



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

The Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions

Book 10

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: APRIL 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.17

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Airport Industrial Property Unit Trust	1
2.2	Car Parking Strategy	1
2.3	Relevant Representation Report (Traffic and Transport)	4
2.4	Surface Access Highways Plans – Structure Section Drawings – For Approval	7
3	Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign	9
3.2	Questions relating to Document 10.9.2 - The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISH 1: The Case for the Proposed Development	9
3.3	Questions relating to Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport	14
3.4	Questions relating to The Applicant's Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport	18
3.5	Questions and Comments related Questions to Document 10.5 - The Car Parking Strategy	21
3.6	Comments on the Document 10.2, the Relevant Representations Report	26
3.7	Questions and Comments related to 10.10 Technical Note on the Future Baseline and 10.6 Needs Case Technical Appendix	28
4	Holiday Extras Ltd	30
5	Legal Partnership Authorities	32
5.2	10.8.2 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH 1: The Case for the Proposed Development	32
5.3	10.9.2 The Applicant's Response to Actions from ISH1: The Case for the Proposed Development	43
5.4	10.8.3 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH2: Control Documents / DCO	49
5.5	10.9.3 The Applicant's Response to Actions from ISH2: Control Documents / DCO	51
5.6	10.8.4 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH3: Socio-economics	61
5.7	10.8.5 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH4: Surface Transport	62
5.8	10.9.5 The Applicant's Response to Actions from ISH4: Surface Transport	71
5.9	10.9.6 The Applicant's Response to Actions from ISH5: Aviation Noise	84
6	National Highways	103

6.2	The Applicant's Cover Letter – Deadline 1	103
6.3	Draft Development Consent Order	104
6.4	Legal Partnership Authorities Post Hearing Submission Issue Specific Hearing 2	111
6.5	Legal Partnership Authorities Post Hearing Submission Issue Specific Hearing 4	112
6.6	The Applicant's Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport	113
6.7	The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions – ISH2 Control Documents / DCO	116
6.8	The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions - ISH4 Surface Transport	118
6.9	The Applicant's Response to Matters Raised at Open Floor Hearings 1 and 2	121
6.10	Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground	121
6.11	Local Impact Report (Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council and West Sussex County Council)	122
6.12	Local Impact Report (Surrey County Council, Mole Valley District Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council)	128
6.13	Written Representation of Kent County Council Deadline 1 Submission	129
6.14	Written Representation of Network Rail Infrastructure (NR) Deadline 1 Submission	131
6.15	Written Representation of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Deadline 1 Submission	132
6.16	Written Representation of Transport for London (TfL) Deadline 1 Submission	133
6.17	Written Representation of the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (CILT) Deadline 1 Submission	136
6.18	Written Representation of Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) Deadline 1 Submission	137
7	Surrey County Council	140
7.2	Comments on Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling	140
8	West Sussex Joint Local Authorities	143
8.2	Draft Development Consent Order Schedule of Changes	143
8.3	Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Outline Arboricultural Method Statement	144
8.4	Statement of Commonality	150
8.5	Draft Itinerary for Accompanied Site Inspection	154
8.6	Car Parking Strategy	155
8.7	Air Quality	161
8.8	Needs Case/Capacity and Operations Summary Paper	161
8.9	Rights of Way and Access Plans	161
8.10	Surface Access Highways Plans	166
8.11	Traffic Modelling	166

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document provides a response to the comments made available at Deadline 2 to the Applicant's submissions at Deadline 1. The following Interested Parties provided comments:
- 1.1.1.1. Airport Industrial Property Unit Trust;
 - 1.1.1.2. Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign
 - 1.1.1.3. Holiday Extras Ltd;
 - 1.1.1.4. Legal Partnership Authorities;
 - 1.1.1.5. National Highways;
 - 1.1.1.6. Surrey County Council; and
 - 1.1.1.7. West Sussex Joint Local Authorities.
- 1.1.2 A number of the submissions made overlap in substance with those submitted by the same parties at Deadline 1 as part of their written representations and local impact reports (as appropriate). In the interests of efficiency, the Applicant has sought not to duplicate responses below which it is separately providing in those documents; however, has provided additional comment below where considered helpful/necessary.

2 Airport Industrial Property Unit Trust

2.1.1 The topics raised in the Airport Industrial Property Unit Trust’s response to the Applicant’s submissions at Deadline 1 [\[REP2-069\]](#) are summarised below.

2.2 Car Parking Strategy

2.2.1 Table 1 sets out the Applicant’s response to the matters raised by AIPUT on the Car Parking Strategy submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 1 Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by AIPUT on the Car Parking Strategy

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
N/A	The Car Parking Strategy contains an insufficient level of detail required for the scale of the Northern Runway Project responses to written questions/LIRs/WRs where additional detail on the approach to parking is provided.	We note the comment and respectfully disagree that the Car Parking Strategy is lacking in detail. There is considerable information contained in the document regarding the approach to car parking at Gatwick Airport and the capacity proposed. The proposed parking provision for the Northern Runway Project is both consistent with and proportionate to the approach currently taken in respect of car parking provision at the airport. Additionally, the estimate of parking capacity required is consistent with the modelling approach that supports our mode share commitments.

		Further responses relating to car parking are included in The Applicant’s Response to Written Representations (Doc Ref. 10.14), The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15) and The Applicant’s Response to ExA Questions (Doc Ref. 10.16), submitted at Deadline 3.
N/A	The proposals are discussed but no commitment to parking provisions or a definitive strategy is made.	The Project Description [REP1-016] and Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) make clear the amount of parking that will be lost and replaced as part of the project and the additional capacity that is being sought under the DCO. The Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] submitted at Deadline 1 provides sufficient information regarding the strategy for on-airport parking and assumptions regarding off-airport parking.
N/A	More detail is required on mode split targets and penalties for not hitting mode split targets. GAL have demonstrated a predict and provide approach to planning for travel to and from the airport. By default, this will tend to replicate existing patterns rather than plan for more people to travel by sustainable modes. Whilst the DCO documents refer to mode split targets and timescales within which they are to be delivered, these are all post completion and opening of the new runway. AIPUT would therefore raise their concern with	The Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) provides clear information on the binding commitments on mode shares, the approach to monitoring and the requirements should there be indications that the mode share targets may not be met. The mitigation measures included demonstrate GAL’s commitment to supporting travel by sustainable modes and provide targets that are equal to or exceed those of any UK airport, including future published plans.

	<p>the lack of penalties in the event that GAL did not achieve their modal split targets during operation. AIPUT would suggest that appropriate penalties to incentivise sustainable transport through modal splits should be considered within the Development Consent Order</p>	
<p>N/A</p>	<p>The transport modelling and hence all the forecast highway impacts, are based on the assumption of minimum parking charges. Any changes in the car parking charging regime compared to that modelled, would nullify the results of the modelling. Of note is that Annex B of the Transport Assessment makes several assumptions on travel costs including costs for car parking / access charges. GAL should provide a summary table of these cost assumptions and provide a commitment that these are the charges that would apply during operation of the Northern Runway. In the absence of such a commitment little weight can be placed on the forecasting methodology which relies on future charges being implemented at a certain level (for example see Annex B Table 24). More detail or commitment on parking charges is therefore required.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3) and Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260] set out the way in which parking charges have been used in the model to reflect future changes to generalised travel cost relative to other modes. GAL has committed in the Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) to use changes in parking charges to support its mode share targets, which are binding under the DCO. It is not necessary to have specific parking charges set within the DCO as there are requirements already in place should proposed measures fail to meet the mode share targets.</p>

2.3 Relevant Representation Report (Traffic and Transport)

2.3.1 Table 2 sets out the Applicant’s response to the matters raised by AIPUT on the Relevant Representation Report.

Table 2 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by AIPUT on the Relevant Representation Report

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
N/A	We do not consider that the capacity forecast will be delivered on the ground because highway schemes do not meet desirable minimum design standards	Please see the response to a similar point later in this table
N/A	There is no headroom in the traffic forecasts at all in terms of highway capacity being able to absorb increases in traffic in the event that the forecasts are even slightly out. Section 6.11 of Annex B to the Transport Assessment explicitly states that forecasting is “inherently uncertain”. In this context it would be reasonable that a range of forecasts are tested in order to ensure that the mitigation proposed is sufficiently durable to absorb changes in traffic forecasts.	The Applicant has responded to the ExA’s question related to sensitivity testing in its answer to TT.1.13 in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16). During the development of model forecasts, and through discussions with key stakeholders including National Highways and SCC and WSCC, sensitivity testing has been used to help understand specific topics in more detail and to help build confidence in the forecasting process, assumptions and outputs.

		<p>As an example, through discussions with National Highways, a test which explored a 10% increase in airport traffic was undertaken to understand the sensitivity of the model in terms of performance of the highway network and its resilience to traffic flows greater than those forecast through the core modelling process.</p> <p>The transport modelling that has been undertaken shows that the highway works proposed as part of the Project are appropriate and can adequately accommodate the expected demand arising from background traffic growth and from the Project with resilience to deal with changes in future traffic forecasts.</p>
N/A	<p>Furthermore, to ensure the traffic modelling proposals are transparent and consulted upon effectively, the Local Model validation Report (LMVR) should be available for public comment in order to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the GHOST model.</p>	<p>As noted in The Applicant’s Response to the Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15) in answer to a similar point from Kent County Council, copies of the Local Model Validation Reports for the strategic and VISSIM modelling were shared with West Sussex County Council, Surrey County Council and National Highways, as the highway authorities for roads in the immediate vicinity of the Airport, as part of ongoing technical engagement during the development of those models. Section 5 of Transport</p>

		<p>Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260] summarises the validation process and key validation outcomes.</p>
N/A	<p>Additionally, the highway improvements are inadequate because they do not meet the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards and hence are unlikely to deliver the theoretical capacity improvements predicted. In the context of the current proposals and level of traffic modelling undertaken, the highway network will be working at the edge of its ability in the future. AIPUT and Motion therefore conclude that despite the additional information provided in the Relevant Representation Report, there is no sufficient evidence to suggest that the concerns raised in AIPUT’s Written Representation at Deadline 1 are addressed.</p>	<p>As set out in Section 6.11 of the Design and Access Statement Volume 5 [APP-257], National Highways’ strategic road network elements have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and Local highway authority roads have been designed in accordance with relevant design standards and guidance including Manual for Streets. Where required, Departures from Standard application submissions have been made to the relevant highway authorities in accordance with the relevant highway authority process. The detailed design of the strategic road network elements of the scheme will be subject to National Highways approval in accordance with the protective provisions for National Highways set out in Schedule 9 Part 3 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6). The detailed design of the local highway authority elements of the scheme will be subject to highway authority approval in accordance with requirement 5 in Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6).</p>

2.4 Surface Access Highways Plans – Structure Section Drawings – For Approval

2.4.1 Table 3 sets out the Applicant’s response to the matters raised by AIPUT on the Surface Access Highways Plans – Structure Section Drawings – For Approval.

Table 3 The Applicant’s Response to the Matters Raised by AIPUT on the Surface Access Highways Plans – Structure Section Drawings – For Approval

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
N/A	<p>The structure section drawings are welcomed by AIPUT and provide some detail to the surface access highway plans being proposed. Motion would like to query on behalf of AIPUT, how the lane widths have been determined. For instance, the two-way single carriage ways are labelled as 7.25m despite a width of 7.3m being the established DMRB requirement, suggesting unfamiliarity with DMRB. AIPUT would also request that dimensioned plans are provided for junctions across the highway network.</p>	<p>It is assumed that the carriageway cross section being referred to is the proposed North Terminal Flyover Link cross section illustrated in Sheet 5 of the Surface Access Highways Plan – Structure Section Drawings (Doc Ref. 4.8.3 v3). This is proposed to be a one way carriageway that is to provide connectivity between Airport Way Westbound and A23 London Road Northbound. The link cross section at the North Terminal Flyover Bridge is comprised of a 3.7m wide single traffic lane for northbound traffic plus a 3.3m wide nearside hard shoulder provision and a 0.3m wide offside hardstrip in line with the DMRB CD 127 'Cross-sections and Headrooms' requirements for an urban all-</p>

purpose connector road. The cross section on Sheet 5 of the **Surface Access Highways Plan – Structure Section Drawings** (Doc Ref. 4.8.3 v3) is being amended at Deadline 3 to correct the typo in the 7.25m carriageway dimension label and confirm the proposed 7.3m wide carriageway provision.

In terms of the proposed carriageway cross section provision elsewhere on the scheme, as set out in Section 6.11 of the **Design and Access Statement Volume 5 [APP-257]**, National Highway’s strategic road network elements have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and Local highway authority roads have been designed in accordance with relevant design standards and guidance including Manual for Streets. Where required Departures from Standard application submissions have been made to the relevant highway authorities in accordance with the relevant highway authority process. The **Surface Access Highways Plans - General Arrangements [APP-020]** illustrate the scheme layout and lane provision on each road including at junctions. Cross sections are included in the proposed **Surface Access Highways Plans - Structure Section**

		<p>Drawings (Doc Ref. 4.8.3 v3) at the scheme structures. A summary of the carriageway cross section provision for each road with reference to the relevant design standards and guidance is provided in Appendix A of this document. Table 2 in Appendix A of the Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport [REP1-065] provides a summary of the cross sections for the schemes active travel infrastructure proposals.</p>
--	--	---

3 Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign

- 3.1.1 The topics raised in Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign’s response to the Applicant’s submissions at Deadline 1 [[REP2-074](#)] are summarised below.
- 3.2 Questions relating to Document 10.9.2 - The Applicant’s Response to Actions - ISH 1: The Case for the Proposed Development
 - 3.2.1 Table 4 sets out the Applicant’s response to the matters raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Applicant’s Response to Actions – ISH1: The Case for the Proposed Development.

Table 4 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Applicant’s Response to Actions – ISH1: The Case for the Proposed Development

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
-----	---------------	--------------------------

N/A	<p>Can the Applicant please advise the thickness of runway removed and thickness of runway replaced during the resurfacing in 2022, and the extent to which the proposed pavement removal and overlay is intended to strengthen the emergency runway pavement?</p>	<p>During the main runway rehabilitation (resurfacing works) completed in 2022, the central keel of the runway (10m either side of the centre line) was resurfaced with an inlay of 110mm placed in two layers, the remaining 10m either side of the central keel received a 50mm inlay. The shoulders were not resurfaced.</p> <p>The existing northern runway is currently utilised as a runway for the entire aircraft fleet mix when the main runway is closed for maintenance. It is therefore already structurally strong enough and the resurfacing will not be strengthening the pavement.</p>
N/A	<p>Please can the Applicant confirm the comparative distribution of passengers for the project and without project cases in 2038 and 2047, both with and without Heathrow Airport expansion?</p> <p>Please can the Applicant confirm whether passengers overnighing in hotel and guesthouse accommodation around the airport are counted as having travelled from there, or from their home postcode?</p>	<p>Outputs by catchment are provided from the modelling undertaken in the Needs Case Technical Appendix [REP1-052] using an updated baseline (2019) and updated longer term demand forecasts (Jet Zero 2023).</p> <p>A summary of the distribution of passengers (excluding transfers) is provided below for the base and NRP, both without LHR:</p>

	Baseline		NRP	
	2038	2047	2038	2047
Greater London	43%	44%	43%	44%
Southeast England	37%	37%	38%	37%
East of England	8%	7%	7%	8%
Southwest England	5%	5%	5%	5%
Midlands	3%	3%	3%	3%
Other	4%	4%	4%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total # (m)	59.6	64.2	72.2	76.6

Passengers overnighting in hotel/guesthouse around the airport are captured as travelling from the local area (within West Sussex, which sits within the Southeast England

		<p>summary provided above). They accounted for approximately 1% of Gatwick’s demand in 2019. This analysis is based on the CAA Survey data.</p> <p>The impact of Heathrow 3R on the forecasts is discussed in Section 7 of Needs Case Technical Appendix [REP1-052].</p>
N/A	Can the Applicant set out the extent of this displacement from other airports, and can the economic benefits attached to this be broken down for clarity.	This is set out in Table 8.1.1 of the Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251].
N/A	As the Project is predicted to increase passenger numbers up until 2047, can these be provided for 2047 too, both with and without the project, so that the increase over the whole project period is clearly set out.	Yes, the annual passenger numbers forecast for 2047 are 67.2 million in the baseline and 80.2 million in the Northern Runway Scenario. This is provided in the Forecast Data Book [APP-075], Table 9.3-1.

<p>N/A</p>	<p>Please can this be justified in terms of need and demand forecasting and in comparison to the Gatwick Airport 2015 second runway expansion plan.</p>	<p>The second runway expansion plan developed during the Airports Commission’s inquiry was a very different scheme to the Northern Runway seeking to build a new runway to the south of the existing runway with an extensive mid-field terminal to handle the passenger traffic.</p> <p>The need is still very relevant, by 2019 demand for the London market had outgrown Government projections (Airports Commission Forecasts from 2013) and Gatwick was already outperforming the Government’s projections for Gatwick’s own through put (more passengers and ATMs).</p> <p>Long term demand growth is expected with the latest Government forecasts predicting demand to increase by nearly 50% in 2050 (versus 2018).</p> <p>Many of the conclusions from the Airports Commission’s findings still stand relating to the need and demand. London is short of airport capacity today and with demand set to grow significantly in the coming decades there will be significant impacts leading to lost demand, lost connectivity, as well as passenger and economic impacts across the wider UK.</p>
------------	---	--

3.3 Questions relating to Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport

3.3.1 Table 5 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport.

Table 5 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
N/A	Please can the data be provided to set out why June is a worse case than August for a) road traffic and b) rail traffic, so the worse case for both the road and rail network has been modelled.	The Applicant provided a technical note commenting on the use of June as a basis for the transport modelling, which forms Appendix B to The Applicant’s Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005].
N/A	Does that mean that the modelling of train services and capacity assumes perfect operation and that typical actual performance, which will include a reduction in capacity due to unreliability, has not been represented? Is that considered by the Applicant to be a realistic scenario?	<p>Please see response to question TT.1.14, in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16) submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>In line with standard practice, all of the rail modelling is based on timetabled services or where new services are proposed and not within the timetable, the anticipated hourly frequency. No account has been taken of cancellations and actual performance against timetabled services on the basis</p>

		<p>that the timetable reflects the operators' anticipated operating plans. The Applicant is continuing to discuss rail crowding analysis and assumptions with Network Rail and GTR and will update the ExA accordingly within the SoCG due at Deadline 5.</p>
<p>N/A</p>	<p>If it is the case that Gatwick Station has not been designed to accommodate the demand that will arise from the Gatwick Northern Runway Project, will that therefore mean that there will be congestion on the platforms which could cause delays to trains accessing the platform, and knock on impacts at other stations?</p>	<p>An assessment of station performance has been undertaken using a Legion model, as set out in Chapter 10 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3) and Transport Assessment Annex D - Station and Shuttle Legion Modelling Report [APP-262]. The modelling and analysis demonstrate that the Project does not require any additional works beyond those already committed to the station to mitigate the Project's impact, as station performance remains acceptable, as described in paragraphs 10.9.2 to 10.9.5 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3).</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with Network Rail on technical matters, including the performance of the station, and these matters will be included in the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Network Rail.</p>

N/A	<p>How has the balance between on-airport and off-airport parking been examined, how was it defined and how will it be delivered?</p>	<p>The Applicant’s achievement of the balance between on-airport and off-airport parking and how it will be delivered is explained further in the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051], particularly at paragraphs 2.4.3, 3.1.1, sections 3.3 and 3.7 and 4.3.2.</p> <p>As explained further in the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051], the Airport's existing Section 106 Agreement includes provisions requiring the Applicant to provide sufficient, but no more than necessary, parking spaces to achieve the specified mode shares. These obligations would effectively be superseded by the Surface Access Commitments if the DCO is granted.</p> <p>As explained further in the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051], local planning policies restrict the level of off-airport parking. Unauthorised off-airport parking is variable and in some cases seasonal. Local authority officers are responsible for enforcement of unauthorised parking. Paragraph 7 of Schedule 3 of the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] secures a contribution paid by the Applicant to Crawley Borough Council for the purposes of off-airport traffic management and/or parking control and</p>
-----	---	---

		<p>enforcement with the intention of limiting unauthorised parking, deterring rat running and maintaining traffic flow, which could be used to employ an Enforcement Officer to be shared across the local authorities to address unauthorised parking.</p> <p>Further detail on how the Applicant will deliver this balance is set out in response to TT.1.40 in The Applicant's Response to EXQ1-Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 10.16).</p>
N/A	<p>What measures has the Applicant considered to prevent any increase in car use as a result of the project, and have those measures been assessed?</p>	<p>The issue of seeking to achieve no car growth as a result of the Project was raised at Issue Specific Hearing 4. There is no policy requirement to completely prevent additional traffic. The Applicant's response, submitted at Deadline 1, can be found in paragraph 6.1.5 of Written Summary of ISH4 Oral Submissions from ISH4 Surface Transport [REP1-059]. The modelling has assessed a number of interventions which would support achieving the mode share commitments which GAL is making in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [APP-090].</p>

N/A	Will the record of this meeting be shared with other interested parties?	Technical engagement is currently underway with Network Rail. Records of specific meetings will not be shared with other parties but the engagement addresses matters which will be included in the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Network Rail and which will record the status of the issues identified. The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter and provide further updates to the SoCG in due course.
-----	--	--

3.4 Questions relating to The Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport

3.4.1 Table 6 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport.

Table 6 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
N/A	Can the Applicant please set out this worse case clearly for all of the topics of the Environmental Statement, not	The Applicant’s methodological approach to the environmental impact assessment, including in respect of the future baseline, is explained in Chapter 6 of the ES

	<p>least for: surface transport, air pollution, noise, climate change, noise and biodiversity impacts.</p>	<p>[APP-031] and additional information has also been provided in response to GEN 1.30 of the ExA’s written Questions (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>
<p>N/A</p>	<p>Has the Applicant carried out sensitivity tests of the scale of these three different types of off-airport parking that could (and already do) occur and, consequently, the impact this would have on the achievement of mode share targets, the extent of the highway network that would be affected and the levels of traffic that would arise? If not, can this please be completed and shared based on available data.</p>	<p>In the latest survey undertaken by Crawley Borough Council there were 23,229 authorised off-airport spaces available and 3,507 vehicles parked in unauthorised sites. This compares with 21,200 and 6,300 respectively assessed in the application. There is annual and seasonal variation in the number of unauthorised spaces related to the enforcement activities of local planning authorities.</p> <p>Apart from providing sufficient parking on-airport, GAL has no control or influence over the extent of off-airport parking, which is controlled through local planning policy and enforcement. The Applicant already consults with local authorities regarding the incidence of parking in local areas and in its Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2), it includes funding for additional enforcement of unauthorised off-airport sites. The draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] secures a contribution paid by the Applicant to Crawley Borough Council for the purposes of off-airport traffic management and/or parking control and</p>

enforcement with the intention of limiting unauthorised parking, deterring rat running and maintaining traffic flow, which could be used to employ an Enforcement Officer to be shared across the local authorities to address unauthorised parking (paragraph 7 of Schedule 3 of the draft **Section 106 Agreement** [\[REP2-004\]](#)). This enforcement will remain the responsibility of the local planning authorities.

Informal parking “rental” on driveways offered by local residents to otherwise unconnected individuals (distinct from friends/relatives) and promoted through websites and apps is not illegal unless there are specific planning restrictions in force. No information is available on the extent to which this is providing airport-related parking capacity, or how much uptake can be directly attributed to airport passengers or staff. Some, but not all of the websites on which these services are advertised provide limited information on the number of times a site has been used, and if a site is available or unavailable for a specified period of time. As this activity cannot be controlled or regulated it is not appropriate to consider any sensitivity testing on its capacity. However, it is noted that sites are generally a single space or very limited number of spaces, spread across a wide

		<p>area, accessed at different times of day. Therefore, the individual and combined traffic impact of this type of parking is anticipated to be relatively limited.</p> <p>Further information is set out in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 10.16) in response to TT.1.6 and TT.1.9.</p>
N/A	Is the Applicant aware of any other inaccurate tables or other data in the documentation?	<p>The Applicant has identified a small number of other errata since ISH4. These are being corrected through an updated version of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3), Transport Assessment Annex E: Highway Junction Review (Doc Ref. 7.4 v2), ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1 v3) , ES Appendix 12.9.1: Highway Flows and Driver Delay Review (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) and ES Appendix 12.9.2: Rail Passenger Flows (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) at Deadline 3.</p>

3.5 Questions and Comments related Questions to Document 10.5 - The Car Parking Strategy

- 3.5.1 Table 7 sets out the Applicant’s response to the matters raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the **Car Parking Strategy** [[REP1-051](#)] submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 7 The Applicant’s Response to Matters raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on Document 10.5 - The Car Parking Strategy

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
N/A	<p>The Car Parking Strategy is self-contradictory. In section 2 (paragraph 2.3.6) it implies that the Applicant’s role in ensuring off-airport parking enforcement and management is sufficiently well planned and resourced is not required as its strategy aims to ensure there is “enough car parking at the airport to meet demand and deter off-airport parking.” However, in section 4 the same strategy states (paragraph 4.5.2) that, “the use of [on-airport] parking charges is part of the suite of measures to influence travel choice and achieve the committed mode shares.” Indeed, the extent that parking constraints support a modal shift from car transport to/from the airport to bus, coach, rail and active transport then it will act as a constraint, so a far more active role in parking policy is requested.</p> <p>Given that the strategy’s stated aim is to be part of the way mode share is to be delivered then the on-airport parking extent and charging will also actively drive off-airport parking. This should be acknowledged by the</p>	<p>The Applicant would direct the respondent to the preceding paragraphs to clarify its reading of paragraph 2.3.6. The referred to paragraph 2.3.6 of the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] describes how the local authorities policy positions in terms of restricting authorised off-airport parking and seeking to enforce planning policy against unauthorised off-airport parking may be upheld only if there is sufficient parking on-airport to meet residual demand. It is noted that this requirement for providing sufficient on-airport parking is also part of a Section 106 Agreement between the Applicant, Crawley Borough Council and West Sussex County Council. In order to support local plan policies the Applicant must provide sufficient on-airport parking, whilst at the same time ensuring there is not an excess of on-airport parking such that its commitments to sustainable travel mode shares are not undermined.</p> <p>Local planning policies are the correct mechanisms for addressing off-airport parking policy and strategy.</p>

	<p>Applicant, and an off-airport parking strategy be developed to show what the overall way parking is to be constrained off-airport for airport passengers and workers, as well as on-airport and forecourt charges.</p>	
	<p>The Surface Access Strategy and Car Parking Strategy should be updated such that the parking strategy, modal shift and achievement of Surface Access Commitments, planned capital investment in transport infrastructure (e.g. increase in road capacity, allocation of road space to buses and active travel, rail investment) and incentives to shift transport (e.g. increased workplace parking levy, subsidised rail and bus fares for passengers and workers) are actively seen as connected, not separate strategies.</p> <p>The Applicant has assumed no change in the quantum and locations of authorised off-airport parking. The total modelling however, should include the total of authorised, and unauthorised sites, inclusive of driveway and street parking. All of this off-airport parking should be modelled, and the strategy should have policies and plans, resources and enforcement mechanisms such</p>	<p>The Applicant has submitted a revised Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3v2) at Deadline 3 which includes a mechanism for independent oversight of the action plans.</p> <p>The way in which the Applicant's existing Airport Surface Access Strategy interacts with the Surface Access Commitments is set out in section 2 of the Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) and paragraphs 8.4.34 and 8.4.35 of the Planning Statement [APP-245]. Further details on the context of the Airport Surface Access Strategy is set out at paragraphs 8.4.3 and 8.4.18 of the Planning Statement [APP-245].</p> <p>The Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3) and Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260] set out the way in which parking has been modelled, included within all airport-related journeys based on extensive data collection. There</p>

	<p>that all of it is sufficiently constrained. The Applicant should set out how it envisages that fly-parking is to be constrained where it is an issue now, and where achievement of the SAC make it likely to become an issue in the future.</p>	<p>are no committed developments for increasing off-airport parking so no change in the amount of off-airport authorised capacity is assumed. Following consultation with local planning authorities no change to the amount of unauthorised (off-street) off-airport parking is assumed.</p> <p>It is noted that it is not possible to determine with certainty if a car parked on-street has carried airport passengers, airport staff or is there for non-airport reasons. On-street parking and use of private driveways and other premises for informal parking “rental” offered by local residents is not found to be significant in the amount of airport parking activity relative to on-airport and off-airport authorised parking sites or control of unauthorised sites that are subject to planning enforcement activity.</p>
	<p>The Applicant’s Car Parking Strategy excludes data on specific car parking charges. In paragraph 3.1.2 it is noted that “GAL uses variable parking charges to optimise the occupancy of spaces”, and in paragraph 4.5.5 it is noted that “GAL is not committing to implement a specific level of charge”. The level of parking charges and the availability of free parking are</p>	<p>On-airport parking charges vary by parking product, time of year and availability, depending on demand. Further information on the factors influencing parking charges is contained in the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051]. Charges applying to air passenger spaces are available on the Applicant’s website The Applicant manages pricing and capacity in a way that supports delivery of the sustainable</p>

<p>important influences on car use by airport staff, passengers and other visitors, and therefore a significant factor in the achievement of mode share targets. Car use will also be influenced by the proximity of car parking spaces to on-airport work locations and other destinations. The absence of any specific data on the level of car parking charges is a significant gap in the Car Parking Strategy. Can the Applicant describe the existing level of car parking charges or, if variable, the range and how it is applied for staff and passengers, how this changed between pre-covid and post-covid, the extent of free parking for staff and airport visitors, and pre-covid and post-covid changes in the location of parking for staff and visitors relative to on-airport work and other destinations, and any planned future changes.</p>	<p>mode targets set out in the Airport Surface Access Strategy and this is evidenced by the continued increase in public transport mode share delivered at the same time as an increase in parking charges and capacity below the level of growth experienced at the Airport over the decade leading up to the Covid pandemic. On-airport parking is provided at a number of different locations with passenger parking provided either within walking distance of the terminals or remotely with a connecting bus Service. Limited staff parking is available within walking distance of terminals and other workplaces and the remaining staff parking is supported by a connecting bus service.</p> <p>The Applicant has no influence over charges that may apply for any off-airport parking.</p>
<p>The Car Parking Strategy (reference 10.5) appears to be primarily an on-airport parking strategy. Although it notes four different types of airport related parking (paragraph 1.1.2) it deems that ‘all off-airport parking provision are matters for local planning authorities ...’ so limits GAL’s commitment to on-airport parking and providing financial support for off-airport parking.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Applicant has no control over off-airport operations, local plan policies restricting or permitting off-airport parking, no enforcement responsibilities for off-airport unauthorised parking and no ability to restrict or otherwise influence individual property owners in the area from legally renting</p>

	<p>However, as the car parking strategy is completely silent on what constitutes sufficient “policy, parking standards, enforcement and management” for off-airport parking (as noted in paragraph 1.1.2) it appears to be only half a car parking strategy. Whilst the Applicant has direct control over on-airport parking it should accept responsibility of the extent to that its current operations, future operations, and proposed project have an impact on off-airport parking, and that the extent of finance and/or other resources provided by the Applicant, will deem the extent to which off-airport parking is controlled. This must go beyond plan policies (see paragraphs 2.3.2-4) and enforcement (2.3.5).</p>	<p>parking spaces within their own premises. As a result, the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051], whilst acknowledging the role of wider parking provision in the area, sets out the measures and approach that the Applicant will take to manage on-airport parking in a way that supports the mode share targets committed under the DCO. Any significant increases to off-airport parking may undermine the achievement of those mode share targets and increase car travel contrary to the approach proposed by the Applicant.</p>
--	---	--

3.6 Comments on the Document 10.2, the Relevant Representations Report

3.6.1 Table 8 sets out the Applicant’s response to the matters raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Relevant Representations Report.

Table 8 The Applicant’s Response to Matters raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Relevant Representations Report.

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
-----	---------------	--------------------------

N/A	<p>Can the Applicant set out why it appears this applies uniquely to Gatwick rather than at other airports, and why a future planning application that is neither drafted nor submitted that might limit the design life of the runway in future (or not, if it does not occur) should be given weight for this DCO application?</p>	<p>The Applicant has not relied on a future planning application when determining the appropriate design life of the NRP to assess for climate change purposes. As explained at paragraph 3.7.6 of ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment Version 2 [AS-078], the design life has been selected having regard to the reasonably foreseeable future for the Project given the dynamic and changing nature of the aviation industry.</p> <p>It should be noted that the fluvial flood risk mitigation strategy does not in effect differentiate between the two design lives. The mitigation strategy as reported in ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment [AS-078] has been developed holistically and mitigates fluvial impacts for all Project elements up to the Central allowance of 1% (1 in 100) + 20% climate change event (the 2080s epoch). In effect therefore, the Project provides additional mitigation beyond that required for the airfield and associated elements given their shorter assumed design life of 40 years, equating to a 100-year design life for the whole project.</p> <p>Furthermore, in accordance with Environment Agency guidance, a more extreme climate change scenario: the</p>
-----	--	---

		Critical Maximum Scenario, has also been assessed (see Section 3.7 of ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment [AS-078], which has not identified any additional significant effects.
--	--	---

3.7 Questions and Comments related to 10.10 Technical Note on the Future Baseline and 10.6 Needs Case Technical Appendix

3.7.1 Table 9 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Technical Note on the Future Baseline and the Needs Case Technical Appendix.

Table 9 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by Gatwick Area Conservation Campaign on the Technical Note on the Future Baseline and the Needs Case Technical Appendix

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
N/A	Can the Applicant please explain and quantify how the demand for peak spreading at Gatwick Airport in future is predicted to be affected by a possible expansion of Heathrow Airport, and to what extent are the overall trends in the London aviation market shaped by available slots (even if at less desirable times)?	<p>The baseline and Northern Runway scenarios assumed that peak spreading would continue, reflecting a combination of current trends, including an increasing share of year round long haul traffic.</p> <p>Under the sensitivity testing for LHR R3, Gatwick is forecast to ‘lose’ some long haul traffic to Heathrow whilst the LCC short haul segment will be less impacted owing to the challenges of operating these business models at LHR</p>

		<p>(even higher charges under R3, operational challenges limit LCC business models). Lost demand will be backfilled by other carriers / markets, for example carriers have typically favoured deployment at Gatwick over other London airports such as Luton.</p> <p>Gatwick is expected to remain highly congested in the peak months (as it already has been for the last 10+ years) although a shift towards more short haul markets may result in a slightly peakier schedule than that assumed under the baseline cases (i.e. Gatwick with and without the Northern Runway)</p>
--	--	--

4 Holiday Extras Ltd

- 4.1.1 The Applicant notes the submissions made by Holiday Extras Ltd to the Applicant's submissions at Deadline 1 in respect of the **Car Parking Strategy** [\[REP1-051\]](#) and related matters. In view of their extent/detail, the Applicant has not provided a summary response for this deadline and will instead consider all comments received and provide a full response at Deadline 4; however, in the interim would also direct attention to the Applicant's response in respect of the following matters:
- 4.1.2 In respect of Green Controlled Growth:
- 4.1.2.1. the Applicant's response to the matters raised in the Written Representation from Surrey County Council in **The Applicant's Response to the Written Representations** (Doc Ref 10.14);
 - 4.1.2.2. the Applicant's response to the matters raised in the Written Representation from Surrey County Council in **The Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Reports** (Doc Ref 10.15); and
 - 4.1.2.3. in addition, the Applicant refers to its submissions on the principle of managed growth, including by comparison to Luton's Green Controlled Growth approach, in Section 5 of its **Summary of Oral submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 2** [\[REP1-057\]](#).
- 4.1.3 In respect of the mode share commitments and the interaction between the Surface Access Commitments and the Airport Surface Access Strategy:
- 4.1.3.1. The Applicant has submitted a revised **Surface Access Commitments** (Doc Ref. 5.3v2) at Deadline 3 which includes a mechanism for independent oversight of the action plans;
 - 4.1.3.2. The way in which the Applicant's existing Airport Surface Access Strategy interacts with the Surface Access Commitments is set out in section 2 of the Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3v2) and paragraphs

8.4.34 and 8.4.35 of the **Planning Statement** [\[APP-245\]](#). Further details on the context of the Airport Surface Access Strategy is set out at paragraphs 8.4.3 and 8.4.18 of the **Planning Statement** [\[APP-245\]](#); and

4.1.3.3. The funding commitments set out in the SAC are secured in Schedule 3 of the **draft Section 106 Agreement** [\[REP2-004\]](#).

4.1.4 In respect of Rail Capacity Issues, the Applicant notes the response provided below at Section 6.16 in response to National Highways' comments on the Written Representation of the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (CILT) Deadline 1 Submission.

4.1.5 In respect of the Hilton Hotel car parking spaces. MSCP7 and the use of robotics technology:

4.1.5.1. The Applicant notes the response at section 4.6 of **The Applicant's Responses to Actions - ISHs 2-5** [\[REP2-005\]](#) and the Applicant's response to TT.1.38 in the in **Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport** (Doc Ref. 10.16).

5 Legal Partnership Authorities

5.1.1 The topics raised in the Legal Partnership Authorities’ response to the Applicant’s submissions at Deadline 1 [[REP2-081](#)] are summarised below.

5.2 10.8.2 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH 1: The Case for the Proposed Development

5.2.1 Table 10 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH 1: The Case for the Proposed Development.

Table 10 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH1: The Case for the Proposed Development

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
3.1.4	<p>It is important to highlight, as does Heathrow Airport Ltd in its Written Representation (REP1-192), that it is of particular relevance that the ANPS requires applicants seeking to make best use of their existing runways need to demonstrate that there is a need distinct from that need, particularly for hub airport capacity, that would be met by the provision of an additional runway at Heathrow.</p> <p>This is material as the Authorities consider GAL has not yet demonstrated that its projected demand forecasts</p>	<p>This is a misreading or a partial reading of the ANPS. Read as a whole, paragraph 1.42 clearly states that any application to make more intensive use of existing runways “<i>should be judged on the application’s individual merits.</i>”</p> <p>What then follows, which commences with “However...”, is intended to be positive, helpful and encouraging. In contrast with paragraph 1.41 which could be read to suggest that the need has been met by the new runway at Heathrow. In the light of the conclusions of the Airports Commission which are referenced at paragraph 1.6, the paragraph explains that it</p>

adequately take into account the extent to which at least some element of the projected future demand with the NRP relates to demand that could only be met at Heathrow with its specific hub role, such that there is a part of the passenger demand forecast for the NRP that is unlikely to be realised. The Authorities consider that the ‘top down’ benchmarking of the demand projections put forward by GAL has not appropriately taken account of the specific ANPS requirement to demonstrate that the need which GAL proposes to meet is “additional to (or different from) the need which is met by the provision of a Northwest Runway at Heathrow” as set out at paragraph 1.42 of the ANPS.

may well be possible for applicants to show a sufficient need for their proposals additional to or different from the need with is met by a new runway at Heathrow.

The words do not say that such a need must be shown for an application to be acceptable. Those words are not there. The paragraph is positive, not restricting. The ANPS is encouraging applicants to be aware that there may well be a need; not stating “*you must show a need*” – the two are very different.

Consistently with the referenced paragraph 1.6, the ANPS is signposting the applicant to the work of the Airports Commission who found that there is an “*imperative need to grow domestic and international capacity.*”

And paragraph 1.42 obviously follows paragraph 1.39 which has already established that the Government is “*supportive of airports beyond Heathrow making best use of their existing runways*” – without qualification (ie not saying, only if you can show a need) or precondition.

The same policy is set out in Beyond the Horizon, published in the same month, without reference to having to show a

		<p>need or any reference to needing to demonstrate complementarity with Heathrow.</p> <p>The JLAs have taken part of the paragraph to assert a policy test which is not expressed.</p> <p>Inescapably, the Secretary or his Inspectors have said as much in decisions applying the policy at Stansted (paragraph 17) and Manston (paragraph 37). Read fairly, the words of the ANPS do not create a doubt but, if any doubt is claimed, the Secretary of State has settled it.</p> <p>At Manston, the Secretary of State did make reference to need – not as a test or policy requirement but as a benefit. (Manston paragraph 37).</p> <p>The question might be asked: why make reference at all to a need additional to or different form a new runway at Heathrow? In Gatwick’s view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The government did not want to give any impression that its policy for R3 at Heathrow was the end of the need;
--	--	---

- it wanted to encourage other airports to recognise that there was still a need and to come forward with applications (it was “*imperative*” that they did);
- Government was signaling that it was not going to argue that there was no such need if an application came forward for MBU;
- It is well known that the existence of a need helps to generate benefits in a development to offset against impacts that invariably arise from airport development. Encouraging the idea that a need is likely to exist is helpful in that context – but it is plainly not expressed as a precondition.

Even if such a pre-condition did exist the Applicant’s application would meet it. No party seriously suggests that the airport is not busy to the point where it is showing signs of a lack of resilience, particularly in the peak hours from extreme demand from low cost carriers to utilise the first cycle of the day. The need for additional capacity to relieve that condition is uniquely a Gatwick need.

The fact that some of Gatwick’s growth would be long haul is not a reason to argue that such growth must only / can only be met at Heathrow (with the consequence that it will and should not be met if the third runway is not developed at Heathrow). It is apparent from the Airports Commission Final Report (paras. 16.40-43) that the Commission positively applauded MBU if it secured long haul traffic (and the same is true of the APF at paragraph 1.24). The Luton Rising DCO application forecast and made a virtue of its potential to secure long haul traffic in the name of MBU.

In the absence of a third runway at Heathrow, Gatwick is attracting and will attract long haul traffic. In the interests of the UK, that should be seen as a positive benefit.

No party appears to be saying that any airport but Gatwick can expand and can attract long haul traffic (and such an argument would be both remarkable and contrary to the ANPS and Beyond the Horizon).

At Manston (paragraph 48) the Secretary of State recognised that the UK’s airports are largely privatised; they compete with each other in a competitive international market. He

made clear that the Government continues to welcome private investment in airport infrastructure.

The Secretary of State was not willing to hold up investment in one airport in case other investment came forward elsewhere (Manston paragraph 97).

If he did, and that other investment did not come forward, “*imperative*” needs would not be met and the national interest would be harmed.

Gatwick recognises that the opening of R3 at Heathrow would cause much of Gatwick’s long haul traffic to be lost to Heathrow, because of the greater attraction to long haul of a hub airport. In its **Needs Case Technical Appendix [REP1-052]** submitted at Deadline 1, GAL tested the impact of Heathrow R3 on Gatwick and reported as follows:

“At Gatwick two major impacts arise, firstly the opening of LHR R3 has a significant impact on long haul volumes. Secondly, the lost long-haul demand at Gatwick is in part back filled by short haul demand reflecting LGW’s strong positioning within this market segment. Consequently, LGW

		<p><i>and LHR are both forecast to be operating at approximately 90% of their capacity in the 2040s.”</i></p> <p>In these circumstances, it is not clear what public (or private) interest is being protected by an argument that Gatwick can only grow if its growth is unrelated to growth that would be attracted to Heathrow if Heathrow had a third runway; or where that case can be found in policy.</p>
3.1.5	<p>The application of sections 104 and 105 of the Planning Act 2008 is considered in the Joint West Sussex LIR [REP1-068] at paragraph 6.3 to 6.10 and in the joint LIR prepared by the Surrey local authorities [REP1-097] at paragraph 4.3 to 4.10. Further discussions with the Applicant are ongoing to see if a common position can be reached, potentially by Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to this point in summary in The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15) and will continue to engage with the JLAs on this subject to see if common ground can be reached.</p>
3.1.7ff/ 3.1.36	<p>The Authorities are grateful for the additional construction information provided by the Applicant in [REP1-062] and for the cross-sections in Appendix B. However, the information provided on the drainage arrangements for the works is lacking in sufficient detail to allow the Authorities to form a view on whether it</p>	<p>The existing Northern Runway currently operates a linear slot drain along the northern edge at the interface of the runway and shoulder. This slot drain will therefore be removed when the runway is repositioned. The current slot drain to be removed is not as deep as the proposed full depth construction so will not require remediation at a depth greater</p>

	<p>would be possible to retain the bulk of the substrata of the runway (as implied by the crosssections). The cross-sections do not provide any details of the drainage arrangements. Further comments are made in response to the Applicant’s response to Action Points 4 and 5 in [REP1-062].</p>	<p>than shown on the Indicative Cross-Sections, contained in Appendix B of The Applicant’s Response to ISH1 Actions [REP1-062].</p> <p>The new drainage system to be installed for the repositioned northern runway will be constructed as part of the northern shoulder’s construction (as shown on Appendix B on REP1-062). The composition of the drainage is yet to be confirmed but will comprise of either a slot drain or using a series of gullies as per the existing arrangements on the Main Runway.</p>
3.1.28	<p>The Authorities consider that GAL’s statement in this regard seeks to infer too much from the inclusion of the NRP in the Jet Zero modelling. The Authorities certainly concur that the modelling exercise (and the inputs to it) is not a policy statement. However, the Authorities do not accept that it can be inferred that what has been modelled is necessarily consistent with Government policy as regards capacity. In its Jet Zero modelling, the Department for Transport sought to test the climate change/carbon implications of potential air passenger demand growth overall. In so doing, it took into account the extent to which growth might ultimately be priced off</p>	<p>The Applicant does not understand why the JLAs are trying so hard to deny the words written by the Government in the Jet Zero Modelling Framework – or to avoid quoting them.</p> <p>The Applicant’s point is straight forward. In Its Jet Zero Modelling Framework, published in March 2022, the Government said this:</p> <p><i>“In June 2018, the government set out its policy support for airports to make best use of their existing runways in Beyond the Horizon: The future of UK aviation: making best use of existing runways (“MBU”) and a new runway at Heathrow</i></p>

due to capacity constraints at particular airports. In order to test the ceiling on UK level carbon impacts, it in essence, allowed all airports to grow unconstrained by short term capacity limitations up to what were considered longer term limits. That does not of itself imply that any individual capacity expansion is consistent with Government policy overall, rather that expansion of capacity to the level proposed under the NRP would not, of itself, compromise the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets. This not quite the same as implying that somehow the inclusion of the NRP capacity within the Jet Zero modelling implied that the extent of capacity was accepted as consistent with policy as the total volume of airport capacity tested in the modelling far exceeded the capacity required to meet the level of underlying demand projected for the UK as a whole. Each airport must still demonstrate a specific level of demand (need) for their expansion proposals in terms of the contribution to meeting their own share of demand projected for the UK as a whole. The Authorities do not consider that

*Airport in the Airports National Policy Statement: new runway capacity and infrastructure at airports in the South East of England (ANPS), subject to related economic and environmental considerations. In common with the Jet Zero Consultation **the capacity assumptions in our modelling reflect and are aligned with these policies.***” (Jet Zero Modelling Framework para 3.18.) (emphasis added)

Annex D to the Modelling Framework (page 50) **shows the modelling assumption of 386,000 ATMs for Gatwick.**

The Applicant is not over-stating the case when it points out that the Government identified the NRP as a project consistent with its MBU policies and included the NRP in its Jet Zero modelling, with the consequences reported in its Jet Zero Strategy.

	<p>GAL has yet adequately substantiated its share of overall demand.</p>	
<p>3.1.32</p>	<p>It is recognised that case law (subject to the forthcoming Appeal in respect of the Manston Airport DCO decision) is clear that there is no requirement to take into account the extent to which capacity expansion may come forward at other airports. In the Manston Airport decision,¹ the Secretary of State states at paragraph 37: “The Secretary of State agrees with the Applicant that the ANPS does not provide an explanation of ‘sufficient need’. He also agrees that the MBU policy, which is relevant to this Application, does not require making best use developments to demonstrate a need for their proposals to intensify use of an existing runway or for any associated Air Traffic Movements (“ATMs”).</p> <p>The Secretary of State notes, however, that the MBU policy states that a decision-maker, in taking a decision on an application, must take careful account of all relevant considerations, particularly economic and environmental impacts and proposed mitigations (MBU paragraph 1.29). The Secretary of State considers that</p>	<p>Paragraph 37 in the decision letter at Manston records the Secretary of State explaining that he needs to assess whether “<i>the expected economic benefits will outweigh the expected environmental and other impacts from this Development.</i>”</p> <p>In doing so he states that his consideration will include a range of issues, including “<i>the likely usage of the Development.</i>”</p> <p>There is nothing here with which the Applicant disagrees.</p> <p>There was a particular issue at Manston. The airport was closed and parties disputed whether it was viable to reopen it. There was a particular need there to test whether the usage of the development was likely.</p> <p>However, even if that were not the case, the likely usage of the airport is, of course, relevant. At Gatwick, the Applicant has forecast the use of the airport and assessed the benefits</p>

the benefits expected from a proposed development would materialise if there is a need for that development. Therefore, in order to assess whether the expected economic benefits will outweigh the expected environmental and other impacts from this Development, the Secretary of State has considered need in the context of identifying the likely usage of the Development from the evidence submitted in the Examining Authority's Report, the Independent Assessor's Report and the representations submitted by Interested Parties during the redetermination process...

In this context, specific emphasis is placed on the projections of usage, i.e. the demand forecasts, in terms of assessing whether there is a need for a specific development. It is in this regard, that the Authorities continue to have concerns regarding the projections of likely usage of Gatwick Airport with and without the NRP. In addition, it remains important for any proposals other than at Heathrow to show that the need to be met by those proposals is "additional to (or different from) the need which is met by the provision of a Northwest

and the impacts of that usage. It agrees that these matters are relevant to the examination.

If the JLAs doubt the forecasts, that is potentially material, although they need to substantiate their case.

However, there is nothing in the Manston decision which supports the JLA's assertion that "*it remains important for any proposals other than at Heathrow to show that the need to be met by those proposals is "additional to (or different from) the need which is met by the provision of a Northwest Runway at Heathrow."*

	Runway at Heathrow” (as is required by para 1.42 of the ANPS.	
4.1.3	The Authorities consider that GAL is overstating its latent attractiveness to long haul carriers and considers that those airlines and routes that have seen growth at Gatwick have been predominantly in leisure markets, such as Air Mauritius.	<p>Historically Gatwick has supported a highly successful leisure long haul flight program alongside many carriers serving key business-oriented markets.</p> <p>Gatwick’s recent track record demonstrates its attractiveness to all business models and markets.</p> <p>Recent long-haul growth has been driven by carriers including JetBlue, Air India, Air China, China Eastern, Saudi Arabian Airlines, Delta Airlines, Ethiopian Airlines, China Southern Airlines amongst others.</p> <p>Many of these carriers are amongst the world’s largest airlines serving important destinations for UK connectivity (New York, Shanghai, Beijing, Boston, etc.).</p>

5.3 10.9.2 The Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH1: The Case for the Proposed Development

5.3.1 Table 11 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ response to the Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH1: The Case for the Proposed Development.

Table 11 The Applicant’s Response to Matters raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH1: The Case for the Proposed Development

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 3.3.8	<p>In respect of paragraph 3.3.8, whilst the Government has allowed for the potential increase in capacity that the NRP could provide in assessing its overall UK air passenger growth forecasts and their consistency with achieving the Jet Zero targets, this should not be taken to imply that the demand projections by the Department for Transport mean that the capacity would be fully taken up over the timeframe. There is still a requirement for the Applicant to demonstrate that its forecasts of usage are robust as a basis for assessing the benefits and harms associated with making best use. The Authorities do not consider that it has yet done so.</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees and has not argued otherwise.</p>
Para 3.5.4	<p>In respect of paragraph 3.5.4, the Applicant wrongly highlights the physical works that formed part of the original planning application submitted in 2012, prior to the MBU, as being part of the recently approved application to vary conditions attaching to the original planning consent. These works were in the main</p>	<p>The Applicant accepts this correction – the description of development in the decision letter of 13 October 2023 records the development being applied for, just as GAL recorded it.</p> <p>However, the Applicant acknowledges that this Luton application was largely an application to vary conditions and</p>

	<p>completed by the time of the MBU policy, including the road works highlighted.</p>	<p>that operational development had largely taken place under an earlier consent, dated October 2017.</p> <p>The point remains, however, that substantial operational development was consented at Luton to make better use of the airport four years after the policy of MBU was re-expressed in the APF and a year after the publication of the ANPS.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the JLA's response does not take issue with the principle of the point being made by it, namely that substantial operational development has been consented at four airports in the name of MBU and that more is proposed in the Luton Rising DCO application.</p>
<p>Action Points 4 and 5</p>	<p>As part of the Accompanied Site Visit on 7th March, the current northern runway was visited. The submitted information does not reflect the understanding of the runway construction witnessed at the site visit by Jean McPherson of Crawley Borough Council. Currently the emergency runway is effectively divided into 3 sections. There is a central runway strip which is deeper and stronger to accommodate the weight of the aircraft. On</p>	<p>The existing Northern Runway is not cambered but falls to the north, therefore the area that was inspected is the location of the existing drainage collection for the runway. The shoulder on the south side of the existing northern runway therefore does not contain a drain.</p> <p>The intention is to maintain this arrangement in the proposed works to reposition the northern runway and therefore there is</p>

either side of the runway is a shallower depth strip of concrete (the shoulders) which are distinguished in situ by two solid white lines running parallel with the main centre line of the runway. Within the centre of the white line runs a slot drain. Ms McPherson inspected the northern section of the shoulder on the site visit and assumes that the construction arrangement would be mirrored on the southern side (as logically drainage would need to disperse evenly off both sides of the runway). The description of works in para 4.1.3 highlight 'replacement of drainage' as a key construction element. The cross sections submitted do not show this drainage arrangement or any drainage arrangement as existing or proposed, just a footnote they would be developed during detailed design. (For instance, Drawing SK-001 is unscaled and it is unclear where the cross section is drawn from along the runway). If the Applicant were to mirror the present arrangement, in order to create a new runway 15 shoulder on the south side, a new runway shoulder line would need to be created 7.5m from the edge of the repositioned runway and therefore a new drainage channel would need to be cut into the original runway. This could involve considerable engineering

no requirement to cut into the original runway construction to create a drainage run on the south side. The proposed drainage is yet to be confirmed at this stage, but will comprise of either a slot drain or using a series of gullies as per the existing arrangements on the Main Runway and will be constructed at the same time as new shoulder area is completed.

Further information on the drainage arrangements is provided in response to the Legal Partnership Authorities' Response to The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH1 (Item 3.1.7ff/3.1.36 above) which should be read alongside the explanation on the surfacing work for the repositioned northern runway in the **The Applicant's Response to ISH1 Actions** [[REP1-062](#)].

	<p>work (given the depth of the runway at 1.5m). This is not referred to at all in the Applicants description of works at paragraphs 4.1.7 to 4.1.10 [REP1-062] and an explanation as to why not would we welcomed. As a general point, Ms McPherson considers the information provided under Action Points 4 and 5 to be very limited. For context, the Appendix to this Table includes a photograph (taken from the northern runway) and which clearly shows the white line under which there is a drainage system. No drainage system is shown on the over-simplified cross-sections which the Applicant has provided).</p>	
<p>Action Point 8</p>	<p>Because of the shortcomings in the Applicant’s approach to assessing how Gatwick would compete with other airports and its reliance on top down benchmarking of its projections against the DfT’s overall UK air passenger forecasts that assume growth at Heathrow in its hub role, the Authorities do not consider that the totality of demand growth with the NRP can be considered as additional at the total system level.</p>	<p>In parallel to understanding Gatwick’s demand from a bottom-up approach, a robust top-down approach has also been considered factoring in the wider UK demand for aviation.</p> <p>Therefore, the additional demand generated by the NRP is not all considered additional, whilst there is still a significant benefit to the total UK air passengers modelled there is some degree of displacement.</p>

To the extent that there is a greater proportion of demand that is displaced, the user benefits will have been materially overstated by the Applicant.

Furthermore, the approach to estimating air fare savings using fares applying over the whole London airport system, including fares commanded at Heathrow that tend to be higher than at the other airports, the Authorities consider that the air fare saving benefits have been overstated, compounding the overestimation of the benefits of the NRP. This is material in so far as the benefits are a relevant planning consideration in terms of weighing against the harms arising from the NRP.

For example, some demand that is spilt to the UK's regional airports in a 'do nothing' case is re-accommodated across the London airports whilst Gatwick's traffic is also shown to impact the traffic (and mix) at other London airports including Stansted and Luton.

This is incorporated into the economic appraisal as set out in Table 8.1.1 of the **Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment** [[APP-251](#)].

The methodology for estimating benefits from air fare savings follows the most recent TAG guidance (TAG Unit A5.2). The mechanism the methodology captures is a reduction in air fares due to the Project, which are higher than they would be, absent the Project, due to capacity constraints in the London system. The Applicant's analysis uses 2019 average London-wide fares broken down by haul and passenger type.

Although market circumstances might differ between airports, all airports in the London system compete with each other. For instance, while Gatwick and Luton primarily compete on short-haul routes, Gatwick and Heathrow also compete on long-haul destinations. According to CAA Airport Statistics in 2023, 58% of long haul routes offered by Gatwick, were also

		<p>offered by Heathrow Airport. Likewise, 66% of short haul routes offered by Gatwick were offered by Luton Airport. These statistics are an under-estimate of the extent of competition, since passengers (especially on long-haul routes) can choose different routes, including transfers, when choosing between competing London airports, and these choices aren't captured in these percentages.</p> <p>Therefore, while market circumstances at each airport influence fares, by looking at fares by haul and passenger type, we expect that fares would be concentrated around a central average price due to competition. As such, the Applicant believes that using a London-wide approach to estimate air fares results in a robust estimation of passenger benefits from fare savings.</p>
--	--	--

5.4 [10.8.3 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH2: Control Documents / DCO](#)

5.4.1 Table 12 sets out the Applicant's response to matters raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities' response to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH2: Control Documents / DCO.

Table 12 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH2: Control Documents / DCO

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 3.1.5	<p>This could be a matter of concern to the Authorities, as if there is concern about surface access. Also, a movement only cap could result in more movements by heavier and noisier aircraft carrying more passengers placing greater importance on a robust Noise Envelope.</p>	<p>Whether it is likely that future aircraft at Gatwick Airport will be heavier, is a matter for the forecasts on which the ES is based. The ES assesses the likely significant effects of the NRP. It has not been the JLA’s case that the outcome expressed in its ‘concern’ is likely.</p> <p>If it were, the appropriate response is to consider the requirements for noise mitigation, not a passenger cap.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded further on the question of a passenger cap in response to the questions from the ExA, particularly ExQ1 DCO.1.40 (R19) (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>
Para 3.1.25	<p>The Applicant’s response does not make it clear whether the retention of existing night movement controls (i) only applies in circumstances of no development or (ii) would continue to apply with the NRP. This should be clarified.</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to the immediately preceding paragraph 3.1.24 of its Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH2 [REP1-057]: <i>"The Applicant confirmed that the Project is being taken forward on the basis of the existing core night flight regime and noted that the DfT consultation on the regime does not seek to change</i></p>

		<i>the current controls. The Project would not require a change to the level of night flights considered appropriate by government."</i>
Para 5.1.9	The Authorities are concerned that the proposed approach to ensuring the noise envelope is not breached are not robust in terms of the timing when action would be taken, against a forecast breach, and the ability to manage slot allocation. As proposed, slots could already have been allocated to airlines such that a breach could not be prevented. The Authorities consider that forward looking noise budgets should be used to control the allocation of slots to ensure that the noise envelope is not breached.	The Applicant refers to its responses to rows 14.1D and 14.1V in its Response to the Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15) on the operation of the noise envelope and the adequacy of processes and sanctions in the event of a forecast or actual breach.

5.5 10.9.3 The Applicant's Response to Actions from ISH2: Control Documents / DCO

5.5.1 Table 13 sets out the Applicant's response to Matters Raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities' Response to the Applicant's Response to Actions from ISH2: Control Documents / DCO.

Table 13 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH2: Control Documents / DCO

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Action Point 1 2.1.5	Whilst the Authorities accept the exclusion of such ‘emergency flights’ as defined by the Secretary of State, the Applicant does not address how other non-commercial flights, e.g. business aviation activity, would be controlled. The Authorities request that an explanation is provided.	As noted in response to this Action Point, Requirement 19(1) imposes an ATM cap on the airport in respect of ‘commercial air transport movements’. Whilst the term ‘commercial’ is referenced in the requirement, the definition of ‘commercial air transport movements’ in Requirement 1(1) of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO confirms this covers all ‘air transport movements with the exception of diverted or emergency flights.’ Accordingly, non-commercial flights, e.g. business aviation, would be subject to the same control as commercial flights for the purposes of this Requirement as they do not constitute emergency or diverted flights and so fall within the limited exception.
Action Point 3	The controls described appear to deal with aircraft safety. They do not address environmental controls which may be necessary; for example, drainage infrastructure and the management of flood risk on and off site which are critical in this location given the	The ExA requested information about compliance of Work Nos. 2-7 with the Civil Aviation Authority controls.

<p>position of the River Mole and the extent of the floodplain. If flood mitigation structures and measures are removed to facilitate these works and there is no compensation provided (or provided at the end of construction) then this could increase the risk of flooding elsewhere if flood compensation capacity is temporarily lost. This is why a detailed understanding of the sequencing and interaction between various works elements is so important. GAL seem to have expanded this point a little in 10.1.9 and 10.1.10 of their submission but the Authorities will need to double-check the level of detail in the control documents mentioned (for instance, ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment [AS-078] and ES Appendix 5.3.3: Indicative Construction Sequencing [AS-088]). It is of note that the Flood Risk Assessment is not a certified document and so not listed in Schedule 12 to the dDCO [REP1-004] and the Authorities would welcome an explanation as to why this is the case.</p>	<p>The environmental controls which may be necessary for the Project are described in the Planning Statement [APP-245] and the Mitigation Route Map [REP2-011].</p> <p>In relation specifically to flood risk, DCO Requirement 23 requires a flood compensation delivery plan setting out the timeframe for delivering the key flood compensation measures to be approved prior to the first works in the floodplain being commenced.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment forms part of the Environmental Statement and will therefore be certified in that regard. The Environmental Statement is listed in Schedule 12 of the draft DCO [REP1-004].</p>
---	--

<p>Action Points 4 and 5</p>	<p>A minor point in respect of hotels and evidence given by GAL at ISH1 that the hotels were not required to achieve the baseline (but were justified for inclusion as part of the DCO proposal). Here the evidence suggests they would be built before the suggested baseline passenger limit is exceeded</p>	<p>This issue is addressed in response to the ExA’s question GEN.1.24 (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>
<p>Action Point 8</p>	<p>Paragraph 10.1.3 lists the works the Applicant considers have a mitigatory function. It is noted Work No. 41 (ecological area at Pentagon Field) is listed; however, this is already (in part) an ecological area as the site was identified for tree planting and habitat mitigation when the North West stands were developed. There is a risk of double counting here. GAL also exclude the fact that they are using this site for the deposit of at least 4 metres of soil (from other works sites) during the construction phase process before creating the ecological area referenced. So, the position is not as straightforward in respect of the Work No. 41 site as suggested by the Applicant.</p>	<p>The area of existing planting to the west and south of Pentagon Field has not been included in the assessment of the planting to be included as part of the Project which comprises additional tree planting to the east of the Pentagon field. The ecological benefit assessed as part of the Project only includes the additional areas of planting, not existing areas of mitigation planting. The exclusion of the North West Stands mitigation woodland planting from consideration with the assessment of the NRP is shown by its exclusion from the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) calculations (see Figures 2.1 et seq. ES Appendix 9.9.2 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement [REP2- 029])</p>

<p>Action Point 9</p>	<p>The Authorities consider the Applicant’s answer does not fully address the question posed. GAL define their land into 4 ‘categories’ but do not provide any plan to explain this and they present a rather oversimplified picture of the operational land situation at the airport. As worded, it appears that GAL are seeking all land in categories A B and C to become operational land under the DCO, and this is of concern to the Authorities as areas used for environmental mitigation etc. such as Pentagon Field and Museum Field would become operational land, potentially allowing further airfield infrastructure, but in particular airport parking, to be expanded beyond the areas currently specified in the dDCO. GAL should provide a clear plan to accompany the written explanation provided. It is noted that GAL have provided an ‘Airport boundary plan’ which they seek to get approved as Certified document APP-004 –However, it shows a different boundary to the DCO Limits and an explanation for this disparity should be provided.</p>	<p>Conversely, the Applicant considers that <i>"operational land"</i> is a fact-specific designation that cannot be simplified into a plan. Whether a specific parcel of land is operational land at any point in time is a fact-specific question and depends on the purposes for which that land is being used or held at that point in time.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that land within categories A, B, C and D <u>could</u> constitute operational land if the land were used, or the interests were held, for the purpose of the Applicant carrying out its undertaking.</p> <p>This principle does also apply to Pentagon Field and Museum Field. For the purposes of the Project, the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6) restricts the use of Pentagon Field and Museum Field through the oLEMP and subsequent LEMPs under Requirement 8. The LEMPs must include details of the monitoring and management requirements and be approved by CBC. Each LEMP must include provisions for management of the planting for a minimum of 30 years, in line with the oLEMP.</p>
-----------------------	--	---

		<p>The Airport Boundary Plan [APP-004] shows the area of the airport as defined by sections 66 and 67 of the Civil Aviation Act 2012. This is not the same definition as "operational land" under section 263(1) of the Town and Country planning Act 1990.</p>
<p>Action Point 10</p>	<p>The Authorities disagree with the Applicant’s use of the concept of ‘excepted development’ to bypass effective control over parts of the authorised development for the reasons explained in [REP1-212]. The Applicant’s rationale for this ‘carve out’ is that the works in question could ordinarily be undertaken as permitted development. However, precisely because the works are part of the authorised development and that development is a single indivisible project, those works are EIA development and they do not benefit from any permitted development rights. The premise for the ‘carve out’ is therefore misconceived. In any event, the Authorities have other concerns about the use of ‘excepted development’. The Applicant states in paragraph 12.1.7 that whether a Work No. is “excepted development” would depend on whether</p>	<p>As regards the Councils' comment on the interaction between "excepted development" and restrictions on EIA development, the Applicant addressed this in paragraph 4.2.13 of its Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 2: Control Documents / DCO [REP1-057].</p> <p>The principle of operational land has been explained in response to the Councils' comment on Action Point 9 above. The Applicant notes the Councils' detailed comments on works they considers not to constitute "excepted development" and is further considering how best to articulate and secure the delivery of the operational land principle through the draft DCO and will provide a further response at Deadline 4.</p>

the land is operational at that time. Based on this, in paragraph 12.1.6, the Applicant has “preliminarily categorised the numbered works in Schedule 1” and sets out those it considers would constitute “excepted development”. The Authorities consider the list of “excepted development” in paragraph 12.1.6 is misleading as no attempt has been made to establish the land that is currently “operational land”. Owing to this, the Authorities consider the following work numbers do not fall within the meaning of “excepted development” for the reasons set out below (leaving aside the point already made that this is a single indivisible project which is EIA development and so there are no permitted development rights available)

- Work No. 1 (reposition northern runway) – the Authorities consider this Work would fall foul of paragraph F1(a) of the Schedule 2, Part 8, Class F of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 because it would involve the construction or extension of a runway.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work No. 4 (works to taxiways) – this Work requires Purple Parking land (which is not operational land). • Work No. 9 (constructing the CARE) – since this is potentially EIA-scale development, it would not benefit from permitted development rights. • Work No. 16 (constructing the new hangar) – since this is potentially EIA-scale development, it would not benefit from permitted development rights. • Work No. 18 (removing and replacing western noise mitigation bund) – this structure is controlled via planning condition 4 of Application Ref CR/125/1979. • Work No. 28(b) to (e) (works at Car Park H, excluding hotel) – based on the information provided by the Applicant it is unclear whether 	
--	--	--

	<p>this Work would constitute “excepted development”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work No. 33 (works at Purple Parking) – the Authorities understand that Purple Parking is not operational land (and further understand the site is owned by a third party). See the legal agreement dated 24 May 2022 [AS-115]. • Work No. 38 (habitat enhancement and flood compensation at Museum Field) – again, this is not operational land. Again, see the legal agreement dated 24 May 2022 [AS-115]. • Work No. 41 (ecological area at Pentagon Field) – this land is understood not to be operational land as it was shown outside of the airport boundary in 1979. Some planting on this site was agreed as part of condition 4 compensatory habitat creation for CR/2008/0665/FUL Gatwick North West Zone. 	
--	---	--

- Work No. 43 (water treatment works) – this land is understood not to be operational land as it was shown outside of the airport boundary in 1979.

It is also noted that Work Nos. 28(b)-(e) (works at Car Park H), 30 (constructing Car Park Y), 32 (replacing North Terminal Long Stay car park) and 33 (works at Purple Parking) relate to the provision of car parking. This would be “excepted development” provided the Applicant can show the proposal complies with Obligation 5.6 of the current S106 Agreement [AS-115]. CBC has had advice that if a Permitted Development consultation came in that conflicted with this Obligation 5.6, CBC would be able enforce the obligation, if necessary. (To date, no conflict between a Permitted Development consultation and Obligation 5.6 has arisen).

5.6 10.8.4 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH3: Socio-economics

5.6.1 Table 14 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH3: Socio-economics.

Table 14 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH3: Socio-economics

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 3.2.3	<p>It is noted the Applicant has not included comments, included in the transcription of ISH3, in which the Applicant said: “The only thing we haven’t done is essentially because we don’t believe it’s appropriate is to then assess the significance of the impact of every single one of those, potentially up to 37 local authority areas that fit in within our overall assessment area”. These comments should also be noted by the ExA when considering the Applicant’s assessment of impacts at a local authority level.</p>	<p>The Applicant is content that it has expressed its position and the reasons for that – significance has been assessed at the functional market area scale.</p>
Para 5.2	<p>It is noted that, in paragraph 5.2, the Applicant has not accurately reflected the ExA’s question which was, in fact, in relation to all local authority areas located in close proximity to Gatwick such as Crawley Borough</p>	<p>We note the submissions made by the Authorities’ in response to the Applicant’s written summary of oral submissions from ISH3, and the Applicant does not</p>

	Council whose issues in relation to housing were discussed at length during ISH3.	consider any further submission to those made in the underlying summary document is required in response.
--	---	---

5.7 10.8.5 Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH4: Surface Transport

5.7.1 Table 15 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH4: Surface Transport.

Table 15 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH4: Surface Transport

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 3.1.2	Whilst this point relates to the level of growth without the NRP (Para 3.1.2), the Authorities argue that a realistic worst-case has not been considered as it is assumed that the proposed mitigation delivers the Surface Access Commitments (SAC). No evidence has been presented of the potential impacts should the SAC fail to be met.	The Applicant’s approach to the Surface Access Commitments is addressed in the answer to question TT.1.35 in Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16).
Para 3.1.5	SCC is concerned that the M25 around Junction 8 is at capacity, which means more traffic would transfer onto	The Applicant’s response to the point on highway capacity is covered in The Applicant’s Responses to Actions

	<p>SCC’s network. Furthermore, should it not prove possible to enhance rail services as proposed or should the Applicant otherwise fail to meet the mode share targets, then the “without NRP” demand would not be able to be accommodated on the transport networks without significant impacts</p>	<p>from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport [REP1-065] (section 2). An item on highway capacity and the M25 is included at Row 2.20.1.1 of the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Surrey County Council [REP1-036]. The Applicant will continue to engage with Surrey County Council on this matter and provide further updates to the SoCG in due course.</p> <p>The matter on rail services was included in the Joint Surrey Local Impact Report [REP1-097] and responses are provided in The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15).</p>
<p>Para 3.1.9</p>	<p>WSCC would like to review any further VISSIM modal outputs and would like the Applicant to consider and address the further modelling information requests made by WSCC in their Local Impact Report [REP1-068].</p>	<p>Please see the response to paragraph 3.6 of the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities Deadline 2 submission, which is in Section 8.11 of this document.</p>
<p>Para 3.1.10</p>	<p>WSCC note that the Applicant has no in principle issue with including measures, such as the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) works, included in the baseline,</p>	<p>In relation to the CIP works, please see the response to TT.1.20 in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and</p>

	<p>but identified by NH as not being guaranteed to come forward, in the Draft Development Consent Order (draft DCO). There are other works, such as the 2,500 robotic parking spaces, which are included in the baseline and consideration should be given as to what other works, that are included in the baseline, should form part of the Development Consent Order and be part of the Project. WSCC would welcome a discussion with the Applicant on this point.</p>	<p>Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16) submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>In relation to the robotic parking spaces, the Applicant has provided a response on this in the answer to question GEN.1.28 in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>
<p>Para 3.3.1</p>	<p>SCC have repeatedly asked for more of SCC’s network to be considered in the VISSIM model and so its scope has not been agreed with all stakeholders. SCC request this expansion of the modelled area because excluding junctions up/downstream from Longbridge Roundabout means the model lacks the vital interactions between junctions to ensure the accurate representation of Longbridge Roundabout. It also lacks assessment of impact on the A23/Vicarage Lane/Victoria Road junction, which is already constrained.</p>	<p>This matter was included in the Joint Surrey Local Impact Report [REP1-097] and a response to item TT9 is provided in The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15).</p>

<p>Para 4.2.5</p>	<p>As discussed during the hearing and presented in Para 2.8 of Network Rail’s Written Representation (REP 1- 090), there is currently no funding for the resumption of rail service capacity to pre-Covid levels – albeit it is recognised as being theoretically possible. SCC has repeatedly stated that this is a significant assumption and failure of rail services to reach the service patterns assumed by GAL will mean their SAC is either extremely difficult or impossible to meet given the importance of the rail mode in meeting those commitments. The impact on SCC’s network would be significantly worse than assessed.</p>	<p>This matter was included in the Joint Surrey Local Impact Report [REP1-097] and responses are provided in The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports(Doc Ref. 10.15).</p>
<p>Para 5.1.3</p>	<p>SCC have stated previously in their Local Impact Report (REP1-097) that the modelling shows that there is no need for the extra spaces as volumes of parking in the future baseline and with NRP are the same. Furthermore, Surface Access Commitment 7 (APP-090) Para 5.2.7 states that GAL will provide these spaces over a period of time as demand requires. SCC still await confirmation of how this need will be triggered.</p>	<p>Information on the calculation of car parking requirement was provided in the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] which was submitted at Deadline 1. Further information has been provided in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16). for questions TT.1.38, TT.1.39 and TT.1.41</p>

<p>Para 5.1.10</p>	<p>SCC would be interested to know the relationship between on-airport car parking charges and the achievement of an increase in sustainable transport mode share, given that there is not a linear relationship between a decrease in on-airport car parking provision and the achievement of an increase in sustainable transport mode share.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] which was submitted at Deadline 1, in particular paragraph 3.3.9. The committed mode shares in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) are supported by comprehensive strategic modelling which tested the package of sustainable travel interventions set out in the SAC, including the assumed levels of parking charges which are identified in paragraph 7.3.5 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3) for the purposes of the modelling. It should be noted that due to the complexity of factors affecting travel behaviour, and the variability of some of these factors a simple linear relationship between parking charges and public transport mode share is not assumed, nor would it be meaningful in isolation.</p>
<p>Para 6.1.1 and 6.1.2</p>	<p>WSSC's concerns remain in relation to the Surface Access Commitments (SACs). As set out in the West Sussex LIR [REP1-068], the commitments lack detail and robustness which therefore compromises their ability to ensure a suitable certainty of outcome</p>	<p>The matter relating to the SAC was included in the WSSC Local Impact Report [REP1-068] and responses are provided in The Applicant's Response to Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15).</p>

<p>Para 6.1.3</p>	<p>In paragraphs 6.2.5 and 6.2.6 of the Surface Access Commitments (APP-090), the Applicant clearly sets out that an Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) will be produced containing information against the key modal split targets. The Applicant states in SAC (APP090), “If the AMR shows that the mode share commitments have not been met or, in GAL’s reasonable opinion, suggests they may not be met (having regard to any circumstances beyond GAL’s control which may be responsible), GAL will prepare an action plan to identify such additional interventions which are considered reasonably necessary to correct such actual or potential non-achievement off the mode share commitments. Paragraph 6.2.6 of the SAC (APP-090) goes on to state, “If two successive AMRs continue to show that the mode share commitments have not been met or, in GAL’s reasonable opinion, suggests they may not be met (having regard to any circumstances beyond GAL’s control which may be responsible), GAL will prepare a further action plan and will provide this to the TFSG, together with additional data if necessary and possible, in order that</p>	<p>The Applicant has carefully considered the approach to growth and surface access commitments. The commitments being made and the way in which they are structured are appropriate in the context of the anticipated rate of growth which is forecast for dual runway operations at the Airport.</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) requires the Applicant to achieve the mode shares to which it is committing, and the Applicant will make interventions (including parking charges) as necessary to achieve these commitments. The SAC makes clear that the approach for using the AMR is not retrospective and is intended to allow an action plan to be developed to maintain a trajectory towards the proposed targets.</p> <p>Following National Highways' mark-up of the SAC document [REP2-056] submitted at Deadline 2, the Applicant has submitted proposed amendments to the SAC document in an updated version of ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2).</p>
-------------------	---	--

the TFSG can consider, comment on and approve or reflect the action plan.”

Concerns remain that a significant period of time could pass where the SAC’s modal split targets are not being complied with and action plans may not be successful or, the measures within them, would take time to implement or to be effective in changing travel habits. As set out within the West Sussex LIR [REP1-068], the local Highway Authorities are advocating a Green Controlled Growth approach, similar to that proposed in the Luton Airport DCO project. This would enable growth to happen but also ensure compliance with the modal split targets and provide certainty of outcome to surface access to the airport. Owing to the uncertainty over the delivery of baseline rail services and whether it is desirable to set parking and access charges sufficiently high to influence drivers in the absence of viable alternatives, SCC is concerned that the DCO application may not include all the necessary measures to mitigate impacts on our network.

<p>Para 6.1.4</p>	<p>While SCC agrees that GAL has a high public transport mode share, its “without NRP” target is 52% of passenger journeys to the airport by public transport by 2030 and its “with NRP” target is 55%. Whilst the pre-Covid mode share was 47%, the mode share of 43.7% in 2022 suggests there is a long way to go. In such circumstances, SCC seeks reassurance that should mode share targets not be met, there should be controls on growth to ensure that the impacts on its networks are no worse than assessed in the Environmental Statement.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded thematically to comments made within relevant representations regarding mode share targets, at Section 4.26 of its Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048].</p> <p>The mode share commitments set out in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [APP-090] present the position the Applicant is committing to achieve. These commitments draw on the modelling of mode choice and transport network operation. ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) also includes a section on GAL’s further aspirations, which includes more ambitious mode share targets which the Applicant will be working towards. For the DCO Application, it has set the committed mode shares and the timescales within which they are to be achieved explicitly to ensure that the core surface access outcomes set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1 v3) and in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3) are delivered.</p>
<p>Para 6.1.5.3</p>	<p>SCC seek clarification regarding whether this means that public transport mode has reached its peak at 55% (mode share is likely to follow the shape of an ‘s-</p>	<p>The rail improvements included in the future baseline are those which are committed, in keeping with the DfT’s Transport Appraisal Guidance Unit M4. The improvements</p>

	<p>curve’) or whether any further shift in public transport more is only like to come from the Brighton Mainline axis. In either case, the enhanced rail services assumed in the baseline are of such vital importance that should they not materialise, the likelihood of increased car-based travel through the county of Surrey is likely and its impacts are unreported.</p>	<p>are set out in paragraph 9.4.2 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3), and it should be noted that some of these are already in operation.</p> <p>The Applicant believes that there is potential to increase public transport mode share beyond 55% and has include aspirations to achieve a figure of 60% within Section 7 of ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2). Any increase beyond 55% will not necessarily come from the Brighton Mainline corridor; although that corridor provides good rail links, the Application will continue to work with rail and bus operators to identify opportunities across the catchment area for enhanced public transport connections.</p>
<p>Para 7.1.4</p>	<p>While changes were made, they do not necessarily reflect the feedback and requests made by SCC at the time.</p>	<p>This is noted. The Applicant engaged with the local authorities to explore options for active travel route provision but the decision on which enhancements were included as part of the proposed highway works took account of a wide range of considerations, including potential environmental impacts, costs and the likely contribution to supporting increased active travel mode</p>

		share specifically in relation to airport activity and growth, alongside stakeholder requests.
--	--	--

5.8 10.9.5 The Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH4: Surface Transport

5.8.1 Table 16 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH4: Surface Transport.

Table 16 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH4: Surface Transport

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Action Point 1	The Authorities are broadly supportive of the response from the Applicant in that the Environmental Statement has provided a “description of the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment (baseline scenario) and an outline of the likely evolution thereof without implementation of the development...” (Para 2.2.2). This was as anticipated by the Authorities.	Discussions with Network Rail are ongoing with respect to the timetabling assumptions. The DCO Application modelling relied on service enhancements whilst the Post COVID modelling assumes the rail services return to a 2019 timetable (with known improvements added), which is a reasonable assumption as it requires no additional capital investment. The Applicant has addressed matters related to M25 Junction 7 in its response to Kent County Council in The

	<p>However, the Authorities remain concerned about some of the assumptions in this future baseline, such as the assumed recovery of rail services to pre-Covid levels and planned service enhancements as well as congestion issues on the M25 around Junction 8. The first point is likely to result in lower public transport mode share than planned and both points will combine to create a greater traffic and wider environmental impact within the county.</p>	<p>Applicant’s Response to the Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15) at Section 5.3.</p>
<p>Action Point 6</p>	<p>The Applicant submitted a Car Parking Strategy at deadline 1 [REP1-051], which is welcomed. This includes all matters related to parking except details of occupancy at unauthorised off-site parking locations and on-street parking (fly parking), due to limitations of sourcing and the robustness of this data. The document explains how the Applicant has identified the need for 1,100 new on-airport passenger car parking spaces in association with the Project. This is set out at Section 3.5 of the document, including the worked example of Table 2. The Authorities understanding of this process (in summary) is that 2019 authorised on and off-airport</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the submissions made by Legal Partnership Authorities in [REP2-081] in respect of the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051]. The Applicant will consider all comments received and provide a full response at Deadline 4; however, in the interim, would also direct attention to the responses to TT.1.10, TT.1.38, TT.1.39 and TT.1.40 in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16) submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

spaces have been totalled up, with these assumed (for practical reasons) to operate at 87.5% capacity. The separate Transport Modelling has been used to estimate likely mode share for travel to/from the airport, and in assuming a public transport mode share of 55% to be achievable, appears to estimate a 20% increase in Park and Fly trips would arise from the Project. This uplift is plugged into the equation, to identify a total peak parking accumulation, with authorised off-airport spaces (at 87.5% capacity) subtracted to give an estimated total on-airport parking requirement of 48,300 spaces (again assuming for operation at 87.5% capacity). The difference in total spaces from 2019 compared with the Project identifies a requirement for an additional 7,700 on-airport spaces, which subtracting the Applicant's assumed baseline of 6,570 spaces, arrives at a requirement for the Project of 1,100 spaces. Noting the Applicant's approach, the Authorities raise the following points relating to the Applicant's calculations:

	<p>[[Note: Table 7 of [REP2-081] continues at this point and sets out the full comments from the Legal Partnership Authorities].</p>	
<p>Actions Points 10 and 11</p>	<p>Appendix A: Technical Note: Active Travel Provision Details paragraph 2.2.1 – WSCC as Highway Authority still require further technical information relating to the Surface Access Highway Works. As set out within the West Sussex LIR [REP1-068] further information is required to fully appraise the proposed highway works, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designers Response; • A Design Review of the highway works, demonstrating how they accord with the relevant design standards and setting out any Departures from Standard that are required; and 	<p>Bullet 1 - The Stage 1 RSA and Stage 1 RSA Designer Response in Draft was issued to Highway Authorities for review and comment, with WSCC returning comments on 24/05/2023. The final Stage 1 RSA Designers Response and agreement of RSA actions has been the subject of ongoing engagement with the highway authorities through the SoCG process and a Draft 2 version of the Designers Response has been shared with Highway Authorities.</p> <p>Bullet 2 - As part of technical engagement with WSCC an updated highway design review and package of information in relation to departures from standard in the vicinity of WSCC highway network was shared on 05/10/23 and discussions in relation to this material are ongoing. In summary, as set out in Section 6.11 of the Design and Access Statement Volume 5 [APP-257], National Highway’s strategic road network elements have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justification for the proposed speed limits against the relevant WSCC Speed Limit policy. 	<p>Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and Local Highway Authority roads have been designed in accordance with relevant design standards and guidance including Manual for Streets. Where required Departures from Standard application submissions have been made to the relevant highway authorities in accordance with the relevant highway authority process. The detailed design of the strategic road network elements of the scheme will be subject to National Highways approval in accordance with the protective provisions for National Highways set out in Schedule 9 Part 3 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6).The detailed design of the local highway authority elements of the scheme will be subject to highway authority approval in accordance with the process set out in Schedule 2 Paragraph (4) of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6).</p> <p>Bullet 3 - The urban/partially built-up characteristics of this section of the A23 London Road combined with the proposals to provide new and upgraded facilities for pedestrians and cyclists alongside and crossing the A23 London Road at the proposed new signal controlled junction with North Terminal Link are considered to most</p>
--	---	---

		<p>closely align with West Sussex Speed Limit Policy’s Functional Hierarchy category for 40mph speed limit roads. It is expected that the proposed speed limit reduction would encourage reduced speeds on the road with safety benefits for all road users including active travel users.</p> <p>The West Sussex Speed Limit Policy highlights that “lower traffic speeds may also encourage more walking and cycling”. This aligns with the scheme's objective of increasing sustainable mode share through measures which include the scheme’s proposed active travel infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>This topic is being discussed further with WSCC. Further details have been shared with WSCC as part of ongoing technical engagement supporting the SoCG process with highway authorities.</p>
<p>Actions Points 10 and 11</p>	<p>Appendix A: Technical Note: Active Travel Provision Details paragraph 2.2.5 – the Applicant states that the condition of National Cycle Route (NCR)21, as it passes underneath South Terminal, is subject of a</p>	<p>The additional improvements to National Cycle Route (NCR) 21 as set out in Appendix A: Technical Note: Active Travel Provision Details paragraph 2.2.5 are not included within the DCO as the Applicant has initiated</p>

	<p>further improvement as part of business-as-usual investment. WSCC as Highway Authority questions why these improvements do not form part of the Project and will not be delivered by the DCO. WSCC remains of the view, as set out in its LIR [REP1- 068], that further active and sustainable transport mitigation is required to mitigate the impacts of the development and maximise the sustainable transport trips to and from the airport, as per the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS). WSCC would look for further active and sustainable travel mitigation to be provided by the Applicant, including further improvements to key walking and cycling, such as those identified within the Crawley Local Cycling Walking Improvement Plan (LCWIP), which includes the NCR21.</p>	<p>this work as part of its current ASAS, in consultation with the Transport Forum Steering Group, and intends to deliver these works early as part of business-as-usual investment and prior to the completion of the Gatwick NRP Surface Access works. This reflects the existing approach to using the Capital Investment Programme (CIP) and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) to make improvements to surface access as part of our commitment to sustainable travel. It is noted that the current ASAS includes its own targets for sustainable travel, which this initiative supports.</p> <p>The active and sustainable transport provisions included within the Project are considered to be sufficient to achieve the schemes target sustainable mode share commitments to and from the airport and have been developed with due consideration of the Crawley Local Cycling Walking Improvement Plan (LCWIP). The proposed active travel provisions between South Terminal and North Terminal as well as the additional NCR 21 improvements will complement and deliver a</p>
--	--	--

		<p>number of the desired benefits of equivalent routes identified in the LCWIP.</p>
<p>Actions Points 10 and 11</p>	<p>While SCC welcomes the additional detail provided in Appendix A: Technical Note: Active Travel Provision Details, there is no change in the proposals. As such, SCC’s concerns as raised previously, including most recently in the Local Impact Report (REP1-097), are still relevant - i.e. that the active travel provision is considered insufficient, especially if the ambitious sustainable mode share targets in the SAC are to be met, and in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a fully segregated route via Longbridge Roundabout; • upgrade the most direct routes between Horley and Gatwick Airport for pedestrians and cyclists (via the new signalised crossing of the A23 London Road and Riverside Garden Park to North Terminal; and from the southern end of The Crescent through the 	<p>Bullet 1 - Shared use path provision has been proposed across the two new bridge structures over the River Mole (A23 Brighton Road bridge and A23 London Road bridge) to reduce the required width of the overall structure minimising embodied carbon and the impact to the River Mole flood plain.</p> <p>It is also expected that there will be a reduction in the proportion of pedestrian users of the bridges at both of these locations due to the introduction of the pedestrian crossing of A23 London Road between Riverside Garden Park and North Terminal at the new signal junction. The route characteristics (partially built-up / inter-urban with limited building frontages) are considered to further justify the shared use provision at these locations which align with the criteria set out in LTN 1/20 for locations where shared use provision may be considered adequate, as summarised in paragraph 5.5.3 LTN 1/20 as follows: <i>“away from the highway, and alongside busy interurban</i></p>

	<p>landscaped Car Park B to the South Terminal);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide a new crossing of the Brighton Mainline suitable for pedestrians and cyclists to facilitate access east of the railway line; and • provide Rights of Way improvements to surrounding residential areas, including Charlwood, Hookwood and Povey Cross. 	<p><i>roads with few pedestrians or building frontages, shared use might be adequate (see Chapters 6 and 8)."</i></p> <p>In addition, the cross-sectional width proposed on the River Mole bridges respects the recommended minimum widths of shared use provision for routes carrying under 300 pedestrians per hour as given in Table 6-3 of LTN 1/20. Based on the results of the walking and cycling survey counts undertaken for the scheme and the proposed alternative route provision for pedestrians via the new signalised junction on A23 London Road, it is expected that usage numbers are likely to remain below this level in the design year with due consideration of the target mode share growth and seasonality considerations with respect to when the survey was conducted.</p> <p>Bullet 2 - The crossing provision on the A23 London Road and provision for the footway running alongside A23 London Road are both proposed to be pedestrian only as the Project seeks to minimise environmental impact to Riverside Garden Park. To provide a shared use provision on the northeastern wide of A23 London Road would require widening of the existing road</p>
--	--	---

		<p>embankment which would lead to habitat loss and environmental impact to Riverside Garden Park.</p> <p>Cyclists are also expected to prefer to travel between Horley and the airport either via the new active travel path connection between Longbridge Roundabout and North Terminal Roundabout or via the existing NCR21 route.</p> <p>The design proposals do not preclude potential future upgrades of the route crossing A23 London Road to a shared use path as the staggered crossing and footway alongside North Terminal Link are sized for shared use.</p> <p>With respect to the provision of a cycle route between the southern end of The Crescent and the landscaped Car park B, the strategy adopted is to encourage cyclists to continue to use the existing NCR21 route to minimise the risk of conflict between pedestrians and cyclists in the replacement open recreational space at Car Park B. This will also minimise tree loss at the end of The Crescent cul-de-sac which would result from the provision of a new access route at this location and the proposals will maintain the existing quiet residential cul-de-sac</p>
--	--	--

		<p>characteristics of this residential street. Pedestrians will continue to benefit from the existing pedestrian only route connecting to The Crescent west of the rail footbridge, noting that this route is constrained by properties located either side, impeding the possibility of providing an increased cross-section which is suitable for shared-use.</p> <p>Bullet 3 - The proposed surface access design submitted as part of the Application does not incorporate improved crossing provisions over the London to Brighton rail line. The key reasons for the decision can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>Existing crossing provision over the railway provides good connectivity for walkers and cyclists wishing to access the airport. The Project proposals create no additional severance effects on these existing routes.</p> <p>Design options considered would have a range of environmental impacts (e.g. vegetation loss, impacts on proposed planting and increased embodied carbon), visual impacts, disruption (road and rail), constructability</p>
--	--	---

		<p>and cost dis-benefits, considered to be disproportionate to the value brought about by the options considered.</p> <p>For residents of southeast Horley (east of the rail line), Victoria Road rail bridge provides connectivity for cyclists to NCR 21 and onward connection to airport assets and Gatwick Airport station with journey distances less than 5km. Similarly for residents of eastern and north-eastern Horley north of Victoria Road rail bridge NCR 21 crosses the rail line via an existing rail subway located approximately 440m north of Victoria Road rail bridge providing onward connectivity to/from the airport.</p> <p>Bullet 4 - The scope and scale of the proposed active travel improvements is sufficient to support the modal shift outlined in Section 14 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3).</p> <p>The proposed active travel provision has been developed with due consideration of schemes identified in the Reigate and Banstead Local Cycle and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) and Crawley LCWIP to</p>
--	--	---

		<p>complement these proposals as well as delivering a number of their desired connectivity outcomes.</p> <p>The proposed active travel improvements are designed to benefit as large a population as possible by targeting residential areas where employees reside with improved active travel infrastructure in an effort to maximise the uptake of sustainable travel. Residents of Hookwood and Povey Cross will benefit from the proposed physical active travel improvements to infrastructure at Longbridge roundabout, alongside the A23 London Road and Longbridge Way, between South Terminal, Gatwick Airport railway station and Balcombe Road and alongside Perimeter Road North between North and South Terminals. These improvements supplement and provide further benefit to users of the existing active travel routes, which are already largely off-road and will be retained. No further mitigation is proposed, the active travel improvements are sufficient to support the modal shift targets set out in the SAC [APP-090].</p>
--	--	---

5.9 10.9.6 The Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH5: Aviation Noise

5.9.1 Table 17 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH5: Aviation Noise.

Table 17 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response to the Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH5: Aviation Noise

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 2.1.3	The Authorities consider that this is accurate but whilst standards are set we would enquire as to the mechanisms by which compliance is checked and corrected where necessary, particularly for ground noise below.	The Applicant would propose to submit a report to the Local Planning Authorities demonstrating compliance with the noise limits set for fixed noise sources in ES Appendix 14.9.3: Ground Noise Modelling [APP-173] . The Applicant is considering how best to reflect this commitment within the control documents supporting the DCO Application and will confirm approach at the next Deadline.
Para 2.1.5	This does not preclude that by poor planning and not locating activities in appropriate locations with appropriate mitigation those activities could still give rise to a nuisance but yet no action could be taken. Also, proper planning in the public interest is	The Applicant does not accept the premise of this comment. The proposals have been properly planned with appropriate mitigation. They are not concerned merely with the avoidance of nuisance but are based on the consideration and application of a range of policy and guidance relating to assessment of noise effects and the

	concerned with more than merely the avoidance of statutory nuisance.	appropriate mechanisms by such which effects can be mitigated.
Para 2.1.6	We are not certain why the comparison with roads is drawn here. Aviation noise is far more disturbing than road traffic noise, is much harder to deal with as most often the source is in the air so barriers are implausible.	The comparison with roads was not to do with the level of disturbance but ‘the protection afforded to airports is no different to that of a road’
Para 2.1.7	The Authorities consider that the application of the environmental principles duty, including the application of the precautionary approach is essential and is implicit under the “avoid” response to SOAEL and has bearing on noise levels within LOAEL. We consider that there is sufficient in planning policy and decisions to ensure that the utmost is done to ensure that nuisance does not occur in the first instant through good design and mitigation including provision for relocation; but where it does then appropriate compensation is in place.	The Applicant considers that in operating the airport and planning the design and operation of the airport with the northern runway all reasonable noise mitigation measures have been considered and adopted consistent with policy which includes minimising adverse effect and avoiding significant adverse effects on health and quality of life in the context of the government sustainable development policy, whether or not it is considered that policy is based on a precautionary approach.

	<p>We also consider that this is consistent with the EU Regulation (retained) 598/2014 which states that:</p> <p>“(2)Sustainable development of air transport requires the introduction of measures aimed at reducing the noise impact from aircraft at Union airports. Those measures should improve the noise environment around Union airports in order to maintain or increase the quality of life of neighbouring citizens and foster compatibility between aviation activities and residential areas, in particular where night flights are concerned.”</p>	
<p>Para 2.2.1</p>	<p>For the noise envelope to be successful it needs to set operational controls and outcomes for all the periods. The authorities view is that there is a need for all periods of the year and day to be controlled. Existing controls, including those over core and actual night periods will need to be incorporated in some way</p>	<p>The Noise Envelope proposed includes limits on the 16 hour day and the eight hour night, i.e. covering the full 24 hours. The limits all set for the noisiest summer season when noise disturbance is greatest so as to provide protection in the worst period of the year. The project has also set a limit on the number of aircraft in any 12 months.</p>
<p>Para 2.2.2</p>	<p>The Authorities comment further on this in the LIRs.</p>	<p>Paragraph 13 of the definitions in Regulation 598 states:</p> <p><i>‘The competent authority responsible for adopting noise-related operating restrictions should be independent of any</i></p>

<p>The proposal by the Applicant, which was not discussed with the local authorities, is a point of difference.</p> <p>The Authorities are not persuaded that the role envisaged for the CAA as ‘independent air noise reviewer’ for the purposes of Part 2 of Schedule 11 to the draft DCO is only concerned with matters that sit outside of the scope of the ‘competent authority’ for the purposes of Regulation 4(1) of the Airports Noise Related Operating Restrictions (England and Wales) Regulations 2018, which is concerned with ‘operating restrictions’ within Article 6(3) of EU Regulation 598/2014 which are imposed by a DCO. Under Article 2(6) of Regulation 598/2014 an ‘operating restriction’ means:</p> <p>“a noise-related action that limits access to or reduces the operational capacity of an airport, including operating restrictions aimed at the withdrawal from operations of marginally compliant aircraft at specific airports as well as operating restrictions of a partial nature, which for example apply for an identified</p>	<p><i>organisation involved in the Airport’s operation, air transport or air navigation service provision, or representing the interests thereof and of the residents living in the vicinity of the Airport’.</i></p> <p>Clearly the local authorities represent residents living in the vicinity of the Airport.</p> <p>The Secretary of State is the competent authority for Gatwick Airport, and the CAA act independently of them. The role suggested for the CAA is consistent with that suggested at paragraph 5.66 of the ANPS.</p>
---	--

period of time during the day or only for certain runways at the airport.”

A noise plan within Part 2 of Schedule 11 to the DCO could include actions that constitute an operating restriction within the scope of the above definition.

That definition is broad in scope and includes actions which have the effect of limiting access to an airport or reducing its operational capacity.

The role envisaged for the CAA in Part 2 of Schedule 11 of the DCO is not limited to verifying monitoring information but includes approval of noise plans submitted by the applicant. The local authorities see this role as including, or having the potential to include, matters which are for them to determine as ‘competent authorities’.

The Applicant is therefore requested to either review its approach to the involvement of the CAA or to make changes to Part 2 of Schedule 11 to the draft DCO to ensure that there is no scope for any overlap between matters dealt with by the CAA and matters that fall

	<p>within the remit of the local authorities as ‘competent authorities’ under the 2018 Regulations.</p>	
<p>Para 2.2.3</p>	<p>Noted but whether or not the airport remains designated or not, does not extinguish local authorities from control. There are a other regimes that work for other forms of environmental pollution where local authorities are the enforcing body and as part of the enforcement function are required to have regard to national policy for example, on enforcement principles, statutory guidance as well as national standards and industry practice.</p>	<p>Noted for other forms of pollution.</p> <p>In relation to noise, Gatwick is a designated airport. For the reasons set out at paragraph 3.10 of the APF, the Secretary of State considered it important that government has an important role to play in reconciling local and national interests.</p>
<p>Para 2.2.6</p>	<p>This is referred to in the LIRs. No approach was made to the Authorities on this matter. We would highlight to the ExA the local authorities role and extensive experience in planning law, their duties under the complementary but separate environmental permitting regime, other noise control regimes, experience in determining nuisance and advocacy on behalf of all residents across the region. We also refer to the model suggested by Luton for an Environmental</p>	<p>Noted and see above. We note Luton is not a designated airport.</p>

	Scrutiny Board comprising officials from all local authorities.	
Para 3.1.4	The Authorities consider that within the LOAEL range, as noise levels increase, greater effort is required to minimise and mitigate because the adverse effects increase. This is consistent with the ProPG approach.	The Applicant agrees that the greater the exceedance of LOAEL the greater the extent of mitigation likely to be required. The ProPG relates to planning for new housing when a wide range of site building design options are available to provide Good Acoustic Design, that is not applicable to the use of a runway.
Para 3.1.6	The Authorities consider that where there is a change then adverse effects can occur dependent on the context. The area around Gatwick is predominantly rural and tranquil area (noting that there are other factors that contribute to tranquillity). This is in contrast to other locations where background sound levels are higher and may be masked, to a degree, by other noise.	<p>The areas to the north and south of Gatwick and elsewhere are not rural.</p> <p>The policy guidance on assessing air noise does not require the consideration of context in the way described that is often required for other noise sources, ie those on the ground.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted The Gatwick Airport Ambient Noise Study 2018 at Deadline 1 Written Summary from Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 5:</p>

		<p>Aviation Noise [REP1-060], the conclusions of which include:</p> <p>The literature review found conflicting reports, some linking ambient noise to aircraft noise annoyance and some not.</p> <p>This analysis (within the Leq 51dB LOAEL contour) demonstrated that aircraft will usually be clearly discernible near to rear facades of any house, whether that house is located on an urban or rural road.</p> <p>The further analysis of the SoNA social survey dataset within the Leq 51dB contour shows no clear relationship between ambient noise and aircraft noise disturbance. Consequently, it is not possible to incorporate a measure of ambient noise into metrics for assessing aircraft noise impacts.</p>
<p>Para 3.1.12</p>	<p>The Authorities refer to the Post Hearing Submission Note for ISH 5, where the Applicant is asked to produce sensitivity testing using different levels of LOAEL.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to this request in The Applicant’s Response to ExA’s Written Questions – Noise and Vibration NV.1.5 Sensitivity Test for Total Aviation Noise (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>

<p>Para 3.1.14</p>	<p>Noted that the Applicant cannot determine this but in scoping opinion and relevant representation the UKHSA advised that further work was required on this to understand the issue. Local authorities also consider that further work is required locally to understand perceptions about noise including how people consider they are affected and have referred to this further in the LIR.</p>	<p>The Scoping Report proposed modelling noise levels at LOAEL and above and the Scoping Opinion did not require noise levels below these to be modelled.</p> <p>The Applicant understands that UKHSA is interested in these effects and has responded to UKHSA’s representation (see section 3.87 of Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048]). The Applicant has also provided a full response to the suggestion to assess noise levels lower than LOAEL in our response to Examining Authority Question NV.1.5 (Doc ref 10.16).</p>
<p>Para 3.1.16</p>	<p>The Authorities are interested in this analysis. In part this might be explained by the presentation of noise modelling using single mode contours in the same way that Heathrow have. The Applicant has not yet presented this information and it is believed that this would result in much clearer explanation of effects on any given day at specific locations.</p> <p>The comment in relation to single mode is not confined to the SOAEL.</p>	<p>The Applicant is not party to the analysis referred to by the Examining Authority.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the area referred to is overflowed by arrivals roughly 75% of the time. The Applicant has responded to the local authority's views on single mode noise contours expressed in the LIR.</p>

	The Authorities refer to this further in the LIR.	
Para 3.1.18	Whilst there are specific LOAELS we consider it important that to understand total impacts that sensitivity testing is performed to lower levels.	See The Applicant’s Response to ExA’s Written Questions – Noise and Vibration NV.1.5 (Doc Ref. 10.16).
Para 3.1.19	<p>The Applicant’s comments are noted. The Authorities refer to comments above and as already indicated support that further assessment to understand what is driving the statements from the residents and whether anything further needs to be done.</p> <p>Without the analysis of the comments within the relevant reps from the cluster we consider that it is too early for the applicant to form a view and would ask the ExA to consider asking the Applicant to perform this analysis.</p>	Noted, as above.
Para 3.1.25	There is no reason why the airport should not go beyond the policy requirements (which are a minimum), especially where there is new information that ought to be taken into account.	See The Applicant’s Response to ExA’s Written Questions – Noise and Vibration NV.1.5 (Doc Ref. 10.16).

<p>Para 3.2</p>	<p>The Local Authorities consider that there should be sensitivity testing to World Health Organisation values that are onset and as such can be regarded as LOAEL. This is 40 Lnight for the night period and 47 LAeq, 16h day, (derived from SoNA conversion of Lden to LAeq16h where the WHO standard is 45Lden.</p>	<p>The Applicant has not seen this daytime value before.</p> <p>See The Applicant’s Response to ExA’s Written Questions – Noise and Vibration NV.1.5 (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>
<p>Para 3.2.1</p>	<p>The LOAEL provided by the government preceded the additional SoNA work that does provide further insight into the effects of noise and having regard to that work and having regard to the environmental duties principles, the ICAO Balanced Approach and the various aviation policies it would appear reasonable to at least understand those aspects and bring forward tentative proposals. There is no reason for the applicant to limit itself to the thresholds upon which they rely. The LOAELs also do not take account of international health based work which is unrelated to annoyance.</p>	<p>The further analysis of the SONA study did not recommend lower values of LOAEL and the government has not changed its guidance on LOAEL as a result of this work.</p> <p>See also The Applicant’s Response to ExA’s Written Questions – Noise and Vibration NV.1.5 (Doc ref 10.16).</p>

<p>Para 4.1.4</p>	<p>Aviation policy including subsequent papers has moved to recommending insulation at lower thresholds than those stated by the Applicant.</p> <p>The threshold for insulation is discussed further in the LIRs. A majority view is that for residential properties the maximum financial award for the ‘inner zone’, for insulation should be offered at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60 dB for daytime; or one noise induced awakening, on average, per night; or • at least at 55 dB for the full night period; or whichever is the greater area. The levels should be interpreted when compared against the single mode contours for summer day unless otherwise stated. <p>In review of the SoNA work there is an alternative view in the local authorities that given the importance of the night period in policy and the updated SoNA work there is a strong argument for the night 48 LAeq 8h to</p>	<p>This paragraph is pointing to the linkage between SOAEL and noise installation standards not discussing the policy on noise insulation levels in full.</p> <p>The policy paper that is subsequent to the APF noise insulation level of Leq 16 hr 63dB suggests insulation should be offered above Leq 16 hr 60dB, with other qualifying criteria. The NRP scheme is more generous than this by offering noise insulation above Leq 16 hr 54dB. There is no policy or guidance indication the significance of Leq 8 hr night 48dB.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to the 60dB view and single mode contours view in the LIR.</p> <p>Planning applications for new housing are a different situation to planning the increased use of an airport.</p>
-------------------	---	--

	<p>mark the point at which the inner zone insulation should commence.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that discussion, it is interesting to note that planning decisions for new noise sensitive development is being considered against the NPSE and the behavioural responses whilst decisions for airport expansion are considered based on a metric.</p>	
<p>Para 4.1.5</p>	<p>It is not clear to the Authorities that the proposed SOAEL is set at a level where it might be considered that there is an onset of the need to keep windows closed. The studies relied upon are those related to annoyance, by reference to specific questions and this is the basis upon which the Department for Transport has selected a LOAEL.</p> <p>The Authorities note the comment about precedent schemes referred to. The Authorities believe those to be the ones referred to in our response in 4.2.1 below which suggest a lower noise threshold at which mitigation is required.</p>	<p>The noise levels at which noise insulation has been offered in the precedent cases quoted in 4.2.1 are not referred to as SOAEL by the Applicant. Furthermore, the NRP scheme offers noise insulation consistent with the lowest noise levels (ie most generous) of these precedents.</p>

<p>Para 4.1.7</p>	<p>The Authorities note that this section relates to noise insulation as a form of mitigation and understand the important role that it plays but remain of the view that in a mitigation hierarchy, it is, or at least should be, mitigation of last resort for any aspect of the noise associated with the development. The Authorities discuss their views on this within the LIRs.</p>	<p>Agreed, the Applicant has considered and included all other available noise mitigation measures before considering noise insulation as the last resort.</p>
<p>Para 4.1.9</p>	<p>There is a requirement under the Noise Policy Statement for England for noise that falls within the LOAEL band, to mitigate and reduce to a minimum. This has always existed and is not new. It is implicit within existing noise policy.</p> <p>The DfT clearly felt it was necessary to amplify this within the Overarching Aviation Noise Policy (2023)</p> <p>“The impact of aviation noise must be mitigated as much as is practicable and realistic to do so, limiting, and where possible reducing, the total adverse impacts on health and quality of life from aviation noise.”</p>	<p>Agreed, the Applicant recognises the requirements of policy and has considered and included all other available noise mitigation measures in accordance with the NPSE in the context of the government’s policy on sustainable development.</p>

<p>Para 4.2.1</p>	<p>This is not so clear cut to the Authorities. In reviewing the decisions referred we summarise our sample below:</p> <p>2021 Bristol Airport Noise insulation from 63 LAeq (which we consider a poor decision)</p> <p>2021 Stansted noise insulation from 57 LAeq16h</p> <p>2022 Manston refers to 60 LAeq16h</p> <p>Present Day Luton Noise insulation from 54 LAeq16h</p> <p>Further 'The Future of UK Aviation:2050 recommended changes:</p> <p>“-to extend the noise insulation policy threshold beyond the current 63dB LAeq,16hr contour to 60dB LAeq,16hr for airspace changes which lead to significantly increased overflight, to set a new minimum threshold of an increase of 3dB LAeq, which leaves a household in the 54dB LAeq 16hr contour or</p>	<p>Paragraph 4.2.1 refers to the SOAELs adopted on 6 airport development projects that are the same as that used in the ES, not standards adopted for noise insulation for various projects quoted here.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the Heathrow proposal which has not progressed is very different to that at Gatwick in particular involving newly over flying populations which is not the case at Gatwick.</p> <p>The noise installation threshold for the Project is not 63dB Leq 16 hr as stated, it is Leq 16 hr 54dB consistent with best practice in the UK.</p>
-------------------	--	--

	<p>above as a new eligibility criterion for assistance with noise insulation”</p> <p>With the proposed Heathrow expansion, insulation was proposed from 60 dB LAeq 16, hr under full single mode Easterly and Westerly noise contours.</p> <p>Therefore we disagree with the Applicant that the noise insulation threshold is 63 dBLAeq 16hr (by reference only to the daytime metric).</p>	
<p>Para 4.2.2</p>	<p>The Leq metric alone, while carrying some weight, is not sufficient by itself to explain how people are affected by noise.</p> <p>The Authorities raised this point in relation to night noise and the role of additional awakenings.</p> <p>In relation to the other metrics cited by the Applicant, these were not provided in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement for all years.</p> <p>Furthermore, the choice of metrics and the periods for which they were covered was and remains a point of</p>	<p>The other metrics cited were all reported in the ES and for the year of greatest noise impact, 2032, and as noted not for all years, in the interest of avoiding unnecessary information that would not add to the assessment.</p>

	<p>disagreement for the local authorities with the noise envelope.</p> <p>This is further discussed in the LIRs.</p>	
Para 4.2.6	<p>This has been referred to in some of the LIRs. Whilst noting that additional work is ongoing, and that the SoNA work was not designed for the purpose, the SoNA further analysis produces some of the few UK derived exposure response functions for night noise. This clearly indicates that the 55dBLAeq8h has the same level of response the 48 dBLAeq8h threshold and therefore using 55 underestimates the effects and the impacts on people between the 48-55 dBLAeq8h.</p>	<p>It is not clear to which figure this comment refers or what is meant by ‘the 55dBLAeq8h has the same level of response the 48 dBLAeq8h threshold’. Figure 4 indicates that at 55dB (the level used for SOAEL) this piece of evidence suggested that about 15% of the population were high sleep disturbed, and at 48dB about 10% were.</p>
Para 4.2.8	<p>The Authorities consider that given the total impacts of noise there must be a level at which exposure to noise is unacceptable and that this could be due to individual or combination of effects and how the intended use of land has so fundamentally changed that it is no longer suitable for that use.</p>	<p>Noted, this may be the view when considering land use planning for noise sensitive development but that is not the proposal being considered here.</p> <p>Unacceptable noise levels are addressed in other noise guidance but they do not arise here.</p>

<p>Para 5.1.4</p>	<p>The Authorities consider that the Applicant has not considered the worst case scenario for schools by the use of the LAeq, 16h. An averaging period over which exposure may be experienced at the school should be used. Demonstrating compliance with BB93 30 minute and the LA1 metric is considered to be relevant for educational premises around the airport.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that these are current design standards, the airport is expanding to change the noise environment in which these buildings are situate. In addition, the standards are based on meeting a suitable learning environment and thus the age of the premises is irrelevant where the impact of expanded airport operations is going to influence learning and development.</p>	<p>The ES reports the largest noise increase at any school from the Project is 1.4dB LAeq 16 hr. Because of the nature of the Project, in particular it will not change the fleet of aircraft or require new flight paths, noise levels measured over shorter periods of time, such as those referenced in BB93 Building Bulletin 93: acoustic design of schools performance standards - will also not increase by more than about 1.4 dB LAeq, so significant effects on schools from the project are not expected, and the scoping criterion of LAeq 16 hr 51dB for considering schools for noise insulation is considered appropriate. Any school coming forward to be considered for noise insulation under the scheme will be fully assessed using appropriate noise standards including measurements over shorter periods if appropriate. The NIS will be updated to reflect this and referred to in the Applicant’s Response to ExA’s Written Questions – Noise and Vibration NV.1.18 (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>
<p>Para 5.1.6</p>	<p>The Authorities consider a shorter more appropriate exposure time should be used reflecting school opening hours.</p>	<p>See above response.</p>

Para 5.4.3	<p>The Authorities refer to the issue of designation above.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the airport controls capacity release and thus it is within it's gift to prevent further deterioration in effects during the night period.</p> <p>With reference to other airports, the Authorities do not know if this is correct or whether it is comparable with effects</p>	<p>The noise envelope limits noise across the 8 hour night period.</p>
------------	--	--

6 National Highways

6.1.1 The topics raised in National Highways’ response to the Applicant’s submissions at Deadline 1 [\[REP2-055\]](#) are set out below using the headings within the submission.

6.2 The Applicant’s Cover Letter – Deadline 1

6.2.1 Table 18 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to the Applicant’s Cover Letter submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 18 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raise by National Highways’ Response to the Applicant’s Cover Letter submitted at Deadline 1.

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 4	<p>National Highways notes the Applicant’s intended strategy for dealing with the representations made by National Highways as part of its relevant representation.</p> <p>However, in accordance with the Rule 8 letter [TR020005/APP/], there will only be 1 interim version of the SoCG issued at Deadline 5 prior to the final SoCG being prepared at Deadline 9. National Highways therefore queries whether the frequency of these updates facilitates the necessary written</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to respond to submissions made by Interested Parties at each deadline. Where relevant, the Statement of Common Ground will be updated to reflect any updated positions or new matters that may arise.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with National Highways regularly to provide updates on further information to be provided.</p>

	<p>dialogue process that will be required to satisfactorily resolve National Highways matters.</p> <p>For example, within the SoCG submitted at Deadline 1, the Applicant advised of material to be submitted at Deadline 1, however other additional information did not receive a prescribed deadline. National Highways requires further clarification from the Applicant as to when this information will be introduced.</p> <p>National Highways requests that each of its submissions are responded to by the Applicant going forwards. This ensures that the Examining Authority is up to date on the latest issues between the parties.</p>	
--	---	--

6.3 Draft Development Consent Order

- 6.3.1 Table 19 sets out the Applicant's response to matters raised by National Highways' response to the Draft Development Consent Order submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 19 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Draft Development Consent Order Submitted at Deadline 1

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 2	<p><u>Article 8</u></p> <p>National Highways notes that article 8 continues to allow the Applicant to transfer the benefit of the Order (which includes a highways NSIP) without prior notification to National Highways. This is considered unreasonable given the scale of the potential impact on the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK, and the limited/administrative impact on the Applicant. National Highways requests this is amended.</p>	<p>In version 6.0 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6) the Applicant has amended article 8 to add an obligation to notify National Highways in the event that the power in article 8(1) is exercised to transfer or grant to a person other than National Highways the benefit of the order in respect of national highway works.</p>
<u>Page 2</u>	<p><u>Article 18</u></p> <p>National Highways notes that the Applicant has not addressed its concerns on timeframes in this article which are out of sync with other transport DCOs (this is relevant given the highway NSIP forming part of the authorised development). National Highways requires 12 weeks’ notice under article 18(5) and 56 days</p>	<p>Pending further justification from National Highways as to why the much longer timeframes proposed by them (e.g. 12 weeks for notification) are required, the Applicant considers the current timeframes included in article 18 to be appropriate and justified for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic regulations made pursuant to article 18(1) or (2) are already specified in schedules to the draft

	<p>under 18(8), for the reasons set out in the SoCG at 2.7.1.19 and 20 [TR020005/REP1/036]. The Applicant should make the amendments to the draft DCO or justify why this is unnecessary</p>	<p>DCO. These measures are subject to scrutiny during the DCO examination, which the relevant traffic authorities (including National Highways) are participating in. Traffic authorities should not, therefore, require a further protracted period to review proposed traffic measures at the time they come to be enacted pursuant to article 18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where a traffic regulation not specified in schedules to the DCO is proposed pursuant to article 18(3), this is subject to pre-notification consultation with the chief officer of police, traffic authority and any other relevant person under article 18(5). This gives the traffic authority time to engage on the proposed measure before the notice period in article 18(4) starts to run. • Where a traffic regulation not specified in schedules to the DCO is proposed pursuant to article 18(3), it requires the consent of the traffic authority under article 18(6). This must not be unreasonably withheld or delayed and is subject to deemed
--	--	---

		<p>consent, but this affords the traffic authority a longer period than 28 days to consider such an application.</p> <p>As per the Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and National Highways [REP1-036], the time periods in article 18 are well precedented, including in article 45 of the recently made National Grid (Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project) Development Consent Order 2024. National Highways' preference for transport DCO precedent is noted but the Applicant observes that many of these were promoted by National Highways itself and are therefore likely to contain drafting which supports National Highways' preferred time periods.</p> <p>National Highways is invited to justify, in light of the above, why longer time periods are required operationally.</p>
Page 2-3	<p><u>Article 32</u></p> <p>National Highways continues to have concerns around how wide this power is, as set out at para 2.7.1.22 of the SoCG [TR020005/REP1/036]. National Highways</p>	<p>Article 32 has effect when the undertaker acquires land or enters onto land. The Applicant cannot therefore "make clear" which rights of National Highways will be affected, as</p>

	<p>requests that the Applicant expressly make clear which private rights of restrictive covenants belonging to National Highways will cease to have effect and provide justification for each plot in which restrictive covenants and rights are likely to be affected, or provide drafting (as set out in the SoCG) to expressly preserve National Highways’ interests.</p>	<p>this will only be known once the parcels of land to be permanently acquired are confirmed.</p> <p>Beyond this, the Applicant refers to its response on this point in the Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and National Highways [REP1-036], which confirms that National Highways is offered sufficient protection by virtue of its protective provisions in Part 3 of Schedule 9.</p>
<p>Page 3</p>	<p><u>Article 37</u></p> <p>National Highways continues to have concerns around the Applicant’s approach towards temporary possession powers, as set out at para 2.7.24 of the SoCG [TR020005/REP1/036]. In accordance with the relevant compulsory purchase guidance, the Applicant should be seeking proportionate powers which are no more than reasonably necessary. National Highways would only expect temporary powers to be used where works are within the highway boundary and no change is made to the classification.</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response in the Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and National Highways [REP1-036] which summarises its position and to the CA questions in its Response to ExQ1 (Doc Ref. 10.16) for a detailed justification of its approach to compulsory acquisition.</p>

	<p>The Applicant should remove National Highways’ land from the scope of permanent compulsory acquisition powers and instead take temporary powers.</p>	
<p>Page 3</p>	<p><u>Article 45</u></p> <p>The scope of this power remains unclear to National Highways, as set out in the SoCG at 2.7.1.25 [TR020005/REP1/036]. The Applicant claims in the SoCG that this is a temporary power, however the drafting implies that the Applicant may “enter into and use” airspace over the Order land as may be required for the “construction, operation and maintenance” of the authorised development. The Applicant is not required to acquire the land, and so in effect, has a permanent right to occupy airspace over the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK. The Applicant should expressly make clear that this is a temporary power does not apply to the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK and is, in any event, subject to a time limit which aligns with other compulsory acquisition / permanent power.</p>	<p>The Applicant refers to its response in the Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and National Highways [REP1-036] and particularly to the confirmation that the protective provisions for the benefit of National Highways should provide sufficient comfort to National Highways regarding the ability of the undertaker to use article 45 over the strategic road network.</p>

<p>Page 3</p>	<p><u>Schedule 2, Requirement 6</u></p> <p>National Highways has raised concerns around the reference to the provisional certificate in this Requirement, in the SoCG at 2.7.1.27 [TR020005/REP1/036]. The Applicant should carry out further modelling to confirm when the highway works should be in place, and then the requirement should be re-drafted to ensure that the works are in place at the point at which they are required. National Highways refers to its Deadline 1 submission [TR020005/REP1/088] which sets out its concerns in this regard.</p>	<p>This matter is included at Row 2.7.1.27 of the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and National Highways [REP1-036]. The Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways on this matter and provide further updates to the SoCG in due course.</p> <p>The Applicant has further explained its position in response to DCO.1.40 (R6) in its Response to ExQ1 (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>
<p>Page 3</p>	<p><u>Schedule 2 Requirement 20</u> National Highways maintain significant concerns around the wording of this Requirement. The surface access commitments relate to the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK and it is therefore wholly inappropriate for the Applicant to be able to agree amendments to those commitments without National Highways' consent.</p>	<p>The Applicant wishes to implement a consistent and streamlined approach to oversight and authorisations of Project-wide control documents. For this reason, it considers that such documents should primarily be overseen by the lead local authority, Crawley Borough Council (CBC). However, the Applicant is content to specify in requirement 20 that CBC must consult National Highways in relation to any agreement under requirement</p>

		20 and has added this in version 6.0 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6).
--	--	---

6.4 Legal Partnership Authorities Post Hearing Submission Issue Specific Hearing 2

6.4.1 Table 19 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Post Hearing Submission for Issue Specific Hearing 2, submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 20 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Post Hearing Submission for Issue Specific Hearing 2

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 6	<p>National Highways engagement with the Applicant regarding the safe operation of a construction access off South Terminal Roundabout remains ongoing. National Highways will engage on any longer-term proposals for the land through the local plan consultation/formal process.</p> <p>The Applicant provided a technical note with further information; however, National Highways have not yet received a response to comments raised. The Applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated how the construction traffic impact on the Strategic Road Network has been</p>	This is noted and the Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways on matters related to the South Terminal Roundabout compound and will provide an update as part of updates to the Statement of Common Ground in due course.

	<p>used to inform the decisions in relation to preferred location sizes and uses for the construction compound, and it can be operated safely. These matters need to be addressed to the satisfaction of National Highways before they are considered resolved in both National Highways' Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement [TR020005/RR/3222] and the Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant [TR020005/REP1/036].</p> <p>National Highways will continue to monitor the concerns raised by other Statutory Bodies in the event that any other concerns may need to be escalated in National Highways submissions</p>	
--	--	--

6.5 Legal Partnership Authorities Post Hearing Submission Issue Specific Hearing 4

- 6.5.1 National Highways' comments are not directed at the Applicant's submissions for ISH4 nor does it have any further comments. The Applicant notes that National Highways will continue to monitor issues raised by the Legal Partnership Authorities throughout the examination.

6.6 The Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport

6.6.1 Table 21 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to the Applicant’s response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport.

Table 21 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 7	In conjunction with the points raised below for unsegregated shared routes, where the potential for edge restraints may reduce the overall available space allocation, National Highways request clarity on the numbers of users per hour.	<p>An Active Travel User Count Survey was procured by GAL in November 2022. Due consideration was given to the existing peak hour flows for pedestrians and cyclists that were measured as part of this survey in developing the scheme design proposals whilst also giving due consideration to seasonality considerations in relation to the timing of the user count survey and allowing for growth in users numbers including growth in the number of active travel users travelling to/from Gatwick (as set out in Diagram 14.2.3 in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3)).</p> <p>Overall based on these factors, user levels are anticipated to likely remain below the maximum flow of 200 users per hour at the North Terminal Link Road footway labelled c11</p>

		<p>in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Doc Ref. 4.6 v3) (where a footway future proofed for potential future upgrade to a shared use path is proposed) and along the Perimeter Road North shared use path labelled c2-c3-c4-c42 in the Rights of Way and Access Plans (Doc Ref. 4.6 v3). The minimum widths proposed for these routes are all in excess of the associated desirable minimum width of 2.0m and are also at or in excess of the higher 3.0m desirable minimum provision for user flows greater than 200 users per hour set out in DMRB clause E/3.5. Note that these proposals also meet the desirable minimum 3.0m width of shared use paths set out in LTN 1/20 Table 6-3 for shared use paths carrying up to 300 pedestrians per hour and up to 300 cyclists per hour (i.e. up to 600 active travel users per hour in total).</p> <p>For reference information on relevant existing peak hour flows from the November 2022 survey is provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the existing layout for North Terminal there is no ability to cross directly from Southern Horley to North Terminal in the vicinity of the proposed signalised junction and footway c11. The most relevant survey
--	--	---

		<p>point of existing user flows is considered to be the count on NCR 21 in Riverside Garden Park. The max peak hourly flows surveyed at this location were as follows: 43 pedestrians per hour and 14 cyclists per hour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The maximum peak hourly flow surveyed at the refuge crossing of Northway on the approach to North Terminal Roundabout (at the western end of the onward section of the proposed shared use path labelled c2-c3-c4-c42 between c40 and c6) were as follows: 55 pedestrians per hour and 1 cyclist per hour. The max peak hourly flow surveyed between the Perimeter Road North / Queensgate Roundabout and the walking cycling subway under A23 London Road at the eastern end of the proposed shared use path labelled c2-c3-c4-c42) were as follows: 52 pedestrians per hour and 3 cyclists per hour.
Page 7	Where C11 passed under the Airport Way flyover, it is National Highways assumption that this area is the point at which width of the footway decreases to 3m. However National Highways request the Applicant consider the need for whether the abutment face of	The proposed footway width under the bridge is 3.0m as this width provides a future-proofed cross section for potential future upgrade by the Highway Authority to a shared use route at a later stage. On the carriageway side of the 3.0m footway there is a 0.5m separation strip which

	<p>the structure may act as an edge shyness provision in accordance with CD143 Table E/1.5, therefore reducing the theoretical width of the available footway below 3m.</p>	<p>is in accordance with CD 341, Clauses E/1.2.1 for walking routes and E/3.5.1 for shared use routes. To the abutment side of the 3.0m footway is a 0.5m verge which accounts for edge shyness provision to a vertical face greater than 1.2m in height (the abutment face) and is in accordance with CD 341 Table E/1.2.</p> <p>This maintains the clear 3.0m footway width.</p>
Page 7	<p>For shared use provision C41, National Highways notes that the Applicant is to repurpose the existing traffic island as a shared use crossing point. Whilst this does not form part of National Highways network, National Highways queries whether the width of this traffic island, viewed in conjunction with the signage that would be required on the island, is too small to suitably accommodate cyclists waiting to cross.</p>	<p>The existing depth of the traffic island measures 2.5m in the directions of travel of pedestrians and cyclists, achieving the requirements of CD143 Table E/4.7 which states an absolute minimum depth of 2.5m. Through the detailed design, if it is considered appropriate, the depth of the traffic island could be increased through minor works within the proposed Order Limits and limits of deviation.</p>

6.7 The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions – ISH2 Control Documents / DCO

6.7.1 Table 22 sets out the Applicant's response to matters raised by National Highways' response to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions – ISH2 Control Documents / DCO.

Table 22 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Applicant’s Written Summary or Oral Submissions – ISH2 Control Documents / DCO

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 7	<p>National Highways has made representations in its written submission at Deadline 1 [TR020005/REP1/088] to request that Requirement 6 is, at the very least, amended such that the surface access works are in place prior to the operation of the second runway. This relates to National Highways’ concern that the modelling only shows 2029 and 2032, and not whether capacity is forecast to be exceeded in the interim years prior to the surface access works being completed. In other words, interim growth between 2029 and 2032 may necessitate the highway works being in place sooner than the Requirement currently legally requires. Furthermore, between 2029 and 2032, the Applicant will also need to consider, alongside any interim growth, the temporary construction phasing and traffic management works that may reduce capacity on the highways in order to demonstrate Page 9 of 11 that the reported demand</p>	<p>This point has been raised in the ExA’s Questions at DCO.1.40 (Requirement 6) and a response is provided in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16). This matter is also included at Row 2.7.1.27 of the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and National Highways [REP1-036]. The Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways on the milestone for the delivery of the Project highway works and is also engaging on the point related to network operation in the construction period. The Applicant will provide further updates to the SoCG in due course.</p>

	can be accommodated through the construction period.	
--	--	--

6.8 The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions - ISH4 Surface Transport

6.8.1 Table 23 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions - ISH4 Surface Transport.

Table 23 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions - ISH4 Surface Transport

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 7	National Highways notes that the Applicant will be providing further detail in relation to the performance of the Network and ask that the Applicant clarify which deadline this will be made available and whether it will reside within a technical note covering wider issues or will be introduced as a single submission to allow National Highways to have clarity for its review of future deadline submissions.	The Applicant has responded to the points raised in this comment in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Development Consent Order and Control Documents (Doc Ref 10.16) in its response to DCO.1.40 R6 – National highway works.

Page 8	<p>National Highways shares the concerns of GTR in respect of railway capacity, specifically the risk of a lack available rail capacity to achieve modal shift targets. Should the modal shift targets not to be achieved there is a high probability that GAL customers will access the airport via other means, including by road and private car. As a result of this, the Applicant's Transport Assessment may underrepresent the impact of the proposals on capacity, congestion, safety and journey time reliability on the Strategic Road Network.</p>	<p>Technical engagement is currently underway with Network Rail. Issues related to existing and future rail capacity will be included in the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Network Rail. The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter and provide further updates to the SoCG in due course.</p>
Page 8	<p>National Highways queries how these future Airport Surface Access Strategy Action Plans would be secured or accountable when compared to the surface access commitments contained in the Development Consent Order Application [TR02005/APP/090].</p>	<p>The way in which the Applicant's existing Airport Surface Access Strategy interacts with the Surface Access Commitments is set out in Section 2 of the Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) and paragraphs 8.4.34 and 8.4.35 of the Planning Statement [APP-245]. Further details on the context of the Airport Surface Access Strategy is set out at paragraphs 8.4.3 and 8.4.18 of the Planning Statement [APP-245].</p>

<p>Page 8</p>	<p>Can the Applicant please list the guidance or standards that have been utilised in implementing inclusive design principles?</p>	<p>Inclusive design principles have been adopted by the Project through the use of DMRB CD143, noting that CD 143 clauses E/1.1 and E/3.3 reference the Department for Transport (UK Gov) Inclusive Mobility guidance for the design of crossfalls and gradients on footway and shared use routes. These criteria have been applied in the development of the preliminary design for the scheme.</p> <p>Due consideration has also been given to guidance set out in LTN1/20 including the core design principles set out in section 1.5 which define the importance of inclusive design and noting that paragraph 1.4.1 sets out that "the concept of 'inclusive design' underpins the document. The proposed active travel design will be further developed at the detailed design stage and will be subject to agreement with Local Highways Authorities at the detailed design stage as part of technical approvals in accordance with Schedule 2, Clause 5 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6). The detailed design of the strategic road network elements of the scheme will be subject to National Highways approval in accordance with the protective provisions for National Highways set out in Schedule 9 Part 3 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6).</p>
---------------	---	--

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

6.9.1 National Highways’ comments are not directed at the Applicant’s submissions for OFH1 and 2 nor does it have any further comments.

6.10 Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground

6.10.1 Table 24 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground.

Table 24 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Appendix A	National Highways notes that in Appendix A of the Support Air Quality Technical Notes document, the Applicant provides a figure showing verification zones. Based on that figure and the verification zones taken forward to the assessment, can the Applicant please provide justification for zone called “Brighton Road” and why this zone is different to the surrounding Gatwick zone.	The model verification process is included in Section 3 of ES Appendix 13.6.1: Air Quality Data and Model Verification [APP-159] . The verification methodology follows Defra LAQM Technical Guidance (TG22) and was agreed with local councils at the modelling methodology workshop in November 2022. The selection of verification zones takes into consideration a wide range of factors which affect model performance as set out in Paragraph 3.1.2 of ES Appendix 13.6.1 [APP-159] . Considering model performance in this area, localised traffic congestion and that Brighton Road is

		<p>within an AQMA, a higher verification factor was used. This provides a realistic worst case view of potential effects from the project.</p>
--	--	--

6.11 **Local Impact Report (Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council and West Sussex County Council)**

6.11.1 The Applicant notes that National Highways shares some of the same concerns as the Surrey County Authorities.

6.11.2 Table 25 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to the Local Impact Report (Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council and West Sussex County Council).

Table 25 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Local Impact Report (Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council and West Sussex County Council)

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 9	<p>National Highways outlined in its updated position statement in the Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant at Deadline 1 [TR020005/REP1/036] with a request to alter the wording of Requirement 24 as follows: 24. Gatwick North Terminal and South Terminal Roundabout Signalisation 24. (1) No part of</p>	<p>The Future Baseline assumptions of the growth which would occur at the Airport in the absence of the Project include improvement works (including signalization) of both the North Terminal and South Terminal roundabouts (as explained in Section 4.4.9 of ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operations [APP-029]) and at TT.1.20 of the Applicant’s Response to</p>

	<p>the authorised development may begin, until the North Terminal and South Terminal roundabout signalisation scheme is completed and open for traffic This proposed requirement has been requested in order to reflect the assumption made in the Applicants traffic modelling that the signalisation is in place prior to the construction of the authorised works.</p>	<p>ExQ1 – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16) . As per that section, it is anticipated that these works will be completed by 2029.</p> <p>Following discussions with National Highways, the Applicant has agreed to secure the delivery of these works in the draft DCO. However, in light of the anticipated timescale above, which was noted in the ES, it is considered inappropriate to secure that the works will be delivered prior to the beginning of any part of the authorised development. This would shift the anticipated timetable for these works forward by several years. Instead, the Applicant can agree to deliver the works prior to commencement of dual runway operations.</p> <p>The Applicant is engaging with National Highways to seek to agree appropriate drafting to secure these works with a view to including this in the draft DCO in due course.</p>
<p>Page 9</p>	<p>National Highways shares the councils concerns in respect to the quantity of woodland loss, notably on National Highways current estate bordering the surface access works. National Highways itself has a biodiversity Key Performance Indicator (KPI) to</p>	<p>The Applicant has sought to replace as much of the lost highways planting within National Highways land. However, the current standards and guidance for which the highways designs must comply with and a desire not to encroach further than is required onto public open space and private land</p>

<p>achieve no net loss to the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK by 2025, and to have a net positive impact on nature in Road Investment Period 3* (2025-2030) and beyond. National Highways considers that land forming part of the Strategic Road Network can be used and could deliver a route for providing enhancement, which the Applicant should provide in light of the specific policies in the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) (paragraph 5.91, 5.96, 5.104) which are important and relevant policies for the Applicant's application. In light of those policies in the ANPS, National Highways therefore requires the Applicant to provide further information to demonstrate that, within the limits of the Strategic Road Network, that the proposed mitigation conserves and enhances habitats to maximise biodiversity and achieves at least not net loss. * Roads Investment Periods are where National Highways receives funding from the Department for Transport in five year cycles. Road Investment Period 1 ran from 2020 to 2015. National Highways are now in Road Investment Period 2 which runs from 2020 to 2025.</p>	<p>restricts the extent to which this is possible. Any lost highway planting that is not replaced within National Highway's land has, however been offset elsewhere through the replacement and enhancement achieved in the scheme as a whole.</p> <p>The types of plants that can be replanted on highway margins is dictated by the current highway planting standards with respect to distance of trees from the carriageway. The Applicant has sought to replace the woodland lost as far as is possible within the confines of an operational airport or within close proximity to where the loss occurs including at Museum Field, Car Park B, Pentagon Field and Longbridge Roundabout. This must all be carefully considered with regard to the airport's safeguarding requirements.</p> <p>The loss of woodland from the Project as a whole was assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-034] as being Moderate Adverse in significance during the initial assessment periods due to the time required to reach maturity. However, once mature, the impact would be minor adverse and no longer significant.</p> <p>As set out in ES Appendix 9.9.2 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3 v3), the Project, when considered as</p>
--	---

a whole, delivers over 20% BNG. The position with respect to habitat trading, relating to the loss of woodland, was agreed by Natural England at paragraph 5.11 of their Relevant Representation [\[RR-3223\]](#).

Under DCO Requirement 8, a LEMP substantially in accordance with the oLEMP must be approved by CBC in relation to a part of the development before that part of the development is commenced. The oLEMP requires that the LEMPs include reporting on BNG and monitoring and management regimes.

Any construction activities must be carried out in accordance with the **CoCP** [\[REP1-021\]](#) under DCO Requirement 7. Annex 6 of the CoCP comprises an **Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement** (oAVMS) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) which includes Preliminary Tree Removal and Protection Plans. The oAVMS requires the Applicant to submit Detailed Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statements (AVMS) which will include Detailed Vegetation Removal and Protection Plans and, where required, Detailed Tree Removal and Protection Plans to CBC for approval by CBC (following consultation with MVDC and RBBC as appropriate). These

		<p>AVMS must be approved for an area prior to the removal of any trees or vegetation in that area. These AVMS and associated plans will be substantially in accordance with the oAVMS and associated plans.</p> <p>The oLEMP requires that LEMPs incorporate any retained vegetation and trees into the detailed landscape designs (DCO Requirement 8).</p>
Page 9	<p>National Highways shares the councils concerns in respect to the ecological impact on bat species. National Highways notes the Applicant is conducting further bat surveys and request that this material is submitted into the examination at the earliest opportunity.</p>	<p>Such surveys are on-going and will be reported when complete (anticipate Deadline 8). Surveys comprise the climbing of trees to determine the presence/absence of roosts on up to three occasions (depending on the roost potential of the tree) during the bat active season with at least two climbs between May and July. Any tree that cannot be climbed will be subject to appropriate emergence surveys.</p>
Page 9	<p>National Highways shares the council concerns in respect to the risk of blockages in watercourses and has requested that Applicant justifies the use of 400mm freeboard and complete blockage assessments, to quantify the residual flood risk should a blockage occur at the structures listed in Paragraph</p>	<p>ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment Version 2 [AS-078] demonstrates that the Project would not increase peak water levels (and therefore flood risk) in local watercourses including the River Mole and the Gatwick Stream which are conveyed by the three structures listed in FRA</p>

	7.2.31 of the Flood Risk Assessment [TR020005/APP/147]	<p>paragraph 7.2.31. Therefore the Project will not exacerbate the residual flood risk that exists in the current situation.</p> <p>The 400mm freeboard referred to in FRA paragraph 7.3.32 is intended as a degree of sensitivity analysis.</p> <p>A blockage assessment would be undertaken as part of the development of the detailed design of these crossings.</p>
Page 9	National Highways requires the Applicant to undertake its noise assessments in accordance with the DMRB guidance.	A full DMRB noise assessment is reported in ES Appendix 14.9.4 Road Traffic Noise Modelling [APP-174].
Page 9	National Highways shares the concerns of the council and it is National Highway’s view that 10-minute survey periods are not sufficient to provide data suitable for validation of the road traffic noise model in the case of the Airport.	With regards baseline surveys, the purpose of the one hour surveys reported in the Riverside Garden Park in ES Appendix 14.9.4 was not to validate the road traffic noise model but to gain an understanding of the park environment, as clarified in the noise topic working group. Validation of the traffic noise model is now reported in Appendix D - Traffic Noise Important Area Assessment of Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground (Doc Ref. 10.13).

Page 10	<p>National Highways shares the concerns of the council and National Highways maintains that the Applicant’s proposed control documents relating to highway works and the long-term operation of the Strategic Road Network are inadequate. National Highways proposes to submit into the examination “mark ups” of the Surface Access Commitments [TR020005/APP/090] by Deadline 2. How mode share commitments will be secured and maintained in the long term are a key matter for National Highways.</p>	<p>National Highways' response and marked up version of the SAC [REP2-056] submitted at Deadline 2 are noted. The Applicant has submitted proposed amendments to the SAC document in an updated version of ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Version 2) at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2).</p>
---------	---	---

6.12 **Local Impact Report (Surrey County Council, Mole Valley District Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council)**

- 6.12.1 The Applicant notes that National Highways shares some of the same concerns as the Surrey County Authorities. The Applicant has responded to points made which are made in addition to the local authorities’ comments.
- 6.12.2 Table 26 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to the Local Impact Report (Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council and West Sussex County Council).

Table 26 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Local Impact Report (Crawley Borough Council, Horsham District Council, Mid Sussex District Council and West Sussex County Council)

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 11	<p>National Highways share the concerns of the Local Authorities in respect to the safe operation of the North Terminal Junction with the A23.</p> <p>In National Highways written representation submitted at Deadline 1 [TR020005/REP1/088], it is National Highways current preference that the operation and maintenance responsibility for all signal infrastructure at this junction resides with National Highways. National Highways welcomes a proactive discussion between National Highways, the Applicant and West Sussex County Council to agree the principles of this proposal.</p>	<p>This matter was included in the Joint Surrey Local Impact Report [REP1-097] and a response to item TT12 is provided in The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15). This was also raised by National Highways in its Written Representation and the Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways on this matter and provide further updates to the SoCG in due course.</p>

6.13 Written Representation of Kent County Council Deadline 1 Submission

6.13.1 Table 27 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to Kent County Council’s Written Representation submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 27 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to Kent County Council’s Written Representation

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 11	<p>National Highways has set out its position that there are a number of significant concerns about the modelling, which are not yet resolved. These are fully set out in National Highways' Relevant Representation [TR020005/RR/3222], the Statement of Common Ground [TR020005/REP1/036] and the Post Hearing Submissions [TR020005/REP1/086]. The ExA is requested to further note that National Highways is not yet content that the modelling justifies the specific monitoring and mitigation put forward, particularly the impacts on the wider Strategic Road Network including the M25 and M23 motorways. At Deadline 2, National Highways proposes to put forward amendments to the Surface Access Commitments which are, at minimum, required whether or not the modelling concerns are resolved.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to points raised by Kent County Council in Section 5.3 of The Applicant’s Response to the Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15).</p> <p>National Highways' response and marked up version of the SAC document [REP2-056] submitted at Deadline 2 are noted. The Applicant has submitted proposed amendments to the SAC document in an updated version of ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Version 2) at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways in respect of any outstanding queries related to the transport modelling.</p>

6.14 Written Representation of Network Rail Infrastructure (NR) Deadline 1 Submission

6.14.1 Table 28 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to Network Rail’s Written Representation, submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 28 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to Network Rail’s Written Representation

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 12	<p>National Highways shares the concerns of NR in respect of railway capacity, specifically the risk of a lack available rail capacity to achieve modal shift targets. Should the modal shift targets not to be achieved there is a high probability that GAL customers will access the airport via other means, including by road and private car. As a result of this, the Applicants Transport Assessment may underrepresent the impact of the proposals on capacity, congestion, safety and journey time reliability on the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>The predicted usage of the Strategic Road Network is fundamental to our understanding of the impacts of the Scheme and any mitigation required. The RR requested that the Applicant demonstrate the</p>	<p>The Applicant addressed the points raised in Network Rail’s Written Representation in section 88 of The Applicant’s Response to the Written Representations (Doc Ref. 10.14).</p> <p>The Applicant has also responded on points raised in relation to sensitivity tests, to ensure robustness in the assessment, in the answer to question TT.1.3 in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p> <p>The Applicant is continuing engagement with Network Rail and Govia Thameslink Railway in relation to the performance of the rail network and will continue to engage with National Highways.</p>

	<p>methodology used to determine the modal split is both reasonable and achievable to provide assurance in respect of the forecast demand on the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK.</p>	
--	--	--

6.15 Written Representation of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council Deadline 1 Submission

6.15.1 Table 29 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to Reigate and Banstead Borough Council’s Written Representation, submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 29 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to Reigate and Banstead Borough Council’s Written Representation

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 12	<p>The Applicant provided a technical note with further information; however, National Highways have not yet received a response to comments raised. The Applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated how the construction traffic impact on the Strategic Road Network has been used to inform the decisions in relation to preferred location sizes and uses for the construction compound, and it can be operated</p>	<p>This is noted. The Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways on this matter and provide further updates to the SoCG in due course.</p>

	<p>safely. These matters need to be addressed to the satisfaction of National Highways before they are considered resolved in both National Highways' Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement [TR020005/RR/3222] and the Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant [TR020005/REP1/036].</p>	
--	---	--

6.16 Written Representation of Transport for London (TfL) Deadline 1 Submission

6.16.1 Table 30 sets out the Applicant's response to matters raised by National Highways' response to Transport for London's Written Representation, submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 30 The Applicant's Response to Matters Raised by National Highways' Response to Transport for London's Written Representation

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant's Response
Page 12	<p>National Highways notes TfL's concern regarding the scope of the Sustainable Transport Fund proposed by the Applicant. Similarly National Highways is concerned that the proposed Transport Mitigation Fund is lacking in definition and requested in further clarity from GAL in our initial PADSS</p>	<p>The Applicant's proposals in respect of the Sustainable Transport Fund and the Transport Mitigation Fund are further detailed in response to TT.1.2 and TT.1.29 of The Applicant's Response to EXQ1-Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref 10.16). Further detail in respect of both funds is set</p>

	<p>document contained in Annex A of our Relevant Representation (RR) dated 27 October 2023 [TR020005/RR/3222].</p>	<p>out in Schedule 3 of the draft DCO Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] at paragraphs 4 and 10 respectively.</p>
<p>Page 12 & 13</p>	<p>National Highways is concerned that mode share targets, particularly in respect of railway are rail are not achievable based on the current available capacity and lack of a funded programme of infrastructure improvements. Should the modal shift targets not to be achieved there is a high probability that GAL customers will access the airport via other means, including by road and private car. As a result of this, the Applicants Transport Assessment may underrepresent the impact of the proposals on capacity, congestion, safety and journey time reliability on the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>National Highways’ Relevant Representation (RR) dated 27 October 2023 [TR020005/RR/3222], set out its position that the predicted usage of the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK is fundamental to our understanding of the impacts of the Scheme and any mitigation required. The RR requested that the</p>	<p>This is noted and further technical engagement in relation to the modelling methodology is ongoing with National Highways in order to progress the SoCG between Gatwick Airport Limited and National Highways [REP1-036].</p>

	<p>Applicant demonstrate the methodology used to determine the modal split is both reasonable and achievable to provide assurance in respect of the forecast demand on the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK.</p>	
<p>Page 13</p>	<p>As set out in our RR, National Highways considered the traffic modelling and transportation assessment to be flawed as it over estimates the capacity of the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK through the inclusion of the M25 J10-16 Smart Motorway, which is no longer programmed for implementation. National Highways continues to engage with the Applicant to review the traffic model, baseline and forecast assessments to confirm that the impacts of proposals on the Strategic Road Network are understood, and appropriate mitigation is included in the DCO, where necessary. These matters remain unresolved and have been highlighted in National Highways Relevant Representation [TR020005/RR/3222] and reinforced in its written</p>	<p>This matter is included at Rows 2.20.1.5-6 of the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and National Highways [REP1-036]. The Smart Motorway scheme on M25 between J10 and J16 has been removed from the sensitivity tests undertaken as part of considering post-Covid behaviour, which are documented in Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling [AS-121].</p>

	representation [TR020005/REP1/088] submission at Deadline 1.	
--	--	--

6.17 Written Representation of the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (CILT) Deadline 1 Submission

6.17.1 Table 31 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport’s Written Representation, submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 31 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by National Highways’ Response to the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport’s Written Representation

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 13	National Highways notes the position of the CILT with respect to mode share targets, however, there remains a specific concern that the current railway services and railway infrastructure has insufficient capacity to support the target for rail passenger numbers. This is reflected in the concerns of both Network Rail Infrastructure and Govia Thameslink Railway (Reps REP1-090 and REP1-185 respectively). National Highway is concerned that if the mode shift targets not to be achieved there is a high probability that GAL	<p>The DCO Application contains a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the Project on the rail network and rail capacity in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3) and ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 5.1 v3)</p> <p>The assessment shows no significant increase in crowding on rail services is expected as a result of the Project and no significant effects would arise for rail users.</p> <p>The mode share commitments within ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2)</p>

	<p>customers will access the airport via other means, including by road and private car. As a result of this, the Applicants Transport Assessment may underrepresent the impact of the proposals on capacity, congestion, safety and journey time reliability on the Strategic Road Network.</p>	<p>represent the position the Applicant is committing to achieve, based on the modelling of mode choice and transport network operation. The SAC contain commitments to monitoring and should it become apparent that the mode share commitments are not or may not be met, the Applicant will be required to identify and take further action to achieve the committed mode shares. The funding commitments set out in the SAC are secured in Schedule 3 of the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] which includes provision for a Transport Mitigation Fund, which is available to provide mitigation of an unforeseen or unintended impact from the Project including impacts on the highway network and the railway network.</p>
--	--	--

6.18 Written Representation of Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) Deadline 1 Submission

6.18.1 Table 32 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ response to Govia Thameslink Railway’s Written Representation, submitted at Deadline 1.

Table 32 The Applicant’s response to matters raised by National Highways’ Response to Govia Thameslink Railway’s Written Representation

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
-----	---------------	--------------------------

<p>Page 13</p>	<p>National Highways shares the concerns of GTR in respect of railway capacity, specifically the risk of a lack available rail capacity to achieve modal shift targets. Should the modal shift targets not to be achieved there is a high probability that GAL customers will access the airport via other means, including by road and private car. As a result, the Applicants Transport Assessment may underrepresent the impact of the proposals on capacity, congestion, safety and journey time reliability on the Strategic Road Network. As set out in the summary of principal areas of concern contained in our Relevant Representation (RR) [TR020005/RR/3222] dated 27 October 2023, the predicted usage of the Strategic Road Network is fundamental to our understanding of the impacts of the Scheme and any mitigation required. The RR requested that the Applicant demonstrate the methodology used to determine the modal split is both reasonable and achievable to provide assurance in respect of the forecast demand on the STRATEGIC ROAD NETWORK.</p>	<p>Please refer to the response to National Highways' comments on the Written Representation from Network Rail Infrastructure, above.</p>
----------------	--	---

7 Surrey County Council

7.1.1 The topics raised in Surrey County Council’s response to the Applicant’s submissions at Deadline 1 [[REP2-061](#)] are set out below using the headings within the submission.

7.2 Comments on Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling

7.2.1 Table 33 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by Surrey County Council’s response to Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling.

Table 33 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by Surrey County Council’s response to Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Page 2	For both the future baseline and NRP scenarios, the sensitivity tests show a small reduction in the public transport mode shares driven primarily by reduced congestion on the road network and potentially also a result of the post-Covid rail timetable. As a result, the public transport mode share for air passengers is lower than estimated in the Application and Table 32 and Table 33 of TR020005 AS-121 shows that in 2032, GAL is not able to meet the mode share targets set out in the SACs for both passengers and staff.	The post-Covid sensitivity testing in Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling [AS-121] uses the same assumptions about transport interventions that would be applied as were used for the core modelling in the Application. This was a deliberate choice, to provide consistency of comparison between the core and sensitivity tests. The post-Covid sensitivity tests showed a general reduction in traffic volumes compared to the core, notwithstanding a slightly lower public transport mode share outcome in the sensitivity tests. In practice, if it became apparent that the mode share commitments set out in ES

	<p>This demonstrates the sensitivity of the model to both relatively small changes to background highway demand that has manifested itself in reduced journey times by car and small changes in the rail timetable. Both of these changes have conspired to result in greater use of car as the mode of access to the airport and reduced public transport mode share. It suggests the fine margins at which the surface access strategy was set to achieve the public transport mode shares reported in the application, adding to the uncertainty over the forecasts and potential impacts. SCC has long asked for other sensitivity tests to be undertaken such that the impacts of not meeting the mode share SAC can be understood.</p>	<p>Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) were not likely to be met, the Applicant would vary the scale or type of interventions in order to address the potential shortfall. This could, for example, take the form of varying parking or forecourt access charges, which the Applicant would be able to do in response to observed mode share trends.</p> <p>As noted in The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Traffic and Transport (Doc Ref. 10.16) in answer to TT.1.13, during the development of model forecasts, and through discussions with key stakeholders including National Highways and SCC and WSCC, some sensitivity analysis has been undertaken to build confidence in the forecasting process, assumptions and outputs.</p>
Page 2	<p>This post-Covid sensitivity test has raised a number of issues that may well play out in reality should the Annual Monitoring Report produced as part of SAC Commitment 16 show similar results. SCC would now like to understand how GAL would respond in such circumstances, as the absence of a Green</p>	<p>The issue of adopting a Green Controlled Growth approach was included in the Joint Surrey Local Impact Report [REP1-097], ref TT16] and a response is provided in The Applicants Response to Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>

	<p>Controlled Growth approach such as that proposed at Luton Airport, means that growth could continue unabated yet the mitigation remains undefined and the impacts on our network understated</p>	
--	---	--

8 West Sussex Joint Local Authorities

8.1.1 The topics raised in the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to the Applicant’s submissions at Deadline 1 [[REP2-042](#)] are summarised below and have retained the headings set out in the response.

8.2 Draft Development Consent Order Schedule of Changes

8.2.1 Table 34 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to the Draft Development Consent Order Schedule of Changes.

Table 34 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to the Draft Development Consent Order Schedule of Changes

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Multiple	<p><i>The Councils have provided comments on all changes made to the draft DCO at Deadline 1 by reference to the Applicant's Draft Development Consent Order - Schedule of Changes [REP1-005]</i></p>	<p>Where the Councils' have confirmed that changes made by the Applicant at Deadline 1 are acceptable, this is welcomed.</p> <p>Where the Councils have repeated concerns with drafting that are also contained in their Local Impact Reports, these are not addressed here but have been addressed in The Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.15) submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

		The limited number of points not dealt with in that document are excerpted and addressed below.
3	<p><u>Article 2 (interpretation)</u></p> <p>For additional clarity, should the reference to “Part 1” be replaced with “section 66 (airports)” which includes the definition of “airport”?</p>	The Applicant is happy to substitute this reference given that it does not affect the interpretation of this definition. This change has been made in version 6.0 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6).
18	<p><u>Article 27 (compulsory acquisition of land)</u></p> <p>The Authorities did not request for his amendment to be made</p>	The Applicant understood the Councils' remark at row 20.19 of the Local Authority Issues Tracker [AS-060] to be requesting this change. In any event, either form of drafting is of materially the same effect.

8.3 Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Outline Arboricultural Method Statement

8.3.1 Table 35 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to the Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Outline Arboricultural Method Statement.

Table 35 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ Response to the Tree Survey, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Outline Arboricultural Method Statement

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 2.3	A key problem is that the survey plans and tables are difficult to cross reference and aside from the highway works it is very hard from the information in the survey document and the key on the accompanying plans to work out which trees are being retained and which are likely to be removed. Recommendations of how to address these matters are provided within the PADSS	<p>ES Appendix 8.10.1: Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP1-026,REP1-027,REP1-028,REP1-029, REP1-030] includes tree survey schedules and plans detailing the site survey results. The tables and plans have been carried out in accordance with the requirements of British Standards 5837:2012 as detailed within the report.</p> <p>The Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3) includes preliminary plans of trees to be removed based on the preliminary design work, which are hatched in Orange and shown in the Key, along with tree removal schedules.</p>
Para 2.4	The AIA lacks detail of the following which are required to demonstrate how arboricultural features have been considered:	<p>ES Appendix 8.10.1: Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) provides a worst case assessment of the arboricultural impact of the Project within the survey area, based on the preliminary design work, including construction</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detail of construction elements which may directly or indirectly impact arboricultural features (this is required to demonstrate the need for proposed tree loss, or where mitigating measures are proposed to retain trees); • Design principles which may reduce tree loss through detailed design reviews (as well as opportunities to enhance retained features); and • Demonstration that compensatory tree planting proposals consider local planning policies. 	<p>requirements (such as the construction compounds). Further information about the securing mechanisms has been provided below and this has been considered in the development of the AIA.</p> <p>Section 7.2 of the AIA (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) includes consideration of CBC Local Plan Policy CH6 and the relevant tree removal and replanting calculations within Crawley Borough. Appendix J of the AIA includes the Replanting Calculation Methodology and Schedules.</p> <p>Any construction activities must be carried out in accordance with the CoCP [REP1-021] under DCO Requirement 7. The CoCP includes a number of construction management measures for the protection of trees and vegetation during construction. Annex 6 of the CoCP comprises an Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2). Detailed Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statements (AVMS) including Detailed Vegetation Removal and Protection Plans and, where required, Detailed Tree Removal and Protection Plans will be prepared and submitted to CBC for approval (following consultation with MVDC and RBBC as</p>
--	---	--

		<p>appropriate) prior to the removal of any trees or vegetation in that area. These AVMSs and accompanying plans will be substantially in accordance with the Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement (CoCP Annex 6) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2).</p> <p>Landscape design principles for the new landscaping provisions to be delivered on-site are included in Section 3: Landscape and Ecology Zone Objectives of the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v3). The obligations within the oLEMP are secured through a requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1v6) in that before work can commence on any part of the Project, a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) for that part must be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. Each LEMP must be substantially in accordance with the principles in the oLEMP.</p> <p>The LEMPs will demonstrate how the detailed landscape proposals have incorporated the retained vegetation including hedgerows, woodland, trees, shrubs, wetland and amenity planting. Appendix 1 of the Design and Access Statement (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) includes Design Principles L1</p>
--	--	--

		<p>and L4 to review any vegetation of value for retention and incorporate into the design where feasible to minimise impacts on character and visual resources.</p>
<p>Para 2.5</p>	<p>The oAMS does not provide clear working methodologies and facilitation requirements for all activities that are likely to occur within the construction exclusion zones of trees proposed for retention. Further, it has not been made clear what will be included within the detailed arboricultural method statements and tree protection plans that are proposed for approval by the relevant planning authority in order to secure adequate tree protection.</p>	<p>Annex 6 of the CoCP [REP1-021] includes an Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement (oAVMS). The oAVMS provides information and measures to ensure the protection of retained trees throughout the construction of the Project and Preliminary Removal and Protection Plans to illustrate the proposed protection measures. The plans show the alignment and design of protective fencing to define a construction exclusion zone and root protection areas.</p> <p>At this stage of the design, the plans showing tree removals are based on a worst case scenario and trees are either assumed to be within works areas and removed or outside and retained. No works are proposed within retained trees RPAs.</p> <p>Detailed Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statements (AVMS) including Detailed Vegetation Removal and Protection Plans and, where required, Detailed Tree</p>

		<p>Removal and Protection Plans will be prepared and submitted to CBC (in consultation with MVDC and RBBC as appropriate) for approval prior to the removal of any trees or vegetation in that area. These AVMS and accompanying plans will be prepared in accordance with BS5837 and will be substantially in accordance with the oAVMS.</p>
<p>Para 2.6</p>	<p>Of utmost concern is the inadequate assessment of impacts to Horleyland Wood, an irreplaceable habitat of ancient woodland status. Whilst the AIA states no tree loss will occur within ancient woodland, a contradicting note is shown on the Airport Tree Removal & Protection Plan (Appendix 5.3.2 Annex 6, Sheet 9) indicating that removal of trees within Horleyland Wood, and trees within its existing buffer zone (which form a pre-existing physical barrier), will be assessed after detailed design. No justification for impacts to ancient woodland has been provided, nor detail of adequate protection measures in mitigation (such as buffer zones), nor has a suitable compensation strategy been presented as a last resort.</p>	<p>No designated Ancient Woodlands are located within the Project site boundary, as shown on the Planning Policy Plan in the Planning Statement Appendix B (Doc Ref. 7.1 v2) and ES Figure 9.6.1 [APP-048].</p> <p>No trees within any Ancient Woodland, including Horleyland Wood, are to be removed as part of the Project.</p> <p>The indicative pipeline route within the Project Description Figure 5.2.1e is shown located within the 15m buffer around the Ancient Woodland. This alignment will be designed to ensure that the pipeline will lie outside of the 15m buffer. To provide assurances of this, a new Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3 v2) is proposed specifying that detailed design</p>

		must take account of buffer zones to Ancient Woodland and submitted at Deadline 3.
--	--	--

8.4 Statement of Commonality

8.4.1 Table 36 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to the Statement of Commonality.

Table 36 The Applicant’s Response to Matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ Response to the Statement of Commonality

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 2.10 & 2.11	The Authorities do not accept that matters are mostly agreed (Green) on Climate Change and Greenhouse matters. With regard to the former, the Authorities are awaiting additional information from the Applicant, before it is willing to accept that there are no remaining issues of concern. With regard to the latter, the Authorities retain concerns on several issues which are listed in their Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statements (PADSSs) and in the Statement of Common Grounds (SoCGs) submitted at Deadline 1.	<p>The Statement of Commonality [REP1-031] is a tool to understand the broad position of stakeholders across various topics as described at paragraph 3.1.1 of that document. This does not indicate that all matters have been resolved or not agreed but where the majority of matters within a topic have reached a position of agreed or not agreed.</p> <p>This assists with communicating to the Examining Authority the areas where resolution or a conclusion has largely been reached. It is not the intention of the Applicant to discontinue</p>

	<p>Similarly, the Authorities are concerned that the Applicant appears to suggest that the status with several topics across the Authorities are matters mostly not agreed (Red). This would suggest that the Applicant is not willing to enter into discussion on these matters, when other Authorities, have the same topics (with similar issues having been identified) colour coded as a matter mostly subject to ongoing discussion (Yellow). The consistency applied to the status of matters between various parties therefore needs to be checked. It is suggested at this stage that all relevant categories should be shaded yellow as none are completely addressed but equally it is not understood to be the case at this early stage in the process that any matter is coded red which would suggest that no agreement can be reached on this matter during the course of the Examination.</p>	<p>discussions on topics where there are still outstanding matters that have not been resolved.</p> <p>For example, for the Climate Change topic, the following proportion of matters were marked as agreed by the West Sussex local authorities at Deadline 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Sussex: 8 of 12 (75%) • Crawley: 10 of 14 (71%) • Horsham: 4 of 4 (100%) • Mid Sussex: 7 of 7 (100%) <p>Therefore, the Applicant has represented this topic as broadly agreed for all four local authorities in the Statement of Commonality.</p> <p>In the case of Greenhouse Gases topic, the following proportions apply:</p>
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Sussex: 7 of 13 (54%) – remaining issues are a combination of under discussion and not agreed • Crawley: 7 of 12 (58%) - the remaining 5 issues are not agreed. • Horsham: 8 of 11 (72%) • Mid Sussex: 6 of 11 (54%) – has been represented as half agreed, half not agreed in the Statement of Commonality. <p>The Applicant will update the Statement of Commonality to reflect a more even split between matters agreed and not agreed / under discussion for West Sussex and Crawley.</p>
<p>Para 2.12</p>	<p>Horsham District Council (“HDC”) is extremely concerned at the Applicant’s categorisation of air quality matters for the district as “Matters not relevant to a particular SoCG party”. HDC has raised concerns about the impacts of the project on air quality matters at all stages of the pre-examination and examination process, and this is reflected in the</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this error and has corrected the table within the revised Statement of Commonality (Doc Ref. 10.1 v2) submitted at Deadline 3.</p>

	SoCG itself (REP1-040). The SoC should be amended to reflect this fact	
Para 2.13	Mid Sussex District Council (“MSDC”) is concerned at the Applicants categorisation of ‘Project Elements and Approach to Mitigation’ for Mid Sussex as “Matters not relevant to a particular SoCG party”. MSDC has raised concerns in its Relevant Representation setting out specific issues. In addition, these issues have not been reflected in the SoCG (REP1-042).	The Applicant would appreciate specific references to these issues. When producing the Statements of Common Ground, all issues were captured from the Relevant Representations and Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statements. The topic headings used by each of the stakeholders do not neatly align with those used by the Applicant and it may be that those issues are within a separate topic heading.
Para 2.14	There is a concern that there are topic areas not covered by the current SoC following the submission of the Local Impact Report such as Design and Sustainability that should be listed separately. The Authorities therefore, considers that there would be merit in reviewing the topic area list for the SoCGs and SoC to correspond more closely with the Applicants Environmental Assessment topic list (and the West Sussex LIR) but with added items not covered such as Design and Sustainability.	<p>The Applicant is updating the Statements of Common Ground in advance of a further iteration at Deadline 5. These will be shared with the local authorities at the end of April/early May for further updates. This will also provide an opportunity to include any new issues that have arisen as part of developing the Local Impact Report.</p> <p>Should there be a need to incorporate a new topic heading due to issues not neatly fitting within the existing headings, the Applicant is happy to consider this.</p>

Para 2.15	While it is agreed that a Joint SoCG is to be prepared on Forecasting and Need, Capacity and Operations with the Joint Local Authorities, this fact needs to be made clear within the SoC. Each authority does have concern about this issue and has a column in the table but who the Joint Local Authorities comprise should be listed.	The Joint Local Authorities comprise all ten local authorities with which the Applicant has a Statement of Common Ground. The Applicant will ensure that the membership of the Joint Local Authorities is clear within the Statement of Common Ground.
-----------	---	--

8.5 Draft Itinerary for Accompanied Site Inspection

8.5.1 Table 37 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to the Draft Itinerary for the Accompanied Site Inspection.

Table 37 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ Response to the Draft Itinerary for the Accompanied Site Inspection

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 2.17	The Authorities wish to correct an issue with the title of the document, which does not reflect the content of the document, which sets out the itinerary for unaccompanied site inspections, as opposed to accompanied site inspections. WSCC and CBC	Noted.

	suggested additional site visits at procedural deadline A and have no further specific comments to add concerning the Applicants list.	
Para 2.18	Table 3.2 of the Draft Itinerary for an Accompanied Site Inspection (REP1-049) includes on site put forward by HDC in Bartholomew Way, however the table incorrectly states that “HDC consider it is representative of overflown residential areas”. The site was proposed in HDC’s written submission in response to the Rule 6 letter at Deadline A (PDLA-016) due to the fact it was due to be newly overflown. The intention is that the ExA can visit an area which is currently unaffected by overflight and air noise but will be under the Project.	

8.6 Car Parking Strategy

- 8.6.1 Table 38 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to the Car Parking Strategy.

Table 38 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ Response to the Car Parking Strategy

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
N/A	<p>It would be helpful if the Car Parking Strategy could provide a more detailed commentary to explain how the mode share targets and uplift in Park and Fly trips, are factored into the calculation. This will need to explain more clearly how the proposed number of new passenger spaces links to the mode share commitments in the SAC. The Authorities’ understanding is that it is the “1.20 multiplier” that essentially factors in the Project’s mode share targets to the parking need equation, but it would be helpful if this could be clarified by the Applicant.</p>	<p>The estimate of passenger car parking requirement was made at an early stage in the transport modelling process, because parking provision and location is an input to the strategic model and therefore needed to be defined before the full model runs could be undertaken.</p> <p>The factor was derived from initial estimates of the change in the number of Park & Fly trips between 2019 and 2032 with the Project, which were available at that time from the mode choice model, together with the anticipated growth in passenger throughput between 2032 and 2047. The factor therefore combines a factor of 1.08 for Park & Fly trips between 2019 and 2032 (drawing on information in Table 133 of Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260]) and a factor of 1.11 for growth in passenger throughput between 2032 and 2047 (from 72.3mppa to 80.2mppa), giving an overall factor of 1.2.</p>

Table 1 of the Car Parking Strategy identifies 2019 passenger parking (GAL operated) totalling 40,611 spaces. This broadly reflects the equivalent figure shown in the September 2019 Local Authority Parking Survey, which identifies 40,790 GAL operated spaces. Whilst this shows the total number of GAL operated spaces, the Authorities note that there are other passenger parking spaces on-airport, for example the 3,280 spaces at Purple Parking, and other spaces at on-airport hotels including Povey Cross Travelodge (623 spaces) and Sofitel (565 spaces). The omitted spaces, whilst not operated by GAL, are on-airport spaces that are used by passengers travelling to/from the airport. From the Car Parking Strategy, it is unclear if or how these (and other on-airport spaces not operated by GAL) have been taken into account in the Table 2 worked example. The Authorities would wish to understand how on-airport spaces not operated by GAL are taken into account in any calculations, as to exclude them may result in the Applicant over-estimating the amount of new parking required as a result of the Project.

Whilst several providers such as Purple Parking and hotel operators are located close to or within the airport boundary for the purposes of the car parking strategy and calculations they are considered to be “off-airport”. The distinction is between parking under GAL’s control, and therefore considered when balancing pricing and demand against sustainable travel mode share targets (on-airport), and commercial parking provided by third parties where there is no requirement to support sustainable travel and logically the focus is on maximising parking occupancy.

The capacity provided by these third party providers is included in the estimate of off-airport parking as counted annually by Crawley Borough Council and is therefore included in the assessment of parking need.

<p>The Authorities note that the Applicant is including within its Baseline the 820 parking spaces proposed at the Hilton Hotel. Notwithstanding the Authorities’ concerns as to the appropriateness of some specific projects being included in the Baseline, there would seem to be a point of consistency as to why the non-GAL operated Hilton proposal is included, when existing non-GAL operated on-airport parking (as mentioned above) appears not to factor into the calculations.</p>	<p>As acknowledged in paragraph 4.6.5 of The Applicant’s Responses to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005], planning permission for the 820 parking spaces at the Hilton hotel has lapsed and those spaces no longer form part of the future baseline or with Project scenarios. The 820 spaces have therefore been removed from the expected passenger parking provision in the years 2029, 2032 and 2047.</p>
<p>The Applicant has identified authorised off-airport provision for 2019 as being 21,200 total spaces. This does not appear to tally with the equivalent figure in the September 2019 Local Authority Parking Survey, which identifies 18,110 authorised off-airport spaces. It is unclear why the Applicant’s figure is higher. It may be that the Applicant has based its calculations on a different Airport Boundary to that used by the Authorities (for clarity, the Authorities have used the Gatwick Airport Boundary as shown on the Crawley Local Plan Map 2015 for the purpose of determining whether a location is on or off-airport). It is possible that the Applicant may have included within this figure parking within the airport</p>	<p>The Gatwick Parking Survey 2019 details a total of 22,819 spaces that are not controlled by the Applicant, slightly in excess of the 21,200 spaces including in the modelling and transport assessment. The previous survey in 2018 noted 22,320 spaces that are not controlled by the applicant, including 671 spaces not held by the Applicant but at hotels within short walking distance of the terminals.</p> <p>Only on-airport parking capacity operated by the Applicant is subject to the commitments set out in the Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) as these are the</p>

	<p>boundary that is not operated by GAL. It would be helpful if the Applicant could please clarify in more detail the sites included in its authorised on and off-airport figures including a map showing the site locations.</p>	<p>only spaces under the Applicant’s control. The capacity of all other sites is assumed to remain constant.</p>
	<p>The Authorities do not concur with the Applicant’s assumption that the circa 3,300 parking spaces can be included in the baseline. It has not been demonstrated that the Hilton Hotel car park planning permission has been lawfully commenced and the permission may have lapsed. Additionally, the capacity increase achieved through the robotic parking is not proven. Whilst coming forward as Permitted Development submitted to CBC as the planning authority, , the Applicant would need to demonstrate that a proposed increase in parking is justified by evidence of demonstrable need and having regard to GAL’s surface access commitments as per Local Plan Policy GAT3 and the existing S106 legal agreement. The assumption, to include the robotic parking in the baseline, is made in advance of the individual PDR consultations.</p>	<p>As acknowledged in paragraph 4.6.5 of The Applicant’s Responses to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005], planning permission for the 820 parking spaces at the Hilton hotel has lapsed and those spaces no longer form part of the future baseline or with Project scenarios. The 820 spaces have therefore been removed from the expected passenger parking provision in the years 2029, 2032 and 2047.</p> <p>GAL operates its on-airport parking with flexibility towards the proportion of spaces operated as self-park (the passenger parks the car themselves in individual car parking spaces and retains the keys) and block-park (the car is parked by a valet operator in a more space-efficient manner and returned to a collection point when the passenger returns), in response to variability in passenger demand. The difference in the parking density between self-park and</p>

		<p>block-park is approximately 35-40% depending on the area in question.</p> <p>The term “robotic parking” describes an automated version of block parking which uses autonomous robots to tow vehicles to their parking spaces and parks them closer together than for self-park operation with a similar density to block-parking using valet drivers. The difference between traditional block-parking and "robotic parking" is only in the customer experience and automation of the process. The net increase of 2,500 spaces arises because of the conversion of existing self-park spaces to robotic (or block) parking spaces which maximises the available space and has been included in the Future Baseline assumptions as the growth which would occur at the Airport in the absence of the Project.</p>
	<p>The Authorities would also wish to reiterate that there is a concern that there is no control through the draft DCO or proposed s106 agreement to prevent the current PDR being used to create an overprovision of parking in the future, undermining sustainable travel to the airport. It is therefore considered that the Applicant should waive</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed in the Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) to use changes in parking charges and control of parking capacity to support its mode share targets, which are binding under the DCO. This provides sufficient control to limit the amount of parking the Applicant provides as unduly increasing the amount of</p>

	<p>permitted development rights for additional on-airport parking from the draft DCO, as this would enable the Local Planning Authority to effectively control the provision of future airport parking and ensure that Gatwick provides sufficient parking, but no more parking than is required to support its sustainable strategy for airport access.</p>	<p>parking would risk not meeting the mode share targets leading to a breach of the terms of the DCO.</p>
--	--	---

8.7 Air Quality

8.7.1 The Applicant notes that the local authorities are preparing a technical note on air quality and await its submission.

8.8 Needs Case/Capacity and Operations Summary Paper

8.8.1 The Applicant notes the local authorities' comment. For matters which may be between the parties on these issues, please see GAL's Response to the LIRs.

8.9 Rights of Way and Access Plans

8.9.1 Table 39 sets out the Applicant's response to matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities' response to the Rights of Way and Access Plans.

Table 39 The Applicant's Response to Matters Raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities' response to the Rights of Way and Access Plans

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant's Response
-----	---------------	--------------------------

<p>Para 2.33</p>	<p>It is the understanding of the Authorities that updated versions of the Rights of Way and Access Plans have been submitted by the Applicant to address</p> <p>National Highways and the local Highway Authorities' request that the Rights of Way and Access Plans define the segregated and shared use active provisions separately for pedestrians and cyclists and that no other changes have been made to these plans.</p>	<p>The Rights of Way and Access Plans were revised to address comments received relating to the shading of the active travel provisions to provide delineation between footways, shared-use and segregated provisions. These revised plans were submitted to the Planning Inspectorate at Deadline 1 [REP1-014].</p>
<p>Para 2.34</p>	<p>On that basis the Authorities have no further comments to make on these plans, but would reiterate that there is outstanding technical work required to fully enable consideration and to appraise the highway safety and capacity implications of these works. The Applicant should therefore provide the following, as set out in the West Sussex LIR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designers Response and to appropriately address concerns raised by the auditors. 	<p>The Stage 1 RSA and Stage 1 RSA Designer Response in Draft was issued to the Highway Authorities for review and comment, with WSCC returning comments on 24/05/2023. The final Stage 1 RSA Designers Response and agreement of RSA actions has been the subject of ongoing engagement with the highway authorities through the SoCG process and a Draft 2 version of the Designers Response has been shared with the Highway Authorities.</p> <p>As part of technical engagement with WSCC an updated highway design review and package of information in relation to departures from standard in the vicinity of WSCC highway</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Design Review of the highway works. • Justification for the proposed speed limits against the relevant WSCC Speed Limit policy. • A copy of the VISSIM model validation report. • A more detailed narrative around queue lengths, or the provision of junction modelling outputs should be provided, to enable the authority to better understand the impact on the network. Additional modelling results should be obtained from VISSIM, including vehicle delays or plotting queue length over time to demonstrate that the junction is forecast to operate satisfactorily. • A LINSIG assessment of the signalised junction should be undertaken, and the outputs of this modelling provided, such as the Practical Reserve Capacity (PRC) and the Degree of Saturation (DoS), to better 	<p>network was shared on 05/10/23 and discussions in relation to this material is ongoing. In summary, as set out in Section 6.11 of the Design and Access Statement Volume 5 [APP-257], National Highway’s strategic road network elements have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and Local highway authority roads have been designed in accordance with relevant design standards and guidance including Manual for Streets. Where required Departures from Standard application submissions have been made to the relevant highway authorities in accordance with the relevant highway authority process. The detailed design of the strategic road network elements of the scheme will be subject to National Highways approval in accordance with the protective provisions for National Highways set out in Schedule 9 Part 3 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6). The detailed design of the local highway authority elements of the scheme will be subject to highway authority approval in accordance with the process set out in Schedule 2 Paragraph (4) of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6).</p> <p>The urban/partially built-up characteristics of this section of the A23 London Road combined with the proposals to</p>
--	---	--

	<p>quantify the performance and capacity of the junction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A summary of demand matrix changes that have been applied in the VISSIM model for each future scenario would be useful to better understand the impacts presented. 	<p>provide new and upgraded facilities for pedestrians and cyclists alongside and crossing the A23 London Road at the proposed new signal controlled junction with North Terminal Link are considered to most closely align with the West Sussex Speed Limit Policy’s Functional Hierarchy category for 40mph speed limit roads. It is expected that the proposed speed limit reduction would encourage reduced speeds on the road with safety benefits for all road users including active travel users. West Sussex Speed Limit Policy highlights that “lower traffic speeds may also encourage more walking and cycling”. This aligns with the scheme's objective of increasing sustainable mode share through measures which include the scheme’s proposed active travel infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>This topic is being discussed further with WSCC. Further details have been shared with WSCC as part of ongoing technical engagement supporting the SoCG process with highways authorities.</p>
<p>Para 2.35</p>	<p>As previously stated in the authority’s comments on the draft DCO there appears to be an error in relation to page 66 of the draft DCO. The draft DCO refers to</p>	<p>The relevant text in Schedule 3, Part 1 of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6) references "a24" with the intended green colour of the shading for A23 London Road left-in Diverge to</p>

<p>the A23 London Road Diverge to North Terminal Roundabout as being shown by green striped hatching (indicating National Highways responsibility) but on the associated Rights of Way and Access Plans it is shown as a blue hatched plan (indicating Local Highway Authority maintained). These latest Rights of Way and Access Plans continue to indicate the A23 London Road Diverge to North Terminal Roundabout as Local Highway Authority maintained. However, WSCC would envisage that the A23 London Road Diverge to North Terminal Roundabout would be managed and maintained by National Highways and therefore clarification should be provided by the Applicant and the plans amended to accord with the wording in the draft DCO.</p>	<p>North Terminal Roundabout with a trunk road designation as it is envisaged to form part of National Highway's strategic road network. The previous Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP1-014] have been amended for resubmission at Deadline 3 submission (Doc Ref. 4.6v3) to align with this to reflect the road's intended classification as a trunk road.</p> <p>In version 6.0 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 2.1v6), the reference in Schedule 3, Part 1 to "a24" has been amended from 325m to 380m to reflect the length of the full diverge as part of this update.</p>
---	---

8.10 Surface Access Highways Plans

8.10.1 Table 40 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to the Surface Access Highways Plans.

Table 40 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ Response to the Surface Access Highways Plans

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 2.36	The Authorities of the understanding that updated versions of the Surface Access Highway Plans, including the structural section drawings, have been submitted to address National Highways’ request that the indicative central reserve safety barrier provisions are reflected on the Structure Section Drawings and to address errata in relation to the position and direction of sections for Airport Way Bridge over A23 London Road and Balcombe Road Underbridge.	This is correct, these plans were submitted at Deadline 1: Surface Access Highways Plans – Structure Section Drawings [REP1-015] .

8.11 Traffic Modelling

8.11.1 Table 41 sets out the Applicant’s response to matters raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to Traffic Modelling.

Table 41 The Applicant’s Response to Matters Raised by the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ response to Traffic Modelling

Ref	Matter Raised	The Applicant’s Response
Para 3.3 & 3.4	<p>As there is now less baseline congestion in this post-Covid forecast, car travel is more attractive, resulting in a lower public transport mode share. Sustainable transport mode shares, as presented in Table 32: Public transport mode shares – air passengers (AADT) and Table 33: Sustainable transport mode shares – Employees (June), are seen to drop slightly in the With Project sensitivity test. The Applicant concludes that this is as a consequence of the total highway demand and reduced congestion and that this is considered a reasonable response from the sensitivity test model.</p> <p>Whilst these drops in public transport mode shares are small (less than 0.7% with the Project) it does however mean that the modelling is forecasting that the Surface Access Commitments (APP-090), in relation to a minimum 55% of air passenger journeys to and from the airport by public transport (Commitment 1) and a minimum of 55% of airport</p>	<p>Section 6.6 of Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling [AS-121] explains the highway network performance in the sensitivity tests with the updated magnitude of impact assessment for the sensitivity tests presented. Section 6.7 and 6.8 of Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling [AS-121] show the updated assessment for rail and bus respectively. The outputs of the Covid sensitivity tests are also being considered in the context of the ES and the Applicant will provide further information to the ExA in due course.</p>

	<p>staff journeys to and from the airport by public transport, shared travel and active modes (Commitment 2), are not forecast to be met by the Applicant. For example, in 2032 the revised modelling forecasts that 54.7% of employees will travel sustainably to the airport. This then is forecast to reduce further to 54.3% by 2038 and then further still in 2047 to 54.0%. It is also noted that the Applicant has not offered any further mitigation to address the transport impacts, as part of this additional work.</p>	
Para 3.5	<p>The Authorities remain concerned about a lack of suitable control, should the Surface Access Commitments not be met, and would look for the Applicant to propose further sustainable transport mitigation and advocate a Green Controlled Growth approach, like that adopted by the Applicant for the Luton Airport DCO (TR020001).</p>	<p>This matter was included in the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities Local Impact Report [REP1-068], ref 17.1P and a response is provided in The Applicants Response to Local Impact Reports (Doc Ref. 10.16).</p>
Para 3.6	<p>As stated in the West Sussex LIR, to fully understand the strategic modelling the Authorities would look to have sight of any modelling reports produced</p>	<p>The Applicant has reviewed the request for further modelling information in the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities documents (Local Impact Report [REP1-068] and</p>

	<p>including the Local Model Validation Report, Forecasting Report, Data Collection Report and the model files for the various scenarios</p>	<p>'Comments on any submissions received by Deadline 1' [REP2-042, paragraph 2.34]. The following has been requested and GAL has provided a response to each item below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - VISSIM model validation report: A copy of the VISSIM model validation report was shared with West Sussex highway authorities during pre-application engagement in September 2022 and this was confirmed as acceptable by WSCC in November 2022. GAL can confirm that no further updates to this have been made. - Further detailed information, including further narrative on queue lengths: Transport Assessment Annex C: VISSIM Forecasting Report [APP-261] contains average speed plots at a half hourly level which provides a proxy estimate of queuing extent. This is not expected to vary at a shorter time period as the demand profiling is sufficiently aggregate. The variability between the 20 analysis runs used for reporting (using different random seeds) shows a good level of consistency indicating that the models
--	--	--

		<p>are providing stable results. It should be noted that GAL is working through queries on queue lengths with National Highways and additional material to support the understanding of queuing behaviour is being prepared. GAL will be share this with WSCC when it becomes available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- A LINSIG assessment of the signalised junction: The new signalised junction on the A23 at North Terminal is fully part of the VISSIM model area and therefore a standalone LINSIG model is not required. In the Transport Assessment Annex C: VISSIM Forecasting Report [APP-261], Appendix D provided a full tabulation of journey times passing through the model, routes connecting points 5, 6 and 7 (5-7, 7-5, 5-6, 6-5) help to illustrate the performance of this junction between the different model scenarios.- Demand matrix changes that have been applied in VISSIM: In the Transport Assessment Annex C: VISSIM Forecasting Report [APP-261], Appendix B provides a worked example of the method used in deriving demand inputs for the VISSIM model
--	--	---

		<p>scenarios. As can be seen from the Appendix, and considering the specification of the model, there are over 320 matrices input into each scenario simulated. GAL will work through this query with WSCC as part of the ongoing engagement supporting the SoCG process.</p>
<p>Para 3.7</p>	<p>To address concerns of the local highway authorities about the potential for Strategic Road Network (SRN) traffic displacing onto the local road network, due to capacity on the SRN, the Applicant could undertake further analysis of the SATURN model to clearly identify the routes used by airport traffic with and without the proposals (e.g. a Select Link Analysis to isolate traffic to/from airport zones). This would show the extent to which airport traffic is using the local network and would also confirm corridors/junctions likely to experience the most impact from the Project.</p>	<p>The Applicant will work with West Sussex on providing further information around this point through the ongoing engagement as part of the SOCG process. An updated magnitude of impact assessment for the sensitivity test scenarios is included in section 6.6 of Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling [AS-121] which shows the impact of the Application on the highway network under post-Covid conditions and can be compared to the equivalent information in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3).</p>

Appendix A – Surface Access Highways Cross Section Details

This Appendix responds to the matters raised by AIPUT on the Surface Access Highways Plans – Structure Section Drawings – For Approval as set out in Table 3 above.

Proposed carriageway cross sections have been developed in accordance with the design standards and guidance set out in Section 6.11 of the **Design and Access Statement Volume 5** [\[APP-257\]](#). National Highway’s strategic road network elements have been designed in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) and Local highway authority roads have been designed in accordance with relevant design standards and guidance including Manual for Streets (MfS). Where required, Departures from Standard application submissions have been made to the relevant highway authorities in accordance with the relevant highway authority process. The highways design proposals have been developed in consultation with the relevant highway authorities and design engagement is ongoing.

The **Surface Access Highways Plans - General Arrangements** [\[APP-020\]](#) illustrate the scheme layout and lane provision on each road including at junctions. Cross sections are included in the proposed **Surface Access Highways Plans - Structure Section Drawings** (Doc Ref. 4.8.3 v3) at the scheme structures.

Typical carriageway cross section details for each road are summarised below in Table 42.

Table 2 in Appendix A of **The Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport** [\[REP1-065\]](#) provides a summary of the cross sections for the schemes active travel infrastructure proposals.

Table 42 Typical Surface Access Highways Cross Section Details

Road	Road Class	Key Design Standards / Guidance documents	Typical cross section details	Highway Authority	Comments
A217	Urban	MfS/ MfS2	Single carriageway with hatched central reserve similar to existing with a minimum carriageway width of approx. 14.8m over section to be realigned (minimum lane widths of 3m)	SCC	Lane provision increases on Longbridge roundabout approach to accommodate three lanes on the roundabout entry and 2 lanes on the roundabout exit
Povey Cross Road	Urban	MfS/ MfS2	Single carriageway similar to existing with a minimum carriageway width of approx. 7.3m over section to be realigned (typical lane widths of approx. 3.65m)	SCC	Lane provision increases on Longbridge roundabout approach to accommodate two lanes on the roundabout entry
A23 Brighton Road	Urban	MfS/ MfS2	Single carriageway with localised right turning lane provision with a minimum carriageway width of approx. 9.4m over section to be realigned (typical lane widths of 3m+)	SCC	Lane provision increases on Longbridge roundabout approach to accommodate two lanes on the roundabout entry and two lanes on the roundabout exit plus the segregated left turn lane onto A23 London Road.
A23 Brighton Road to A23 London Road Segregated Left Turn Lane (SLTL)	Urban	MfS/ MfS2 (and DMRB CD116)	Similar to existing (minimum width of 5.3m between tapers)	SCC (Transitioning to WSCC beyond roundabout exit)	

A23 London Road	Urban	DMRB: CD 127	<p>Typically Dual 2 lane urban all-purpose road (D2UAP) cross section as defined in DMRB CD 127 with typical 7.3m wide carriageway in each direction.</p> <p>Localised sections widen to three lanes with a Dual 3 lane urban all-purpose road D3UAP cross section as defined in DMRB CD 127 with typical 11m wide carriageway in the given direction. Refer to comments for details of changes in lane provision along the link.</p>	WSSC (SCC for approach to Longbridge roundabout)	<p>Lane provision on Longbridge roundabout approach comprises three lanes on roundabout entry and two lanes on the roundabout exit merging down to a single lane in advance of the SLTL exit.</p> <p>Lane provision increases through A23 London Road / North Terminal Link Signalised Junction. A third lane southbound is introduced in advance of the signalised junction and is dropped at the A23 London Road diverge onto Airport Way Eastbound.</p> <p>Lane provision increases northbound to three lanes from the North Terminal Flyover Link merge to Longbridge Roundabout.</p>
Airport Way	Urban	DMRB CD 127	<p>Eastbound: D2UAP cross section with typical 7.3m wide carriageway.</p> <p>Westbound: D3UAP cross section with typical 11m wide carriageway.</p>	NH	
Airport Way Westbound Diverge to North Terminal Roundabout	Urban	DMRB CD 127	Two lane urban all purpose connector road (DG2F) cross section as defined in DMRB CD 127 with a typical 8.6m wide carriageway including hard strip provision.	NH	

A23 London Road Northbound Left-in Diverge to North Terminal Roundabout	Urban	DMRB CD 127 and CD 123	Typical carriageway width of 7.3m including hard shoulder provision	NH	Single lane carriageway widening to two lanes on approach to North Terminal roundabout. Hard shoulder provided through bend to provide increased resilience in the event of a breakdown and to ensure adequate provision made to accommodate vehicle turning movements.
North Terminal Flyover Link	Urban	DMRB: CD 127	DG2F cross section as defined in DMRB CD 127 with a typical 8.6m wide carriageway including hard strip provision narrowing to a single lane urban all purpose connector road (DG1D) cross section with a typical 7.3m wide carriageway including hard shoulder and hard strip provision	NH	
Northway	Urban	MfS/ MfS2 (and DMRB CD 116)	One way Gatwick internal road similar to existing (minimum lane widths of 3m)	GAL	Four lanes to be provided on approach to North Terminal Roundabout to increase capacity.
Longbridge Way	Urban	MfS/ MfS2	Single urban carriageway similar to existing (typical lane widths of 3m)	GAL	Localised improvements to existing carriageway proposed with modifications to junction approach to North Terminal Roundabout.
North Terminal Link	Urban	DMRB CD 127	D3UAP cross section with a typical 11m wide carriageway widening to a typically Dual 4 lane urban all-purpose road	NH	

			(D4UAP) cross section with a typical 14.7m wide carriageway		
Gatwick Way	Urban	MfS/ MfS2	Single urban carriageway similar to existing (typical lane widths of 3.65m+)	GAL	Localised improvements to existing carriageway.
Perimeter Road North	Urban	MfS/ MfS2	Single urban carriageway similar to existing (typical lane widths of 3.65m)	GAL	Localised improvements to existing carriageway with introduction of right turning lane for traffic turning onto Gatwick Way
North Terminal Approach	Urban	MfS/ MfS2 (and DMRB CD 116)	One way Gatwick internal road similar to existing (minimum lane widths of 3m)	GAL	Localised improvements to existing carriageway proposed with modifications to junction exit from North Terminal Roundabout.
Gatwick Spur - westbound (previously M23 Spur)	Rural	DMRB CD 127	Dual 3 Lane Rural all-purpose (D3AP)* cross section with typical carriageway width of 11.25m westbound	NH	Localised refinement of existing lane configuration. *Provisional departure agreed with National Highways for reduced cross-section similar to existing.
Gatwick Spur - eastbound (previously M23 Spur)	Rural	DMRB CD 127	D3AP** with typical carriageway width of 11m eastbound	NH	Existing hard shoulder to be converted into a third lane eastbound. **Provisional departure agreed with National Highways for reduced cross-section similar to existing westbound provision

Gatwick Spur/ Airport Way Flyover	Rural	DMRB CD 127	Dual 2 Lane Rural all-purpose (D2AP)*** cross section with a typical carriageway width of 9.3m in each direction and a narrowed central reserve provision of 1.8m.	NH	*** Provisional departure agreed with National Highways for reduced central reserve cross-section maintaining continuity of central reserve width along the corridor.
Gatwick Spur Westbound Diverge	Rural	DMRB: CD 127	Two lane rural all-purpose connector road (DG2E) cross section as defined in DMRB CD 127 with a typical 9.3m wide carriageway including hard strip provision	NH	Lane drop diverge arrangement
Gatwick Spur Eastbound Merge	Rural	DMRB: CD 127	Single lane rural all-purpose connector road (MG1C) cross section as defined in DMRB CD 127 with a typical 7.7m wide carriageway including hard shoulder and hard strip provision	NH	Lane gain merge arrangement
Airport Way Eastbound Diverge	Urban	DMRB: CD 127	DG1D cross section with a typical 7.3m wide carriageway including hard shoulder and hard strip provision	NH	Taper diverge arrangement
Airport Way Westbound Merge	Urban	DMRB: CD 127	Single lane urban all-purpose connector road (MG1D) cross section with a typical 7.3m wide carriageway including hard shoulder and hard strip provision	NH	Lane gain merge arrangement

Ring Road North	Urban	MfS/ MfS2 (and DMRB CD 116)	Three lane roundabout entry with lane widths of 3m+	GAL	Localised improvements to the existing carriageway.
Ring Road South	Urban	MfS/ MfS2 (and DMRB CD 116)	Two lane roundabout exit with lane widths of 3m+	GAL	Localised improvements to the existing carriageway
B2036 Balcombe Road	Urban / Rural	MfS/ MfS2	Single carriageway with varying lane widths to tie in to existing provision. (Minimum lane widths = 3.0m)	SCC (North of M23 Spur) / WSCC (South of M23 Spur)	