



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

The Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's
Written Questions – General and Cross-Topic

Book 10

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: APRIL 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.16

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

- 1 Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions – General and Cross-Topic
1

1 Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions – General and Cross-Topic

The below table sets out the Applicant’s response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions relating to general and cross-topic matters.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
GENERAL AND CROSS-TOPIC		
GEN.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary</p> <p>In respect of the Environmental Statement (ES) Non-Technical Summary [APP-217] please amend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The contents page that omits the Section 7.7 Transport from the contents; and b) Paragraph 1.4.5 which contains a formatting error in respect of Diagram 1.4.1.
		<p>The requested amendments have been made in Version 2.0 of the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary (Doc Ref. 5.4 v2), submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
GEN.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Existing Use of Northern Runway</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3.2 of ES Chapter 1 [APP-026] states that a planning condition has prevented the northern runway from being used at the same time as the main runway. Additionally, paragraph 2.5.4 of the Planning Statement states that the Development Consent Order (DCO) application proposes to remove the condition.</p>

		<p>How would this condition be removed if the DCO were granted?</p> <p>The planning condition described in paragraph 1.3.2 of ES Chapter 1: Introduction [APP-026] is attached to the 1979 planning permission for the northern (emergency) runway, as listed in the Gatwick Airport Planning History schedule [APP-246], contained in Appendix A of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>Article 9 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6) sets out how the DCO will interact with other planning permissions, should the DCO be granted. Article 9(4) provides that any conditions of any planning permissions granted prior to the date of the Order that are incompatible with the requirements of the Order or the authorised development shall cease to have effect from the date that the authorised development is commenced. The operation of the repositioned northern runway, once implemented, would be incompatible with the restrictions on its use under the 1979 planning permission. As such, Article 9(4) would be engaged and that use restriction under the 1979 planning permission would cease to have effect.</p>
GEN.1.3	The Applicant	<p>Safety Implications of Moving Northern Runway</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4.7 of ES Chapter 3 [APP-028] indicates that the existing northern runway is located 198 metres to the north of the main runway.</p> <p>Would moving it further north have safety implications for the development to the north of the runway? Why was the existing northern runway not planned to be further north in 1979?</p> <p>Paragraph 1.3.3 of the Planning Statement [APP-245] makes clear there are no obvious safety-related impediments why the Project should not progress, including the shift of the runway centreline datum 12m north. A draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) and draft Letter of No Impediment (LoNI) (Doc Ref. 10.1.16) have been jointly prepared and have been submitted at Deadline 3. The Applicant believes these</p>

		<p>are final and complete with no further substantive changes expected. We understand the CAA will provide signed versions of the SoCG and LoNI towards the end of the examination</p> <p>Although records have been checked, we are not able to say why the Northern Runway was not planned further north in 1979. We believe that is likely that the separation distance of 198 metres between the main runway and northern runway reflected the airfield layout and existing infrastructure at that time and no consideration was given to the possibility of operating both runways concurrently.</p>
GEN.1.4	The Applicant	<p>Alternatives</p> <p>In ES Chapter 3 [APP-028] three scenarios are considered – Do Minimum (Scenario 1), making best use of its existing runways (Scenario 2) and a second runway (Scenario 3).</p> <p>Are these realistic alternatives to the Proposed Development?</p> <hr/> <p>The three scenarios mentioned in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered [APP-028] were developed, presented and consulted on as part of the Applicant’s draft 2019 Master Plan for the Airport’s longer term future in view of increasing demand. They represented alternative approaches, considering Gatwick remaining as a single-runway operation (Scenario 1), dual runway operations through the routine use of the existing northern runway (Scenario 2) and the continued safeguarding for a future, new southern runway (Scenario 3). Scenario 2 was ultimately taken forward as the preferred option for the reasons set out in the concluding paragraphs 3.4.12 to 3.4.17 of ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered [APP-028]; however, Scenarios 1 and 3 were valid and realistic alternatives to the question of how Gatwick could develop to accommodate increased demand.</p>

GEN.1.5	The Applicant	<p>Second Runway to the South</p> <p>Paragraph 3.7.2 of ES Chapter 3 [APP-028] states that Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) is not actively pursuing the option of a second runway to the south of the existing runway:</p> <p>a) Clarify this statement.</p> <p>b) How is this land reflected in local planning policy and can the safeguarded land be released? If not, why not?</p> <hr/> <p>a) The current Gatwick Airport Master Plan was published in July 2019 and confirmed that Gatwick is no longer actively pursuing plans for an additional runway to the south, but nevertheless also confirmed that there remains a possibility of building and operating one in the future. Following an extensive amount of work undertaken during the Airports Commission process in 2015 to develop a detailed master plan for the additional runway, no further work has been undertaken by the Applicant on developing the scheme or carrying out environmental surveys to the level necessary for the preparation of a planning application.</p> <p>b) Land to the south of the existing runway at Gatwick has been safeguarded through local planning policy for a new full length additional runway after it was first required to be safeguarded in the Government’s 2003 Aviation White Paper - The Future of Air Transport (Dec 2003), DFT, para 11.11. This requirement was adopted into local planning policy through the Crawley Borough Council Core Strategy in 2007 and reaffirmed again in the adopted Crawley Borough Local Plan (2015 – 2030) published in December 2015 (see Chapter 9 and policy GAT2). The Draft Crawley Borough Local Plan (2024 – 2040) Submission Publication Consultation May – June 2023, (which is currently being independently examined by the Secretary of State) also confirms that land at Gatwick is still required to be safeguarded for a potential additional runway (see para 10.17 and 10.18) and, as such, draft policy</p>
---------	---------------	---

		<p>GAT2 continues to identify a significant amount of land that is safeguarded from development which would be incompatible with the expansion of the airport to accommodate the construction of an additional wide spaced runway. Following public hearings in November 2023 and January 2024, the Inspectors set out their initial preliminary findings including on the Draft Local Plan’s general approach to Gatwick Airport being sound albeit matters of detail need to be addressed. The Draft Local Plan is currently under-going further consultation on the Main Modifications, but with the principle of continued safeguarding having been established. Releasing safeguarded land would also be contrary to government policy as set out in the Aviation Policy Framework 2013 (para 5.8 and 5.9), Aviation 2050 Dec 2018 (para 3.66) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (para 110).</p>
GEN.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Use of Taxiways</p> <p>According to ES paragraph 5.2.9 [APP-030] modifications to the existing Taxiways Lima and Tango are proposed to create independence in routing to and from the northern runway for large aircraft, while avoiding the need to move Taxiway Juliet 27 metres further north along its entire length.</p> <p>Explain why Taxiway Juliet might otherwise have to be moved?</p> <hr/> <p>Once the Northern Runway is repositioned 12 metres further north, all aircraft taxiing on Taxiway Juliet in its existing location would infringe on the Northern Runway. Taxiway Juliet must be moved at a minimum between the western end of the runway and Taxiway Uniform to provide an aircraft route to and from the western end of both runways independent of the Northern Runway. If Taxiway Juliet is not moved a gap in operations would be required for every aircraft utilising Taxiway Juliet (in 08 direction this would be every departing aircraft and in 26 direction every arriving aircraft), reducing the capacity of the Northern Runway significantly.</p>

		<p>Moving taxiways Juliet between Uniform and Quebec, along with the centerline realignment adjacent to the Aircraft holding area (between Quebec and Papa), as illustrated in the ES Chapter 5: Project Description Figures [AS-135], Figure 5.2.1a, is also required to provide wingtip clearance to maintain Taxiway Juliet as an alternative aircraft route to and from the eastern end of the runways from the pier areas. This will alleviate congestion in the pier areas and provide resilience to aircraft ground routing.</p>
GEN.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Use of Stands</p> <p>Table 5.2.2 of the ES [APP-030] describes the Number of Proposed Stands. Do these numbers represent existing and new stands?</p>
		<p>The content of Table 5.2.2 has been clarified through the updated versions of ES Chapter 5: Project Description. Please refer to paragraph 5.2.53 of the latest version of the Project Description [REP1-016] which confirms that the number of aircraft stands set out in Table 5.2.1 (formerly Table 5.2.2) take account of the Project proposals.</p>
GEN.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Link Between Construction and Passenger Growth</p> <p>Table 5.3.1 of the ES [APP-030] provides an Indicative Sequencing of Construction Works.</p> <p>Do these works relate directly to the growth in passenger numbers. If so, how does this operate? If, not, why not?</p>
		<p>ES Appendix 5.3.3: Indicative Construction Sequencing [REP2-016] overlays the forecast passenger growth alongside the indicative construction programme and the proposed delivery of key Project elements. In broad terms, there are clearly certain elements of the Project which are necessary to facilitate</p>

		that passenger growth – primarily the works to reposition the northern runway and its associated airfield works. In addition, and to varying degrees, the airport support facilities (Work No. 8 to 34) and other associated development will all be necessary to ultimately deliver the Project and its forecast passenger growth (for the reasons the Applicant advocates that they are necessary parts of the Project); however, in a less delineable way than the Northern Runway coming into routine operation.
GEN.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Construction Programme</p> <p>Section 5.3 of the ES [APP-030] describes the approach to construction which is anticipated to take place up until 2038.</p> <p>If tighter environmental standards were introduced over this timescale, how would they be incorporated into the controls or standards which are currently envisaged?</p>
		<p>The implications of new environmental “standards” would depend in any case on the nature of the change and its specific relationship to the project as consented under the DCO. In general terms, environmental legislation on which the Applicant must rely when carrying out construction under the DCO, in particular under the Code of Construction Practice [REP1-021], will be adhered to when relevant activity takes place; and to the extent that this legislation is tightened in the future the Applicant would comply with it. However where control documents relevant to construction are approved under the DCO and otherwise fix the principles or form of mitigation, they would remain unchanged given the approval of those documents. There may be circumstances where outline plans or detailed approvals need to be secured post-consent, and changes in policy or guidance may be taken into account when considering aspects of those decisions, but it would be inappropriate for such changes to be applied on a retrospective basis so that any “tightening” amends or introduces inconsistency with matters established through the earlier approval of the document in question. Any other approach would undermine the certainty and confidence required</p>

		to undertake development (a principle which applies to all consented development). The DCO also provides for certain exceptions where the Applicant has expressly provided for future reviews or updates specifically in recognition of evolving or anticipated policy updates, the definition of 'airport operations' in the CAP being an example (see para 4.4.12 of the CAP [APP-091] for instance). In this context, the Applicant does not consider that it is necessary to go further and incorporate within the DCO specific provisions which anticipate as yet unknown environmental standards.
GEN.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Evolution of Code of Construction Practice</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.82 of the ES [APP-030] explains that construction would be undertaken in accordance with a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [APP-082].</p> <p>Would the CoCP evolve over the construction timeframe?</p>
		<p>The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP1-021] and its Annexes sets out the management systems and measures that will be in place throughout the construction of the Project.</p> <p>As explained in response to DCO.1.52 (Doc Ref. 10.16), should a change or update be required to the CoCP itself, Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6) provides a mechanism through which agreement of any changes / updates could be sought from Crawley Borough Council.</p>
GEN.1.11	The Applicant Crawley Borough Council (CBC)	<p>Development at Gatwick Airport – Supplementary Planning Document</p> <p>Paragraph 1.4.6 of the Planning Statement [APP-245] notes that CBC has adopted a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) entitled Development at Gatwick Airport (November 2008).</p> <p>Should either the Applicant or the Council wish to cite the SPD in support of their case they are asked to</p>

		<p>provide a copy or relevant extracts.</p> <p>The Development at Gatwick Airport Supplementary Planning Document¹ (SPD) was adopted by Crawley Borough Council (CBC) on 17 December 2008. The SPD (para 4) explains that it provides guidance on CBC's approach to the Gatwick Airport Interim Masterplan of October 2006 and the Applicant's legal obligations and other commitments towards mitigating against adverse impacts arising from the growth of business at the airport up to 2015. The SPD (paras 5 and 8) also explains that, should any proposals come forward which may exceed the 40 mppa capacity, the Council will need to consider reviewing the SPD. The SPD has not been updated despite passenger numbers reaching more than 46 mppa in 2019.</p> <p>As the 2006 Masterplan was subsequently replaced (the 2019 Masterplan being the latest version) and it is now circa 9 years post-2015, the Applicant does not consider the SPD to be up-to-date or that it should be given any weight in relation to the Project's DCO determination.</p> <p>It is also noted that CBC has not made reference to the SPD as being relevant to the Project within the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report [REP1-068].</p>
GEN.1.12	The Applicant	<p>Securing Air Quality Monitoring</p> <p>Paragraph 8.5.18 of the Planning Statement [APP-245] states that air quality monitoring commitments are intended to be secured under the s106 agreement.</p> <p>Why is such monitoring not to be secured under the DCO?</p> <p>In the context of the conclusions of the Air Quality Environmental Assessment [APP-038], and the</p>

¹ <https://crawley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2020-06/Development%20at%20Gatwick%20Airport%20SPD.pdf>

		<p>absence of any significant effects identified as a result of the Project, it was not considered necessary or appropriate for this monitoring to be secured as a requirement to the DCO. However, in acknowledgment of the monitoring arrangements under the existing 2022 s106 Agreement, the Applicant is happy to continue to support the understanding of air pollution effects more generally in the local area, and accordingly GAL is proposing to commit to continued monitoring obligations under the new DCO s106 Agreement. Appendix A of The Applicant’s Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005] contains a table showing the commitments in the existing s106 Agreement and how those are proposed to be treated in the DCO s106 Agreement.</p>
GEN.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Summary of Mitigation Measures</p> <p>Appendix D of the Planning Statement [APP-248] references Appendix A: ‘Summary of Mitigation Measures included as Part of the Project’.</p> <p>Please provide a copy of Appendix A as it appears to be missing.</p> <hr/> <p>An updated version of the Sustainability Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1 v2), comprising Appendix D of the Planning Statement, is submitted at Deadline 3 with Appendix A included.</p>
GEN.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Mitigation Route Map</p> <p>According to paragraph 1.1.3 of the Mitigation Route Map [APP-078], the document is submitted for information only. [Note that after paragraph 1.1.5 the numbering sequence begins again.]</p> <p>Why is the Mitigation Route Map not proposed to be a certified document when it identifies all of the mitigation which the Applicant is committed to?</p>

		An explanation as to why the Mitigation Route Map [REP2-011] is submitted for information only is provided against DCO.1.6.
GEN.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Mitigation Route Map</p> <p>Table 2.2.1 of the Mitigation Route Map [APP-078] includes references for each topic eg HE-1, LV-1 etc.</p> <p>How do these references and the associated impacts and mitigation relate to the relevant sections of the ES?</p>
		<p>The references in the Mitigation Route Map (MRM) [REP2-011] are provided for ease of navigation through the document, corresponding to the environmental topics. This approach is also of benefit should any updates be required to the document during the Examination, in that new mitigation and commitment can be inserted at the end of each environmental topic without disrupting the referencing system (see for example, the updates made at Deadline 2 [REP2-012]).</p> <p>The references do not correspond to the Environmental Statement (ES). Instead, the right-hand column in the MRM table specifies the ES source, including the specific paragraph or table number in the relevant ES Chapter.</p>
GEN.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Indicative Construction Sequencing</p> <p>The Indicative Construction Sequencing for the Project is set out in Appendix 5.3.3 of the ES [APP-088]. Explain why the proposed highway works to A23 and M23 are not in the programme.</p>
		<p>The works to the A23 and M23 are included in the Construction Sequencing under the main heading</p>

		Surface Access. They are referenced as South Terminal Junction Improvements, North Terminal Junction Improvements and Longbridge Roundabout Junction Improvements, shown as occurring from 2029 onwards.		
GEN.1.17	The Applicant	<p>Terminal capacity</p> <p>Provide further details regarding the internal capacity of the North and South terminal for the baseline case and the Proposed Development, including the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Capacity/ service levels built to; b) Capacity of key bottlenecks – check in, security, gate provision, immigration/ border control, luggage belts/ carousels and area; c) Comment on the Jacobs details cited by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign (GACC) in its Written Representation (WR) (Section 3.1, page 21 [REP1-173]); and d) The inclusion or otherwise of Pier 7 in terminal capacity calculations. 		
		<p>a) The terminals are built to the following service levels (Table 1) for both the baseline and the Project based on the busy day:</p> <p>Table 1 Service standards</p> <hr/> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Terminal facility</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Service standard</th> </tr> </thead> </table>	Terminal facility	Service standard
Terminal facility	Service standard			

		<p>Check-in Traditional desk: <= 10 minutes queue time</p> <p> Bag drop: <= 5 minutes queue time</p> <hr/> <p>Security <= 5minutes queue time</p> <hr/> <p>IDL >=3.2 sqm space per passenger</p> <p> Seating available for 60% of passengers at peak occupancy (80% utilization of seats assumed).</p> <hr/> <p>Pier served stands 95% of passengers in each terminal</p> <hr/> <p>Immigration e-gates <= 10 minutes queue time</p> <p> Traditional desks: <=25 minutes queue time for UK/EU/EEA & 45 minutes rest queue time for the world (based on UKBF service standards).</p> <hr/> <p>Reclaim <5 minutes wait for free reclaim belt for unloading passenger bags.</p> <hr/> <p>In airport capacity planning the key metric is the hourly passenger capability. Table 2 below illustrates the terminal capacity in each growth scenario compared to the Summer 2024 declaration. The capacity is based on the area which has the lowest capacity:</p>
--	--	--

Table 2 Terminal capacity

Hourly Terminal Scheduling Limit	Departures		Arrivals	
	NT	ST	NT	ST
S24 Declaration	5,400	3,800	4,200	3,350
Future Baseline	5,500	3,900	4,450	3,700
Proposed development	6,400	4,900	5,050	3,950

- The increase in hourly throughput in the baseline is very modest, around 2% in each terminal, as peak slots declared do not exceed the current maximum of 55 and therefore the majority of passenger growth is outside of the peak hours. The increase in baseline capacity to accommodate this can be achieved through internal terminal developments, except for pier service, which will be met by the construction of the Pier 6 western extension which is detailed in Para 4.4.2 in **ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operations** [\[APP-029\]](#).
- The hourly throughput increases by a further 20% by 2047 with the Project. Full details of the planned NRP terminal developments to accommodate the passenger growth can be found in Section 5.7 (Northern Campus) of Volume 3 of the **Design and Access Statement** [\[REP2-034\]](#) and Section 5.10 (Southern Campus) of Volume 4 of the **Design and Access Statement** [\[REP2-035\]](#).

b) **Table 3** below illustrates the facilities available in each area currently compared to the baseline and

Proposed Development for total and North terminal (NT) and South terminal (ST):

Table 3 Terminal facilities

Terminal facility	Current <i>Total (NT/ST)</i>	Baseline <i>Total (NT/ST)</i>	With Project <i>Total (NT/ST)</i>	Details on proposed terminal developments
Check-in <i>Desks & bag-drops</i>	325 (168 / 157)	325 (168 / 157)	445 (212 / 233)	Sections 5.7.8 and 5.7.9 of the DAS [REP2-034] for details on the NT Security lane capacity increase which impacts check-in capacity in addition to growth, and Section 5.10.6 of the DAS [REP2-035] for ST check-in plans.
Baggage <i>Make-up positions</i>	267 (169 / 98)	267 (169 / 98)	367 (239 / 128)	NT outbound baggage plans are detailed in Section 5.7.11 of the DAS [REP2-034] ST outbound baggage plans are detailed in Section 5.10.9 of the DAS [REP2-035]
Security <i>Lanes</i>	19 (10 / 9)	19 (10 / 9)	23 (12 / 11)	Please refer to Section 5.7.8 of the DAS [REP2-034] for details on the NT Security lane capacity increase. The South terminal lane provision can be returned to return to the previous 11 lane set up (pre-2020) with minor internal reconfiguration.

		International departure lounge <i>Square meters</i>	44,135 (23,085 / 21,050)	44,135 (23,085 / 21,050)	79,135 (45,585 / 33,550)	NT IDL extension plans are detailed in Section 5.7.6 of the DAS [REP2-034] . ST IDL extension plans are detailed in Section 5.10.5 of the DAS [REP2-035] .
		Immigration <i>Desks</i>	60 (32 / 28)	60 (32 / 28)	112 (54 / 58)	NT Immigration internal reconfiguration can be found in Section 5.7.12 of the DAS [REP2-034] . ST Immigration internal reconfiguration detailed in Section 5.10.8 of the DAS [REP2-035] .
		<i>e-gates</i>	50 (25 / 25)	50 (25 / 25)	50 (25 / 25)	
		Reclaim <i>International & domestic belts</i>	20 (11 / 9)	20 (11 / 9)	21 (12 / 9)	The NT reclaim belt plans are detailed in Section 5.7.7 of the DAS [REP2-034] . Two of the existing South terminal belts will be lengthened to increase capacity as per Section 5.10.7 of the DAS [REP2-035] .
		Stands <i>Pier served</i>	77 (39 / 38)	85 (47 / 38)	99 (61 / 38)	Baseline & the proposed development include Pier 6 western extension. The proposed development also includes Pier 7.
		<i>Remote</i>	61	61	74	
		c) In response to the comments raised by GACC in Section 3.1 of its Written Representation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.1.1: In response to GACC’s general comments regarding the size of the terminal expansion 				

		<p>compared to the second runway scheme: the second runway scheme was a completely different scale of development. It required a new, separate terminal because the new runway was much further from the existing terminals, the number of new stands required could not be accommodated north of the current runway(s) and aircraft travelling to the new southern runway from the northern campus would interfere with the current main runway operation. In addition, the significant increase in peak demand required a far more substantial increase in terminal capacity – the second runway scheme increased peak scheduled movements by 78%, whereas the Northern Runway proposal increases the peak scheduled movements by just 25%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.1.2a: In response to GACC’s comment regarding the South terminal capacity in 2019: <p>We would observe that in the peak month of August 2019 all terminal related core service standards were met in both terminals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.1.2b: In response to GACC’s comment regarding RACC in the terminal buildings: <p>Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) is present in several of Gatwick’s buildings, for example, the North Terminal roof, Piers 2 and 3 in South Terminal and the fire station. The locations are well documented and regularly inspected for any visible defects or indications of failure. Inspections carried out in 2023 raised no concerns.</p> <p>3.1.2c: In response to GACC’s comment regarding the arrivals fire exits:</p> <p>The Airport has a comprehensive fire strategy which fully complies with BS9999. This means that the infrastructure is engineered with smoke extract systems, automatic fire detection and fire curtains to allow expected passenger numbers sufficient time to evacuate. In addition, the Airport has a 24/7 control centre (Gatwick Control Centre or GCC) which continuously monitors the operation and</p>
--	--	---

		<p>ensures that no overcrowding occurs. The fire strategy is routinely updated to reflect any infrastructure changes and/or changes to passenger forecasts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.1.2d: In response to GACC's comments regarding the proposed hotel adjacent to MSCP3 limiting potential to extend the terminals: <p>An expansion of the South Terminal into the area adjacent to MSCP3 would need to span: four roads (the airport perimeter road, the A23, the Lower Forecourt and the Coach Road); the London Brighton rail line(s); and would require the demolition of both the inter-terminal shuttle station link bridge and the South Terminal Upper Forecourt northern ramp. Such a scheme would be prohibitively disruptive and expensive and does not form part of the Applicant's proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3.1.3: In response to GACC's comments regarding the existing terminal infrastructure's ability to support the growth in passenger numbers: <p>Since 2010, the Applicant has invested £3 billion in developing the Airport and have published plans to invest a further £2 billion in the next five years. The Applicant has consistently sought to make best use of existing terminal infrastructure by re-purposing under-utilised space (for example, converting North Terminal landside commercial space into modern self-service bag drop facilities) and improving the efficiency of processes so they require less space (for example, security) and expect to continue this approach to accommodate baseline growth. The specific pier served stand capacity issue highlighted is being addressed by the Pier 6 Western extension project which is currently under construction.</p> <p>3.1.4: In response to GACC's comments regarding the 2014 Jacobs report:</p> <p>The second runway reports and forecasts are more than 10 years old, relate to a fundamentally</p>
--	--	---

		<p>different scheme and do not reflect the latest thinking in terms of traffic forecasts, fleet characteristics, capacity planning, space utilization or sustainable development. A wide range of options for terminal developments to support the routine use of the Northern Runway were evaluated, details of which can be found in the ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered.[APP-028]. The suite of expansion and reconfiguration projects that comprise the project proposal offer a proportionate, affordable and sustainable solution for the modest increases in hourly throughput that are forecast.</p> <p>d) Pier 7 is required to deliver Gatwick’s 95% pier served passenger target under the NRP forecast and serves an additional 14 code C pier served stands or 9 Code E stands.</p>
GEN.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Good Design</p> <p>Sections 4.29 and 4.30 of the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) state that applicants should include design as an integral consideration from the outset of a proposal and that applying ‘good design’ to airport projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction, and matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetics as far as possible.</p> <p>Policy within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) also advocates for good design as do the ‘Design Principles for National Infrastructure’, developed by the National Infrastructure Commission.</p> <p>Please outline your approach to good design for the Proposed Development, signposting relevant sections in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) [APP-253] where necessary.</p> <hr/> <p>Good design that reflects national policy guidance is integral to the Project proposals. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) [REP2-032] to [REP2-037] including Appendix 1 - Design Principles (Doc</p>

Ref. 7.3 v3) captures this, explaining how these were included in the masterplanning of the development (Section 3 [\[REP2-032\]](#)) and then the guidance and commitments which will govern the detailed design of the development going forward, Section 6 [\[REP2-034\]](#).

Sections 3.3.12 to 3.3.21 of the **DAS** set out keys parts of the polices that have been considered in the development of the masterplan for Gatwick Airport.

The approach to good design is aligned to the *Airports National Policy Statement* and considers Sustainability and efficient use of materials, Sensitivity to place and Consideration of Aesthetics.

Sustainability: Sustainability was considered at the outset of the masterplanning of the Project and this included Gatwick's *Decade of Change* goals which are detailed in Section 3.3 of the **Design and Access Statement** [\[REP2-032\]](#).

This will be embedded in the design of the Project through the sitewide design guidance in Section 6 of the **DAS** [\[REP2-034\]](#) which gives guidance on a range of areas where sustainability will be considered in the design including the limitation of greenhouse gases, see Section 6.6. These are supplemented with site-wide guidance and guidance on each building type and how they can include sustainable design features (see Section 6.12).

The **Design Principles** (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) commit to a number of key sustainability strategies including that all new buildings constructed as part of the Project will be designed and constructed for Net Zero emissions during operation, (see Section BF1). Detailed designs for the Project must be in accordance with these Design Principles pursuant to DCO Requirements 4, 5,10 and 11.

Sensitivity to Place: The project has adopted the National Design Guide's '*10 characteristics of a successful place*' as the basis of the sitewide design guide as set out in Section 6.2.6 of the **DAS**

		<p>[REP2-034]. This will influence any detailed design going forward. The first key consideration of this is that for a ‘well designed place’ context and the project surroundings must be considered in the design.</p> <p>Good Aesthetics: The proposals contained in the DAS are indicative, with the final aesthetic character to be developed in the detail design stage. The DAS sets out a framework for this and includes design guidance on the build infrastructure in Sections 6.9 to 6.11, and Section 6.12 which gives clear guidance on the appearance and materials that should be considered for the buildings.</p>
GEN.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Good Design</p> <p>Section 4.33 of the ANPS states that schemes should take into account aesthetics, including the scheme’s contribution to the quality of the area in which it would be located. Section 4.34 of the same document states that there may be opportunities for the applicant to demonstrate good design in terms of siting and design measures relative to existing landscape and historical character and function, landscape permeability, landform and vegetation.</p> <p>The design of airport buildings and development is often aspirational and ambitious, reflecting the role of airports as gateways to the UK and the world. A good example of this could be Gatwick’s own original Beehive terminal.</p> <p>However, details relating to the aesthetics of the proposed built structures in the documents submitted are limited with indicative massing plans only seemingly provided within the DAS [APP-253] and blocking plans within the Landscape and Visual Impact visualisations [APP-060 to APP-062]</p> <p>Please provide scale drawings (which may be referred to as outline design and landscape plans) and revised visualisations where necessary showing the proposed three-dimensional design of the elements of the Proposed Development detailed below to the maximum parameters within the Rochdale envelope.</p>

		<p>Such plans should include proposed materials/ finishes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) North Terminal IDL Extensions (north and south);b) North Terminal Baggage Hall;c) Pier 7;d) North Terminal forecourt;e) Car Park J Multi Storey;f) Car Park Y Multi Storey;g) Maintenance Hangar;h) Replacement CARE Facility (as amended);i) South Terminal IDL Expansion;j) Destinations Place Hotel;k) South Terminal Hotel (Car Rental Site);l) South Terminal Forecourt Hotel;m) Car Park H Multi Storey;
--	--	--

		<p>n) South Terminal Office – Car Park H; and</p> <p>o) South Terminal Hotel – Car Park H.</p>
		<p>The design of the Project elements listed in GEN.1.19 is not at a sufficient stage to be able to provide three-dimensional scaled drawings. Where possible based on the level of design development, indicative massing drawings, cross sections, floor plans and axonometric drawings are contained in the Design and Access Statement (Volumes 1 to 5) (DAS) [REP2-032 to REP2-036] including for those Project components listed in GEN.1.19. By way of example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative massing drawings, floor plans, cross-sections, CGI images and axonometric drawings of the North Terminal IDL extensions and the North Terminal baggage hall are included in Figures 46 to 59 and 70 to 71 of the Design and Access Statement Volume 3 [REP2-034]; • Indicative massing drawings, floor plans, CGI images and an axonometric drawing of Pier 7 are included in Figures 66 to 69 of the Design and Access Statement Volume 3 [REP2-034]; • An indicative massing drawing on North Terminal forecourt is included in Figure 75 of the Design and Access Statement Volume 3 [REP2-034]; • Indicative massing drawings of multi-storey Car Parks J and Y are included in Figures 76 to 82 of the Design and Access Statement Volume 3 [REP2-034]; • Indicative massing drawings, CGI image, floor plans and axonometric drawings of the aircraft hangar are included in Figures 27 to 29 of the Design and Access Statement Volume 3 [REP2-034];

- Indicative floor plans, massing drawings and CGI image of the replacement CARE facility (as amended by the Project Change) are included in **Figures 13 to 15** of the **Design and Access Statement Volume 3** [\[REP2-034\]](#);
- Indicative massing drawings, floor plans and CGI images of the South Terminal IDL extension are included in **Figures 13 to 19** of the **Design and Access Statement Volume 4** [\[REP2-035\]](#);
- Indicative massing drawings, elevational drawing, axonometric drawing and a typical floor plan of the Destinations Place hotel are included in **Figures 30 to 34** of the **Design and Access Statement Volume 4** [\[REP2-035\]](#);
- Indicative massing drawings, layouts, CGI images and axonometric drawings of the redevelopment of Car Park H are included in **Figures 41 to 63** of the **Design and Access Statement Volume 4** [\[REP2-035\]](#). This relates to the South Terminal Hotel (Car Rental Site), South Terminal Forecourt Hotel, multi-storey Car Park H, South Terminal Office (Car Park H) and the South Terminal Hotel (Car Park H), with an additional massing drawing of the South Terminal Hotel (Car Rental Site) is shown in **Figure 36** of the **Design and Access Statement Volume 4** [\[REP2-035\]](#).

The above figures are accompanied by the Section 6.12 of the **Design and Access Statement (Volume 5)** [\[REP2-036\]](#) which provide details on the likely appearance and materiality of the proposed building designs, split by the building typologies of terminal buildings, commercial buildings, car park s and operational buildings. The suite of **Design Principles** (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3), secured under Requirement 4 of the **dDCO** (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6), contain detailed built-form design principles (DBF1 to DBF36) which describe matters to be reflected in the detailed design, including building finishes, external materials and the overall appearance of the new buildings.

The Project has been assessed against the maximum extent and area of each Work No. as shown on the

		<p>Works Plans [AS-017] and Parameter Plans [AS-131], on a reasonable worst-case basis. This is a common approach in large-scale infrastructure projects, where a lengthy design process means it is necessary to maintain a level of flexibility for the detailed design stage post-DCO consent and which is facilitate through the use of the Rochdale Envelope for assessment purposes.</p> <p>The detailed design of each Project component will be controlled through the approval and consultation processes with the relevant Local Authorities set out in Requirement 4 and 5 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6). As specified in Requirements 4 and 5, the detailed design must be in accordance with the design principles contained in the DAS Appendix 1 (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) and the limits of works in Article 6 of the Draft DCO.</p> <p>Further detail on the design process that would be carried out post-DCO consent is provided in response to GEN.1.21.</p>
GEN.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Good Design</p> <p>Explain how the design of the Proposed Development (with signposting to the DAS where relevant) meets the National Infrastructure Commission’s Design Principles for National Infrastructure (February 2020) in respect of Climate, Places, People and Value, in all three phases of construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <hr/> <p>The proposed development meets the National Infrastructure Commission’s (NIC) Design Principles in its approach to the project masterplan described in Section 3.3 of the Design and Access Statement (DAS) [REP2-032]. There is also alignment with the Design Principles through the Design Guidelines in Section 6 of the Design and Access Statement [REP2-036] and the commitments set out in Appendix 1 – Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3). Both of which inform the detailed design stage of the developments.</p>

		<p>The approach to the construction of the Project set out in Section 8.1 of the DAS [REP2-036] also follows these core principles. Part of the DAS design guide in Section 6.8 [REP2-036] details the approach to reduce waste in the construction and demolition process.</p> <p>The NIC Design principles emphasize four key aspects: Climate, Places, People, and Value. These aspects then need to be addressed whilst considering the importance of appreciating the wider context, engaging meaningfully, and continually measuring and improving infrastructure design.</p> <p>Section 3 of the DAS [REP2-032] details how the wider context was considered when the masterplan was developed. Section 4 of the DAS [REP2-032] then details the masterplan options and subsequent consultation on those, which allowed engagement and to receive feedback on the proposals. The design guidelines in Section 6 of the DAS [REP2-032] and the Design Principles in Appendix 1 (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) ensure that control of the design through commitments is met but that the design can continually improve through its development. The commitment that all new buildings constructed as part of the Project will be designed and constructed for Net Zero emissions during operation allows that a measurable standard has been set, (section BF1).</p> <p>Climate: Sustainability was considered at the outset of the masterplanning of the Project and this included Gatwick’s <i>Decade of Change</i> goals which are detailed in Section 3 of the DAS [REP2-032]. This looks at the wider context and impact of the Project.</p> <p>This will be integrated into project detail designs through site-wide design guidance provided in Section 6 of the DAS [REP2-036]. This guidance covers various sustainability aspects, including the reduction of greenhouse gases (Section 6.6), affirming the aim to achieve Net Zero for the Applicant’s Scopes 1 and 2 emissions by 2030. Additionally, the Design Principles in Appendix 1 (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) outlines key sustainability commitments in Sections BF1-BF2 of the Site-Wide Design Principles and for the Specific</p>
--	--	---

Built Form Principles (DBF) committing the promotion of natural daylight, re-use of existing structure, designing robust fabric and consideration of renewable energy generation.

People: The NIC design principles asks that the design should “*Find opportunities to improve the quality of life for people who live and work nearby and...to take steps to mitigate negative impacts.*”

Section 6 of the **DAS** [\[REP2-036\]](#) and **Appendix 1 – Design Principles** (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) sets out how each of the types of development should respond to the aim of creating environments that improve the quality of life of people and how negative impacts can be mitigated. The Design Principles commit to buildings that consider the health and wellbeing of people, that they offer accessibility for all and that where possible they ‘promote natural daylight’ and for terminal buildings they should consider the experience of the passenger (DBF1 to DBF8). Active travel is considered also in the proposals with pedestrian and cycle routes provided as well as outdoor amenity space is also proposed in the design to include planting and new habitat creation for ecological and visual mitigation (**DLP1 to DLP14**).

Places: The NIC design principles asks that the design should Integrate infrastructure for environmental and community benefit. There is guidance for any future design development in Section 6.2.6 of the **DAS** [\[REP2-036\]](#), which sets out 10 ways in which the design will approach creating a ‘successful place’. This covers a need to consider Context and the Identity of Gatwick as well as other considerations such Nature, Use and lifespan of the design of any elements of the development.

Value: There has been a wide range of project considerations that add value beyond just providing the main function of increasing capacity. This has been done by including a number of specialists to consider different aspects to inform the strategy for design of the whole development. This includes consideration of things like visual amenity, biodiversity, water, lighting, and noise as detailed in Sections 6.3 to 6.10 of the **DAS** [\[REP2-036\]](#).

<p>GEN.1.21</p>	<p>The Applicant</p> <p>Relevant Planning Authorities (RPA)</p>	<p>Good Design</p> <p>Comment on the desirability of implementing the following measures to ensure that good quality sustainable design and integration of the Proposed Development into the landscape is achieved in the detailed design, construction and operation of the project. How might they be secured? Are any further measures appropriate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A ‘design champion’ at board level to advise on the quality of sustainable design and the spatial integration of the proposed structures, buildings, new landscape features, and visual amenity. b) A ‘design review panel’ to provide informed ‘critical-friend’ comment on the developing sustainable design proposals; c) An approved ‘design code’ or ‘design approach document’ to set out the approach to delivering the detailed design specifications to achieve good quality sustainable design; d) An outline, including timeline, of the proposed design process, including consultation with stakeholders and a list of proposed consultees. <p>In the opinion of CBC and other local authorities where relevant, would the implementation of any or all of the above measures assist in determining post-consent approvals (including the discharge of requirements) in relation to achieving good design?</p> <hr/> <p>By way of introduction the Applicant is grateful for this question and wants the ExA to be aware that it has sparked a conversation within GAL about the approach to take; recognising the importance of good design to the airport and its community. As set out below, design issues are already taken very seriously and</p>
-----------------	---	--

		<p>consulted on widely but the Applicant would like the opportunity to explore further the ideas prompted by the question and to develop its response through the examination.</p> <p>a) GAL's Chief Technical Officer is responsible for overseeing design matters and sits on GAL's Executive Management Board. The Chief Technical Officer has overall responsibility for the Airport's development programme, construction as well as sustainability. The Applicant is exploring whether that approach could be supplemented by additional advice.</p> <p>b) Securing good design is an important feature of GAL's procurement process and the Applicant carefully considers the appointment of its contractors / designers, including those who have a track record and examples of airport developments. In addition, the Applicant can call on the expertise of its major shareholders Vinci Airports, who own / manage / operate nearly 70 different airports world-wide, and who have a particular interest and specialism in airport design. The Applicant will consider the desirability of a design review panel for certain key buildings in light of comments received by the local authorities.</p> <p>c) The Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3), secured under Requirement 4 of the dDCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6) contain detailed built-form design principles (DBF1 to DBF36) which describe matters to be reflected in the detailed design, including building finishes, external materials and the appearance of new buildings. The detailed design of each Project component will be controlled through the approval and consultation processes with the relevant Local Authorities set out in Requirement 4 and 5 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6). As specified in Requirements 4 and 5, the detailed design must be in accordance with the design principles contained in the DAS Appendix 1.</p> <p>d) The detailed design process will take place in accordance with Requirement 4 of the dDCO. Design details (layout, siting, scale and external appearance) for all parts of the authorised development except for highway works and excepted development (as defined) must be submitted to and approved</p>
--	--	---

by Crawley Borough Council (in consultation with the other borough councils to the extent relevant). The timing of this process will depend on the particular work in question (within the bounds of the timescales specified in Schedule 11 of the dDCO), and will take into account the indicative construction sequencing. For highway works, design details are subject to approval by the relevant highway authority under Requirement 5 or, for national highway works, National Highways under Requirement 6 and the provisions for the protection of National Highways in Part 3 of Schedule 9 to the dDCO. Crawley Borough Council must be consulted on the detailed design for excepted development in the same manner as it would be consulted for such development (being that which the Applicant as airport operator can bring forward under permitted development rights) currently, under Requirement 4(4). Excepted development must be carried out in accordance with the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) by virtue of Requirement 4(5).

In addition to the approval process described above, the Applicant also has existing processes in place to engage with and consult key stakeholders on design matters on an on-going basis, including:

- the Passenger Advisory Group (a sub group of GATCOM) on matters such as way finding, design, passenger ambience, etc.
- more specialist input may be sought from the Independent Gatwick Accessibility Panel on accessibility issues;
- Airlines – through the Airline Consultative Committee (ACC) in relation to developments identified in the Capital Investment Plan;
- GAL’s Aerodrome Safeguarding Team in relation to aerodrome safety and navigational aid safeguarding requirements, including building design, use of materials and landscaping considerations.

The Applicant is internally considering whether additional processes would be beneficial and would like

		the opportunity to develop this response.
GEN.1.22	The Applicant	<p>Sustainable Design</p> <p>a) Explain the steps that have been undertaken to ensure that the Proposed Development achieves a good quality of sustainable design and integrated into the landscape. How are these measures secured?</p> <p>b) Explain the measures to be taken to ensure the standards of sustainable design. Will (building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) Excellent (or higher) certification be incorporated into the scheme design? How would this be secured?</p>
		<p>For the proposed approach to sustainable design please refer to the response to GEN 1.18 above.</p> <p>With respect to integration into the landscape, the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) forms ES Appendix 8.8.1 [REP2-021,REP2-023, REP2-025, REP2-027] and is secured through Requirement 8 of the draft DCO. The report defines the distinctive landscape and ecological zones within the site. The report describes how the Project will be developed and the outline mitigation and enhancement measures which have been prepared based on a set of environmental objectives including landscape integration, landscape amenity, public access and biodiversity. Outline landscape proposals at Figures 1.2.1 to 1.2.18 have been developed to illustrate the broad concept of soft and hard landscape proposals within the Project. Landscape elements have been defined which describe the range of soft landscape treatments that will be implemented to enhance the landscape zones.</p> <p>Our approach to BREEAM standards is contained in Volume 5, Section 6 of the DAS [REP2-036] Sustainability accreditation schemes are one way of achieving sustainable outcomes. Different schemes are available for different types of assets and covering different sustainability issues. GAL will consider</p>

		whether the use of sustainability accreditation schemes will result in sustainability outcomes that may otherwise not be achieved and this would be explained at the time details are submitted in relation to dDCO requirement 4 (Version 6.0 of the dDCO submitted at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6)).																																										
GEN.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Future Baseline - Economic Footprint</p> <p>Figure 3.2 of the Planning Statement [APP-245] shows the economic footprint of the Project. The Applicant is asked to provide a similar table to explain the economic footprint of the future baseline.</p>																																										
		<p>The estimates are provided for the Six Authorities Area in line with those presented in Planning Statement [APP-245] Figure 3.2.</p> <p>Table 4: Future Baseline employment with and without NRP</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Employment</th> <th colspan="4">Baseline without NRP</th> <th colspan="4">Baseline with NRP</th> </tr> <tr> <th>2029</th> <th>2032</th> <th>2038</th> <th>2047</th> <th>2029</th> <th>2032</th> <th>2038</th> <th>2047</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Direct</td> <td>27,600</td> <td>28,100</td> <td>28,800</td> <td>29,700</td> <td>28,600</td> <td>31,200</td> <td>32,000</td> <td>32,800</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indirect</td> <td>17,800</td> <td>18,100</td> <td>18,600</td> <td>19,200</td> <td>18,400</td> <td>20,100</td> <td>20,600</td> <td>21,200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Induced</td> <td>11,100</td> <td>11,300</td> <td>11,600</td> <td>12,000</td> <td>11,500</td> <td>12,600</td> <td>12,900</td> <td>13,200</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Employment	Baseline without NRP				Baseline with NRP				2029	2032	2038	2047	2029	2032	2038	2047	Direct	27,600	28,100	28,800	29,700	28,600	31,200	32,000	32,800	Indirect	17,800	18,100	18,600	19,200	18,400	20,100	20,600	21,200	Induced	11,100	11,300	11,600	12,000	11,500	12,600
Employment	Baseline without NRP				Baseline with NRP																																							
	2029	2032	2038	2047	2029	2032	2038	2047																																				
Direct	27,600	28,100	28,800	29,700	28,600	31,200	32,000	32,800																																				
Indirect	17,800	18,100	18,600	19,200	18,400	20,100	20,600	21,200																																				
Induced	11,100	11,300	11,600	12,000	11,500	12,600	12,900	13,200																																				

Total* (excl. catalytic**)	56,600	57,500	58,900	60,900	58,600	63,900	65,500	67,200
-----------------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Table 5: Incremental employment over Baseline due to NRP

Employment	2029	2032	2038	2047
Direct	1,000	3,100	3,200	3,100
Indirect	600	2,000	2,100	2,000
Induced	400	1,300	1,300	1,300
Catalytic	2,500	7,600	7,200	6,500
Total*	4,500	14,000	13,700	12,800

Table 6: Future Baseline GVA with and without NRP

GVA	Baseline without NRP	Baseline with NRP
------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

	2029	2032	2038	2047	2029	2032	2038	2047
Direct	£2,033m	£2,139m	£2,352m	£2,738m	£2,105m	£2,377m	£2,615m	£3,024m
Indirect	£1,207m	£1,270m	£1,397m	£1,626m	£1,250m	£1,411m	£1,553m	£1,796m
Induced	£755m	£794m	£873m	£1,017m	£782m	£883m	£971m	£1,123m
Total* (excl. catalytic**)	£3,995m	£4,203m	£4,622m	£5,382m	£4,138m	£4,671m	£5,138m	£5,943m

Table 7: Incremental GVA over Baseline due to NRP

GVA	2029	2032	2038	2047
Direct	£73m	£238m	£263m	£286m
Indirect	£43m	£141m	£156m	£170m
Induced	£27m	£88m	£98m	£106m
Catalytic	£168m	£532m	£538m	£550m

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Total*</td> <td>£310m</td> <td>£1,000m</td> <td>£1,054m</td> <td>£1,112m</td> </tr> </table> <p>* Values may not sum due to rounding.</p> <p>** Catalytic impacts were estimated on the incremental impact of the Project only.</p>	Total*	£310m	£1,000m	£1,054m	£1,112m
Total*	£310m	£1,000m	£1,054m	£1,112m			
GEN.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Future Baseline – Hotel and Office Provision</p> <p>Explain why the future baseline does not require any additional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Hotel provision; and b) Office provision. 					
		<p>As explained in paragraph 4.4.1 of ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation [APP-029], the Future Baseline is based upon developments that are currently consented or under construction and would proceed in the absence of the Project. There are no hotel or office developments on-airport that meet this criteria and therefore are not included in the Future Baseline.</p> <p>It is likely that further hotels will be required as the airport passenger numbers grow in the baseline and these could be provided on or off-site and applications will be made by the Applicant or the market as appropriate. This application is for the NRP and it is forecast that further hotels will be required. It is appropriate that they are applied for in this application.</p>					
GEN.1.25	The Applicant	Future Baseline – Terminal Capacity					

	<p>easyJet Emirates Airlines</p> <p>International Airlines Group (IAG)/ British Airways</p>	<p>easyJet [RR-1256], Emirates Airlines [RR-1350] and IAG [REP1-198] mention the current terminal infrastructure constraints at the airport. Given these concerns, and without any improvements that are included in the Project case, how deliverable are the future baseline projections of up to 67 million passenger per annum (mppa) in 2047, some 20 mppa over the 2019 baseline and some 26 mppa over the 2023 passenger levels?</p>
	<p>Other airlines</p>	<p>The future baseline does not increase the number of scheduled aircraft movements per hour beyond the current peak movements of 55 per hour and therefore the limited additional hourly throughput (2%) and correspondingly minor impact on existing terminal facilities detailed in response to ExQ1 GEN.1.17 above comes from a) more consecutive hours at 55 movements through the day, the week and the year and b) predicted growth in passengers per air traffic movement over time. As briefly outlined in ISH1 (Para 5.1.11 in The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 1: Case for the Proposed Development [REP1-056]), of the 20 million growth referenced in the GEN.1.25 question, only 2 million is attributable to growth in the peak periods (a combination of capacity and increased demand in off-peak periods (days and hours) of the peak months, this capacity is then largely used for year round operations. The forecast assumptions are fully explored in the Technical Note on the Future Baseline submitted at Deadline 1 (REP1-047).</p> <p>The response to GEN.1.17 c) above describes Gatwick’s strategy of process improvement and reconfiguration of existing terminal space to create capacity and / or enhance the passenger experience and GAL will continue to adopt this approach as it responds to the modest busy hour growth in the baseline. Such interventions can be delivered within the existing terminal footprints and do not require any planning consent. The future baseline is therefore considered to be eminently deliverable whilst retaining currently agreed service standards.</p>

		<p>easyJet’s central concern about the operational capability of the airport is addressed in response to CS.1.22 below. Their more specific comments about the expansion of security, immigration and stands are addressed in response to GEN 1.17 above. IAG make similar points about operational resilience and details of how the Project supports this can be found in the Section 7.2 of the Needs Case [APP-250] and in response to their written representation submitted at this Deadline 3 [REP1-098]. Emirates’ queries about the infrastructure required to meet the NRP growth are addressed in the ES Chapter 5: Project Description [REP1-016] and Section 5.7 (Northern Campus) of Volume 3 of the Design and Access Statement [REP2-034].</p>
GEN.1.26	The Applicant	<p>Future Baseline - Indicative Construction Sequencing</p> <p>Explain why the following are not in the programming of the Indicative Construction Sequencing [APP-088]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Extension to Pier 6; b) South Terminal Hilton Hotel Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP); and c) 2500 robotics parking. <p>These developments are not included in the Indicative Construction Sequencing as they do not form part of the Project. Section 4.4 of ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operations [APP-029] describes these future baseline projects and the anticipated timescales for these developments. Further clarification on the provision of robotics parking and the South Terminal Hilton MSCP was provided at Section 4.6 of the Deadline 2 Submission, The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISHs 2-5 [REP2 - 005].</p>
GEN.1.27	The Applicant	<p>Future Baseline - Hilton Hotel MSCP</p>

		<p>Paragraph 4.23 of the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-068] states that the planning permission for the Hilton Hotel MSCP expired in March 2022 and that in any event the spaces provided would not be under the control of the Applicant. Explain why these 820 spaces are included in the future baseline provision and not in the Project parking allocation.</p> <p>As noted in paragraph 4.4.6 of ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation of the ES [APP-029], the South Terminal Hilton Hotel MSCP was being promoted by the hotel operator and benefitted from an Outline Planning Permission granted in 2018 (and renewed in 2021). Its permission/delivery was not linked to the Northern Runway Project. Accordingly, it fell to be considered as Future Baseline development as that which would occur in the absence of the Project.</p> <p>However, whilst it was due to be completed this year, as noted in response to Action Point 7 of ISH4 in paragraphs 4.6.4 and 4.6.5 of the Applicant's Response to Actions from ISHs 2 to 5 [REP2-005], the Applicant now understands that the planning permission has lapsed and its delivery is uncertain. In such circumstances, the additional 820 spaces it was due to provide no longer form part of the Future Baseline, nor (by consequence) the parking provision as part of the Project scenario with the total quantum of spaces correspondingly reduced. For completeness, as the Hilton car park area is co-located (in terms of access points) with other car parks, the loss of spaces is not considered to lead to any potential traffic redistribution effects and the loss of 820 spaces is not significant within the wider parking capacity on offer for passengers and does not materially impact on traffic volumes or mode shares.</p>
GEN.1.28	The Applicant	<p>Future Baseline - 2500 Net Increase in Robotic Parking.</p> <p>The Airport Surface Access Strategy 2022-2030 is a reference document in ES Appendix 5.4 [APP-090] Surface Access Commitments in which it is stated on page 40 “2,500 incremental spaces from robotic parking – the trial phase of this project is anticipated to re-start in 2023, with full incremental capacity</p>

		<p><i>coming on stream in phases over subsequent years subject to an Environmental Screening Assessment and planning approval.”. Given no submission has yet been made date to CBC concerning these additional spaces, explain:</i></p> <p>a) If the trial phase of 100 spaces been completed?: and</p> <p>b) Why the additional 2500 spaces yet to be implemented should not be included in the Project parking allocation.</p> <p>The Applicant launched a 100-space trial of the robotic parking equipment on site in the South Terminal Long Stay car park, but this was paused in 2020 due to the Covid pandemic. The results of the trial were positive and provided proof of concept for operation at Gatwick Airport. Progress towards delivering the full 2,500 spaces has been delayed due to the pandemic and required changes to car park operations during the airport’s recovery, noting the South Terminal itself reopened only two years ago. The Applicant provided information in relation to the proposed additional 2,500 robotic parking spaces and its status as part of the Future Baseline in respect to Action Point 7 of ISH4 in paragraphs 4.6.42 and 4.6.3 of the Applicant's Response to Actions from ISHs 2 to 5 [REP2-005], which is considered to address the ExA's query under part (b) of this question</p>
GEN.1.29	The Applicant	<p>Future Baseline – Heathrow Airport Third Runway</p> <p>It is noted that in paragraph 20.7.6 of ES Chapter 20 [APP-045] <i>“it has been considered that in circumstances that Heathrow R3 were to become operational by the mid-2030s, air traffic levels at Gatwick would likely decline in the period immediately following the opening of Heathrow R3, by comparison to the scenario where Heathrow R3 were not operational.”</i> However, in Figure 1.1 of the Technical Note on Future Baseline [REP1-047] only steady growth is shown in this figure. Has full</p>

		<p>consideration been given to the effects of the delivery of the third runway at Heathrow Airport in the forecasting of the future baseline airport growth?</p> <p>The Applicant notes that this question seeks to compare paragraph 20.7.6 of ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045] and Figure 1.1 of the Technical Note on Future Baseline [REP 1-047]. These documents were prepared for different purposes. The reference to paragraph 20.7.6 relates to the consideration of Heathrow R3 as part of a cumulative assessment sensitivity, under which the Heathrow R3 is treated as a cumulative project which is developed no earlier than the mid 2030s, several years after the implementation of the Project. It was not treated as part of the future baseline in Figure 1.1. This is explained further below.</p> <p>Figure 1.1 of the Technical Note on the Future Baseline [REP1-047] refers to the Gatwick baseline, but this does not include a third runway at Heathrow (LHR R3). The steady growth captured within the base case (and NRP case, with a 13 million passenger benefit for the NRP) reflects ongoing trends in increases in average aircraft size and load factor. These were also the main drivers of Gatwick’s growth in the 2010-19 period. Figure 1.1 does not show the implications of developing Heathrow R3 because these are accounted for instead as part of the cumulative sensitivity. Similarly, in the Needs Case Technical Appendix [REP1-052], the Applicant has not presented the impact of LHR R3 on Gatwick’s future baseline. LHR R3 is a potential but longer term project. It would not be appropriate to include Heathrow R3 as a project which is assumed as part of the future baseline and also as a project which has a further cumulative effect on the baseline as part of a cumulative assessment. The delivery of the third runway has therefore been considered, but as part of a cumulative scenario within ES Chapter 20.</p>
GEN.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Future Baseline – ES Chapter 12 Transport</p> <p>Has any assessment in the ES been done of the future baseline transport effects of either the increase of</p>

movement from the 2023 40.9 mppa or the 2019 baseline 46.6 mppa to the future baseline levels of 57.3 mppa in 2029, 59.4 mppa in 2032 and 67.2 mppa in 2047?

As set out in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of **The Applicant's Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport** [[REP1-065](#)], the approach to assessing the Project in ES Chapter 12 is in keeping with the ES Scoping Request submitted to and the Scoping Opinion subsequently issued by the Planning Inspectorate in October 2019. The ES does not require separate assessments of the transport effects of increased air passenger numbers that could occur in scenarios without the Project.

The **Transport Assessment** [[AS-079](#)] and **ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport** [[AS-076](#)] considers the performance of the transport networks under the combined demand from 'business as usual' Airport growth, background growth resulting from increased population, employment and economic activity, and the additional demand that would result from dual runway operations as part of the Project. This performance is compared to performance without the additional demand from the Project and therefore the modelling used for the assessment does test the future baseline scenarios as well as the with Project scenarios.

The **Transport Assessment Annex B Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [[APP-260](#)] provides a more detailed assessment of the performance of future transport networks in the absence of the Project. This takes account of the projected 'business as usual' growth at the Airport, together with background growth, but excludes additional Airport growth associated with the Project. The **Transport Assessment Annex B Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [[APP-260](#)] covers the following points:

Mode share:

In the future baseline scenarios, air passenger mode shares are forecast to continue to move away from car and towards public transport, with public transport mode share for passengers forecast to increase

from 43% in 2016 to 52% in 2047. This is a response to increasing congestion and journey times on the highway network, increased parking and forecourt access charges over time and improvements to bus and rail provision, all in the absence of the Project. Future baseline employee mode shares are forecast to increase from 29% in 2016 to 35% in 2047.

Highway network performance in the future baseline:

Section 11.8 of **Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [\[APP-260\]](#) discusses the changes in highway performance from a 2016 base year to each of the future baseline years. The information is presented in terms of changes in vehicle flows, journey times, volume to capacity ratios for highway links and the magnitude of impact at junctions. These are reported in more detail by performance area in Section 11.9 of **Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [\[APP-260\]](#). In summary:

- Road traffic flows are expected to increase as a result of background growth and 'business as usual' growth at the Airport through all the future baseline assessment years. The most significant increase in road traffic would be on the strategic road network, resulting in increased congestion and journey times over the modelled period. Additionally, the majority of the M25 within the Area of Detailed Modelling (AoDM) would operate with a Volume over Capacity (V/C) ratios of over 90% from the 2032 future baseline onwards and there would also be sections of both the M23 and A27 with V/C ratios above 90%.
- In Performance Area A (Gatwick, Crawley and Horley) the model shows a number of increases in V/C ratios and/or journey times in the vicinity of the Airport as a consequence of 'business as usual' Airport-related and background growth. The future baseline scheme at South Terminal and North Terminal plays a role in helping to mitigate these impacts.

- In performance area B (M25 to A272) the model shows that the majority of locations affected by future baseline growth would be on the M25 in both directions between J6 and J8. There would also be some impacts in the Redhill area and on the A264 at Copthorne and East Grinstead.
- In Performance Area C (Inter-London) the model shows a number of impacts in the Croydon and Sutton areas resulting from future baseline growth, with a small number also on the M25. However, much of this is due to 'model noise' in this area that results from additional growth in an area that is already congested. This growth would also contribute to increased journey times on routes through the area over the modelled period.
- In Performance Area D (A272 to A27) the model highlights potential impacts of future baseline growth at junctions in the Burgess Hill area alongside increases in the number of links at or over capacity in this area.

Rail network performance in the future baseline:

Tables 110 to 115 and 117 to 122 of **Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [[APP-260](#)] provide information on the rail crowding factors for the base year (2016) and the future baseline years for the morning and evening peak periods. Overall rail growth between 2016 and 2047 is forecast to be 48%, an annual average growth rate of just over 1% per year. On the Brighton Main Line, there would be standing in all future years in increasing numbers in the peak periods between east Croydon and London Bridge and between Clapham Junction and East Croydon. Between East Croydon and Gatwick no standing is forecast in the early years but by the 2047 future baseline there would be some passengers over this journey sector.

Bus and coach demand in the future baseline:

		Tables 128 and 129 of Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260] provide the bus / coach air passenger and employee trip numbers for the base and future baseline years. It is assumed that bus and coach service frequencies would increase as the industry responds to growth in demand. Additional local bus services part-funded by the Applicant would provide extra capacity for employees and other airport users.
GEN.1.31	The Applicant	Future Baseline – ES Chapter 17 Socio-economics Has any assessment been undertaken in respect of the future baseline and housing provision? If not, please explain why not.
		The future baseline in respect of population, working-age population, jobs, dwellings and labour supply within the assessment areas is detailed at para 17.6.96 onwards of ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic [APP-042]. Further detail on future housing provision based on current housing trajectories by local authority is set out in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201], and specifically at Annex 3.
GEN.1.32	The Applicant	Future Baseline – ES Chapter 18 Health and Wellbeing Has any assessment been undertaken in respect of the future baseline and local healthcare capacity? If not, please explain why not.
		Paragraphs 18.5.21 to 18.5.29 of ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043] discuss future baseline conditions. Table 18.8.40 of ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043] forecasts future demand on

		<p>ambulance and hospital healthcare due to the Project for each assessment year through to 2047, including the future baseline. A sensitivity test is also provided in Table 18.8.41 [APP-043].</p> <p>Table 18.8.43 of ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043] sets out a baseline of primary care capacity close to the Airport. Modelling of future healthcare baselines is an activity undertaken by NHS strategic service planning, based largely on data that is not within the public domain. Paragraph 18.5.27 notes that health trend forecasting is undertaken as a government public health activity and has been taken into account. Paragraph 18.5.26 explains how the assessment methodology accounts for future population health trends, such that the current health baseline can be used as a suitable proxy for the future baseline.</p> <p>Importantly, paragraph 18.8.541 confirms that, whilst the primary care data on current capacity is provided for context, the Project does not rely on local primary care capacity (current or future). This reflects both the Project’s mitigation (see section 18.7) and that the Project’s workforces are predominantly home-based (Tables 18.8.43 and Table 18.8.44 so are accounted for within NHS routine strategic capacity planning (i.e. future healthcare baselines).</p>
GEN.1.33	<p>The Applicant RPAs</p> <p>RHAs</p> <p>Statutory Bodies</p>	<p>National Networks National Policy Statement - March 2024</p> <p>The Proposed Development was accepted for Examination prior to the publication of the latest National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) and in accordance with paragraph 1.16, the 2015 NNNPS should have effect. However, paragraph 1.17 explains that the latest 2024 NNNPS is potentially capable of giving rise to important and relevant considerations in the decision-making process.</p> <p>Given this, provide an outline of any implications arising for the designation of the latest NNNPS the ExA should consider.</p>

		<p>The Applicant has prepared a detailed comparison table setting out the equivalent or different provisions within the ANPS, the NNNPS 2014 and the NNNPS 2024 (Appendix A to this document). Inevitably, the comparison demonstrates many changes in wording and, for instance, additional information requirements. The final column of the comparison table seeks to identify whether there are more significant differences between the three NPS.</p> <p>The comparison document is necessarily extensive but the Applicant suggests that the principal implications that may arise from an application of the NNNPS 2024 are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 4.23 – attention is drawn to the principle of Biodiversity Net Gain, although no specific percentage requirement is set out.• 4.27 – the NPS provides further detail around Good Design, including identifying four design principles.• 4.32 – sets out requirements for design review and suggests the appointment of a design champion.• 4.57 – the NPS provides greater emphasis on the importance of opportunities to improve active travel (see also paragraphs 4.72, 5.271 and 5.278).• 5.194 – several paragraphs set out more detail about the approach to noise assessment and mitigation, for example in relation to construction and traffic noise.• 5.31 – sets out a requirement for Whole Life Carbon Assessment.• 5.37 - sets out a requirement for a construction carbon plan.• 5.39 – policy in relation to the assessment of GHG impact is more explicit that assessment should be undertaken against Carbon Budgets.• 5.131 – sets out more requirements in relation to Flood Zone 1.• 5.162 – requires LVIA to consider dark sky impacts.
--	--	---