

**Application by Gatwick Airport Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project**

**Issue Specific Hearing 7 – Other Environmental Matters**

**Date:** 01 May 2024

**Venue:** Sandman Signature London Gatwick Hotel; and Microsoft Teams

**Action Points:**

No.	Party	Action	Deadline
<b>Agenda Item 3 – Future Baseline</b>			
1	Applicant	Confirm that figures provided for the baseline case in GEN.1.17 refer to the full extent of the case, e.g. 67.2mppa.	D4
2	Applicant	Do the extra 100 passengers per hour for departures in Table 2 of GEN.1.17 arise from the larger planes and higher seat utilisation of planes described in your case?	D4
3	Applicant	Would an extra 100 passengers require any additional departure facilities? If not, why not?	D4
4	Applicant	The figures in table 2 of GEN.1.17 state that the baseline would result in 4,450 passengers, up from 4,200 in the north terminal and 3,700 from 3,350 passengers in the south. This seems to be more of an increase – and more than the 2% stated in the answer to the question – roughly 6% increase in the north and 10% in the south terminal.  However, immigration desks and baggage reclaim belts would stay the same. Would this be sustainable given this percentage increase in a busy hour? Would the service standards still be met?	D4
5	Applicant	To what extent are you reliant on the UK Border Force for immigration operations and related service standards?	D4
6	Applicant	Easyjet noted in their relevant representation that current critical infrastructure at LGW (including the North Terminal departure facility) is full or close to full during the morning peak hour, making it impossible to add more aircraft or up gauge to larger aircraft with more seats. They also note that there is no capacity to expand on the current security infrastructure within LGW and no increase in security resources at peak times leading to long queues and delays. How does this square with your answer to GEN.1.17 and your proposals for no more departure facilities?	D4

No.	Party	Action	Deadline
7	Applicant	Para 6.1.30 of [REP3-079] states that if the project is not approved that “the avenues through which the Airport and its airline customers can seek to grow and satisfy unmet demand will be more limited and this will increase the focus on those avenues – such as improved seasonality – which are available. Under these circumstances, the seasonal price signals offered under the published tariff and bilateral agreements may be stronger, which would, in turn, support peak spreading.” Please elaborate on this.	D4
8	Applicant	Para 6.1.32 of [REP3-079] refers to Heathrow and the potential for some operations to move from Heathrow to Gatwick. This states that “While the pandemic has created some slot opportunities to accommodate the spill or transfer of demand from Heathrow, the Airport is also full during the peak summer season and the scope for additional services is therefore very limited, particularly as airlines will not launch new services without access to the lucrative peak summer slot capacity where the most profitable opportunities lie.”  How does this statement square with the peak spreading proposals or predictions?	D4
9	Applicant	Applicant to provide a response to the Examination and the Joint Local Authorities regarding the concerns that the LAs have over the runway capacity for the base case to handle the extra numbers of planes forecast.	D4
10	Applicant	Paragraph 5.1.3 of [REP3-079] states that if the local authorities are right and that baseline capacity is lower than the Applicant states, the impacts from the NRP would be greater. But that if the authorities were right about baseline capacity, the need for the NRP would be even greater, as would its benefits.  The JLAs made a request to consider such impacts and benefits. Applicant to explain the broad propositions that it has made regarding the future baseline in response to such suggestions and any further justification as to why this work could not be carried out.	D4
		<b>Note</b> – the statement made to the Examination in CAH1 concerning ongoing discussions with the Joint Local Authorities related to the above two actions (9 &10) is recognised. If necessary these actions can be dealt with in the context of this statement.	
11	Applicant	Applicant to confirm if the Transport Assessment and the Car Parking Strategy need to be updated to reflect that the Hilton Hotel MSCP has been removed from the parking provision.	D4
12	Applicant	It was discussed at ISH4 how parking supply at the airport is an important factor affecting mode choice.	D4

No.	Party	Action	Deadline
		Applicant to consider how the 2,500 robotic parking spaces would come forward were permitted development rights at the Airport removed.	
<b>Agenda Item 4 – Water Environment</b>			
13	Applicant	Thames Water to provide into the Examination results of its initial modelling to demonstrate there is sufficient capacity within the system to accommodate the proposal.	D5
14	Applicant	Applicant to submit into the Examination the correspondence that it has had from Sutton and East Surrey (SES) Water as quoted in the Applicant's response to EXQ1 WE1.9	D4
<b>Agenda Item 5 – Air Quality</b>			
15	Applicant	Applicant to explain the inconsistency between the Air Quality contour map figures and tabulated data in the ES.	D4
16	Applicant JLAs	Applicant and JLAs to outline in their post hearing submissions their position on the assessment of 2047 forecasts of emissions levels.	D4
17	Applicant JLAs	Applicant and JLAs to outline in their post hearing submissions their position on the issue of ultrafine particles and how to deal with any tightening of the air quality standards.	D4
<b>Agenda Item 6 – Draft Section 106 Agreement</b>			
18	Applicant	Applicant to provide an Explanatory Memorandum for the Draft Section 106 Agreement.	D5
19	Applicant	Explain in the EM how the financial contributions within the Schedules been arrived at.	D5
20	Applicant	Set out in the EM how the provisions in the s106 agreement relate to paragraphs 55-58 of the NPPF.	D5