
  - e. replacement and reinstallation of drainage and lighting.
17. These works – including excavation, reprofiling of the land, moving buried utilities, new drainage, new lighting, and upfilling the ground – cannot be described as anything

---

<sup>12</sup> See footnote 6 above on the need for further information on “resurfacing”.

other than a creation of a new runway in a different position and with different physical attributes to the existing standby runway.

### **Representations made by other Parties at Deadline 1 which Support CAGNE's Case**

18. CAGNE notes that there is in fact a high degree of agreement between the various parties on a number of issues that CAGNE has raised. Appendix 1 highlights the submissions that align with and/or support CAGNE's case on policy, noise, surface transport, air quality, flooding and sewage and housing and jobs. To assist, the first four topics are summarised below.
  
19. In summary, on **policy**:
  - 19.1 AEF and CPRE Sussex, among others, consider the proposal seeks to create a new second runway/to turn Gatwick into a two-operational runway airport, contrary to MBU.
  - 19.2 Key local authorities, including the Legal Partnership Authorities, state there is uncertainty as to the applicability of MBU to the proposal given a lack of detail about the nature and extent of the physical works proposed to reposition and resurface the runway.
  - 19.3 Heathrow and the Legal Partnership Authorities emphasise that the Applicant is yet to demonstrate that the aviation demand to be served by the proposal will be additional to, or different from, the additional hub capacity to be delivered by the Heathrow NWR scheme. Heathrow and the Legal Partnership Authorities note that the Applicant's core forecast case has assumed that a Third Runway will not come forward. Heathrow sets out that the proposal is distinguishable from the Manston DCO decision, meaning that decision does not support the Applicant's choice of excluding from its forecasts any additional airport capacity that would be provided by a third runway at Heathrow.
  
20. In summary, on **noise**:
  - 20.1 Noise is a critical issue of concern for many relevant authorities and other organisations, and many raise the same issues as CAGNE. A number, including the Legal Partnership Authorities and Turnbridge Wells Borough Council, take issue with the Applicant's noise modelling, highlighting deficiencies. The West Sussex authorities, the East Sussex authorities, Tandridge District Council, and

Transport for London all raise issues with night flights and noise. The West Sussex authorities, the Joint Surrey Councils, Kent CC and the Legal Partnership Authorities all raise issues with the noise envelope and insulation scheme.

20.2 The Legal Partnership Authorities and British Airways have concerns that growth at the airport will likely require airspace changes, but these have not been modelled in the noise envelope. Horsham DC and Kent CC also raise issues about airspace modernisation.

21. In summary, on **surface transport**:

21.1 Many organisations concur with CAGNE that the Applicant's surface access proposals are inadequate and question various baseline assumptions and aspects of the modelling, including the West Sussex authorities, the Joint Surrey Councils, East Sussex CC and Sevenoaks DC. The Airport Industrial Property Unit Trust also raise significant concern surrounding the lack of sufficient transport modelling and the likely detrimental impact on the transport network.

21.2 Transport for London find that additional work is needed to understand the impacts of the expansion on the wider strategic road network. National Highways currently takes the view that the approach to planning controls is inadequate in the context of the surface access impacts and cannot yet conclude that the Applicant's proposals will not have a detrimental impact on the safe and effective operation of the wider strategic road network.

21.3 Rail is a major issue for many. Network Rail Infrastructure are concerned that the rail system will not have sufficient capacity and reliability at key times and note that the Applicant has not proposed any investment in the rail network to meet the additional demand arising. Thameslink Railway states that the proposal can only proceed if railway capacity is increased to accommodate the additional passengers. Negative rail impacts and/or lack of funding is also raised by the East Sussex authorities, Kent CC, Sevenoaks DC and Horley Town Council.

21.4 National Highways, East Sussex CC and Kent CC all raise issues with the Applicant's reliance on additional bus/coach services, particularly without funding commitments.

- 21.5 Transport for London conclude that aspirations to increase public transport mode share are not matched by the committed interventions and call for increased funding for rail, coach, bus and active travel.
22. In summary, on **air quality**:
- 22.1 A significant number of representations raised problems with the Applicant's air quality assessments in line with comments made by CAGNE's own consultants. In particular, the West Sussex authorities, the Joint Surrey Councils, Tandridge District Council and Horley Town Council are all concerned about Ultrafine Particulate ("UFP")
- 22.2 The West Sussex authorities consider that additional mitigation and control measures are necessary, including an UFP monitoring study, and the Joint Surrey Councils state that monitoring of UFPs should start as soon as possible and a plan for the minimisation and reduction of UFP emissions should be developed by the Applicant.
- 22.3 Natural England still needs further information to robustly assess impacts from changes in air quality as a result of the proposal upon nationally designated sites.

**Noise – Response to Applicant's Post-Hearing Submissions on ISH5 and to ExA Q1 (NV 1.10)**

23. Attached as Appendix 2 is a note produced by acoustic consultants, Suono, setting out the response on behalf of CAGNE to the Applicant's post-hearing submissions on ISH5 [REP2-005] and providing some initial views on ExA Q1 (NV 1.10) concerning noise envelopes.
24. In summary, the response to the Applicant's REP2-005 is:
- 24.1 There is no clear justification for the Applicant disregarding the Heathrow PEIR thresholds, particularly as the Applicant relies on the Heathrow PEIR in other circumstances, for example in relation to Unacceptable Adverse Effect Levels ("UAELs").
- 24.2 The Applicant has not selected UAELs for the day or night and takes a confused approach on awakening thresholds. A full assessment involving appropriate methodology and criteria should be requested by the ExA.



- 24.3 The Applicant’s response to the issue raised by CAGNE concerning the lack of a school noise assessment does not set out what the reasonable worst-case noise effects at schools are, meaning that no proper judgement on the full noise effects of this application can be made. In line with other recent airport applications, the missing information should be requested by the ExA.
- 24.4 The Applicant’s response to the issue raised by CAGNE concerning ground noise contours takes an approach different from that adopted at all other recent airport expansions (despite the Applicant relying heavily on those processes for comparable positions on other aspects of the assessment). The reference to “consideration of ambient noise” is unclear and does not engage with CAGNE’s point on that issue. It is unclear what scenario the promised ground noise contours are for, but they should be for the 92-day summer average, as other airport applications have provided.
- 24.5 The Applicant’s response to the issue raised by CAGNE on wind corrections in the ground noise assessment again takes a different approach from all other airport expansion applications and does not model a reasonable worst case scenario.
- 24.6 The Applicant’s response to the issue raised by CAGNE on the noise insulation scheme and lack of high-quality mapping figures promises further information at Deadline 3, to which response will be made as appropriate. However, Suono points out that online tool is not a substitute for proper figures clearly showing the extents of the noise contours that have been provided.
25. While CAGNE will respond as appropriate at Deadline 4 to the Applicant’s response to ExA Q1 (NV 1.10), Suono makes the summary observation that, as the Applicant has not yet explained which of the two scenarios assessed is most appropriate for setting noise contours, the contours should be set from the smallest contours provided to date, those being the Core Case noise contour areas.

### **Airspace Modernisation**

26. CAGNE notes that at ExQ1 question NV1.4, the ExA asked the Civil Aviation Authority (“CAA”) to clarify points about the need for revisions to airspace/airspace modernisation given the scepticism expressed by British Airways in their WR [REP 1-

198]. As set out at §20.2 above, a number of other parties have also raised concerns about FASIS at Deadline 1.

27. CAGNE notes that Gatwick’s number one airline provider, easyJet, also made clear in their RR that the proposal is not feasible unless modernisation of airspace (Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South or “FASIS”) is undertaken [RR-1256].
28. CAGNE’s noise expert, Suono, raised concerns about airspace modernisation/FASIS by way of comparison with the current situation at Dublin Airport,<sup>13</sup> which is a practical example of expansion of a new parallel runway that, once built and operating, has resulted in planes flying a different flight path than that assessed, causing noise impacts on communities that were not predicted.
29. CAGNE will respond at Deadline 4 as appropriate to the CAA’s answer.

#### **Surface Transport – Response to Applicant’s and Third Parties’ Post-Hearing Submissions on ISH4**

30. At Appendix 3 is a note produced by CAGNE’s transport consultants, Sterling Transport Consultancy Ltd (“Sterling”), setting out the response on behalf of CAGNE to the submissions received by both the Applicant (including REP1-059 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH4 and REP-065 Response to Actions from ISH4) and key interested parties by Deadlines 1 and 2 in relation to surface transport issues.
31. In summary, Sterling note the following:
  - 31.1 The Applicant is still failing to apply the requirements of key policies and guidance (as noted by the responsible statutory bodies);
  - 31.2 All three highway authorities (REP 1-070, REP 1-068, and REP 1-086) share Sterling’s concerns about the scope and assumptions of the traffic modelling;
  - 31.3 While the Applicant has conducted an updated Covid sensitivity test (AS-121), this remains flawed and still springs from the unverified base model;

---

<sup>13</sup> REP1-138 §1.2.

- 31.4 The Applicant does not address the points made by CAGNE in terms of rail capacity;
  - 31.5 Sterling and a number of the key authorities still maintain notable concerns about the bus and coach offer – these are not allayed by the Applicant’s representations;
  - 31.6 The Applicant has simply restated its case on sustainable transport mitigations, failing to address concerns that mitigation is both inadequate and not appropriately secured.
32. CAGNE will respond as appropriate at Deadline 4 to the Applicant’s responses to ExA Q1 TT.1.1 – TT.1.42.

**Response to the Applicant’s Change Request – The New Proposed Reed Beds**

- 33. The Applicant originally included provision for a new Moving Bed Biofilm Reactor (“MBBR”) treatment facility located at the pollution lagoons adjacent to the Thames Crawley STW, to treat surface water runoff potentially contaminated with de-icer. The Applicant has now replaced this water processing site with reed beds to tackle flooding.
- 34. CAGNE is concerned that there is no evidence before the Examination that this mitigation will work in practice. In particular, there is a lack of evidence that the size of proposed reed beds being offered is large enough to deal with an increasing amount of surface water, run off, and contaminated water, from a new runway and highway. The size of the reed beds will need to be considerable, would need a large silt sump and would also need to be managed carefully.
- 35. CAGNE notes that the Applicant has provided only high-level information about the proposed reed beds at Deadlines 1 and 2.
  - 35.1 At Deadline 1, the ES Chapter 5 Project Description was updated to include the proposed water treatment works being a constructed wetland system using reed beds with Forced Bed Aeration technology to treat the de-icer contaminated waters. This gave an approximate footprint of the reed beds of 16,000m<sup>2</sup> and stated that the system “would draw at least 100 l/sec from the de-icer pollution

storage lagoons and treat this to a standard that would allow discharge to the Gatwick Stream”.<sup>14</sup>

35.2 At Deadline 2, the Design and Access Statement was updated to indicate again that the system would be “approximately 16,000m<sup>2</sup>” and provide only small, contextless, indicative layout images of the water treatment works.<sup>15</sup>

36. The Applicant should provide the ExA with significantly more information about the proposed reed beds, including full details of volumes and capacity and the information on which the Applicant relies to demonstrate that they will be capable of performing the very significant pollution removal function asserted.

37. CAGNE notes the concern of other interested parties:

37.1 The Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Thames Water shows that there are still ongoing discussions about the fact that part of the function of the reed bed treatment will be to “completely remove the need to send glycol contaminated waters to Thames Water CSTW”.<sup>16</sup>

37.2 The Environment Agency flagged that more details need to be provided before the reed bed system can be scoped and agreed as a form of water treatment system.<sup>17</sup> Any new discharge activity would also require an Environmental Permit application.

38. Furthermore, the scant information provided by the Applicant does not address adaptation to climate change and the increase in extreme rainfall events predicted to occur, which potentially impacts the ability of the reed beds to function given potentially high volumes of runoff and/or potential flooding from the reed beds themselves.

39. Finally, much more detail is required on the maintenance of the proposed reed beds, including:

---

<sup>14</sup> REP1-016 §5.2.172-5.2.177.

<sup>15</sup> REP2-035 §5.11.5.

<sup>16</sup> REP1-038 pg 27 §2.22.4.1.

<sup>17</sup> REP1-072 pg 6.

- 39.1 Annual inspection of the main basin areas of reed beds for sediment and to ensure it is kept clear of any encroaching vegetation such as shrubs and trees which if left unchecked will gradually reduce storage capacity.
- 39.2 Once established, the reed beds will need to be cut back seasonally to ensure that they do not deteriorate. Cutting back 25% of the area on a rotational 4 yearly cycle will rejuvenate the reed growth and prevent the accumulation of litter from causing the bed to rise over time (which will impede the ability to conduct flows).
- 39.3 Given the increase in storms and continual rain, the potential for overflow of the reed beds must be considered. Monthly inspections must be put in place to clear any debris such as fallen branches or other detritus that may have escaped from roads, runway, waste sites, and passing traffic.
- 39.4 Connections to the Gatwick Stream (and any other waterways) should be checked to ensure that they are free to rise and fall with the changing water level. The surrounding vegetation must be mowed seasonally to maintain the grass and weed height. There should not be any trees or shrubs growing anywhere within the beds.

19 April 2024