

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
<p>E01: Overstatement of wider economic benefits of the proposal</p>	<p>TDC believes the level of increase capacity attainable from the NRP presented by GAL is overstated, leading to an overstatement of demand forecasts. TDC contests that the methodology used to derive these numbers is best practice or robust. As a result, the wider economics benefits of the proposal have been overstated and it is unclear that there is an economic case for the expansion of Gatwick.</p>	<p>Full modelling of the interaction between the use of the two runways and the respective departure routes needs to be undertaken and the delay information provided at a sufficiently granular level (hourly) to enable the delays to be properly understood and the capacity attainable validated.</p> <p>Robust market analysis and specific modelling of the share of demand that might be achieved at Gatwick in competition with other airports, not limited simply to traffic, including that from other regions of the UK, that has historically used the London airports.</p> <p>The catalytic impact methodology needs to properly account for the specific catchment area and demand characteristics of each of the cross-section of airports to ensure that the catalytic impacts of airport growth are robustly identified.</p> <p>The national economic impact assessment should robustly test the net impact of expansion at Gatwick having regard to the potential for growth elsewhere and properly account for Heathrow specific factors, such as hub traffic and air fares.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>
<p>N01: Interpretation of Aviation Policy and Local Planning Policy (in relation to air noise)</p>	<p>TDC disagrees with the way aviation noise policy is being interpreted and the consequential effects these have on the proposals. TDC also disagrees that compliance with Local Planning Policy has been demonstrated due to a lack of detail in the proposal.</p>	<p>The ES chapters need to be amended to comply with aviation policy and the consequential effects this may have on the proposal. Amendments to the submissions should be made to detail how regard is being had to Local Planning Policy and how the proposals have incorporated these or otherwise.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
<p>N02: Threshold and scope of LOAELs and SOAELs for consideration of air noise</p>	<p>In relation to air noise, the ES only considers the Leq metric for LOAELs and SOAELs. This is too narrow and other metrics should be applied to the decision processes within the project to inform impact and proposals for mitigation. The consideration only of the Leq metric does not represent all the effects of air noise across the district.</p>	<p>Inclusion of assessment for a wider range of criteria, including but not exclusively, awakenings, N above contours in addition to the Lden and Lnight.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>
<p>N03: Modelling of air noise primary and secondary metrics.</p>	<p>The noise model used in the assessment cannot currently be validated by anyone else other than the applicant. Additional scenario testing is considered necessary in the models.</p>	<p>GAL to release all baseline data and uncertainties used in noise modelling to enable validation of the model by participants. Further modelling is to be produced as necessary.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>
<p>N04: For air noise, the assessment of significance of effects – the disregard of total effects of noise on health and annoyance by referring only to marginal impacts of the NRP over a rapidly increasing baseline.</p>	<p>The Environmental Statement takes into consideration only the marginal increase in noise as a result of the additional capacity of the NRP. In that way it disregards the existing health effects of the otherwise uncontrolled and unmitigated growth. For example, awakening data for the NRP part of capacity is below the Heathrow SOAEL of one additional awakening. However, this disregards the awakenings that occur now and the increase in awakenings that will occur with purported increase in baseline growth without the northern runway.</p>	<p>An existing baseline for all metrics needs to be established with sensitivity testing for baseline and cumulative impact with northern runway in operation to understand total effects of the operation and whether this is a) acceptable and b) appropriate mitigation is set in place to address it.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
N05: Limited assessment of changes in sound levels for air noise	Changes in noise levels that lie exclusively within LOAEL or exclusively within SOAEL a have not been comprehensively assessed.	Additional clarification is required for changes in exposure to an agreed range of metrics including N above, awakenings and overflights to understand impacts with confirmation as to how they can be mitigated.	Uncertain
N06: Noise Insulation Scheme	The proposal for the noise insulation scheme is not timely nor adequate to deal with either noise and the problem of overheating created as a result of the noise mitigation and ongoing costs incurred as a result of works to individual properties.	We consider that factors such as extending the range of qualifying metrics (in addition to the Leq), basing the extent of qualifying noise contours on single mode operation and additional award to deal with overheating issues caused as a result of noise insulation need to be brought forward. The promoter also needs to pay for ongoing running and maintenance costs of noise and overheating mitigation as well as renewal at end of life. All community buildings should also be included in the mitigation scheme. All mitigation should be based on agreed predictive contours and installation commence with the decision for permission.	Uncertain
N07: Noise Envelope	We do not consider the noise envelope is fit for purpose for multiple reasons.	The noise envelope needs to be redesigned from first principles to provide a responsive, preventative, self regulating mechanism that incentivises the use of quieter fleet and shares the benefit of technological improvement with the local community through a range of operational and outcome-based measures. It needs to be governed by a steering committee that includes local authorities and provide them with a balanced range of intervention and enforcement tools.	Uncertain

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
N08: Future research	TDC consider that there is insufficient validation of the mitigation; and research to improve understanding of, for example, the effectiveness of the mitigation, the reliability and resolution of the noise contours, local attitudes to noise and cross correlation to the noise contours.	Clear proposals need to be agreed for future research and mechanisms for triggering and setting future research. We would expect this to be mandated in the DCO. The purpose is to provide an iterative feedback mechanism to achieve continuous improvement and for this to succeed the findings must be acted on in a timely manner. All work to be funded by the applicant.	Uncertain
N09: Draft DCO	The draft DCO does not contain adequate provisions for the control of air noise given the magnitude of effect.	A different approach to the management and control of noise is sought to that proposed by Gatwick whereby local authorities have wide ranging statutory powers and are fully funded by the applicant for all the work they undertake.	Uncertain
AQ01: Ultra-Fine Particles Assessment	An assessment of UFPs has not been included, while the council acknowledges a full quantitative assessment cannot be undertaken, TDC has concerns that the suggestion that PM2.5 is a suitable proxy is incorrect. The proposal adds new emissions from aviation. The ES acknowledges that UFPs could have adverse health impacts but no mitigation is proposed to minimise emissions.	Provision of further information and further assessment for Ultra-Fine Particles required. Mitigation proposals are required such as a commitment to lower sulphur aviation fuels.	Uncertain. Please note: For all air quality matters further information has been provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1 including a 567 page technical note on air quality and a new version of Environmental Statement air quality figures. This information is currently being reviewed by our air

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
			<p><u>quality specialists. This means that we are unable to update the resolution status or otherwise on air quality matters within the PADDs. This will be done at the next opportunity within the Examination Timetable and separately in further communication with the Applicant. This applies to all points herein for air quality</u></p>
<p>AQ02: Particulate Matter Standards</p>	<p>The construction impact assessment requires revision to reflect the updated particulate matter standards. The ES assessment is based on advice that uses the older air quality standards. The latest PM2.5 standards are much more stringent and should be reflected in the ES. The concern is that human health impacts have not been fully assessed in the construction impact assessment</p>	<p>The assessment should be revised to reflect the new standards for particulate matter.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
<p>AQ03: Worse-case assessment</p>	<p>The lack of clarity on the selection of assessment years and their configuration re operation and construction gives TDC concerns that the worst-case scenario has not been assessed.</p>	<p>The following information is required: Clarification is needed on how the use of two parallel scenarios for 2029 provide a realistic worst case to be evaluated. A single scenario reflecting the anticipated operation of the increased capacity at the airport with the surface access construction works is the realistic worst case in 2029. Similar clarification as to how operational activities and ongoing construction works in 2032 have been assessed. Additionally, general clarification is required as to how the selection of assessment years and their configuration re operational and construction was made and how this aligns with the requirements of the Airports National Policy Statement including par 5.33, specifically including when at full capacity, including interaction between construction and operational changes.</p>	<p>Unclear</p>

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
<p>AQ04: Mitigation and monitoring</p>	<p>Construction monitoring should form part of the DCO requirements. There is insufficient information provided explaining how air quality data will be reviewed to check that changes are not more adverse than predicted, nor what measures would be taken if a significant adverse deterioration was monitored.</p>	<p>Introduce monitoring requirements in the DCO. Ensure that s106 operational monitoring is proposed and details on how this will be used to test the effectiveness of the Surface Access Commitments provided and agreed.</p>	<p>Likely</p>
<p>AQ05: Assessment of short terms effects</p>	<p>Environmental Statement Air Quality Appendix 13.4.1 Air Quality Assessment Methodology: Paragraph 3.1.3 indicates that short term objectives have been considered through reference to annual values. As previously described this is only appropriate for road traffic sources.</p>	<p>Amendment of assessment method and documents to reflect new assessment with correct metric.</p>	<p>Likely</p>

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
AQ06: Monitoring sites	TDC is concerned that excessive numbers of monitoring sites may have been excluded from model verification which could have improved the quality of the air quality verification and so the confidence in outputs.	Further details on the sites excluded on this basis is required. Further details could be added to Table 3.2.2 of Environmental Statement Air Quality Appendix 13.6.1 to address the clarification points.	Uncertain
AQ07: Verification zones	TDC disagrees that enough justification was provided for the selection of different verification zones and why the model would be expected to perform differently in each area. A sensitivity test is required to demonstrate that the conclusions of the assessment would not change if a single verification factor were used.	A sensitivity test is required to demonstrate that the conclusions of the assessment would not change if a single verification factor were used.	Uncertain
AQ08: Monitoring system for Construction Traffic	TDC disagrees that enough details is provided on the restrictions and monitoring of construction traffic utilising routes through the J10 M23. Reference is made to a monitoring system that 'it is envisaged' will be developed in the full CTMP. Further details are requested during the examination.	Reference is made to a monitoring system that 'it is envisaged' will be developed in the full CTMP. Further details are requested during the examination.	Uncertain
AQ09: Monitoring framework - Construction	The Monitoring Framework for the Construction Workforce Travel Plan is unclear (Document name: Environmental Statement Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice, Annex 2 Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan) .	More information is required during the examination on the monitoring framework.	Uncertain

Principal Issue in question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
<p>AQ10: Petrol and diesel car ban</p>	<p>The government has announced on 20/09/2023 that it would delay the ban on sales of new diesel and petrol cars from 2030 to 2035. It would be useful to understand how this had been factored into the emissions projections and whether it would create any new impact or risen any existing impacts.</p>	<p>The ES modelling will need to be amended and likely impacts and mitigations re-evaluated.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>