



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

The Applicant's Response to Matters Raised at Open Floor Hearing 3

Book 10

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: MAY 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.26.1

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Applicant's Response to Matters raised at OFH3	1
1.	Sir Jeremy Quin MP for Horsham	2
2.	Crispin Blunt MP for Reigate	5
3.	George Tsakraklides on behalf of Mole Valley Epsom & Ewell Green Party	7
4.	Tim Crosland on behalf of Dorking Climate Emergency	8
5.	Dr Gillian Orrow on behalf of Growing Health Together	9
6.	Colin Taylor on behalf of Greensand Holdings Ltd	10
7.	Julie Kapsalis on behalf of North East Surrey College of Technology	10
8.	Duncan Leslie on behalf of Hever Castle	11
9.	Malcolm Ginsberg, Travel News Update	11
10.	Jonathan Cook	12
11.	Joe Concheiro on behalf of Regency Grove Communications	13
12.	Jeremy Taylor on behalf of The Company Connector Ltd	13
13.	Paul Roe	14
14.	Caroline Tayler	14
15.	Adrian M Lee	15
16.	Pradeep Mohile on behalf of DISCprofiles.UK	15
17.	Sophie Broadbent	16
18.	Rachel Bramley	16
19.	Tom Tugendhat MP for Tonbridge and Malling	18
20.	Cllr Mark Hood on behalf of Kent County Council Green Party Group	21
21.	Sir David King on behalf of Betchworth Parish Council	23
22.	Chris Packham on behalf of The Charwood Society	23
23.	Peter Knapp on behalf of Nutfield Conservation Society	24
24.	Miranda Whelehan on behalf of Charles Drake	26
25.	Dirk Campbell on behalf of Katherin Howlin	26
26.	Kelly Dibbert	26
27.	Samuel Albrow	26
28.	Judi Best	27
29.	Krishnan Iyengar	28
30.	Julie Etheridge	28
31.	Richard Jewsbury on behalf of Emirates Airline	29
32.	Robert Carey on behalf of Wizz Air	30
33.	Malcolm McDonnell on behalf of The Ramblers Association, Sussex Area	31
34.	Ken Woffenden	32
35.	Simon Berry	32
36.	Kristin Sjovorr	34
37.	Luke West on behalf of Coast to Capital Ltd	34

38.	Andrew Griffith MP for Arundel and South Downs	35
39.	Greg Clark MP for Tunbridge Wells	37
40.	Eddy Sauvestre on behalf of Air Transat	38
41.	Mims Davies MP for Mid Sussex	38
42.	Ed Winter on behalf of Plane Wrong	40
43.	Marion Barker on behalf of the Barker family	41
44.	Ben Boiling on behalf of Norse Atlantic Airways	42
45.	Olivia Evans on behalf of Mark Howlin	43
46.	Sally Parker	43
47.	Robert Basto on behalf of Kate Lockey	44
48.	Emor Andrew on behalf of Sarah Gorton	44
49.	Clare Finn	45
50.	Christina Ewbank on behalf of The Alliance of Chambers East Sussex	46
51.	Dr Clifford Kendall on behalf of Nancy Clarke	46
52.	Janine Okeeffe on behalf of Scientist Rebellion	47
53.	Bharat Lukka on behalf of Gurjar Hindu Union	48
54.	Craig Berresford on behalf of Preview Graphics	48
55.	Mardi Roberts on behalf of Ridgeview Wine Estate Ltd	48
56.	Sally Williams on behalf of Longwood Business Support Services Ltd	49
57.	Stuart Le Duc on behalf of Robust Floors Ltd	50
58.	Tatiana Seryán	50
59.	Amanda Jones	51

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document contains the Applicant's written responses to matters raised at Open Floor Hearing 3 (OFH3) held on 2 May 2024.
- 1.1.2 The Open Floor Hearing was attended by a member of the Applicant team and the Applicant is grateful to all those interested parties that participated and provided their comments. The purpose of this note is to either provide signposting to where the matters raised have been separately addressed by the Applicant as part of their submissions to date, or to provide a response to any new points that were raised.

2 The Applicant's Response to Matters raised at OFH3

- 2.1.1 Table 1 contains the Applicant's written responses to comments made by Interested Parties during OFH3.
- 2.1.2 The table reflects the order of speakers on the day. In some cases, the order of speakers did not reflect the detailed agenda [\[EV11-002\]](#) and therefore reference numbers have been given to each speaker corresponding to the Examining Authority's (ExA) detailed agenda.

Table 1: Applicant's Response to Matters raised at OFH3

Ref	Summary of the IPs response	Applicant's Response
OFH3 Session 1		
1. Sir Jeremy Quin MP for Horsham		
A Project need, and policy	<p>The Airports Commission's Report in 2015 noted no need for Gatwick expansion, and made strong arguments for Heathrow being preferred. The ANPS is clear that the preferred scheme to increase airport capacity is the northwest runway at Heathrow.</p> <p>Gatwick is an important local employer, but proposal is in practice the creation of a second runway.</p> <p>Particularly struck by the submission of EasyJet, that the Proposal creates the risk of operations at Gatwick becoming less reliable, more expensive, noisier, and worse for carbon emissions. EasyJet also raised major questions on the provision of supporting infrastructure within the airport perimeter and the lack of transparency on</p>	<p>The case for the Project is set out in the Needs Case [APP-250] and Planning Statement [APP-245], with the planning balance, including an assessment of the Project against the ANPS, set out in Section 9 of the Planning Statement. The Applicant has also provide a direct response to those policy points raised by Heathrow in its Written Representation [REP3-075].</p> <p>The Applicant has provided additional commentary in respect of the policy case for the Project in Section 2 of Appendix A of its Response to the Local Impact Reports: Note on the Principle of Development [REP3-079].</p> <p>The Applicant has also responded to the EasyJet relevant representation at Section 3.28 of its Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048].</p>

	<p>financing, which I fear are consistent with the concerns I've been hearing from local councils regarding infrastructure provision and engagement with stakeholders outside that perimeter.</p> <p>Given the ANPS, the questions over demand, and the detrimental impact on local communities, very sceptical of this DCO.</p> <p>If Application is allowed, want a proper control framework. Strongly support local authorities seeking a controlled growth pattern.</p>	
<p>B Local infrastructure</p>	<p>Effects on local transport and infrastructure. Increase to over 80mppa is very significant. Gatwick already has a significant impact on constituents in their transport networks. many constituents, having lost any services first from Horsham and then from Crawley, are now reliant on East Surrey Hospital on the far side of Gatwick. This is often a 45-minute journey and increasing congestion extends these times. This also delays emergency response vehicles.</p>	<p>Matters raised by the Hon. Sir Quin regarding the road network congestion, rail connectivity, and modal shift are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</p>

	<p>Particularly troubling in the 14-year construction period. While appreciating the rail constraints to Gatwick, there needs to be real seriousness about modal shift to the airport.</p>	
<p>C Noise</p>	<p>The benefits of noise reductions for future aircraft improvements should be shared between the airport and the local community. This is a requirement set out in the Aviation Policy Framework. Mid Sussex District Council has raised concerns on this, and of how pressure would, under this proposal, actually be brought to bear on operators to actively reduce noise levels.</p> <p>Health impacts of night flights are growing, and expansion will increase those concerns.</p>	<p>Matters raised by the Hon. Sir Quin regarding the noise effects of aircraft, including night flights, are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further explanation of the analysis of sharing the benefits in response to Examining Authority's question NV.1.9 in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101] which concludes: Following the same methodology, the GAL analysis showed that in 2038 when the Noise Envelope limits reduce, compared to the future 2038 baseline the degree of sharing the benefits would be 50% to the industry (as growth) and 50% to the community (as noise reduction) when measured in terms of the area of the day LOAEL with the Slower Transition Fleet. For night-time the degree of sharing the benefits would be 34% to the industry (as growth) and 66% to the community (as noise reduction). It was noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and there is a smaller benefit to the community.</p>

<p>D Air Quality and carbon emissions</p>	<p>An air quality action plan is a core demand of local councils and reflects growing local concern.</p> <p>On carbon emissions: the UK Committee on Climate Change highlighted factors that could compromise the UK's net zero trajectory, including airport expansion and reliance on nascent technology.</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided a draft Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 to the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004].</p> <p>The Applicant has set out the Government's response of 2023 to such CCC recommendations at Table 36.1 of its Written Representations Report [REP3-072]. In short, the Government has determined that it remains committed to growth in the aviation sector where it is justified, and does not consider restrictions on airport growth to be a necessary measure.</p>
--	---	---

2. Crispin Blunt MP for Reigate

<p>A Needs case, and policy</p>	<p>Factors guiding the AC recommendation on Heathrow are still relevant today. The Application is outside of any consideration of the strategic needs of the UK.</p> <p>No proper consideration of whether we need more runway capacity in the South East. Nothing has changed since the airport commission made its recommendation, nearly a decade ago.</p> <p>Benefits of the Airport, in terms of infrastructure and speed into London, do not exist for local people, especially when charged for taxiing or</p>	<p>The case for the Project is set out in the Needs Case [APP-250] and Planning Statement [APP-245], with the planning balance set out in Section 9 of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided additional commentary in respect of the policy case for the Project in Section 2 of Appendix A of its Response to the Local Impact Reports: Note on the Principle of Development [REP3-079].</p>
--	---	--

	<p>driving to the airport, and the negative impacts on the region's rail configuration.</p> <p>Two key factors as to why the proposal is inappropriate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. transport infrastructure: 2. Employment and Housing: 	
<p>B Transport infrastructure</p>	<p>Single rail access (Brighton Main Line), compared to 8 different fixed line connections to Heathrow. Would be unwise to increase the passenger throughput to Gatwick to 80mppa. Already significant traffic effects on the A23 and the M25. Road and rail access is completely inadequate for the scale of increase.</p>	<p>Matters raised by the Hon. Mr Blunt regarding the road network congestion, and rail connectivity are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.26 on traffic and transport.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to supporting sustainable travel, as set out in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (SAC) [APP-090]. The mode share commitments within the SAC represent the position the Applicant is committed to achieve, based on the modelling of mode choice and transport network operation, to ensure that the core surface access outcomes set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076] and in the Transport Assessment [AS-079] are delivered. The SAC also sets out committed interventions. There are further aspirations identified in the SAC which acknowledge that</p>

		there may be further opportunities to enhance the use of public transport services. In parallel, the Applicant will maintain the operation of the Sustainable Transport Fund to support measures that will help to encourage further shift to sustainable travel modes and this is secured in the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] .
C Employment and Housing	<p>Much of the jobs at an airport are in retail and the service sector. Those jobs will not disappear. Do not have faith in the numbers provided by the applicant – if Gatwick did get towards 80mpa, we're not going to move from 30,000 people working at the airport to 80,000.</p> <p>Workers also need houses, so will add to the existing housing constraints in the area. If 50,000 more people come to the area for jobs created at the airport, noting that employment figures indicate that the labour force will not be found locally, the proposal is not sustainable.</p>	<p>Matters raised by the Hon. Mr Blunt regarding the creation of and nature of jobs at the airport, and the proposal's effects on the housing market are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.25 Socio-economics and Economics.</p> <p>The Applicant considers its assessments to be robust, and has responded at length during the Examination to date in justifying its data and assessments.</p>
3. George Tsakraklides on behalf of Mole Valley Epsom & Ewell Green Party		
Climate change and GHG	<p>According to the UN climate chief we have 2 years to save the world. According to many scientists, this is already too late.</p> <p>Raised concerns regarding mass extinction, due to the climate crisis. The planet has reached the limit of human expansion it can sustain. Benefits</p>	<p>The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP</p>

	<p>of the proposal are irrelevant in the face of accelerating the climate crisis. Should be focussing on developing an airport which does not further the climate crisis.</p> <p>Endorsing this expansion is to opt for short term lifestyle and shareholder benefits at the expense of existentially disastrous future consequences.</p>	<p>project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p>
<p>4. Tim Crosland on behalf of Dorking Climate Emergency</p>		
<p>Climate change and GHG emissions</p>	<p>5 years since the climate emergency declared by the British Government, and longer since the Paris Agreement was entered into.</p> <p>The recent decision in the European Court of Human Rights historic ruling against the government of Switzerland, directs that member states have a positive legal obligation arising under article eight, which is the right to private and family life, which encompasses our health, to implement policies to ensure compliance with the Paris Agreement. This decision applies to the UK as well, and this DCO should therefore be refused.</p>	<p>The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The recent ECHR decision in <u>Verein Klima Seniorinnen Schweiz v Switzerland</u> (Application no. 53600/20) found that Switzerland had "critical lacunae" in its domestic regulatory framework sufficient to amount to non-compliance with its positive obligations under Article 8. It does not follow as a result that "this DCO should therefore be refused". That decision related to Swiss legislation and not to the extensive structure and controls provided for in</p>

		<p>the UK, where the Climate Change Act provides a different and detailed regime including intermediate and successive reduction budgets over identified time periods leading to the net zero neutrality target, with monitoring and reporting arrangements as well as requirements to prepare policies and proposals to meet budgetary requirements.</p>
<p>5. Dr Gillian Orrow on behalf of Growing Health Together</p>		
<p>Human Health impacts – noise and air quality.</p>	<p>Sir pollution is one of the greatest environmental risks to health according to the WHO guidelines. Linked to a number of diseases, including asthma, cardiovascular disease and cancer. Asthma rates are higher within the population registered with the GP in the Horley area, Horley being the East Surrey town closest to Gatwick Airport compared to patients living in other parts of East Surrey. True for all demographics of people. The Airport is generating significant road and air traffic in this area and contributing to the overall burden of air pollution that local residents are exposed to.</p> <p>Noise pollution causes many negative impacts on mental and physical health. High prevalence of hypertension, connection between noise levels and raised arterial blood pressure. Hypertension</p>	<p>Matters raised by Dr Orrow are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.3 Air Quality; - Section 4.6 on climate change; and - Section 4.17 on health and wellbeing.

	<p>is one of the common long term conditions seen in patients within Horley Primary Care Network GP practices.</p> <p>GPs are already seeing effects of climate change in health. expanding opportunities for air travel conflicts with our need as a country to meet urgent targets for reducing carbon emissions</p>	
6. Colin Taylor on behalf of Greensand Holdings Ltd		
	[Interested Party did not attend].	
7. Julie Kapsalis on behalf of North East Surrey College of Technology		
Socio-Economics	<p>GAL has been a trailblazer and award winner for supporting innovation in skills. First employer to sign up to the consortium.</p> <p>Supports the recruiting more women and minorities into engineering, and employed the first apprentice in the programme in cyber security.</p> <p>Crawley has been identified in the 2017 Social Mobility Report as the least socially mobile group in the Southeast.</p> <p>Recognise the need for new green infrastructure, and mitigation of environmental impacts.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

	Having seen the devastating effects of the Covid restrictions, recognise the need to support the airport.	
8. Duncan Leslie on behalf of Hever Castle		
Historic and natural environment	<p>Considers there to be insufficient consideration of AONB landscapes and special places, like Hever Castle.</p> <p>Hever Castle is a grade 1 listed site, along with the grade 1 listed park and garden, and airspace over such sites should be avoided.</p> <p>The second runway, or anything that increases noisy planes over Hever Castle and further blights a larger swathe of the High Weald AoNB and other AoNB should not be acceptable.</p> <p>Record number of UK workers off sick with mental health issues, special sites like Hever castle are vital to the country's health.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Mr Leslie are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.18 Historic Environment - Section 4.19 Landscape, townscape and visual matters including tranquillity. <p>A specific assessment of the effects of the proposal on Hever Castle is included as part of the application: The methodology is described in Section 5.4 of ES Appendix 7.6.1: Historic Environment Baseline Report [APP-101] and the results of the assessment are set out in Section 7.9 of ES Chapter 7: Historic Environment [APP-032].</p>
9. Malcolm Ginsberg, Travel News Update		
General support	<p>Supports the proposal because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New quieter aircraft are improving noise issues. - Less flights would mean more road and rail freight 	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resilience is important, due to lack of other suitable airports. - Good news for local employment. 	
10. Jonathan Cook		
Noise	<p>Night flights are unbearable, provided a log of disruptions to sleep over the last 12 months.</p> <p>Allowing Gatwick to self-regulate has been a failure. Mean noise assessments are not appropriate for acutely affected communities.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Mr Cook regarding the noise effects of aircraft, including night flights are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in section 4.22 on noise and vibration.</p> <p>The ES uses a variety of noise metrics to describe the noise changes to be expected, Leq, 16 hr, Leq 8 hr, N65 day and N60 night and overflights, with Leq 16 hr and Leq 8 hour as the primary metrics to assess significance of effects. This follows DfT guidance in defining Lowest Observable Adverse Effects Level in terms of these metrics. Note Leq is not a mean noise levels, it is a logarithmic average which is highly weighted to peaks such as those created by aircraft, much more so than a mean. See ES Appendix 14.9.8 Noise Envelope Group Output Report [APP-178] at p 148 to 151.</p> <p>The Project also includes a series of noise mitigation measures including an enhanced noise insulation scheme that addresses areas affected by aircraft noise in the future case with the Project regardless of whether the project itself would increase those noise levels and as such addresses</p>

		the total noise effect of the airport not only that of the Project.
11. Joe Concheiro on behalf of Regency Grove Communications		
Socio-Economics	<p>Recognise the critical role the airport plays in supporting the local economy. Covid underscored the importance of the airport to the local area.</p> <p>Crucial to prioritise the local community, so the benefits of the expansion are realised without compromising the lives of local people.</p> <p>Proposal secures prosperous future for local communities.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
12. Jeremy Taylor on behalf of The Company Connector Ltd		
Socio-Economics	<p>Supports the proposal because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outbound flights enable local businesses to reach international markets, and inbound brings in business. Established a network all over the world. A large number of traditionally leisure locations, but much business is also done in these places. <p>Physical attendance at business meetings is crucial. Physical visits produce deeper relationships.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Core benefits of the proposal come from the ESBS strategy. 	
13. Paul Roe		
Socio-Economics, Project need	<p>Supports the proposal because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gatwick has always been a key driver for a strong and diverse local economy. Need to give the future generations the same benefits the current and previous generations have enjoyed. - Passenger forecasts demonstrate need - Gatwick expansion would also fuel housing development by giving developers confidence; but would need local and regional government support to provide that. 	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.
14. Caroline Tayler		
Natural Environment	<p>Highlighting the effects on the Ashdown forest and rural businesses associated with it. The forest is a Site of SSI, SPA, and an Area of Conservation. Expansion is a noise and air pollution threat to the forest and the area.</p>	<p>The potential impacts to Ashdown Forest SPA/SAC were fully assessed as part of ES Appendix 9.9.1 Habitats Regulations Assessment Report [APP-134 and APP-135]. This concluded there would be no adverse effect on the integrity of Ashdown Forest. This conclusion has been</p>

	<p>The heathland is a low nitrogen area which supports rare species; more traffic will increase nitrogen levels.</p> <p>Many rural businesses suffer from customers not receiving the tranquil environment they come seeking in the area.</p>	<p>agreed with Natural England in their Relevant Representation [RR-3223].</p> <p>The Applicant has also responded thematically to impacts to Ashdown Forest at Section 4.13 of its Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048].</p>
<p>15. Adrian M Lee</p>		
<p>Socio-Economics, Needs case</p>	<p>Supports the Project for its immense economic benefits. Major economic catalyst. More direct flights, and enhanced global connectivity. Further modernising infrastructure.</p> <p>Projected investment is £2.2B in a wide range of industries will benefit the local economy. The direct contribution to UK GDP from aviation is well over £5 billion, and it is responsible for over 1.5 million jobs.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>
<p>16. Pradeep Mohile on behalf of DISCprofiles.UK</p>		
<p>Needs case</p>	<p>seeking more direct connectivity to India. Would like to see flights to tier 1 cities in India. Want to attract Indego and Air India, which the second runway could achieve.</p> <p>Proposal is needed as GAL has lost full service carriers to Heathrow over the last 20-30 years.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>

	There is also a lack of connectivity to cities like Rotterdam, Amsterdam or Brussels. Need full-service carriers operating from Gatwick.	
17. Sophie Broadbent		
Climate Change	<p>Oppose the application.</p> <p>Climate anxiety among young people is exceedingly high, with studies showing it is affecting the daily lives of 45%, and 75% feel the future is frightening.</p> <p>Gatwick is big enough. The aviation sector will outgrow the remaining carbon budget.</p> <p>Legacy for future generations should be one of economic stability based on sustainable infrastructure.</p>	<p>The significance to be attached to the greenhouse gas impacts of the NRP is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p>
18. Rachel Bramley		
Climate Change	<p>Object on grounds of climate change and associated legal protections.</p> <p>The UK's Climate Change Committee advises that there should be no net airport expansion. the Climate Change Act commits us to reducing carbon emissions to net zero by 2050.</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out the Government's response of 2023 to such CCC recommendations at Table 36.1 of its Written Representations Report [REP3-072]. In short, the Government has determined that it remains committed to growth in the aviation sector where it is</p>

the European Court of Human Rights has just ruled that climate protection is a human right. Although there's little accountability for missed carbon reduction targets, there is the potential for legal challenges regarding our right to respect for private life, family life and home. The proposal endangers the future of young people, and cannot be approved.

justified, and does not consider restrictions on airport growth to be a necessary measure.

The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in **ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041]** and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the **Planning Statement [APP-245]**. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.

The recent ECHR decision in Verein Klima Seniorinnen Schweiz v Switzerland (Application no. [53600/20](#)) found that Switzerland had "critical lacunae" in its domestic regulatory framework sufficient to amount to non-compliance with its positive obligations under Article 8. It does not follow as a result that this DCO application should not be approved. That decision related to Swiss legislation and not to the extensive structure and controls provided for in the UK, where the Climate Change Act 2008 provides a different and detailed regime including intermediate and successive reduction budgets over identified time periods leading to the net zero neutrality target, with monitoring and reporting arrangements as well as requirements to prepare policies and proposals to meet budgetary requirements

19. Tom Tugendhat MP for Tonbridge and Malling

<p>A Noise</p>	<p>Tunbridge and Edenbridge and other surrounding villages bear the brunt of the environmental impact, while not being able to maximise any economic benefits from the proposals brought forward by the airport.</p>	<p>Matters raised by the Hon. Mr Tugendhat regarding the noise effects of aircraft, including night flights are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.22 on noise and vibration; and - Section 4.25 Socio-Economics and Economics. <p>In response to the Hon. Mr Tugendhat's point that the NRP places an unfair burden on local residents, the mitigation strategies presented as part of the DCO Application look to directly prevent, reduce and where relevant, offset any potential significant adverse effects that are specific to the Project. Overall, the airport generates significant net benefits for the local area.</p>
<p>B Noise</p>	<p>Government policy states that future growth in aviation should ensure that benefits are shared between the aviation industry and local communities. This means that the industry must continue to reduce and mitigate noise as airport capacity grows. Current proposal does not achieve this, as the first noise envelope period of</p>	<p>The Applicant has provided further explanation of the analysis of sharing the benefits in response to Examining Authority's question NV.1.9 in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101] which concludes: <i>Following the same methodology, the GAL analysis showed that in 2038 when the Noise Envelope limits reduce, compared to the future 2038 baseline the degree of sharing</i></p>

	<p>9 years provides benefits of growth only for the airport.</p>	<p><i>the benefits would be 50% to the industry (as growth) and 50% to the community (as noise reduction) when measured in terms of the area of the day LOAEL with the Slower Transition Fleet. For night-time the degree of sharing the benefits would be 34% to the industry (as growth) and 66% to the community (as noise reduction). It was noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and there is a smaller benefit to the community...</i></p>
<p>C Noise</p>	<p>For the second noise envelope period, the noise impacts on communities would be substantially greater once the frequency of aircraft is taken into account, which is a key frustration for local communities after the proposal.</p>	<p>The Government's preferred metric to assess the effects of aircraft noise to health and quality of life is the LAeq metric (for example, see the government's Transport Appraisal Guidance https://www.gov.uk/guidance/transport-analysis-guidance-tag). This has been found by the CAA to correlate best with annoyance when compared with other metrics, for instance those which measure the number of noise events above a certain reference level. The assessments undertaken for the NRP Project provide, therefore, for a robust assessment of the significance of effects of the proposed dual runway operation over the baseline. This shows that in later years the airport will become quieter with the dual runway operation than it was in 2019 with the single runway and that effects to health and quality of life will be less.</p>

		<p>The Project also includes a series of noise mitigation measures including an enhanced noise insulation scheme [APP-180]; see also 5.3 ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme Update Note [REP2-031]) that addresses areas affected by aircraft noise in the future case with the Project regardless of whether the project itself would increase those noise levels and as such addresses the total noise effect of the airport not only that of the Project.</p>
<p>D Noise</p>	<p>Beyond this, the proposed review process would allow noise to increase above the 2019 base year level on any measure. Requesting that noise envelopes be agreed with local communities, and the benefits of growth must be shared. Also seeking progressive and material reductions in the emissions from the 2019 baseline committed to.</p>	<p>The noise envelope ensures that the Airport will be quieter with a dual runway airport than it was in 2019 by 2038, as measured using the Government’s preferred metric LAeq. This is under the Slow Transition Fleet forecast.</p> <p>Gatwick has sought to agree the noise envelope with Local Community Noise Groups, and this is as reported within Appendix 14.9.7 Noise Envelope Group Output Report [APP-178] and Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023].</p> <p>By the beginning of the 2040s, it is expected that the dual runway airport will have a daytime 51LAeq contour area circa some 17% smaller than that of the single runway airport in 2019.</p>

E Night flights	<p>Night Flights: Seeking a ban on night flights – clear guidance in the ANPS no night flights between 11pm-8am.</p>	<p>Night flights are controlled by the DfT through the Night Flight Restrictions that the environmental noise assessment assumes will continue. It is also confirmed that the northern runway will not be routinely used between the hours of 23:00 – 06:00 but may be used between these hours where the southern runway (being the airport’s main runway at the date this Order is made) is not available for use for any reason. In addition, the Noise Envelope to be introduced with the DCO places noise limits on noise levels during the day and night periods.</p>
F UK Aviation strategy	<p>Gatwick's expansion would not enhance, and actually threaten the global status of the UK as an aviation hub.</p>	<p>Heathrow Airport has raised the same concern regarding its aviation hub status. The Applicant has responded in detail to those concerns at The Applicant’s Response to Written Representations Appendix C – Response to Heathrow Airport Limited Written Representation [REP3-075].</p>
G Transport	<p>West Kent has insufficient transport to the airport.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to concerns raised regarding West Kent's surface access to Gatwick in its Written Representations Report [REP3-072], particularly in Table 121.1.</p>

20. Cllr Mark Hood on behalf of Kent County Council Green Party Group

<p>A Climate Change</p>	<p>Climate is being treated contemptuously, putting growth above sustainability. Inconsistent with the ANPS. The proposal will have a material impact on the government's ability to meet the carbon reduction targets by 2050. Cannot be justified.</p> <p>Jet Zero is no more than a strategy, and is not enshrined in law, yet it is exerting a huge amount of influence on justifying expansion.</p>	<p>The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The Jet Zero Strategy sets out the way in which the Government has balanced its priorities with regard to aviation emissions and future development, and is rightly a significant consideration in assessing the Proposal.</p>
<p>B Health, noise and Natural Environment</p>	<p>West Kent residents and surrounding AONBs will suffer adverse effects of overflights from overflights, and further loss of tranquillity. The noise effects will increase the number of awakening events above the 2019 baseline This will have concerning health impacts.</p> <p>Concerned about the health impacts of increased night time disturbances. Impacts mental health and physical health (cardiovascular disease).</p>	<p>Matters raised by Cllr Hood are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.17 Health and Wellbeing - Section 4.19 Landscape, townscape and visual matters including tranquillity; and - Section 4.22 noise and vibration.

21. Sir David King on behalf of Betchworth Parish Council

Climate Change

Oppose the expansion on the grounds of the global challenge of climate change.

Outlined the global challenge of climate change, including the severe natural disasters and weather events occurring across the world in the last 12 months; and the severe ice melts in Greenland and the Arctic Circle.

Proposes that all investments must be future proofed in this context of climate emergency, and this expansion with its associated emissions is not.

Gatwick entirely accepts that issues relating to climate change are material to this application. It is, however, the role of government to formulate planning policies having regard to a wide range of objectives and considerations. The way in which government has balanced its priorities is apparent in its Jet Zero Strategy (“JZS”). The Jet Zero Strategy is clear that the Government supports growth in the aviation sector but is also committed to meeting its binding carbon reduction targets.

The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in **ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041]** and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the **Planning Statement [APP-245]**. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.

22. Chris Packham on behalf of The Charlwood Society

Climate Change

Oppose on climate grounds.

	<p>Sustainable aviation fuel is unachievable, and unlikely to replace more than a tiny percentage of fossil fuels. Biofuel can result in more emissions than fossil fuels, and creates competition for food production.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that it has over-relied on assumptions regarding development of new technologies, such as sustainable aviation fuel.</p> <p>Paragraph 16.2.27 of ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] establishes that the Jet Zero Strategy itself recognises the reliance on new technologies to achieve decarbonisation, and that the rate of development of these - and their respective contribution to emissions reductions in the sector - cannot be fully assumed at this point in time. However, it also restates the Jet Zero Strategy commitment to review the Strategy every five years. The uncertainties within the rate of different technologies to contribute to the Jet Zero trajectory are also discussed in Paragraph 16.5.4 of ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041]. This discusses the inherent uncertainties in the degree of emissions reductions from different technologies to reach the Jet Zero end point in 2050, but argues that the certainty contained within this Jet Zero commitment (and the underlying analysis by UK Government to support it) it is entirely reasonable to base the assessment of GHGs on a similar rate of technological development.</p>
<p>23. Peter Knapp on behalf of Nutfield Conservation Society</p>		
<p>Human health / air quality</p>	<p>Opposed on air quality grounds, particularly ultrafine particle emissions.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Mr Knapp regarding ultra fine particles and NOX/NO₂ emissions are addressed in the Relevant</p>

	<p>Ultrafine particles can enter the body by many routes, and are present in high concentrations at the end of an airport runway.</p> <p>UltraFine particles specifically produced at airports were shown to reduce lung function and increase airway inflammation in individuals with asthma. Already, aviation emissions are responsible for 24,000 of early deaths globally every year.</p> <p>Cost to the NHS from air pollution is £1.7B from 2017-2025, without accounting for UFPs.</p> <p>When limits of UFP are legislated for, Gatwick will have to run at a lower level than present operations. This expansion would create a stranded asset.</p> <p>NoX and NO2 levels:</p> <p>The proposal will increase the NO2 levels in the areas around Gatwick beyond the UK limits (40ug/m³) which would breach the NPPF2023 direction that planning decisions should contribute and enhance the natural and local environment</p>	<p>Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.3 Air Quality; and - Section 4.17 Health and Wellbeing <p>The Applicant has also set out its position on the issue of ultrafine particles and how to deal with any tightening of the air quality standards in response to Action Point 17 in The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISH 7 – Other Environmental Matters submitted at Deadline 4 (Doc Ref. 10.26.3).</p>
--	---	--

	by preventing new development from contributing to unacceptable levels of air pollution.	
24. Miranda Whelehan on behalf of Charles Drake		
	[Interested party did not attend.]	
25. Dirk Campbell on behalf of Katherin Howlin		
Demand Forecasting	Demand projection is based on a linear projection of current demand, which is flawed, as demand is likely to reduce as a result of consumers' climate concerns, and decreasing number of people able to afford to travel.	Matters raised by Mr Campbell are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.21 Need and forecasting. The Applicant is confident in its demand projections.
26. Kelly Dibbert		
Climate change	Opposes on carbon emissions and climate grounds. Need to be creating green jobs which reduce carbon. Airport jobs do not cut carbon, they increase it.	The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245] . The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.
27. Samuel Albrow		

<p>Socio-Economics, General Support</p>	<p>Supports GALs proposal. Connectivity and business opportunities provided by the airport is important.</p> <p>Obvious environmental concern which has been covered, but there is also strong demand for more capacity at the airport. Biggest airlines have quieter more efficient airports, and high occupancy rates on flights.</p> <p>Believe proposal is pragmatic, and will benefit the local area.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>
<p>28. Judi Best</p>		
<p>Noise</p>	<p>Declined to buy a house under a flight path, then new house was suddenly under a flight path. Noise issues are not acceptable, waking up at 1am; adverse effects to health and quality of life.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Ms. Best regarding noise and health impacts are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.17 Health and Wellbeing; and - Section 4.22 Noise and Vibration. <p>The Project also includes a series of noise mitigation measures including an enhanced noise insulation scheme that addresses areas affected by aircraft noise in the future case with the Project regardless of whether the Project itself would increase those noise levels and as such addresses</p>

		the total noise effect of the airport not only that of the Project.
29. Krishnan Iyengar		
General support	<p>Supports the proposal due to resilience benefits; less aircraft queuing in the sky to land means less noise.</p> <p>Dual runway operation may attract more quality long haul airlines to Gatwick, opening new routes and opportunities around the world. Economic benefits for the region.</p> <p>Considers the second runway should continue to not be operated during the night period of 10pm-7am, and a ban on flights between 11pm and 5am.</p> <p>GAL should also provide investment into a new technology focused university campus in Crawley.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p> <p>Matters regarding Mr Iyengar's comments on night flights and local investment are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.22 Noise and Vibration; and - Section 4.25 Socio-Economics and Economics.
30. Julie Etheridge		
Climate Change	<p>Used to fly a lot, but now doesn't fly for environmental reasons. Imperative that we protect the environment because we are protecting ourselves.</p>	<p>The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the</p>

		<p>Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p>
<p>31. Richard Jewsbury on behalf of Emirates Airline</p>		
<p>Future demand, General Support</p>	<p>Emirates has a longstanding relationship with Gatwick Airport, first started flying there in 1987. In the last financial year, Emirates carried 914,000 passengers on Gatwick services, and 17,000 tonnes of cargo on the route. This passenger and cargo capacity supports trade, tourism, education, families and of course, UK exports. Services are a wealth multiplier for the region.</p> <p>Currently operating 3 flights a day to Gatwick, all year round, throughout the day during peak and off peak periods.</p> <p>Global growth and expanding middle class will demonstrate higher demand. Emirates is investing in modern, fuel-efficient aircraft, but need more airport capacity in the UK, and would seek more slots at Gatwick. Considers the</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>

	proposal to be a smart and cost-effective way to meet future demand. Project therefore has Emirates' full support.	
32. Robert Carey on behalf of Wizz Air		
Future demand, operational constraints, general support	<p>Wizz Air has a significant order book today, with more than 340 aircraft coming online, including 47 new long range A321s, and intentions to grow to 500 aircraft by 2030. Currently fly very full planes, with only around 2-3% seasonal variation in operations.</p> <p>See further opportunity for growth of Wizz Air in London, where Wizz Air currently holds about 5% of the market share. Growth is currently limited by runway capacity, resulting in higher fares, and low connectivity.</p> <p>Were the proposal to go ahead, Wizz Air is ready to commit to increased capacity in London, and would commit to 50-60 total aircraft to London by 2030, 2.5x the current allocation. These planes would create approximately 1000 jobs at the airport and an additional 2500 jobs. Without the northern runway expansion and the increase in</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

	<p>capacity, could only see around 18% of that capacity in London.</p> <p>While acknowledging the efficient operations at Gatwick today, the Proposal would unlock operational improvements with fewer delays and less emissions in the air. The proposal would address inefficiencies and foster competition in the London aviation market through long term infrastructure enhancements. Wizz Air is ready to invest the capacity together with Gatwick, and fully supports the proposal.</p>	
--	---	--

33. Malcolm McDonnell on behalf of The Ramblers Association, Sussex Area

<p>Public Rights of Way, Amenity</p>	<p>Experience of path network is going to be diminished.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed rerouting of affected paths are unacceptable, creating less pleasant, and less safe routes, including along busy roads with no footpaths, or cycle lanes.</p> <p>Specific concerns with the Issues for the Sussex Border Path. It's unclear whether permanent diversions will take the Sussex Border Path and other paths when work is finally finished. We would expect to see public path orders using</p>	<p>Matters raised by Mr McDonnell regarding public rights of way, and the Sussex Border Path specifically are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.17 Health and Wellbeing; and - Section 4.19 Landscape, Townscape and Visual <p>The proposals for the management of Public Rights of Way during the construction period is provided in Appendix 19.8.1 of the ES: Public Rights of Way Management Strategy [REP2-009].</p> <p>Schedule 4 of the Draft DCO [REP3-006] includes the schedule of PRow to be permanently stopped up and</p>
--------------------------------------	--	--

	<p>Highways Act or Town and Country Planning Act to make the necessary changes in the Path network.</p> <p>Increase in air traffic will further diminish peoples' enjoyment of national landscapes, including the High Weald, the Surrey Hills and the South Downs National Park</p>	<p>diverted. These are also identified on the Rights of Way and Access Plans – For Approval [REP3-013].</p>
--	--	--

34. Ken Woffenden

A Noise

Noise levels are already intolerable, and getting worse. Damaging effects on local residents health and quality of life. Expansion comes at the expense of local residents.

Also seeking a total ban on night flights

Seeking better communication from GAL, with local residents feeling ignored. A more generous compensation scheme is required for those people worst affected.

Matters raised by Mr Woffenden regarding noise and health concerns are addressed in the **Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048]** submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:

- section 4.17 Health and Wellbeing; and
- Section 4.22 Noise and Vibration.

The Project also includes a series of noise mitigation measures including an enhanced noise insulation scheme that addresses areas affected by aircraft noise in the future case with the Project regardless of whether the Project itself would increase those noise levels and as such addresses the total noise effect of the airport not only that of the Project.

35. Simon Berry

<p>A Noise</p>	<p>Opposed to the development on the basis of noise, and all other emissions.</p> <p>Considers Sussex has become a 'noise ghetto', and feels that GAL no longer listens to residents' concerns.</p> <p>The narrower flight paths increased the effects on those who remain under the flight paths, who are now seriously affected.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Mr Berry regarding noise and health concerns are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.17 Health and Wellbeing; and - Section 4.22 Noise and Vibration. <p>The flight paths are controlled by the CAA and are not proposed to be altered as part of this DCO Application. The Project also includes a series of noise mitigation measures including an enhanced noise insulation scheme that addresses areas affected by aircraft noise in the future case with the Project regardless of whether the Project itself would increase those noise levels and as such addresses the total noise effect of the airport not only that of the Project.</p>
<p>B Greenhouse Gases</p>	<p>Sceptical of the benefits of sustainable aviation fuels. Claims of reduced CO2 by 60%, doesn't account for issues associated with burning fuel at altitude, so likely to only reduce by 30%. Doubling output will therefore still cause greater emissions than currently.</p>	<p>The use of Sustainable Aviation Fuels is one of a range of measures that the UK Government expects to reduce emissions from aviation, and the UK Government has committed to reviewing emissions reductions within the industry periodically in order to identify any additional action required to meet committed emissions reductions. The impacts associated with emissions from aircraft at altitude are also considered within the UK Government's Jet Zero</p>

		Strategy, which acknowledges the importance of non-CO2 emissions, but the uncertainty around the appropriate assessment of impact arising from these. The Applicant has set out its reasons for excluding non-CO2 impacts from the GHG assessment, and also its commitment (within the Carbon Action Plan) to monitor and respond to the UK Government's emerging position on managing non-CO2 impacts.
36. Kristin Sjovorr		
A Climate Change	<p>Oppose on climate grounds.</p> <p>UK is one of the most nature depleted and deforested nations in Europe. The UK has enough airports, and needs to be reducing carbon emissions, not increasing them.</p> <p>The Climate emergency is already impacting many nations, and the UK is not immune itself.</p>	<p>The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p>
OFH3 Session 3		
37. Luke West on behalf of Coast to Capital Ltd		
A General support	<p>Support the proposal for the economic, social and environmental opportunities it provides</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p> <p>The ES Appendix 5.2.3: Mitigation Route Map [REP-011] sets out the mitigation measures that are required to</p>

	<p>14000 jobs, and £1B invested in the area is an enormous economic catalyst, which the region needs to remain competitive.</p> <p>Seeking that Gatwick fully mitigate its effects on the transport network and the environmental impacts.</p> <p>Also seeking robust and deliverable plans are developed with local stakeholders to produce deliverable plans that ensure benefits of the runway expansion are felt by local communities, particularly those in close proximity to the airport.</p>	<p>mitigate the impacts of the Project and how those measures will be secured: either through the draft DCO, s106 Agreement or other consents and licences</p>
--	--	--

38. Andrew Griffith MP for Arundel and South Downs

<p>A Noise</p>	<p>Primary concerns with aircraft noise, and pressures on local transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Night flights have an impact on health and wellbeing by disturbing sleep for those in overflown villages. Additional flights will bring even greater noise effects to those already subjected to them. Rural areas and businesses are more significantly impacted by noise because of the lower levels of ambient noise.</p> <p>West Chiltern residents already observe that there are too many overflights over their village, which is not on most of the official flight paths.</p>	<p>Matters raised by the Hon. Mr Griffith regarding noise and tranquility concerns, including effects on the South Downs National Park dark skies reserve status are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.17 Health and Wellbeing; - Section 4.19 Landscape, Townscape and Visual; and - Section 4.22 Noise and Vibration
----------------	---	---

	<p>Clear correlation between the number of flights, and the number of flightpath disturbances. The South Downs National Park Authority has noted one of the main issues is the impact on relative tranquillity within the national park from overflights, especially with South Downs National Park being designated as an international dark skies reserve.</p>	
<p>B Transport</p>	<p>West Sussex would be unable to deal with even a small portion of the proposed increase, and there are areas of the constituency which sees low frequency of train services as all London services route directly through Gatwick.</p>	<p>A comprehensive assessment has been undertaken for rail capacity as part of the strategic transport modelling work and this is set out in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment [AS-079] and Section 12.9 of ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076]. The assessment shows that the Project would increase the number of rail passengers across the day and across the assessment years, but the greatest additional demands arising from the Project would occur in the counter-peak direction or off-peak periods, when trains are less busy. No significant increase in crowding on rail services is expected as a result of the Project and no significant effects would arise for rail users. Mitigation is not therefore required.</p> <p>There are further aspirations identified in the SAC which acknowledges that there may be further opportunities to</p>

		<p>enhance public transport services and the Applicant is committed to using the Sustainable Transport Fund to support measures that will help to achieve the mode share commitments.</p>
<p>39. Greg Clark MP for Tunbridge Wells</p>		
<p>A Noise</p>	<p>Gatwick is a welcome amenity to the local community, but it is necessary for the airport to be a good neighbour. Opposed to the proposal.</p> <p>Concerned that the current noise level is already unacceptable, and the noise envelopes are based on the assumption of quieter aircraft.</p> <p>Inappropriate, because it means local communities do not benefit from quieter aircraft; the noise levels stay the same with more flights enabled. Overflying events will go from frequent, to constant.</p>	<p>The noise modelling used to develop the noise envelopes is based on forecasts of all aircraft expected to be operated by all airlines in the relevant future assessment years, 2029, 2032, 2038 and 2047, and provides a range of noise levels to represent the range of rates in which the fleet will transition to newer quieter types, as described in ES Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling [APP-172] and ES Appendix 14.9.5 Air Noise Envelope Background [APP-175]. The Applicant is therefore confident in its assumptions built into the noise envelopes.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided further explanation of the analysis of sharing the benefits in response to Examining Authority's question NV.1.9 in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101] which concludes: Following the same methodology, the GAL analysis showed that in 2038 when the Noise Envelope limits reduce, compared to the future 2038 baseline the degree of sharing the benefits would be 50% to the industry (as growth) and 50% to the community (as noise reduction)</p>

		when measured in terms of the area of the day LOAEL with the Slower Transition Fleet. For night-time the degree of sharing the benefits would be 34% to the industry (as growth) and 66% to the community (as noise reduction). It was noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and there is a smaller benefit to the community.
B Transport	Public transport: until 2008 it was possible to travel directly from Tunbridge Wells and from High Brooms, to just outside of Gatwick airport. Now it is no longer possible, so local communities do not receive the benefit of living close to the airport. Want to restore this access if possible, accepting that these services are operated by other bodies, not the Applicant.	The Applicant recognises the Hon. Mr. Clark's concerns regarding train services for his constituents. There are further aspirations identified in the SAC which acknowledges that there may be further opportunities to enhance public transport services and the Applicant is committed to using the Sustainable Transport Fund to support measures that will help to achieve the mode share commitments. However, it is agreed, that this is not a matter the Applicant can address on its own.
40. Eddy Sauvestre on behalf of Air Transat		
	[Interested Party did not attend]	
41. Mims Davies MP for Mid Sussex		
A General concerns	Acknowledging the economic impacts the Airport brings to the local area, the case for the proposal needs to appropriately mitigate the effects on local communities in a fair and transparent way.	<p>The matters raised by the Hon. Ms. Davies regarding the appropriate mitigation of effects have been addressed by the Applicant in the Planning Statement [APP-245].</p> <p>The mitigation strategies presented as part of the DCO application look to directly prevent, reduce and where</p>

	<p>These effects include: £5 drop off charge / taxi charges, pressures on housing, transport and local environment.</p> <p>If granted, the proposal needs to include sanctions and enforceability where any thresholds or targets are not being met, and proper consideration must also be given to the wider transport constraints associated with the increase in flights.</p>	<p>relevant, offset any potential significant adverse effects that are specific to the Project– these are summarised in ES Appendix 5.2.3: Mitigation Route Map [REP2-011]. These would operate in addition to existing measures that control the airport’s operations to ensure that they do not cause harmful effects. Overall, the airport generates significant net benefits for the local area.</p>
<p>B Transport</p>	<p>Significant concerns over the East-West rail connectivity. Some communities are down to 1 rail service per hour, and the traffic impacts on local roads are significant.</p> <p>East Grinstead is down to 1 train per hour to the capital.</p>	<p>A comprehensive assessment has been undertaken for rail capacity as part of the strategic transport modelling work and this is set out in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment [AS-079] and Section 12.9 of ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076]. The assessment shows that the Project would increase the number of rail passengers across the day and across the assessment years, but the greatest additional demands arising from the Project would occur in the counter-peak direction or off-peak periods, when trains are less busy. No significant increase in crowding on rail services is expected as a result of the Project and no significant effects would arise for rail users. Mitigation is not therefore required.</p>

		<p>There are further aspirations identified in the SAC which acknowledges that there may be further opportunities to enhance public transport services and the Applicant is committed to using the Sustainable Transport Fund to support measures that will help to achieve the mode share commitments.</p>
<p>42. Ed Winter on behalf of Plane Wrong</p>		
<p>Noise</p>	<p>Oppose on the basis of noise concerns. Plane Wrong members reside North of Gatwick, primarily in rural areas, along departure routes 3 and 4. Route 4 carries 30% of departures, and is active 2/3 of the time. Applicant has said the focus is on intensification of existing routes. This will mean that to achieve the target intensification, Route 4 will need to need to be maximised, resulting in a flight every 3 minutes, and require the reintroduction of PBN departure processes.</p> <p>Routes 3 and 4 fly along a narrow corridor of airspace between Heathrow and Gatwick. Attempting this increase in traffic in this already over-crowded area is folly.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Mr Winter regarding noise concerns are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in Section 4.22 Noise and Vibration.</p> <p>The Project also includes a series of noise mitigation measures including an enhanced noise insulation scheme that addresses areas affected by aircraft noise in the future case with the Project regardless of whether the project itself would increase those noise levels and as such addresses the total noise effect of the airport not only that of the Project.</p> <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 Routes 3 and 4, is illustrated in ES Figure 8.6.6 [APP-061].</p>

	<p>Other regional airports, and Stansted and Luton have spare capacity. Proposal is based on the ability to create new demand, and pull from other airport catchments, not natural demand in the south east.</p> <p>Should not be able to grow until it can be shown to reduce effects in a proportionate and balanced way, and departure and arrival routes need to have an element of dispersal to envoy.</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.3.3 of the Planning Statement [APP-245] makes clear there are no obvious safety-related impediments why the project should not progress. The Applicant submitted the draft Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and the Civil Aviation Authority [REP3-068] at Deadline 3; the Applicant understands these are final and complete with no further substantive changes expected.</p> <p>The case for the Project is set out in the Needs Case [APP-250] and Planning Statement [APP-245], with the planning balance, including an assessment of the Project against the ANPS, set out in Section 9 of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided additional commentary in respect of the policy framework and need for the Project in Appendix A of its Response to the Local Impact Reports: Note on the Principle of Development (REP3-079).</p>
<p>43. Marion Barker on behalf of the Barker family</p>		
<p>Noise, and GHG emissions</p>	<p>Opposed to the proposal on the basis of noise, and carbon emissions</p> <p>New technology has enabled planes to fly at lower altitudes, with increased noise effects.</p> <p>Peace is regularly disturbed, and difficult to work at home.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Ms Baker's regarding greenhouse gas emissions, and noise and tranquility concerns are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.16 Greenhouse Gases; and - Section 4.22 Noise and Vibration.

	<p>Decision needs to account for the residents, because they are the ones who deal with the impacts from the proposal.</p>	<p>The Project also includes a series of noise mitigation measures including an enhanced noise insulation scheme that addresses areas affected by aircraft noise in the future case with the Project regardless of whether the project itself would increase those noise levels and as such addresses the total noise effect of the airport not only that of the Project.</p>
--	--	---

44. Ben Boiling on behalf of Norse Atlantic Airways

<p>Needs case, general support</p>	<p>Support the proposal.</p> <p>Currently focussing on the 5 aircraft they have now, operating throughout the day – morning, afternoon, and late departures and arrivals. Operational home in the UK is Gatwick, and have been impressed with their operations.</p> <p>Create approximately 500 jobs in the UK, and hundreds more in the supply chain, with flights operating throughout the day, and all year round.</p> <p>Ambitions to grow, but reliant on further slots in the London market. Given London's constraints, consider the expansion of the northern runway at Gatwick to be an excellent use of that existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p>
------------------------------------	---	---

45. Olivia Evans on behalf of Mark Howlin		
Climate change	<p>Opposed to the proposal on grounds of climate change. Detailed the significant impacts on wildlife and habitats from climate change, including impacts on migratory patterns, food chains and ocean acidification.</p>	<p>The significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p>
46. Sally Parker		
Noise, Water Quality, Greenhouse Gases, and Air Quality	<p>Opposed to the proposal on noise, water quality and air pollution grounds.</p> <p>The increased water demands from the airport, and the increased sewage output will have adverse effects on the River Mole.</p> <p>Redhill will see an increase in traffic and congestion, especially the M23 and M25.</p> <p>More Gatwick express services will cut the services to Red Hill, due to capacity constraints.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Ms. Parker regarding noise water quality, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.3 Air Quality - Section 4.6 Climate Change - Section 4.16 Greenhouse Gases; and - Section 4.22 Noise and Vibration. <p>Regarding the climate context, the significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts</p>

	Wrong to approve an airport expansion in a time of climate crisis. Government policy appears out of step with climate wisdom.	is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245] . The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.
47. Robert Basto on behalf of Kate Lockey		
Climate change, and Needs Case	<p>Opposed on the grounds of Climate impact, and growth impact.</p> <p>Increased carbon and related emissions will accelerate climate change.</p> <p>Gatwick has no need to expand, and should be pushing for reducing effects. As aircraft become quieter and more efficient, we should not be using this as an excuse for expansion.</p>	<p>The case for the Project is set out in the Needs Case [APP-250] and Planning Statement [APP-245], with the planning balance set out in Section 9 of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>Regarding the climate context, the significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p>
48. Emor Andrew on behalf of Sarah Gorton		
Climate Change	Any decision which looks to increase emissions must be scrutinised with care. Countries in the global south are being affected by climate change. Approving the Gatwick proposal would	Regarding the climate context, the significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-

	<p>be a backwards step in the collective efforts to mitigate climate change.</p> <p>IPPC has declared that we need to cut global emissions by nearly half by 2030 to avoid the worst impacts of climate change.</p> <p>Need to consider the planet's future over convenience.</p>	<p>245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p>
<p>49. Clare Finn</p>		
<p>Climate Change, and General Concerns</p>	<p>Opposed to the development on climate and all the disruptions caused by aircraft.</p> <p>Claims that the proposal is in line with Jet Zero are based on unproven technology. The UK climate change committee has noted that there should be no net airport expansion across the UK.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider that it has over-relied on assumptions regarding development of new technologies.</p> <p>Paragraph 16.2.27 of ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] establishes that the Jet Zero Strategy itself recognises the reliance on new technologies to achieve decarbonisation, and that the rate of development of these – and their respective contribution to emissions reductions in the sector – cannot be fully assumed at this point in time. However, it also restates the Jet Zero Strategy commitment to review the Strategy every five years. The uncertainties within the rate of different technologies to contribute to the Jet Zero trajectory are also discussed in Paragraph 16.5.4 of ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041]. This discusses the inherent uncertainties in the degree of emissions reductions from different technologies to reach</p>

		<p>the Jet Zero end point in 2050, but argues that the certainty contained within this Jet Zero commitment (and the underlying analysis by UK Government to support it) it is entirely reasonable to base the assessment of GHGs on a similar rate of technological development.</p> <p>The Applicant has also set out the Government's response of 2023 to such CCC recommendations at Table 36.1 of its Written Representations Report [REP3-072]. In short, the Government has determined that it remains committed to growth in the aviation sector where it is justified, and does not consider restrictions on airport growth to be a necessary measure.</p>
--	--	---

50. Christina Ewbank on behalf of The Alliance of Chambers East Sussex

<p>A General support, Noise</p>	<p>Airport is an important supply chain for SMEs across the South East.</p> <p>Support the use of the northern runway to help the local economy grow, but also asks Gatwick to continue to introduce strong incentives for carriers to reduce noise effects.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p> <p>The Project does include a series of noise mitigation measures including an enhanced noise insulation scheme that addresses areas affected by aircraft noise in the future case with the Project regardless of whether the project itself would increase those noise levels and as such addresses the total noise effect of the airport not only that of the Project.</p>
---------------------------------	--	--

51. Dr Clifford Kendall on behalf of Nancy Clarke

<p>A Climate Change</p>	<p>Opposes the application on climate change and humanitarian grounds.</p> <p>Climate change is already responsible for deaths, globally, and while nations' GDP grows, global health and poverty have stalled.</p> <p>Climate change is a humanitarian crisis, and the proposal will continue to contribute to it.</p>	<p>Regarding the climate context, the significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP would not be so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.</p>
<p>52. Janine Okeeffe on behalf of Scientist Rebellion</p>		
<p>A Climate Change, Health, and Air Quality</p>	<p>Opposed to the development on climate change and air pollution grounds.</p> <p>Planetary heating is accelerating, and predicted to continue to do so. This is resulting in significant deaths due to heating.</p> <p>Air pollution causes a number of health issues and diseases such as Heart attacks, strokes, dementia, lung cancer, reduced sperm, low birth weight, diabetes and blood clots.</p> <p>Paris Agreement goal of 1.5 degrees, should be our most important health target.</p>	<p>Matters raised by Ms. O'Keeffe regarding air quality and health concerns, are addressed in the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048] submitted at Deadline 1, namely in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 4.3 Air Quality; and - Section 4.17 Health and Wellbeing <p>Regarding the climate context, the significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the</p>

		Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.
53. Bharat Lukka on behalf of Gurjar Hindu Union		
	[Interested Party did not appear]	
54. Craig Berresford on behalf of Preview Graphics		
General Support, Environmental Mitigation	<p>Support the proposal. Local business is deeply entrenched in the Gatwick community.</p> <p>Unlocks benefits in the local area. Will support growth of business, and open markets to the area. Greater competition and access into Europe.</p> <p>Needs to address environmental concerns, and environmental stewardship can be balanced with all of our responsibility to protect the planet for future generations.</p> <p>Supporting expansion is investing in the future prosperity in the area.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p> <p>The ES Appendix 5.2.3: Mitigation Route Map [REP2-011] sets out the mitigation measures that are required to mitigate the impacts of the Project and how those measures will be secured: either through the draft DCO, s106 Agreement or other consents and licences</p>
55. Mardi Roberts on behalf of Ridgeview Wine Estate Ltd		
General support, Socio-Economics	Support the proposal. Gatwick is incredibly valuable to have access to export to foreign countries. Visitors also come to the area, 25,000 people visited the vineyard, strong presence from Norway.	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.

	<p>Wine tourism accounts for 25% of industry income.</p> <p>Development of the northern runway brings access and greater frequency to overseas destinations. This will assist putting Sussex winelands on the global map.</p>	
<p>56. Sally Williams on behalf of Longwood Business Support Services Ltd</p>		
<p>a</p>	<p>Witnessed the devastating impact on Crawley of the airport closing during the Covid pandemic. The airport is the seedbed of the town, which provides opportunities to local people, and feeds the local community.</p> <p>The Northern runway project will provide further economic stability, and provide access to new markets.</p> <p>Travel to Heathrow, is not appealing, and the expansion of the runway would negate the need to make this trip.</p> <p>Parking and traffic concerns, and query how Gatwick will deal with this.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to supporting sustainable travel, as set out in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (SAC) [APP-090]. The mode share commitments within the SAC represent the position the Applicant is committed to achieve, based on the modelling of mode choice and transport network operation, to ensure that the core surface access outcomes set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076] and in the Transport Assessment [AS-079] are delivered. The SAC also sets out committed interventions. There are further aspirations identified in the SAC which acknowledge that there may be further opportunities to enhance the use of public transport services. In parallel, the Applicant will maintain the operation of the Sustainable Transport Fund to support measures that will help to encourage further shift to</p>

		<p>sustainable travel modes and this is secured in the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004].</p> <p>In respect of any parking concern, we would refer the Interested Party to GAL's Car Parking Strategy submitted at Deadline 1 [Rep1-051], which explains the approach taken and the balance sought to be struck in terms of the quantum of spaces. Furthermore, the Applicant is committing to provide an Off-Airport Parking Support Contribution, to support local authorities in providing effective parking controls in, or monitoring, surrounding streets or taking enforcement action against unauthorised off-airport passenger car parking. This contribution is secured in the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] (paragraph 7 of Schedule 3).</p>
57. Stuart Le Duc on behalf of Robust Floors Ltd		
	[Interested Party did not appear]	
58. Tatiana Seryán		
Climate Change	<p>Oppose on climate change and global impacts grounds.</p> <p>greater capacity will increase flights, which will increase emissions. Accelerating climate change will have major global effects, and propagate climate wars.</p>	<p>Regarding the climate context, the significance to be attached to the impacts of the NRP on climate change is assessed in detail in ES Chapter 16: Greenhouse Gases [APP-041] and the weight to be attached to those impacts is addressed at Section 8.7 the Planning Statement [APP-245]. The analysis demonstrates that the emissions arising from the NRP project would not be so significant that the</p>

		Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets.
59. Amanda Jones		
General Support, Socio-Economics	<p>Support the proposal. Globally it is well accepted that countries seeking growth see tourism as a key source of inward foreign investment. Increased and improved air connectivity improves international tourism. It is essential to the South East's economy.</p> <p>Tourism contributes significantly to the UK economy, and there is a real opportunity for the south east economy to grow as part of this. This is not an economic vs social/moral argument.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes support for the Project.