



Horsham
District
Council



GATWICK AIRPORT NORTHERN RUNWAY PROJECT

Planning Inspectorate's Reference: TR020005

Legal Partnership Authorities

Comments on The Applicant's Response To The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Response to [[REP3-097](#)] | Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources

DEADLINE 4: 15 May 2024

Crawley Borough Council (GATW-AFP107)

Horsham District Council (20044739)

Mid Sussex District Council (20044737)

West Sussex County Council (20044715)

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (20044474)

Surrey County Council (20044665)

East Sussex County Council (20044514)

Tandridge District Council (GATW-S57419)

Legal Partnership Authorities' Comments on the Applicant's Responses To The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1)

Response to [\[REP3-097\]](#) | Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources

The Legal Partnership Authorities are comprised of the following host and neighbouring Authorities who are jointly represented by Michael Bedford KC and Sharpe Pritchard LLP for the purposes of the Examination:

- Crawley Borough Council
- Horsham District Council
- Mid Sussex District Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Surrey County Council
- East Sussex County Council; and
- Tandridge District Council.

In these submissions, the Legal Partnership Authorities may be referred to as the “*Legal Partnership Authorities*”, the “*Authorities*”, the “*Joint Local Authorities*” (“*JLAs*”) or the “*Councils*”. Please note that Mole Valley District Council are also part of the Legal Partnership Authorities for some parts of the Examination (namely, those aspects relating to legal agreements entered into between the Applicant and any of the Legal Partnership Authorities).

Introduction

1. The Legal Partnership Authorities have now had the opportunity to review the Applicant's responses to ExQ1 in conjunction with their specialist consultants and legal advisors.
2. The Applicant provided their response to ExQ1 in the form of 19 separate written submissions to the examination together with annexes. For the ExA's ease of review, the Legal Partnership Authorities set out their comments on the Applicants responses in the final column of the table below.
3. Where the Legal Partnership Authorities have decided not to comment on one of the Applicant's responses, this question has been deleted from the table below.
4. For the avoidance of doubt, where the Legal Partnership Authorities have decided not to comment on one of the Applicant's responses this should not be taken to indicate that the Legal Partnership Authorities agree with the response.
5. At deadline 4, the Legal Partnership Authorities have submitted a paper authored by their specialist aviation consultants at York Aviation LLP entitled “Response to Additional Documents Submitted at Deadline 3 – Case for the Scheme and Related Matters” (the “**York Aviation Deadline 4 Paper**”).
6. **The York Aviation Deadline 4 Paper addresses issues relating to the case for the scheme thematically and includes further commentary on the Applicant's responses to the ExQ1 questions relating to this topic.**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Response	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VISUAL RESOURCES			
LV.1.1	The Applicant	<p>Construction Compounds</p> <p>Provide further details on proposed construction/ contractor compounds, to include likely lighting details, height and colour of site cabins (dual or single stacked), stockpile heights, and areas where the compounds may be visible from.</p> <hr/> <p>Please refer to Appendix A to this document which sets out the details requested by the ExA for each of the construction compounds.</p>	<p>The Authorities do not consider that the Applicant has addressed this question in sufficient detail in its response Appendix A Doc Ref 10.16 [REP3-098]. The Reed Bed Treatment System Compound is not referenced in Appendix A or referenced in supporting document [REP1-021]. The maximum height of the works in Car Park Y varies between document between 6 metres and 8 metres. There is no new information provided since the Deadline 1 submission. None of the documents referenced in the Applicant's response are proposed to be certified in Schedule 12 of the dDCO and therefore there is currently no control over the appearance of these large construction compounds (some of which will be in situ for up to 14 years). It is therefore considered that these construction compounds should be listed as Works (see further detail in response reference DCO 1.39) in addition to further information being provided to inform the Examination.</p> <p>JMc/CBC 8/5</p>
LV.1.2	The Applicant	<p>Pentagon Field</p> <p>Provide further information on the proposed use of Pentagon Field:</p> <p>a) How would the area be managed/ filled? Can site levels and</p>	<p>The Authorities response in respect of each of the items referred to in the Applicant's answer to question LV1.2 are set out below:</p> <p>a) The Authorities do not consider that the Applicant has provided an adequate response to this question. The response suggests that the</p>

		<p>surveys be provided?</p> <p>b) How would the footpath (359/Sy) and views from it be managed in practice?</p> <p>c) Provide further details on vegetation loss and mitigation.</p> <p>d) What scale would the proposed substation likely be in terms of dimensions?</p> <p>e) When would you envisage the proposed planting belt would mature?</p>	<p>significant soil deposition of ‘approximately 100,000 m³’ of spoil is not a figure which has been reached following a rigorous process. The lack of information submitted – which lacks a topographical survey and site management details – suggests that the Applicant has not identified the true impacts of these works. In the absence of this information the Authorities would emphasise the need for additional information on this site including parameter plans and a survey drawing in order to understand the impact of this soil deposition on the landscape and its visual impact on surrounding features. A clearer plan is required to understand the impact on nearby rights of way and showing the means of site access.</p> <p>b) Views of Pentagon Field for walkers on 359Sy are not just from the Northern Boundary. The site is visible from the footpath further to the south allowing views through the tree cover eastwards towards Balcombe Road. The concerns expressed in the West Sussex LIR in relation to this site remain [REP1-068].</p> <p>c) The tree survey for Pentagon Field Appendix 8.10.1 Sheet 8 of 13 [REP3-037] which is based on aerial photography still does not identify clearly which trees are for removal and it is questionable whether just 3 specimens will be impacted in the absence of any detail on where the site access for the soil deposition will be located and proximity of the soil to the existing site trees. It noted that the Applicant is yet to submit this information on tree removal for this site (stated to be supplied at D4). The lack of this detail in terms of survey drawings and levels means further trees could be lost due to compaction from soil deposition, works within root protection areas or root damage from construction traffic accessing and circulating within the site to create the spoil landform. While for this site Works No 41 (considered in insolation) the level of tree mitigation would be adequate in accordance with CBC adopted Local Plan Policy CH6 as it is likely that the tree loss would be more than adequately compensated for by the 1 ha of planting proposed.</p>
		<p>a) Pentagon Field is identified as a spoil receptor site. The import of cohesive arisings from excavations associated with the development activities would be used to landscape Pentagon Field and improve ecological habitat and biodiversity (secured under Work No. 41 of the dDCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6)). The spoil will be progressively landscaped to its final levels as it is imported and eventually accommodate approximately 100,000m³ of spoil. Topographical and utility identification surveys would be completed during the early stages of design followed by any other surveys required by the designers (e.g. ground investigation, boreholes) to enable completion of the final detail design.</p> <p>b) Walkers are able to gain a narrow, open view from PRow 359/Sy through a gap in the hedgerow around Pentagon Field, at a field access gate on the northern boundary, see ES Chapter 8: Landscape Townscape and Visual Resources Viewpoint 10, ES Figure 8.4.14 [REP2-006] and ES Figures 8.9.37 to 8.9.40 [REP2-</p>	

		<p><u>007</u>]. Views into Pentagon Field from other locations on this PRow are heavily filtered by mature hedgerows and trees. A managed footpath crossing point for access by trucks importing spoil to the site would be located on the PRow during the construction period and agreed with the LPA in line with ES Appendix 19.8.1 Public Rights of Way Management Strategy [REP2-009]. Construction traffic would form an intermittent addition to views from a section of the footpath.</p> <p>c) Vegetation loss at Pentagon Field is shown in Appendix C: Airport Tree Survey Schedule and Appendix I: Airport Preliminary Tree Removal Plans of ES Appendix 8.10.1: Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP1-026, REP1-028] and would be confined to a small hawthorn tree and two mature oak trees within the centre of the site. ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Landscape Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3 v3) includes a Sketch Landscape Concept plan of Pentagon Field at Figure 1.2.18 <u>REP2-023</u>]. The Concept plan shows that, as per the Work No. 41 and Design Principle DLP17, a 15 metre wide belt of woodland planting (comprising native trees and shrubs) is proposed to be planted on the eastern edge of Pentagon Field, adjacent to the Balcombe Road. The obligations within the oLEMP are secured through a Requirement in the dDCO (Doc Ref. 2.1) and the approval of the Landscape and Ecology Management Plans before the relevant works can commence. Approximately 1 hectare of land to the south of Pentagon Field is proposed for landscape and ecological planting.</p> <p>d) A substation is not proposed within the Pentagon Field ecological area. The Applicant notes that ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] incorrectly refers to a new substation in paragraph 8.9.14. However, as made clear by Work</p>	<p>d) No response needed.</p> <p>e) The Authorities consider that the Applicant's assumption that in 10 years the proposed planting would screen the spoil is not considered to be robustly justified as only limited details have been provided. There are a number of variables including planting mix and spacing, treatment of the site access and the nature of the spoil being deposited which could influence the growth and effectiveness of any tree screen. It is not clear from the submission if the trees are to be planted prior to the soil deposition or after the land raising has been completed.</p> <p>**</p> <p>The WSCC County Arboriculturalist has commented that providing all aftercare is carried out and the ground is well prepared most trees should grow at a minimum rate of 0.5m in height per year. Assuming planting at 1m staggered spacings and 5 rows deep, the screen would be very dense and potentially by year 10 the trees could reach 5m in height. Two native woodland mixes, A and B are referenced by the Application, neither of which are specified on conceptual plans, and which would vary in overall height depending on which is planted. Furthermore, the existing hedgerow may need coppicing or reducing to 600mm in height for a significant distance either side of the site access to allow for sight lines for lorries depositing the spoil. This feature would need to be reinstated or maintained and should be considered in any LEMP.</p> <p>The Authorities note that there is no information on the nature of the material to be deposited and assuming the transported soil is soil and does not contain other materials (such as inert waste), then it is unlikely to create fine dust which does slow the rate of tree growth. Such detail should be in a construction management plan.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>No. 41 of the DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1) and ES Chapter 5: Project Description [REP1-016], a substation is not proposed at the Pentagon Field ecological area.</p> <p>e) A typical mix of native tree and shrub species planted as predominantly bare root transplants would be sufficiently mature at 10 years to achieve screening and softening of development, ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Landscape Ecology Management Plan: Annex 3 Typical Planting Schedules [REP2-025]. Tree species in particular would continue to grow and mature to further mitigate effects on landscape and visual resources and contribute to the enhancement of green infrastructure generally and integration with the surrounding landscape. The management and maintenance strategies set out in Sections 10 and 11 the oLEMP will be undertaken for a minimum period of 30 years from the date of planting, as confirmed in the updated oLEMP (Doc Ref. 5.3 v3) submitted at Deadline 3 and secured through DCO Requirement 8.</p>	
<p>LV.1.3</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Landscaping</p> <p>Provide further details on landscaping proposals for the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) North Terminal Decked Car Park; b) Car Park X; c) Car Park Y; and d) Purple parking (new). 	<p>While the Authorities note that no tracked changed documents have been provided for the Design and Access statement volumes 1 - 5, it appears no additional detail has been provided within these documents by the Applicant in response to this question. A more detailed response on the revised Appendix 1 – Design Principles document [REP3-056] is provided within a separate Joint West Sussex Authorities Deadline 4 submission.</p> <p>The response provided by the Applicant suggests that because they consider the car parks to be ‘excepted development’ they are not prepared to provide any further design detail. The Authorities do not accept this approach for the reasons set out in response Table 4 – Action Point 10 [REP2-081].</p>

	<p>Such details to include existing survey plans, existing trees to be protected and proposed new/ reinforced landscape proposals.</p> <p>The DCO Application does not contain definitive layouts and designs for proposed car parks. The Design and Access Statement (DAS) [REP2-032, REP2-033, REP2-034, REP2-035, REP2-036] includes indicative plans and diagrams of car parks as follows;</p> <p>North Terminal Decked Car Park: DAS Volume 3 – Figures 22, 23 and 24</p> <p>Car Park X: DAS Volume 2 – Figures 12, 13 and 14</p> <p>Car Park Y: DAS Volume 3 – Figures 79, 80, 81 and 82</p> <p>Purple Parking: DAS Volume 2 – Figures 18, 19 and 20</p> <p>The accompanying Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) to the DAS include project-wide design principles for landscaping which sets out the design of native tree, shrub and hedgerow planting that would be appropriate for car parks within the Project. In particular, Landscaping Design Principle L4 directs that any vegetation will be retained and incorporated into the design where feasible to minimise impacts on character and visual resources. Alongside the project-wide design principles, site-specific design principles are included for individual works. This includes site-specific principles for Car Park X (DBF9), Car Park Y (DBF20, DDP10 and DLP14) and for surface, multi-storey and decked car parking (DBF7 to DBF11).</p> <p>The detailed design must be prepared in accordance with the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3), as secured under Requirement 4 of the dDCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6). The Applicant considers that the provision of these car</p>	<p>The level of detail is inadequate, the Authorities have seen no tree protection or landscaping plans with sufficient detail matched to corresponding design information to be certain that trees and landscaping within and surrounding the car parks would be safeguarded.</p>
--	--	--

	<p> parks would constitute “excepted development” as set out in The Applicant’s Response to ISH2 Actions [REP1-063] and therefore, in line with DCO Requirement 4, the Applicant would consult CBC on the detailed design of these developments. </p> <p> The assessment within Section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] is based on the maximum design scenarios set out in Table 8.7.1. The figures in the DAS provide an indication of car park development of this scale and nature within these locations. Landscape proposals have not been designed at this stage, however a general principle of perimeter planting in the form of linear belts of native trees, shrubs and hedgerows to screen and soften development has been included in ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Landscape Ecology Management Plan [REP2-021, REP2-023, REP2-025, REP2-027], more specifically Section 3: Landscape and Ecology Zone Objectives (Zones 1 and 5) and the assessment and mitigation of effects is included in Section 9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033]. </p> <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 plans and schedules covering these specific car parks, alongside removal plans based on the preliminary design work. Measures to protect retained trees and vegetation are detailed within the Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement, forming Annex 6 of the CoCP (Doc Ref. 5.3), and will be confirmed based on the final detailed design through Detailed Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statements for approval by CBC (in consultation with other relevant authorities) prior to any tree or vegetation removal. </p>	
--	---	--

<p>LV.1.4</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Living Conditions of Residents</p> <p>Provide an assessment of the visual effects of the Proposed Development upon the living conditions of residents on the residential edges of Horley (including but not limited to those residents of Longbridge Road, Balcombe Road and those identified by the JSCs' LIR [REP1-097]). Such an assessment to include any effects of lighting and light spill from new proposed structures, such as Car Park Y.</p>	<p>The Surrey Joint Authorities Local Impact Report [REP1-097] includes the Authorities' concerns on the impact on the landscape (Harm to Green Barrier) and the impact on neighbouring properties in south Horley. Our position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Further details on the works compounds were provided by the Applicant in [REP2-036]. Specifically, details were provided on the South Terminal Roundabout Contractors Compound (Para 8.3.8), Longbridge Roundabout Site Welfare Facility (Para 8.3.9) and Car Park B Compound (Para 8.3.10). Whilst details of the layouts and uses are provided for the South Terminal Roundabout Compound, no visual resources have been provided of the sections of the heights of structures included in the scheme. To help demonstrate the scale of the compound and its visual impacts, the ExA may wish to ask the Applicant for additional information and imaging of the South Terminal Contractors compound.</p> <p>Details for the Longbridge Roundabout Site Welfare Facility and the Car Park B Compound are more limited making visual impact assessments more challenging with no layout plans or sections of buildings. The ExA may wish to seek further plans and sections from the Applicant to help assess the impact of the two compounds on neighbouring residential properties.</p>
		<p>Section 8.9 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] includes an assessment of the effects on occupiers of relevant residential properties throughout the construction and operation period, a summary of which is as follows:</p> <p>Gatwick Dairy Farm (a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses with gardens adjacent to the site boundary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2024 to 2029: Contractors compound and vegetation removal. More open views of existing and temporary lighting and light sources. Moderate to Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2030 to 2032: Contractors compound and surface access construction activities. More open views of existing and temporary lighting and light sources. Moderate to Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2033 to 2038: Newly operational surface access improvements and environmental mitigation area. More open views of existing and proposed lighting and light sources. Moderate to Minor adverse 	

		<p>effects during daytime and at night.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2038 and beyond: Mature environmental mitigation area and surface access improvements Slightly more open views of existing and proposed lighting and light sources.. Minor adverse at night in winter and Negligible adverse during the day. <p>Three Apartment Buildings, Longbridge Road, Horley (Six ground floor, six first floor and six second floor apartments approximately 50m from site boundary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2024 to 2029: Vegetation removal and surface access construction activities. More open views of existing and temporary lighting and light sources. Moderate to Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2030 to 2032: Surface access construction activities. More open views of existing and temporary lighting and light sources. Moderate to Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2033 to 2038: Newly operational surface access improvements and landscape mitigation. More open views of existing and proposed lighting and light sources. Moderate to Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2038 and beyond: Mature landscape mitigation and surface access improvements. Slightly more open views of existing and proposed lighting and light sources. Minor to Negligible adverse effects during daytime and at night mainly in winter. 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Numbers 74, 76, 78 and 80 Longbridge Road, Horley (single storey, detached properties approximately 30m to 50m from site boundary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2024 to 2029: Vegetation removal and surface access construction activities. More open views of existing and temporary lighting and light sources. Moderate to Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2030 to 2032: Surface access and footpath ramp construction activities. More open views of existing and temporary lighting. Major adverse effects number 74 (significant) and Moderate to Minor adverse effects numbers 76, 78 and 80 during daytime and at night. • 2033 to 2038: Newly operational surface access improvements and landscape mitigation. More open views of existing and proposed lighting and light sources. Major adverse effects number 74 (significant) and Moderate to Minor adverse effects numbers 76, 78 and 80 during daytime and at night. • 2038 and beyond: Mature landscape mitigation and surface access improvements. Slightly more open views of existing and proposed lighting and light sources. Minor to Negligible adverse effects during daytime and at night mainly in winter. <p>Number 275 Balcombe Road (detached, single storey property with gardens adjacent to the site boundary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2024 to 2029: Vegetation removal and surface access construction activities. More open views of existing and temporary lighting and 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>light sources. Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2030 to 2032: Surface access construction activities. More open views of existing and temporary lighting and light sources. Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2033 to 2038: Newly operational surface access improvements and landscape mitigation. Slightly more open views of existing and/or proposed lighting and light sources. Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2038 and beyond: Mature landscape mitigation and surface access improvements. Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. <p>Horley Residential edge (approximately 80 properties north-east of Riverside Garden Park approximately 30m to 210m from site boundary)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2030 to 2032: Vegetation removal and surface access construction activities. Barely discernible views of existing and temporary lighting and light sources. Minor adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2033 to 2038: Newly operational surface access improvements and landscape mitigation. Barely discernible views of existing and proposed lighting and light sources. Negligible adverse effects during daytime and at night. • 2038 and beyond: Mature landscape mitigation and surface access improvements. Barely discernible views of existing and proposed lighting and light sources. Negligible adverse to No Change during 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>daytime and at night mainly in winter.</p> <p>Consideration of the effects on the residential visual amenity of residents, in accordance with <i>Landscape Institute Technical Guidance Note 2/19 Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) 2019</i>, can be confined to occupiers of 74 Longbridge Road, Horley. This is the only property that major adverse and significant effects have been identified following the assessment in ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033]. The following criteria has been considered as part of the RVAA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of visual impact is no greater than medium. • The visual effects are temporary during construction and the period immediately following the completion of the surface access improvements works. <p>Vegetation removal within the road corridor would reveal views of the Travelodge Hotel approximately 150m from the property, including light sources at night.</p> <p>Oblique, partially filtered views of Car Park Y and its lighting at night, approximately 160m to the south, would be visible from the end of the rear garden, not from within the property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of visual effect reduces when landscape mitigation planting establishes and matures. • The overall character of views from the property would not 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>significantly change. Occupiers currently have views of a busy dual carriageway, traffic and lighting, which would remain following completion of the Project. The carriageway alignment would remain in approximately the same location whilst the River Mole bridge structure would move slightly closer to the property and a footpath ramp would be added.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is considered that the level of impact and nature and duration of the change in view is not sufficient to reach the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold. The Project would not be overwhelming or over bearing due to its scale and would not be overly intrusive due to its proximity.</p> <p>Through the detailed design work, the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) direct that any vegetation of value will be reviewed for retention and incorporation into the design to minimise impacts on character and visual resources (L4).</p>	
<p>LV.1.5</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Highway works</p> <p>The Joint West Sussex LIR [REP1-068] raises concerns over the “<i>significant loss of existing vegetation</i>” as a result of the highway works associated with the Proposed Development detailed within the Outline LEMP [APP-113].</p> <p>Provide further details of proposed mitigation, including details on the time likely for effective screening to take place.</p> <p>ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Landscape Ecology Management Plan [REP2-021, REP2-023, REP2-025, REP2-027] sets the overarching vision</p>	<p>The Authorities do not believe the Applicant has evidenced how the proposed planting will be of adequate maturity at 5-10 years post planting to mitigate visual and townscape impacts. Much of the existing trees and tree groups are of moderate or high quality/value, having taken a number of decades to reach their current form and valued structural screening.</p> <p>Whilst landscaping concepts provide replacement planting where tree and scrub loss occurs, there appears to be an overall loss of these features adjacent to the surface access proposals. It is suggested that 'woodland planting' is proposed in many areas adjacent to surface access works as replacement for losses, but with a depth of only 1m (two rows of trees) for many of these lengths, this is not recognised as 'woodland planting' by the Authorities. No enhancement planting</p>

	<p>for landscape proposals within the Project of which Figures 1.2.4 to 1.2.15 show the preliminary Surface Access Landscape Proposals [REP2-021].</p> <p>Tree survey plans, tree quality schedules, tree removal plans and the arboricultural impact assessment for the Project are included in ES Appendix 8.10.1: Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) .</p> <p>The majority of the vegetation that would be removed as part of the surface access improvements of the A23 would be scrub and small to medium sized trees. Reinstatement of scrub and tree planting will be designed in accordance with guidelines by National Highways (DMRB LD117 Landscape Design, the Manual of Contract Documents for Highways Works, Major Projects and Highways England, DMRB Asset Data Management Manual Volume 13) to provide some mitigation of landscape, townscape and visual effects immediately following implementation. Significant effects are limited to the 5 year construction period and when the surface access improvements are initially complete. Landscape planting proposals will grow to soften the surface access improvements within its context of settlement and airport edge, create adjacent areas of open space and green infrastructure, and enhance the transition to the surrounding townscape and landscape. Planting will become sufficiently mature within approximately 5 to 10 years to mitigate visual and townscape impacts and reduce effects to a level that is no longer significant.</p> <p>Landscaping principles and sketch concept plans of landscaping proposals are included within the oLEMP [REP2-021], [REP2-023], [REP2-025], [REP2-027]. In accordance with Requirement 8 of the dDCO (Doc</p>	<p>adjacent to retained vegetation, nor advanced planting is proposed near to these areas in mitigation which is disappointing.</p> <p>The Authorities note that the Applicant is not proposing tree mitigation in line with Crawley Borough Council’s standards set out in policy CH6 in the adopted Crawley Borough Local Plan and explained in detail in the Green Infrastructure SPD [both referenced in REP1-068]. Due to the limited detail provided it is not currently possible to calculate the number of replacement trees necessary to mitigate those lost due to the proposed highway works however, the Authorities would expect the Applicant to comply with the policy and to provide payment in lieu on per tree basis (secured via a Section 106 Agreement) when replacements cannot be accommodated on site. Wording has been proposed to this effect which allows the amount due to be calculated when the numbers are known.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Ref. 2.1 v6), the landscape planting proposals will be submitted to CBC for approval as part of the LEMP (in consultation with the relevant authorities).</p> <p>During construction of the Project, measures to protect retained trees and vegetation (and root protection zones) are detailed within the Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement, forming Annex 6 of the CoCP (Doc Ref. 5.3), and will be confirmed based on the final detailed design through Detailed Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statements for approval by CBC (in consultation with other relevant authorities) prior to any tree or vegetation removal. The detailed Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statements will include detailed Tree Removal and Protection Plans and Vegetation Removal and Protection Plans.</p>	
<p>LV.1.6</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Noise Preferential Route 9</p> <p>While noting the details in ES Chapter 14, Noise and Vibration [APP-039], please provide further details on the likely use of Noise Preferential Route 9 under the Baseline and the Proposed Development.</p> <p>How would this usage affect the High Weald National Landscape and tranquillity (including visual effects) within this area?</p> <hr/> <p>No new flight paths are proposed as part of the Project. The increase in the number of overflights in 2032 compared to 2019, including as a result of aircraft using WIZAD (Route 9), is illustrated in Figure 8.6.6 [APP-061].</p> <p>The UK Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) sets out the rules for how the route may be used and is the source for the information as it is published and available to pilots. These rules are framed by a series of restrictions set by the Secretary of State using powers conferred by</p>	<p>The West Sussex Joint Local Impact Report [REP1-068] sets out the Authorities' concerns over the impact that increased overflight of the High Weald AONB, due to increased use of Route 9, will have on the tranquillity of the protected landscape.</p> <p>The additional use of WIZAD is very clearly a change in the way the NPR was intended to be used and results in additional overflight. Overflight data has not been included for all assessment years so actual effects on the area cannot be gauged; the Applicant has not demonstrated that the use of WIZAD was intended to be used in such a way; it is by the airport breaking their implied ceiling of 46mppa through a variety of permitted developments and all the proposals of the DCO that the situation is starting to arise. While it may not be defined by the CAA as an air space change it is very clearly a change to the way the airspace is used due to the potential increase in flights. The Applicant has provided no information to show that this does not conflict with arrivals and the route is a formal consideration for airspace change so it does appear that the expansion</p>

	<p>Section 78 of the Civil Aviation Act 1982. The UK AIP explains that the WIZAD Standard Instrument Departure (SID) is a tactical routing allocated by air traffic control to alleviate airspace congestion and may be offered at a late stage of taxiing to aircraft normally allocated MIMFO (Route 4) SID between 0700 and 2300. The WIZAD SID should not be used for flight planning purposes.</p> <p>Under both the baseline and with Project scenarios, the use of the WIZAD SID would be based on the current airspace route structure and operated in accordance with any existing restrictions or requirements. The worst-case potential growth in use of WIZAD in the baseline or Project cases does not meet the threshold for an Airspace Change as defined by the CAA's CAP1616 Airspace Change process.</p> <p>The WIZAD route involves an initial climb on westerly departures with a turn at approximately 2.3 miles onto a heading which routes the aircraft between Crawley and the northern edge of Horsham. The route onwards is across the High Weald National Landscape. ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] assesses impacts on the High Weald National Landscape having regard to a number of matters, including CAA guidance (CAP1616 Appendix B, para B30 and B56). The frequency of aircraft movements and general orientation of flights are illustrated in Figures 8.6.3 to 8.6.7 of the ES Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources Figures [REP2-007] together with nationally designated landscapes and 10 popular and well known locations within them.</p> <p>The noise assessment indicates as a worst case that use of the WIZAD route will increase to around 32 movements per day in the future baseline by 2032, and that the Project will increase this to around 39 movements per day (see ES Chapter 14 Noise & Vibration [APP-039] Paragraph</p>	<p>at the airport is predicated on bringing this NPR into use.</p> <p>In its response, the Applicant references the increased overflight at Wakehurst Place Royal Botanic Gardens, Historic Park and Garden and Grade 1 listed building. Whilst the 'dot' indicating the site falls within the '11 - 50' contour, the wider parks and gardens fall to the south, the most tranquil parts, and are within the 51 – 100 in 2032 contours [REP2-007] (Figure 8.6.7). Therefore, the figures in [APP-033] table 8.9.1 do not accurately reflect the impacts of increased overflight at this location and the magnitude of the impacts have been understated. The increased frequency of overflight, over areas which are tranquil in nature, will be very noticeable and harmful to the special characteristics of the protected landscape.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>14.6.39 and Table 14.7.1). The Applicant's draft Statement of Common Ground with Horsham District Council [REP1-040] provides an example in which the online air noise viewer is used to look at the area in the North of Horsham Town in more detail - namely postcode RH12 5JY just south of the A264. This location is on the edge of the western boundary of the High Weald National Landscape, and aircraft will be expected to be climbing and hence reducing in noise as they fly eastwards. The number of events above Lmax 65dB is expected to increase from 23.2 to 24.8 as a result of the Project in the noisiest year, 2032 with the noisiest fleet. The addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect as result of the Project (the effects are below the air noise LOAEL by some way in this location and to the east of it).</p> <p>The use of WIZAD will involve a small number of Gatwick's departures more regularly crossing the landscape south of the airport, and these may be audible, and visible (subject to cloud cover on the day). The frequency of aircraft movements and general orientation of flights are illustrated in the flight density plots in the ES Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources Figures [REP2-007]. The baseline flights in 2019 for Gatwick alone, and with all overflights are shown in Figures 8.6.3, and 8.6.5. The 2032 future baseline and assessment cases for the Project and the Project with all overflights are shown respectively in Figures 8.6.6, 8.6.7 and 8.6.8.</p> <p>The ES assesses effects on the perception of tranquility within the High Weald National Landscape as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft up to 7,000 ft above local ground level compared to the future baseline situation in 2032 (see ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] Table 8.9.1 for summary of representative assessment locations and overflight numbers – this includes assessment at Wakehurst Place. At this location, the 2019</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>baseline number of Gatwick overflights is 21, in the future baseline this increases to 28.2 in 2032, and with the project in 2032 increases to 33.8).</p> <p>People generally experience a relatively high level of tranquility in nationally designated landscapes of high scenic quality. These receptors are likely to be of high or very high sensitivity to change. Overflying aircraft at less than 7,000 feet above local ground level currently form a regular visible or audible feature that forms a slightly discordant aspect when experiencing the landscape. The special qualities that people living within and visiting the High Weald AONB experience, including distant scenic views and the landscape’s relative tranquility and dark skies, whilst affected to some extent as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft, would still be positive qualities that would continue to be experienced.</p>	
<p>LV.1.7</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>High Weald and Surrey Hills National Landscapes</p> <p>Table 8.9.1 of ES Chapter 8, Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] contains details of various places within the High Weald and Leith Hill in the Surrey Hills which would be overflown more as a result of the Proposed Development. This table appears to show a 20% increase in flights by 2032.</p> <p>a) Would the flight numbers (and this percentage) be the same for 2047 (when 80.2mppa are forecast)?</p> <p>b) If not, how would this affect the special qualities of the National Landscapes?</p>	<p>The West Sussex Joint Local Impact Report [REP1-068] Chapter 8 sets out the Authorities' concerns over the impact that increased overflight of the High Weald AONB will have on the tranquility of the protected landscape.</p> <p>In contrast to the Applicants analysis, [REP2-007] Figures 8.8.6 and 8.6.7 show that, with the Project, parts of the western section of the AONB will move from 11 – 51 daily overflights to 50 - 100 daily overflights. Therefore, it is not just areas that currently experience the greatest overflight that would experience the greatest increase. The impact on some of the most tranquil (least overflown) parts of the AONB has been understated by the Applicant.</p>

		<p>c) Aircraft are forecast to become larger under both the baseline case and the Proposed Development. Would the increased visual effect of larger aircraft have an effect on the National Landscapes?</p>	
		<p>ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] assesses impacts on the perception of tranquility within nationally designated landscapes having regard to a number of matters, including CAA guidance (CAP1616 Appendix B, para B30 and B56). The chapter provides a thorough, detailed assessment which has taken care to understand local characteristics, including local policy and relevant studies. The statutory purpose and duty of the National Landscapes (formerly AONB's) are expressed and their special qualities set out and analysed. The heat mapping for the proposed overflights, during both day and night time, is based on a forecast increase as a result of the Project by comparison to the future baseline situation of up to approximately 20% overflights by the end of 2032 and would not exceed this level of increase beyond 2033. ES Figure 8.6.7 [REP2-007] shows the increase in the number of Gatwick overflights combined with non-Gatwick overflights in each grid square as a colour. The areas of the landscape currently overflowed by the largest number of aircraft would experience the greatest number of additional aircraft. The data within Table 8.9.1 for summary of representative assessment locations and overflight numbers are also relevant to the assessment of effects in 2033 to 2038 and beyond. The level of increase in the number of overflights as a result of the Project by comparison to the future baseline situation at less than 7,000 feet above ground level within the tranquility study area would remain the same as described in detail for the previous period in 2032 as there would not continue to be a significant increase in overflights.</p> <p>The special qualities experienced by people living within and visiting the</p>	

	<p>nationally designated landscapes within the study area include distant scenic views and relative tranquility and dark skies. Whilst these special qualities would be affected to some extent as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft, they would still be positive qualities that would be perceived. The largest increase in overflights would be in areas that currently experience the greatest number of overflights, where relative tranquility is slightly lower. An increase of up to approximately 20% in the number of aircraft following the same flight paths may be discernible to some residents or observers or barely perceptible to others. The magnitude of change would be negligible, leading to minor adverse effects on the perception of tranquility during the day and at night, which is not significant. Some people within the National Landscapes may be unable to perceive the increase in the number of aircraft and would therefore experience no discernible effect to the level of tranquility.</p> <p>The overflight data for the baseline, future baseline and Project scenarios include a range of aircraft types;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A typical short haul aircraft, eg an A320, has a wing span of about 24-36m. • A typical long haul aircraft, eg a B777 has a wing span of about 52 to 65m. <p>The tranquility assessment does not differentiate between aircraft sizes. It is considered that a person's experience of an overflight by a typical range of passenger aircraft at up to 7,000 feet above ground level would be similar within the context of their overall perception of tranquility within a nationally designated landscape. Any difference in the size of a visible aircraft is unlikely to result in a different level of effect on the perception of</p>	
--	---	--

		tranquility.	
--	--	--------------	--