

File Name: ISH6 30th April 2024 Part 3.mp3
File Length: 01:17:54

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:02:08:06 - 00:02:09:15

So the time is now

00:02:11:00 - 00:02:13:13

2:10 times to resume this hearing.

00:02:15:01 - 00:02:17:28

So now we're going to move on to

00:02:19:27 - 00:02:55:00

the second part of item 6.1. Looking at downstream and world tank emissions, we touched on some of this before lunch. In terms of downstream issues, I think a couple of um IPS who raised issues in their relevant reps, which the applicant responded to. It's 372. These largely relate to the um, Supreme Court case on, uh, Finch, and no need to go into that at this hearing.

00:02:55:02 - 00:03:04:09

So any further questions I might have, we'll deal with through written submissions, unless anyone particularly wants to raise a point on that. So.

00:03:05:28 - 00:03:13:18

Okay. So if we move on to, um, the next part, which is welds tank emissions.

00:03:16:29 - 00:04:12:15

And in a number of relevant reps. Um, East Sussex County Council, Mid Sussex districts, Reigate and Banstead and West Sussex County commented that the ES does not calculate well to tank, which is non-compliance with the Greenhouse Gas Protocol, Corporate Accounting Standards and UK government's carbon accounting methodology. And their concern was that using Wells tank emissions methodology would raise emissions associated with aviation by approximately 20%, and this would result in 1000, sorry, 1,106,530 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent not being accounted for in 2028.

00:04:12:20 - 00:04:44:17

During the most carbon intensive year. The applicant has provided a response on this, and I think there's still issues. I think it's correct to say that it's recorded as not being agreed between the parties in the statements of Common Ground, so I wonder if we could just explore where this has got to and how it might be taken forward. Um, Mr. Lyons, do you want to start on that? And then I'll ask Mr. Bedford. Yes, sir. Scott. For the for the applicant?

00:04:45:05 - 00:05:16:21

Um, yes. It's correct to record that as yet. It's not a matter agreed on the statement of Common ground, but as you indicated earlier, um, we are prepared to look further at, well, to tank, um, emissions, but in a particular context that I've outlined previously. And it's this, um, that, um, with particular reference to aviation emissions, but it applies more and more generally, um, well-defined emissions can arise in relation to the production of fuel outside the UK.

00:05:16:23 - 00:05:47:20

And we would not be content to include that in any, um, assessment given that those well, to tank emissions would not be allowed for as part of the UK carbon budget. And as Mr. Robertson can explain, they have not been allowed for as part of jet zero. So one has to take some care when both contextualizing under jet uh zero and in um, looking at these sorts of emissions when comparing the proposal with the national carbon budget.

00:05:48:07 - 00:06:20:21

So what we're proposing to do is to look at where to tank emissions that arise effectively within the UK, because that would allow a comparison against the national carbon budget. We may need to explain exactly how Contextualisation should work given the complications of that have mentioned, but we're prepared to do that, at least within the UK context. What we're not content to do is to apply those to the production of fuel, which takes place outside, um, at the UK, if it's not covered as part of the UK carbon budget. So we're prepared to look at this further.

00:06:20:23 - 00:06:35:27

Um, we can provide that, um, uh, information deadline for, um, for the purpose of the deadline for we can discuss that with, uh, with the local authorities to see if that will allow matters to move forward.

00:06:36:08 - 00:06:47:25

Thank you. So the elements you're looking at is only the the international flights. Is there agreement on other matters?

00:06:48:28 - 00:07:11:16

Explain that question for the applicant. No we'll look at we'll look at uh, the well to tank emissions associated with all fuel use across the assessment. So that's for aviation but also touches on surface access and construction and the the airport buildings and ground operations which all have fuel use within them. The.

00:07:13:14 - 00:07:48:15

The wealthy tank emissions associated with the supply chain of those fuels, and especially for jet fuel, but also, to a lesser extent, for some other fuels that supply chains outside the UK. So it doesn't. Feature from a contextualization point of view within a comparison against the UK carbon budgets, because those emissions arise outside the scope of the UK carbon budgets. So we'd expect to take a proportional view on looking at what proportion of those well to tank emissions are likely to fall under the UK carbon budgets.

00:07:48:17 - 00:07:54:15

And that's what we can we can take into the the assessment we bring forth at deadline for.

00:07:55:09 - 00:07:56:04

Yeah. Thank you.

00:07:58:21 - 00:07:59:09

Mr. Bedford.

00:08:02:00 - 00:09:02:06

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, the joint local authorities. Well, obviously we welcome the provision of any further information on this, and we'll reserve our position on what we think of that until we've seen it. Um, but there is, um, a related issue which I did touch on earlier, um, which relates to not just, well, to tank, but to whole life carbon assessment. We know, uh, from the most recent national networks, MPs, that whole life carbon assessment is not inconsistent with national budgets and the UK's, uh, um, carbon targets because clearly, um, NPS expects now whole life carbon assessment as part of reporting the carbon implications of national networks infrastructure projects.

00:09:03:09 - 00:09:46:19

Um, and I say what we have seen, uh, reference to in the methodology in chapter 16 of the year is references to documents which might include whole life carbon assessment as part of their um, um, methodologies. But it is not clear to us that those methodologies have actually been applied by the applicant thus far. We know there's a specialist who has just been identified about the approach taken to, well, to tank, but what's not clear to us is whether leaving that aside, the applicant's approach is an approach which is consistent with the whole life carbon uh, assessment or not.

00:09:46:21 - 00:10:14:16

And if not, whether the applicant is proposing, particularly in the light of the revised national networks, MPs to provide further information, uh, on that. And, um, the, the the issue uh, then obviously has, uh, a key bearing on the assessment of the significance of the results which are presented. Thank you.

00:10:15:05 - 00:10:15:20

Thank you.

00:10:17:05 - 00:10:22:17

Does anyone else wish to comment on this before I go back to the applicants? No. Okay.

00:10:23:06 - 00:10:27:03

Let's go ask Mr. Robertson to explain what's been done. Thank you.

00:10:28:24 - 00:11:11:19

Keith Robertson for the applicant. Um, I think the from looking at the responses that have come in, I think what would be useful to provide is clarity on, uh, there are material materiality thresholds defined within whole life carbon assessment methodologies. And what we will provide as part of the response to deadline for is also a look at those to explain how they've been applied. Uh, there are some other elements, um, around, um, repair and replacement emissions associated with the buildings and the infrastructure, which would also fall under a whole life carbon assessment, but we do not think are likely to meet the materiality threshold for the project as a whole.

00:11:11:21 - 00:11:18:22

But we can provide more clarity on how we've applied that logic when we when we provide the submission at deadline for.

00:11:19:05 - 00:11:20:28

Thank you. Yeah.

00:11:24:10 - 00:11:27:17

Are there any other comments on welded tank emissions?

00:11:34:20 - 00:12:01:27

No. Okay. Thank you. So then let's look at the picture of the risks associated with the achievements of the Jet Zero strategy. I think to a degree we covered this this morning certainly in headline terms. Um, but I have a few questions about this arising from various representations.

00:12:04:00 - 00:12:36:18

So. A number of local authorities, including. Sorry County Council, Crawley Borough Council and West Sussex County Council have agreed it's not for the applicant or for the examination to assess risks on the basis that government policy will fail. The applicants also state that it is apparent that

government is committed to net zero targets, and is closely monitoring aviation and other trajectories to ensure compliance.

00:12:36:21 - 00:12:41:24

We've heard plenty of about that this morning. However, um.

00:12:43:19 - 00:13:15:18

The New Comics Foundation. Consider that many of the policies which will be required to increase the probability of the jet zero high ambition scenario being delivered, are not yet designed or legislated. The risk that future emission production, sorry, reduction technologies do not scale up at the pace desired should be considered. I don't know if some new economic foundation are on the line. I can't see anyone listed there.

00:13:16:22 - 00:13:29:06

Are there any other item IPPs who want to pick up that point? Because I think a number did raise that. I wish to expand on that. Yes, gentlemen. That.

00:13:30:26 - 00:13:31:11

Uh.

00:13:31:19 - 00:14:17:10

Dan Osborne, uh, CPA, Sussex. I'm speaking today as chair of CPR Sussex. Um, but my professional background is in environmental risk, and I've done 1 or 2 things to do with climate change risk assessment and the innovation chain. So I know a little bit of of the arguments put forward here. And I do think there are very large risks in the jet zero strategy. Along the lines, the new economic foundation of raised um, flight part of the future, says the government, is clear that any expansion of any airport must meet the, uh, excuse me, must meet its climate change obligations to be able to proceed.

00:14:17:21 - 00:14:52:23

And I think that's that's really important in relation to the jet zero strategy and the remarks that the applicant has made today. Um, and I think there's a kind of run of argument here that goes that climate change is already happening and it's affecting the people and the landscapes of Sussex. Um, the applicant relies on the government actions to reach net zero. So that means really that we've got the sixth carbon budget and all the things we discussed this morning about 1.5 and the Paris Agreement, etc..

00:14:53:00 - 00:15:22:24

But surely if we're accepting that the sixth carbon budget is relevant, so are the conclusions about the expansion of aviation. They are part of the budget in a sense. They're part of the independent advice from the Climate Change Committee. The government relies on Jet Zero to get to um, net zero by 2050 and for aviation to play its part. And there is a roadmap from the sustainable Aviation Carbon Roadmap that I'll refer to in a minute.

00:15:23:11 - 00:15:53:16

And as part of that, the technologies, two of them, hydrogen and carbon capture, are in very nascent stages of development. So there are high risks associated with, um, a decision based around nascent technologies. It's not necessarily, perhaps a very sound way of proceeding in relation to sustainable aviation fuels. A lot depends on the validity of the lifecycle analysis as part of this whole carbon life cycle.

00:15:54:08 - 00:16:03:26

Um, and the Royal Society is very clear that more work is needed. Um, and it's still undeniable that the emissions at the end of the.

00:16:05:22 - 00:16:36:18

The aircraft. Its use of sustainable aviation fuels is still going into the atmosphere, and that represents a substantial and perhaps significant transfer from the terrestrial to the atmosphere. And it's not. A get out of jail card free. Uh, sustainable aviation fuel at all. One thing I was very surprised in the Jet zero strategy is somewhere between perhaps 50 and 65% of the emission reductions aren't happening.

00:16:37:02 - 00:16:56:15

Um, as a result of the technology, about a quarter of it is dependent on carbon pricing and 37 odd percent, I think, uh, depends on on carbon capture externalities. So the aviation sector is, in a sense, borrowing from other sectors, uh, progress that they can make in this area.

00:16:58:06 - 00:17:36:25

All of that for the new technology relies on the aviation sector replacing its fleets and having a different pricing structure, both for carbon and for passengers. And none of those market mechanisms are in place. Part of the roadmap for aviation has a very small, um, activity growth component may be consistent with the 2 or 3% growth that making best use seems to refer to. Um, there's a quite a large slice 14%, which is demand reduction, not demand increase, but demand reduction.

00:17:37:18 - 00:18:13:15

Um, and the rest depends on the technologies I've already referred to. So I think there are a lot of risks associated with the jet zero strategy. It's great to see that strategy is there. Um, that's a step in the right direction. But whether we can really, um, rely on it as the basis for a sound and sustainable decision, I'm not so sure. Uh, and some of the figures in the different strategies and roadmaps are a little bit inconsistent. So the end aviation industry itself seems very keen at the moment on hydrogen fueled vehicles.

00:18:13:17 - 00:18:39:20

And yet in the aviation roadmap, that's only sort of 4% of the of the picture. Um, so you've got differences between government policy and what the aviation sector seems to be pursuing. So all of that, I think, means there are huge uncertainties and very high risks associated with relying solely on the Jet zero strategy. Um, so I think that's all I want to say on that. Thank you for the time. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

00:18:40:18 - 00:18:46:22

Does anyone else, uh, in the other IP, want to comment before I go back to the applicant on that? No.

00:18:48:16 - 00:18:51:05

Okay. Thank you. Oh, sorry.

00:18:55:14 - 00:19:01:17

Yeah, we've got two people online. Um. Mr..

00:19:07:05 - 00:19:10:06

So Finlay Asher is the first one, I think.

00:19:12:02 - 00:19:48:22

And Lee Asher from Safe Landing. Yeah, I'm an aerospace engineer and my group's aviation workers. We've spent a lot of time looking at the Jet Zero strategy. Um, and and as has the Royal Aeronautical Society. Um, there's a lot of risks identified with each of the levers that are in there. Um, the efficiency improvements of aircraft are assumed to get more efficient with time. Um, I've been

working on more efficient aircraft and engine technology, and it's getting more difficult to achieve historic efficiency gains in the future.

00:19:49:06 - 00:20:21:09

Um, and sustainable aviation fuels. We've we've had the mandate, um, come out last week. Um, and we can see in the next ten years the government's just focusing on this waste oil and fat, um, heifer pathway, which has very it's very limited in its, in its kind of sustainability and its scalability. Um, and then there's electric and hydrogen, as mentioned, is a long way off. Um, we're not going to see any aircraft of any significant size for 15, 20 years.

00:20:21:17 - 00:20:54:08

Um, when we're we passed these, these budgets that are in the middle of the next decade. Um, and I think that's the main thing. You know, Jet Zero sort of has a look at how to get to somewhere in 2050, but it doesn't sort of say, what happens if we blow the budget in the next ten years, and it doesn't focus on actual policies to target fossil fuel and drive them down and ensure they go down. Um, and and that's why I'd come back to it. I don't think that the jet zero strategy is not a government policy that will ensure emissions reduce.

00:20:54:10 - 00:21:00:28

Um, and without that policy mechanism, then that's why we need to then look at constraining capacity.

00:21:02:24 - 00:21:09:16

Thank you. And the other person, um, on the screen, I can just see councilor. I think it's Councilor Georgia Taylor.

00:21:10:05 - 00:21:59:10

That's right. Yeah. I'm, um, representing the green group on East Sussex County Council. Um, I just had two points. Just to add to the point about, um, the risks and particularly, um, sustainable, uh, fuel. Um, I think one of the comments made early on was about balancing climate and economic objectives. And so I would really urge the, um, applicant to look at, um, what the economic impact is if, if even if they were successful in replacing fuel with sustainable fuel and how that could increase food prices because of non-availability of land, um, decreased food security.

00:21:59:14 - 00:22:42:15

Um, so the impact of that and balancing out and then also to really take into account how this would play out if carbon tax was increased significantly and the increasing number of climate litigations that are happening globally, and how that would, you know, increase the costs as well, and the viability of this projects overall, which are all real, very, very real risks. And I just wanted to make one point about, um, this issue, about who's responsible at the end of the day, because it was referred early on to how government won't put any demand management measures in place.

00:22:42:17 - 00:23:19:00

And I think the applicant was quite happy with that and confident with that. But, um, and that the private sector and markets will do what's needed. But then I also heard that government has it, you know, has the applicant feels that the government has in place measures and will put in place measures that seem to a huge amount of confidence that government will do that. And so they don't need to be responsible. So, you know, you can't have it both ways. Is it that the private sector is responsible? Is it that government's responsible, and who is going to take the responsibility at the end of the day? Thank you.

00:23:19:27 - 00:23:23:27

Thank you, Mr. Linus. Two issues to respond.

00:23:24:15 - 00:24:05:00

Uh, Scotland's for the for the applicant. Again, as you identified, some of this ground is being covered already. But the fundamental point is the government has committed to net zero strategy to implement measures which have the effect of mitigating aviation emissions, to allow it to fulfil its statutory, um, obligation. Its responsibility is to take action at an industrial scale, um, rather than directly through, um, individual, uh, operators who, uh, simply need to support the transition to new aircraft technologies and other measures in the way that we're committing to do under the cap.

00:24:05:02 - 00:24:45:21

As for the the broad question about uncertainty, um, I mean, it's right to say that we or no one else at this stage can be sure or attach certainty to the example of hydrogen fuel being delivered by any particular date. We acknowledge that, but government has already said that it's accepted. There's uncertainty here. It's accepted both an Mbu and and jet zero and its carbon budget delivery plan that matters are emerging, and it doesn't necessarily have to rely on one specific alternative fuel development to meet its, uh, to meet its targets.

00:24:45:25 - 00:25:20:08

If something doesn't develop sufficiently. It's quite clear from Jet Zero that government has acknowledged that it will need to consider alternative measures or steps to achieve its objectives, so that the aviation sector doesn't compromise its legal obligations to meet net uh, to meet net zero. And it's been entirely, um, clear even in its recent response to the Environmental Audit Committee's third report. Um, it is said if we find that the emissions reductions trajectory is not working sufficiently, they'll consider further measures to maximise in sector reductions.

00:25:20:14 - 00:25:46:00

And it's making those statements. It's been unequivocal in saying it doesn't regard capacity constraints on airports as necessary to achieve that. So the government has acknowledged uncertainty. But it's been absolutely clear and saying that will review and adjust because it recognises that it may need to in order to achieve its, um, objectives. So the risk is understood by government, but it still has a commitment to address them.

00:25:48:27 - 00:26:20:09

And John Rhodes for the applicant, um, I was going to say three points, but that was the first of them. So I think the, um, carbon budget delivery plan is a useful document for these purposes. We'll make sure that. At least the relevant extracts are submitted with our submissions following this hearing. Um, but the second point I was going to make was that, um, government policy. And strategies are published exactly so we can rely on them. That's the purpose of them.

00:26:20:29 - 00:26:56:06

They set out what the government is going to do so that others can take action as a consequence and respond to them and invest on the basis of those government strategies. So. We can and should rely on Jet Zero strategy, particularly for the reasons that I expressed this morning about the way in which it's a dynamic strategy, informed by continuing research and monitoring. But the particular point I wanted to make was if there is a risk that Jet Zero strategy isn't going to succeed, the risk doesn't lie with the climate.

00:26:56:14 - 00:27:35:15

The risk lies with Gatwick Airport in this case, because the government is absolutely committed to net zero. The industry understands that the industry has to invest on the basis of an expectation that the Jet Zero strategy will succeed. And I agree with the councillor that investors need to think very carefully about the impact of Jet Zero strategy on fuel prices, on passengers, on technology, the physical impact on the airport, and certainly Gatwick can explain to you if that's helpful, the work that they're doing in that respect.

00:27:35:17 - 00:28:10:12

But these decisions to promote the Northern Runway project, for instance, are not taken lightly. They're taken in recognition that the industry has to change fundamentally and the airport has to. Invest on the basis that of its own judgment, whether that's going to be successful or not. Recognizing and invest very substantially to accommodate the change. But recognizing the risk is that you could consent an airport, but that doesn't necessarily mean that you will receive the flights.

00:28:10:14 - 00:28:25:00

So if the Jet zero strategy isn't completely successful, um, then there will be an impact on flights and that impact won't be felt by the climate, it'll be felt by the airport operators. So they take a risk on the basis of government policy.

00:28:27:13 - 00:28:28:08

Okay. Thank you.

00:28:30:20 - 00:29:09:07

Yes. So thank you. Estella. Hon. On behalf of Cagney, just to respond on risk, I won't reiterate the points I made earlier about rescue. You have those. Um, but the statement that if. The risk materializes that Jet Zero does not succeed. That risk does not lie with the climate. It lies with Gatwick Airport in. My submission is not right. The risk will lie with the climate, because one of the key mechanisms available across government to address capacity is via the planning system.

00:29:10:19 - 00:29:43:06

And the applicant is very clear that there are lots of mechanisms available, and the government will use them if and when it's necessary, uh, because various policies have not materialised in the way that was anticipated. But what this application does is essentially gazump one of the government's key tools in that toolbox. It's a tool that the government has indicated at this point it is not going to use yet, but it is a tool that the government has indicated remains within the toolbox.

00:29:43:08 - 00:30:19:29

And as the point has been made, um, capacity, well, demand reduction is in fact part of the net zero strategy, albeit at this point achieved via market based mechanisms and carbon pricing, reducing demand, not via capacity reduction and airport control. So it's not right to say that, uh, if risk is relevant to this examining authority's decision, which, for the reasons I say earlier, um, it is that that risk can be avoided by suggesting that it becomes a market risk for investors.

00:30:20:04 - 00:30:42:13

It remains a risk for the climate because a key tool in the toolbox will have been taken off the table. The government will not be able to fiddle around with a planning permission that gives what this applicant asks for, in order to address demand issues down the line.

00:30:46:26 - 00:31:08:01

Just responding to that. Comments. Something we talked about, um, at issue specific hearing too, and it has been mentioned in some of the submissions, uh, that will come up probably tomorrow. The concept of the green growth,

00:31:09:18 - 00:31:11:14

um, approach.

00:31:13:25 - 00:31:24:21

Would that have any impact on what you've just outlined in terms of risk or control, rather over the applicant, if that were to be adopted?

00:31:27:22 - 00:32:02:11

Uh, estate agent for Cagney? Potentially. Although it depends the extent to which the kind of green growth package materializes in different sectors. Uh, so potentially, I think even if green growth is something that is adopted and promoted, that doesn't draw the force from the submission that the risk still lies with the climate and not with Gatwick Airport overall. Um, I can certainly take away that question, and Cagney will think further on it.

00:32:02:13 - 00:32:05:25

And further submissions can be made at deadline four if needed.

00:32:06:01 - 00:32:36:08

Thank you. Um, I mean, Mr. Bedford, this is something that your clients have been pushing as a concept, picking up on what has been promoted at Luton Airport. Uh, examination. And, I mean, we haven't seen what's been proposed, Luton, that people want to put out in front of us. That's for them. But the concept is there. One of the issues I think I raised last time in terms of the different headings was on climate change. So.

00:32:37:24 - 00:32:51:25

Is that a tool that your clients are looking to push as a mechanism to, um, ensure that. Greenhouse gases are controlled in a way.

00:32:53:09 - 00:32:57:03

Thank you. Sir. Um, Michael Bedford, the joint local authorities.

00:32:59:02 - 00:33:34:23

So I think it's fair to say that the main driver. On the part of the authorities in favour of a green growth, green control growth approach is not to impose a check on greenhouse gas emissions. Uh, it is more, uh, as a tool to deal with. Uh, if I use this word, I'm not using it in a, um, a judgmental sense, but more localised environmental impacts of the development.

00:33:35:20 - 00:34:11:03

So whether that is noise, whether that's air quality or whether it's traffic, it's, uh, the concern on the part of the authorities where they have been pressing measures such as green control growth is to tie, uh, the achievement of, uh, any growth to, uh, mitigation measures which offset the undue impacts of that growth. And also insofar as, uh, it said that the growth brings with it benefits.

00:34:11:05 - 00:34:29:25

It's to say, see, that those benefits are actually being achieved as a consequence of the growth. So so that is the I say that's the primary driver that's laying behind our desire for green control growth. But.

00:34:31:13 - 00:34:35:20

Um, possibly in the same way that there are, um,

00:34:37:13 - 00:35:12:14

wheels within wheels, if that's the right analogy. Um, obviously, um, a green growth, green controlled growth approach would have a bearing on then the consequential greenhouse gas emissions. And so to that extent they can march in step. So we certainly wouldn't see them as, uh, inconsistent. Um, there is a related point that I would think it's probably appropriate to raise at this, um, juncture.

00:35:14:06 - 00:35:42:06

Um, whilst, uh, when one takes the jet zero strategy and its trajectory and obviously you've heard reference, uh, to risks, um, but you've also seen from the jet zero strategy that it itself envisages that there will be potentially a need for future action by government. Uh, to keep the trajectory on track.

00:35:44:12 - 00:35:49:08

And accepting that that is clearly the government's strategy.

00:35:51:06 - 00:36:08:01

One of the things which it has identified in its toolbox as a future potential interventions could be measures, uh, affecting, um, carbon pricing.

00:36:11:01 - 00:36:12:18

And they could be measures.

00:36:14:03 - 00:37:03:14

Which then have costs. To transport users, whether that's because the interventions are to require minimum levels of sustainable aviation fuel to be used by, uh, um, airlines in their operations, or whether it's other measures which impose effectively levies or costs on the users of aviation. But what we haven't seen in the applicants assessment in chapter 16, when it's looked in particular at the aviation emissions, is ends any sensitivity testing? Around what the demand forecasts would be.

00:37:04:11 - 00:37:07:28

If particular carbon tools were used.

00:37:09:13 - 00:37:10:25

Which impacted.

00:37:12:18 - 00:38:15:08

On the cost of, um. Aviation, and so had the effect of leading to different and potentially lower patterns of demand. And we don't. We see some sensitivity testing in other parts of the the modeling work that the applicant has presented. And we've got obviously some sensitivity testing around the slow transmission fleet, etc., but we haven't seen anything that seeks to test, well, what would happen if in order to keep the jet zero trajectory on track, the government imposed carbon cost measures which then impacted on the levels of demand? And given that, I think everybody has accepted that there are elements of uncertainty with these matters, we consider that the examination would be assisted if the applicant were to undertake some sensitivity testing around some of the key variables.

00:38:16:03 - 00:38:54:02

And for our part, I know that there has been dialogue between York aviation and the applicants generally, but I think York Aviation would be quite happy to have further dialogue about this issue, see if we can reach some, um, agreed position on what sort of sensitivity testing would be informative, but we think that that is something that would assist in understanding the extent to which either the trajectory is jeopardized by this proposal, or indeed, the proposal is robust enough to cope with what might happen in order to keep that trajectory on track.

00:38:54:09 - 00:38:55:20

Thank you sir. Thank you.

00:38:56:25 - 00:39:09:27

Mr. Linus. Um, could we begin with that point about the sensitivity testing? And is that something in principle, you know, the applicant would be prepared to do? And then could you come on to the other matters.

00:39:10:03 - 00:39:51:04

Scotland has for the for the applicants? And we'll obviously discuss this matter further with the local authorities as part of the general discussion. But we're not convinced at this stage we should be doing this sensitivity analysis. Fundamentally, we say we're entitled to take into account the assumptions that, uh, government has made at this stage when promulgating, uh, jet zero, uh, and reflectors in the assessment that, uh, that we have carried out, um, to the extent that government has indicated that it will, uh, adjust its strategy accordingly in the event that certain measures do not come forward as quickly as anticipated.

00:39:51:15 - 00:40:22:04

And that must be seen in the context that it's fundamentally committed to achieving, uh, jet zero within the timescale that has been identified. So we don't see any strong reason to move beyond the assumptions that we've made, which are consistent with both the assumptions that's made on Jet Zero and its broad commitment to maintaining that trajectory towards net zero over a period of time. So, as I say, we're always open to discussing matters with local authorities. But our position at the moment is it's not necessary or appropriate for us to do that. Sensitivity analysis.

00:40:22:26 - 00:41:00:16

Um, as for the other points that were, uh, that were raised, um, uh, the, uh, I'll deal with Mr. Bedford's point coming back to Cagney for reasons that we've given, uh, at issue two and then writing following that, uh, we fundamentally resist any suggestion that there should be green controlled growth, um, applied here. One can note that although Luton was mentioned, aviation emissions weren't controlled in the same way. And that case largely for the reasons that we are suggesting there shouldn't be controlled through a green control growth mechanism.

00:41:00:18 - 00:41:44:18

And in this case, without wanting to go over ground that we've covered already. The starting point is that we're already imposing a passenger cap, which will have some influence and control over carbon emissions at generally, uh, atm. Sorry, but, um, any further control will be unnecessary and then appropriate because we set out a series of commitments in the cap. Um, one of those effectively anticipates that we will have to report to government, uh, on measures that we are at taking and that we will play our role in reducing aviation emissions in line with what government wants airports to achieve at an industry and industry level.

00:41:44:29 - 00:42:12:11

And that's entirely consistent with what the government says itself will be doing through its Jet Zero strategy. And to impose a restriction on growth would be entirely consistent with how government itself says it intends to proceed, because it doesn't indicate any need to control capacity on airports and to achieve its net zero ambitions. If that's the case, there is no justification for controlling the growth of our airport under this, under this application.

00:42:13:29 - 00:42:57:18

Um, as far as, um, points are concerned, uh, the argument that we would be somehow gazumping a wider process taken to. Collusion is effectively a suggestion that you shouldn't be allowing any airport development to come forward because of the risks of government not achieving net zero. That's flatly contrary to what government says should should happen. Um, the suggestion that any airport development would somehow, um, take the run or gazump, um, the development of future, uh, policy is essentially suggesting that the secretary of State that there should be a moratorium on airport development until any risks are completely resolved.

00:42:57:24 - 00:43:29:17

And that's just flat, contrary to what policy says it should happen. It suggesting that airport development should not be restricted because government has concluded there is a means of dealing with carbon emissions whilst not restricting, whilst not restricting capacity. And we say any

suggestion that we're acting contrary to policy in that respect and that respect is plain wrong. The other thing I would say is that, um, at this point about, um, where our risk is lying and the measures that can be taken to achieve it.

00:43:29:22 - 00:44:06:24

There's a variety of means by which can, uh, controls on demand management could take place if the government wanted to, which would occur well outside the planning system. Again, there's no suggestion and policy that controls have to be placed on the expansion of individual, um, uh, airports, um, to achieve what government, uh, wants to, um, wants to achieve. So again, we simply just don't accept the proposition that any risk which has been identified in policy should somehow prevent any individual proposals from, from coming forward.

00:44:07:16 - 00:44:10:28

Did you say Mr. Rudd's has something to add?

00:44:12:11 - 00:45:00:00

Uh, John Rhodes, the applicant, tried very hard not to replicate what Mr. Lynas has said, but just in relation to green control growth for carbon. I asked myself rhetorically the question why would one want to do that in relation to an individual airport, when the government is absolutely clear that that's what the government is doing and that it's doing it on an economy wide basis, because that's the basis on which it makes sense. At the same time, as it implies constraints on the growth of airport when government policies recognising the economic benefits of airport growth, so imposing green control growth for carbon purposes on an airport, really, in my view, doesn't make sense in policy terms and wouldn't meet a test of necessity.

00:45:00:08 - 00:45:14:04

We recognise the government already has a strategy to do exactly that, and equally, it's not letting the cat out of the bag by approving airport expansion because.

00:45:16:16 - 00:45:48:05

Um, what the government has identified is that it has other downstream measures that it's going to use. And in fact, it states in terms in one of the most recent statements of government policy, which is the networks, uh, NPS, um, that the government, uh, operational emissions will be addressed in a managed economy wide manner to ensure consistency with carbon budgets, net zero, and our international climate commitments. It couldn't be a clearer statement from the government in an up to date policy document.

00:45:49:25 - 00:46:20:10

So that, um, the risk that exists isn't to the climate because the government will manage that risk. It's absolutely committed to do so. And it's said again that it will just a couple of other points, um, demand forecasting and the impact of carbon prices. The modelling framework for Jet Zero makes clear that it has taken into account anticipated impact of carbon on forecast demand.

00:46:20:24 - 00:47:03:03

Um, it's not our task to do that again when the government has done that. And similarly, sensitivity tests, in order that we can start to understand more about the risk. I really do think this examination has got to be careful not to try to do the government's job for it. The sensitivity test for the NRP is not likely to tell you very much, unless you do it for the rest of aviation as a whole. If you do it for the rest of the aviation as a whole, you're doing exactly what the government is doing. And again, the national networks MPs, paragraph 538 Secretary of State regularly assesses the sufficiency of policies to meet net zero.

00:47:03:11 - 00:47:12:27

It would not be feasible or sensible for such an assessment to be done at the time of taking individual development decisions, and there is no legal requirement to do so.

00:47:13:12 - 00:47:20:13

Okay. Thank you. Yes. Someone who wants to speak and then Cagney as well. Was it or not? No.

00:47:20:29 - 00:47:22:06

Is it better if I stand up?

00:47:22:14 - 00:47:22:29

Yeah.

00:47:23:01 - 00:47:57:07

It's fine. Hear me. Thank you. By chance I looked at my phone at lunch time. I'm heading. Is Britain must bend 30 billion to strip CO2 from the atmosphere and to reach net zero. So we are talking about having much less CO2 in the air. That's a report commissioned by government from the Energy Systems Catapult. It also warns that direct capture is absolutely essential to maintain our life on Earth.

00:47:58:02 - 00:48:08:15

It would involve building right along the east coast from East Sussex to Aberdeen. Machinery to take out the CO2.

00:48:10:03 - 00:48:44:06

On the advice side, climate tipping points are critical thresholds in the climate system. When these thresholds are cross, they lead to significant or often irreversible changes. And currently. Report from the Potsdam Institute of Climate Research points to six of the planetary boundaries being exceeded, and the next three of nine have identified. Critical and climate. Monitoring and climate change being threatened.

00:48:44:11 - 00:49:03:12

So of the nine they've identified, six have already been breached and three are on the verge of going the same way. I should point also to Professor Kevin Anderson, who he's argued for some time. He was an engineer in the oil and gas industry, but we have to

00:49:05:09 - 00:49:21:12

refuse anymore, um, airport construction and to to make a cost on frequent flyers. That's how we have to go forward. Thank you. It was just that climate change came up. I've got all the recent evidence, and it's in the form that I sent.

00:49:21:23 - 00:49:22:08

Thank you.

00:49:24:27 - 00:49:33:00

Where's the line? Do you want to respond on that? Okay. No. That's fine, that's fine. Uh, yes. Professor Osborne.

00:49:33:21 - 00:50:03:28

Just one additional point, I think is a bit of a difficulty in what was perhaps mentioned. I think almost any sector could make a similar argument in relation to, to, um, they're part of the emissions but a fundamental aspect of government policy. And it's reflected in, I think, in, in the quote I gave you from flightpath to the future, is that each sector must make its contribution and there must be a certain path to that.

00:50:04:00 - 00:50:33:18

And the applicant themselves have said that the uncertainty, you know, is there in the jet zero strategy. Um, and if every sector makes a similar argument, the risk that we will not meet our obligations under the Paris Agreement is very high. So I'm not sure that it's an argument that is specific to this application. Um, and so I'm not sure how, um.

00:50:35:06 - 00:50:52:05

How that can be taken into the balance of the decision making. If it's an argument that any sector could make when all sectors must take some responsibility for their emissions. So that's it's a difficult answer. Aviation is playing catch up. So it's a very difficult thing for them to address.

00:50:52:15 - 00:50:58:10

Thank you. Um, we've got Mr. Johnson online and then I'll go back to the applicant to respond.

00:51:00:04 - 00:51:32:27

Thank you. Tim Johnson for aviation environment Federation. Um, when I originally put my hand up, I was going to weigh in on the issue of risk and uncertainty. I think others have done that, uh, amply, uh, in the last few minutes. So in the interest of time, I won't repeat that and other points, but I just wanted to highlight a few things that that we're not just talking about a risk. But as the Climate Change Committee said in its 2023 progress report to Parliament, it's a high risk, um, that it won't be met.

00:51:33:03 - 00:52:06:27

Jet zero won't be met due to its reliance on on these and technology, and I think we should keep that in mind, even where we've governments sought to introduce measures that could potentially deal with some of the risk. And a good example of that was reference this morning to last week's announcement by ministers about the sustainable aviation fuels mandate. So it's true that government intends to legislate for, for 10%, um, sustainable aviation fuel by volume by by 2030.

00:52:07:17 - 00:52:41:05

But it also acknowledges the risks in its own statements. And I think there's a particular reference. Um, it's almost a sort of a safety valve that they've introduced that should the price of sustainable aviation fuel start to have a significant impact on, on airfares that consumers pay, then they seek the right to, to go back and, and, and look again at the policy. And so those, those sort of those sort of measures uh, whilst whilst they aim to create some certainty in particular areas equally as they come with these safety valves can't entirely be relied upon.

00:52:41:12 - 00:53:13:15

And then I think the final remark I wanted to make, um, was in relation to the green control growth, um, we think it is entirely appropriate. We see nothing that is either inconsistent or contradictory about having airport level controls that would complement what the government is trying to do with, with, um, jet zero. And, you know, the applicant has said throughout this inquiry that it has confidence, uh, in the government's ability to do that.

00:53:13:17 - 00:53:26:01

And we think that a green controlled growth approach to an airport level restriction would be a way in which that confidence could be reflected and yet could guarantee the environmental outcomes we're looking for. Thank you.

00:53:28:01 - 00:53:41:16

Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Um. Salinas students respond on any of that? Lots of it has been covered already, or you have covered a number of those. I'm just conscious of time, so it could be brief that someone can move on.

00:53:41:23 - 00:54:18:08

Scotland. It will be very brief. I don't think they need to come back on the GHG issue, green control growth issue, what we made at deadline for us and so far as Luton's been mentioned with major sort of clarify the point that I made before, but how it's been dealt with in the context and second preference as far as risk is being talked about, I think it's important to be clear that the risk one is talking about is in relation to getting to the target. As far as we're concerned, the risks that have been identified or uncertainty to be identified are just about the means that one gets there. Uh, and, um, that does nothing to undermine the government's commitment to reaching net zero.

00:54:18:10 - 00:54:20:24

And we're entitled to rely upon statements to that effect.

00:54:22:25 - 00:54:24:15

Thank you, Mr. John.

00:54:24:22 - 00:54:38:21

Just sorry, just briefly to say, well, we'll put in our written submissions in relation to the South Mandate announcement and the measures which the government announced at the same time to, um, regulate any impact on price. Thank you.

00:54:40:06 - 00:54:48:03

Okay. Let's then move on to item seven, which is construction greenhouse gas emissions.

00:54:50:11 - 00:55:15:23

And the agenda item says the applicant will be asked about greenhouse gas emissions during construction phase, including but not limited to, the assessments of effects. Um, my first question here relates to a submission which was put in by, um, Climate emergency Policy and Planning at. There's a relevant rep and.

00:55:18:05 - 00:55:51:24

The comment is that creating new construction emissions and new construction emissions is not consistent with a risk aware and precautionary principle approach to achieving the UK carbon budgets and targets. That's that particular point wasn't addressed in the applicants response to relevant reps. It was covered, I think, in the general response rather than individually to, um, climate emergency.

00:55:52:14 - 00:55:57:20

Do you wish to add anything further to that? Address it now.

00:56:05:10 - 00:56:37:05

John Rhodes for the applicant. I think just two things to say briefly. One is that construction itself, government policy clearly encourages investment in airport improvement. Um, that brings with it construction. Uh, and that brings with it a carbon impact. Um, what we sought to do through our construction carbon management strategy is to limit that impact as far as possible. So, um, clearly any investment or construction is going to generate carbon.

00:56:37:17 - 00:56:44:11

But the policy position is not to stop investing or constructing. It's to ensure it's done in a responsible way.

00:56:44:21 - 00:56:45:12

Okay. Thank you.

00:56:47:28 - 00:57:15:27

Scotland's for the applicant. I mean, as we understand the relevant representation, it was saying that if you have new construction emissions, that's not consistent with achieving UK carbon budgets. I mean, we just don't accept that because we've assessed construction emissions and appropriately contextualize them pursuant to the IMF guidance. And when we consider those emissions, um, as against the national carbon targets and reached a judgment, and we simply don't accept that they're significant in that respect.

00:57:16:04 - 00:57:22:18

So on this point about, uh, risk aware and precautionary principle, I have anything to add on that.

00:57:23:27 - 00:57:54:29

Um, it's got liners for, uh, the applicant. I think the purpose of the EMA guidance is simply to invite you to, uh, assess the construction emissions that you consider are going to be caused by your project. Place them in a proper context with an appropriate benchmark, and reach a judgment on their on their significance. That's the appropriate approach to take and the appropriate manner in which the judgment is reached.

00:57:55:15 - 00:58:01:12

Um, we don't think we need to, um, do anything, uh, do anything beyond that.

00:58:02:13 - 00:58:12:09

Okay. That's fine. Thank you. Um, next question is about embedded carbon. Um.

00:58:14:11 - 00:58:37:02

So the construction assessment is looked at extraction, processing and manufacturing of construction materials. Does the. Um, Carbon Action plan. Ensure that embedded carbon would be reduced as far as possible, and if so, how? You.

00:58:47:09 - 00:59:18:05

Mark Edwards on behalf of the applicant. So the Carbon Action Plan contains two commitments. One is to a construction carbon budget of 1.15 megatonnes, and the other is a commitment towards um, being past 2080 certified. And that's both the applicant and principal contractors. And that would be, uh, renewed annually. So, uh, there's two parts to that. Um, one is in terms of setting that budget, uh, to construct the project. And the second part is around 2080.

00:59:18:07 - 00:59:49:03

So I thought it might be more helpful to explain a little bit more about past 2080. Um, in terms of 2080 is a carbon management, uh, system. So in tries to embed behavioural change to address whole life carbon impacts across the construction of built assets. Um, so what it does is identifies roles and responsibilities across the whole value chain, uh, enabling transparency and enabling collaboration.

00:59:49:05 - 01:00:24:15

So if Gatwick is has 2080 surface sort of certified. Uh, as the asset owner, Gatwick will play a pivotal role in the decarbonisation of the construction process during the whole life of the asset. Uh, so, uh, 2080 is split down into a number of uh clauses, including effective leadership, um, the measurement of carbon, the effective setting of baselines and targets, maximising opportunities to reduce carbon at all stages of asset life, and continuous improvement.

01:00:24:25 - 01:01:02:27

Crucially, there is also a requirement to look at procurement. And this is absolutely vital because procurement is the mechanism by which the value chain, um, can, can contractually, contractually be empowered to deliver, uh, carbon reductions. So in and of itself has 2080 will not, uh, secure any

particular carbon outcome. However, by ensuring that the applicant follows paths 2080, it means the consideration of carbon will be embedded into the process of construction, and carbon will be embedded into the decision making project for the delivery of the whole project.

01:01:04:15 - 01:01:05:14

Okay. Thank you.

01:01:07:18 - 01:01:29:13

So you talked about the, um, whole life of carbon impacts. Does that or maybe ask Mr. Bedford? Does that cover what Mr. Bedford was talking about earlier? The whole life. Assessments. Is it done through that? Has 2080.

01:01:31:21 - 01:01:33:17

It's awesome for the applicant. Um,

01:01:35:14 - 01:01:56:08

there that methodology is available to, to do different things. Um, for the purposes of, of of what Mr. Edwards was talking about. Uh, the, the whole life carbon accounting process is, is, is quite fundamental to that 2080 certification because effectively it's about um.

01:01:58:14 - 01:02:31:05

Uh, instructing and enabling design teams to consider carbon when they are making design decisions and then construction decisions and such and such like. So it's embedded into that past 2080 method and the applicant only to demonstrate that they are taking that approach in order to maintain their certification on the past 2080. Uh, at the risk of speaking for for the other parties, I think the question earlier was more about accounting for the aggregate emissions from the project so that we could carry out an assessment on that effectively.

01:02:31:19 - 01:02:51:04

Uh, for the specific issue around wealth and emissions that is required. And, uh, the, the type of whole life carbon assessment process that will be followed under par 2080, so that that need to consider that wider impact feeds through into that certification process that the applicant is going to going going to achieve. Thank you.

01:02:51:21 - 01:02:53:24

Did you want to come back on anything? Mr.. Sir.

01:02:54:20 - 01:03:42:16

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford the Joint Local Authorities, um. I think there is a distinction between using whole life carbon assessment at further stages as the project as part of particularly the construction. And it's right that the applicant's both carbon action plan and the more recent, um, construction carbon management strategy, that's rep 3107 move further along to embedding whole life carbon assessment to future workstreams that will be part of showing past 2080 accreditation for the actual construction process.

01:03:42:18 - 01:03:53:29

But that's only part of the picture. What we were concerned about in terms of the assessment that's being carried out in chapter 16 of the EAS, is to what extent?

01:03:55:18 - 01:04:24:24

The assessments carried out to date have been carried out on a whole life carbon assessment. Accepting that there may be some level of detail which is not yet known, which may impose limitations on the extent of the assessment. But what we're not clear about is that the assessments

presented in chapter 16, have they been carried out on a whole life carbon assessment basis? Leaving aside the separate point, which is what you do further when you come to construct a project which has been approved?

01:04:24:26 - 01:04:25:11

Yeah.

01:04:25:13 - 01:04:33:18

Okay. Thank you. I think, Mr. Lyons, you said or someone said that was being looked at and be dealt with a deadline for Scotland.

01:04:33:22 - 01:04:39:29

For the applicant. Yes. We've said we would put in a note explaining how that's been done. I understand Mr. Rhodes would want to say something additional.

01:04:41:00 - 01:05:30:02

So I just wanted to say that, um, Mr. Bedford is absolutely right. A whole lot of carbon assessment is different from committing to whole life carbon behaviours. Um, the commitment of, uh, past 28 certification is to commit to whole life carbon behaviours consistent with past 28. And when the NPS refers to a requirement to undertake a whole life carbon assessment. It specifically says consistent with principles in 2018. Um, and just to be clear of the two things, it's not that it's a competition, but by far the most important is to commit to past 2018 and those carbon behaviours, if one was to undertake a whole life carbon assessment, it's possible that the 0.6% impact on the sixth carbon budget might change to 0.6 something.

01:05:30:25 - 01:05:44:05

Um, I'm not sure that's going to assist the examination very much. What's much more significant is the commitment to the behaviour, which will drive low carbon outcomes throughout the construction and operation of the project.

01:05:44:27 - 01:06:02:05

Okay. Thank you. And Mr. Bedford mentioned the construction carbon management strategy, which is web three 107. Can I ask about the status of that documents and will it be secured or certified as part of the DCO?

01:06:11:06 - 01:06:37:14

Ascott has for the applicant. It had been presented at Sur as an explanatory document to detail how we would effectively meet the commitment that's already included in the cap, so we hadn't envisaged it becoming a controlled document in its own right, because the commitment within the cap was there and we were simply telling you how we would meet it.

01:06:38:04 - 01:06:38:28

Okay. Thank you.

01:06:41:17 - 01:06:51:28

Are there any other comments or questions about, um, construction, greenhouse gas emissions? Yes. Councillor. Essex.

01:06:54:00 - 01:07:30:25

Thank you. Thank you. I thought it worth bringing that this up here because there was a mention of whole life carbon impacts. But I looked through the documents and I couldn't find any, any reference to a whole life carbon energy standard, such as a commitment for outstanding or an energy reduction, both on the new build and the existing assets at the airport. And it's all very well saying we're going to

limit the carbon at the construction stage. But what about the operation stage at the airport? Um, in terms of energy, it's the best, most efficient way to reduce carbon is not to build loads of solar panels to put to, but to reduce energy use or for that matter, things like water use on the airport.

01:07:30:27 - 01:07:33:12

Maybe it's there, but I couldn't see it. Thank you.

01:07:36:10 - 01:07:37:26

This is Scotland's applicant.

01:07:40:01 - 01:08:10:10

Mark Edwards, on behalf of the applicant. Um, so we actually need to look at the Bago or airport building and ground operations aspect here as well as the construction. Um, so, uh, one of the commitments within the camp is for Gatwick to be net zero for scope one and two by 2030. Uh, this is then compounded by, uh, getting to absolute zero by 2040. What that means is any assets that are built as part of the project will be net zero compliant.

01:08:11:00 - 01:08:44:22

Net zero is a binary state. Once Gatwick achieves net zero, it will continue to achieve net zero. Um, for example, at the moment we're taking out natural gas boilers. No asset in as part of the project will be built with a natural gas boiler. So once we reach net zero will maintain net zero. Uh, so that's an important part in terms of how to manage the, uh, operational aspects in terms of whole life. It is looking at what is the best outcome in terms of a carbon outcome. So sometimes it is this is um, you can make the analogy to cost here.

01:08:44:27 - 01:09:17:11

Sometimes you might pay more with construction carbon to achieve lower operational carbon outputs. So for example a triple glazed window will have more embodied carbon in it. So you're using more capital carbon because there are three sheets of glass instead of two. That will then result in a lower energy use in the operational cycle. So that's over the whole life. That may be the best outcome from a carbon point of view. So this is how you apply a whole life carbon to looking at these built assets.

01:09:17:20 - 01:09:49:07

So furthermore, to the um, wider issue of Bria, um, which I would call more widely sustainability accreditation schemes, of which there are more than just Bria, it is quite possible and feasible to achieve the same sustainability and indeed carbon outcomes without using those, uh, systems. Um, so I think what we've said in a previous, uh, written responses that we will assess the benefits of using such schemes, um, in terms of whether we actually roll them out or not.

01:09:50:07 - 01:09:58:10

So councillor A6 is comments about the standards you're saying. There are a range including Brian.

01:09:59:20 - 01:10:01:09

Mark, the applicant. Yes.

01:10:01:11 - 01:10:04:19

Thank you. That's helpful. Yes, councillor.

01:10:05:12 - 01:10:38:18

So if I'm if I'm right to understand correctly. So there's a process in place but no standards in place because they've got a process and they don't need to comply with any standards. So that's how I understand it. I read various comments from um, other representations basically saying, well, why don't you set a standard for the for what quality of building you want going forward? And I've not

seen a reply from Gatwick to committing to any certain standards. And I think sometimes it's useful to have a standard to work to. Otherwise, you know, promises can't be upheld.

01:10:38:20 - 01:11:15:09

That's why presumably we have conditions in in planning applications. But I think the point made in terms of basically a return on embodied in carbon invested in construction is very good. And I guess it applies to buildings. But I, I would maybe just make the brief point that the biggest thing being built is, is additional runway capacity, and there isn't any return on that investment that's investing in body carbon, which will drive up operational carbon rather than drive down operational carbon. So maybe it would be better to look at that operational whole life carbon assessment, not just for individual buildings, but for the project as a whole.

01:11:15:12 - 01:11:17:22

Okay. Thank you. Just applicant wish to come back.

01:11:17:29 - 01:11:52:01

Let's go on it for the applicant. I think we need to sort of get away from the suggestion that because Brian isn't being adopted as a specific standard, that there aren't controls over the airport's emissions. We've obviously got their big commitment, which is significant in its own right. And the past 20 years, as we've heard, takes into account, um, whole life carbon performance without commitment to adhering to past 2080. Um, means that when buildings are built, they are going to remain that zero as well. So that's that's an important couple of points to put any suggestion about Brian in contact.

01:11:52:03 - 01:11:58:16

We're making other commitments, which mean that it's not necessary to adhere specifically to Brian as one example.

01:11:58:25 - 01:12:03:04

So is that commitment set out in the carbon action plan or is it elsewhere.

01:12:03:17 - 01:12:19:28

The will there be a good commitment that's set out in the Carbon Action Plan and the past 2080 commitment to set out, albeit as part of the construction phase, but the implications of doing that, the construction phase, have knock on consequences for how those buildings are used during airport operations. So they're set out in the cap.

01:12:20:06 - 01:12:20:28

Okay. Thank you.

01:12:22:26 - 01:12:24:28

All right. Let's continue then.

01:12:25:03 - 01:12:55:13

So sorry, can I sorry I apologize, um, I think I did light up earlier on, but obviously I didn't catch your eye. Sorry. Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. So I know we've got a separate topic to talk about the carbon action plan and related control documents later in the agenda. But one of the things which we are not clear has been done in the assessment that's been carried out to date, albeit it was helpful to hear those further comments from Mr.

01:12:55:15 - 01:13:33:02

Edwards. Um, as well as obviously the guidance, um, in the airports, MPs and the related documents we've been talking about this morning, there are when one comes on to both the obey go got the right

jargon for that and the construction process. There are local development plan policies which are relevant to both the construction and the operation of um, uh, infrastructure assets.

01:13:33:10 - 01:14:05:10

And we don't see, particularly in terms of sustainable building, sustainable energy use, that the applicant's assessment to date has taken into account. There's a suite of policies in the Crawley Borough Local Plan. I just mentioned them briefly EMV six, EMV seven and EMV nine. And there is also an emerging policy which is SDC two, uh, in the draft Crawley Borough local plans. So you'll appreciate from your earlier reading.

01:14:05:12 - 01:14:40:23

That's the one where we're still just awaiting the inspector's report. It's gone through modifications and so on. So probably we'll be able to update you on its status during the course of this examination, but it's on any view. It's an evolved a far evolved local plan. But I say what we don't see in the assessment that's being carried out, that's presented in chapter 16, is that the applicant's assessment of carbon, and in particular, when you look at, um, what they say for the obey go in what's app 192, that's the appendix supporting chapter 16 on Abaco issues.

01:14:40:25 - 01:14:54:22

We don't see that those policies have been addressed. And we're not satisfied that the assessment therefore fairly takes into account the local policy dimension as well as the wider national policy dimension.

01:14:58:25 - 01:15:01:14

Mr. Linus, do you wish to respond on that?

01:15:05:01 - 01:15:05:16

Um.

01:15:06:24 - 01:15:39:24

Um, Scott Linus for the applicant. Um, we're not entirely clear how it's being suggested that those policies are, um, relevant. Uh, but, um, perhaps I could ask Mr. Robertson to explain the approach that was taken to construction emissions and why he thinks that's the standard that's been applied to that is generally policy compliant. Uh, beyond that, we're we're happy to explain our response to that further in writing a deadline, a deadline for.

01:15:42:24 - 01:16:13:02

A question for the applicant. I think as Mr. Lane have said, we'll come back with with detail on the specific, uh, policies and how they reflected. I think the, the general understanding of, I think the message I'd like to put forward on, on the Abigail, um, assessment as a whole is to highlight that the work that's being done by the applicant to decarbonize operational energy is for the for the airport as a whole.

01:16:13:17 - 01:16:44:10

So, so I, I've got no reason to expect that the assessment is deficient by not considering these measures for new development, when actually what's happening is the carbon action plan and the commitments within that apply to new development and the existing development across the airport. But we can come back on the specifics of the individual policies and, and clarify whether, uh, they would be expected to make any difference to the, to the assessment that's being done.

01:16:45:25 - 01:17:02:03

Scotland. The applicant will we'll look through the local impact report. Because if this point has been raised there and those policies mentioned, we may have responded to it already. So we can confirm that response. Otherwise, as I say, we'll we'll look at it and provide more detail in writing.

01:17:03:20 - 01:17:04:05

Okay.

01:17:04:07 - 01:17:39:17

Thank you. I think that concludes item seven. I think at this point we'll have a break. Uh, just after 25 past come back. It's um, 3:45. We've said we said earlier that we would try and finish by 430. I think we might need to go on a little beyond that. But we also need to ensure that, uh, we've got four substantive items still to do. So we'll need to try and get through those, um, probably a quarter of an hour for each of them, if we can.

01:17:39:21 - 01:17:48:00

Any outstanding questions? Obviously, we can put in writing, but we've got to cover all four topics. Okay. So adjourn now until 3:45. Thank you.