

**Gatwick Northern Runway Project (Project Reference: TR020005)**

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) – Version 32**

**East Sussex County Council (Registration Identification Number: 20044514)**

**Deadline 52: ~~26 March~~ 6 June 2024**

This PADSS report has been prepared by East Sussex County Council (ESCC), with input from the joint authorities and appointed consultants where required. This document identifies the initial principal areas of disagreement that have been identified when reviewing Gatwick Airport's (GAL's) Development Consent Order (DCO) documentation and is an update of Version 1 (AS-062). Version 2 (REP2-121).

~~It should be noted that the PADSS have been reviewed without reference to the Applicants project changes to the DCO, which were accepted into the Examination by the Examining Authority (ExA) on 8 March 2024. Any commentary on these changes will be provided via a Written Representation to be submitted at Deadline 3 and considered in the next version of the PADSS which are to be submitted at Deadline 5.~~

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June**

**2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
1	The capacity deliverable with the Northern Runway Project (NRP) Proposed Development	The Applicant has produced updated simulation modelling of the future capacity of the runway with the NRP [REP1-054], which uses more appropriate assumptions about the separations required between departing aircraft but, nonetheless, indicates lower levels of delay. Further information has been sought regarding the calibration of this model to verify that it does not understate delays before it can be agreed that the	Further information regarding the validation of the updated simulation modelling is required. Full modelling of the interaction between the use of the two runways and the respective departure routes needs to be undertaken and the delay information provided at a sufficiently granular level (hourly) to enable the delays to be properly understood and the capacity attainable validated.	Uncertain — <del>subject to GAL</del> transparently undertaking and sharing the relevant simulation modelling.

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement  
(PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June**

**2024**

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Principal Issue in Question</b>	<b>Concern held</b>	<b>What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern</b>	<b>Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination</b>
		<p><u>NRP is capable of delivering the capacity uplift assumed over the longer term [REP4-052] Modelling by GAL of the capacity deliverable with the NRP has assumed that 1 minute separations can be achieved between all departing aircraft using the two runways. This is not possible with the existing structure of SIDS, particularly given the commitment not to use WIZAD SID in the night period, and so additional delays to aircraft will arise so increasing delays above those stated in the Application documents. As a consequence, the achievable capacity, at a</u></p>		

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June 2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<del>level of delay acceptable to the airlines, will be lower than stated.</del>		
2	The forecasts for the use of the NRP are not based on a proper assessment of the market for GAL, having regard to the latest Department for Transport forecasts and having regard to the potential for additional capacity to be delivered at other airports. The demand forecasts are	The demand forecasts have been developed 'bottom up' based on an assessment of the capacity that could be delivered by the NRP (see point above). It is not considered good practice to base long term 20 year forecasts solely on a bottom up analysis without consideration of the likely scale of the market and the share that might be attained by any particular airport.  <u>Alternative top-down forecasts have now been presented by GAL</u>	<u>The adoption of the top down forecasts, including an allowance for capacity growth at the other London airports as the base case for the assessment of the impacts of the NRP and the setting of appropriate controls on growth relative to the impacts.</u> <del>Robust market analysis and specific modelling of the share of demand that might be achieved at GAL in competition with other airports, not limited simply to traffic, including that from other regions of the UK, that has historically used the London airports.</del>  -	Uncertain—subject to GAL producing robust modelling to underpin its forecasts of demand.

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: ~~March~~ June**

**2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	considered too optimistic.	<p>[REP1-052] that show slower growth in the early years following the opening of the NRP. These are considered more reasonable that the original bottom=up forecasts adopted by the Applicant but still fail to take adequate account of the extent to which some part of the demand could be met by expansion at other airports serving London including a third runway or other expansion being delivered at Heathrow.</p> <p>In this case, top-down benchmarking against national forecasts has failed to properly allow for the developments that</p>		

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March June 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		may take place at other airports and the extent to which the overall level of demand across the London system is reliant on the assumption that a third runway would be delivered at Heathrow.		
<u>3</u>	<u>Baseline Case has been overstated leading to understatement of the impacts.</u>	<u>There is concern that it is unreasonable to assume that the existing single runway operation will be able to support 67.2 mppa meaning that the assessment of impacts understates the effects, see REP4-049.</u>	<u>GAL is undertaking sensitivity analysis of alternative baseline assumptions as directed by the ExA. It is considered that the results of this sensitivity analysis should be used as the basis for the assessment of the impact of the NRP and the setting of appropriate mitigations and controls.</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>
<u>34</u>	<u>Overstatement of the wider, catalytic, and national level economic</u>	<u>The methodology used to assess the catalytic employment and GVA benefits of the development is not robust, leading to an</u>	<u>The catalytic impact methodology needs to properly account for the specific catchment area and demand characteristics of each of the cross-section of airports to ensure that the catalytic impacts of</u>	<u>Uncertain —subject to remodelling of impacts by GAL.</u>

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023    Updated: <u>March/June 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	benefits of the NRP.	<p>overstatement of the likely benefits in the local area.</p> <p>The national economic impact assessment is derived from demand forecasts which are considered likely to be optimistic and fails to properly account for potential displacement effects, as well as other methodological concerns.</p>	<p>airport growth are robustly identified.</p> <p>The national economic impact assessment should robustly test the net impact of expansion at GAL having regard to the potential for growth elsewhere and properly account for Heathrow specific factors, such as hub traffic and air fares.</p> <p><u>Work is ongoing between York Aviation and the Applicant regarding a joint local authority SoCG on operations / capacity and needs / forecasting.</u></p>	
<b>Transport &amp; surface access</b>				
5	Public transport: rail of the	The model contains all rail services in the modelled area. However, the assessment focuses	<u>The applicant should include the East Coastway line between Brighton and Hastings as a key</u>	Uncertain – potentially subject to remodelling or well evidenced

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	Transport Assessment	on services on the North Downs Line, Arun Valley Line and Brighton Main Line	<p><del>corridor to join the BML for access to GAL</del></p> <p>As previously requested the applicant should include the East Coastway line between Brighton and Hastings as a key corridor to join the BML for access to GAL. Whilst we recognise the Applicant has responded to this [REP3-078] the East Coastway is the key rail route from East Sussex to the airport (via the Brighton Main Line) and should therefore be modelled. We want to be able to promote rail travel to the airport. We consider the East Coastway to be a key rail corridor and disagree that this part of the rail network does not need to be modelled.</p>	acceptable justification as to why this has not been included
6	Page 36 (12-33) of the Transport	Reference to East Sussex CC comment in PEIR to Extend scope of modelling to include	<del>Not clear whether this has this includes all the relevant Ashdown</del>	Uncertain – potentially subject to remodelling



Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	Environmental Statement	Ashdown Forest. The Area of Detailed Modelling includes the Ashdown Forest area.	<p><del>Forest area. Wish to see a map of the modelled area for clarification.</del></p> <p><u>GAL have confirmed in the March 2024 SOCG (with ESCC) that the transport modelling covers a large area which includes all roads in neighbouring Districts and Ashdown Forest, as indicated in Diagram 5.3.3 of the Transport Assessment.</u></p> <p><u>Whilst GAL has sought to assess the impacts of the NRP on Ashdown Forest, and cites the impacts, ESCC requires mitigation measures that reduces traffic volume in sensitive locations near and through Ashdown Forest - which is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) / Special Protection Area (SPA) – to be considered and introduced.</u></p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March June 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
			<p><u>we note the Applicant's position regarding the modelling which includes Ashdown Forest. However, we maintain that we need to understand what the impacts of vehicular movements on Ashdown Forest will be.</u></p> <p><u>Whilst the applicant has stated that 'Agreement has been reached with Natural England on the method used for the HRA assessment and Natural England's Relevant Representations detail that no further information is required with regard to the HRA assessment' (ES Appendix 9.9.1 Habitats Regulation Assessment Parts 1 and 2 [APP-134 &amp; APP-135].). Regardless of the agreement with Natural England, we wish for an accurate assessment of the current and anticipated impacts needs to be established in order to understand what the impacts would be, regardless of whether or not they are significant.</u></p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
7	5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3)	<p>Whilst we support the proposals for bus service improvements between GAL Airport and East Sussex there is scope for further improvements</p> <p>With there being no direct rail connections from much of East Sussex, and therefore the only option for passengers / employees to travel to the airport by private car / taxis, there must be investment into bus services to provide a public transport alternative</p> <p>Bus service improvement</p>	<p>Would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crowborough – GAL route to run via Forest Row and East Grinstead (in combination with an Uckfield – Forest Row – East Grinstead – service would double the frequency between Forest Row and GAL)</li> <li>• extend the 261 route beyond East Grinstead to provide a direct service between Uckfield and GAL</li> <li>• Extend the proposed Gatwick-Uckfield service to Heathfield</li> <li>• Extend bus operational times to include early mornings, evenings and weekends</li> </ul> <p>Consideration given to Heathfield being an extension to the Uckfield – Gatwick service. Important to integrate this with the existing ESCC funded bus service between Heathfield and Uckfield</p>	Uncertain – dependent upon funding

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
			<p>ESCC is disappointed that the Applicant is still not prepared to commit to funding improved bus services to/from East Sussex to the airport. The only current public transport access to the airport is by rail, and there are no direct bus or coach services. Providing direct bus services to the airport will open up sustainable travel options to East Sussex residents who have no choice but to travel to the airport by private car. This will help the Applicant to meet their modal share targets.</p> <p>It will also align with Gatwick Airport's response to our Local Transport Plan 4 consultation which states- 'Whilst we recognise that in its draft form it is difficult to be too far-reaching in its scope we would encourage ESCC to consider the benefits of the stronger links with Gatwick Airport as an important regional economic driver. In</p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
			<i>particular the opportunities for improved public transport connections that would support the visitor economy and enable improved access to employment at the airport by sustainable means.'</i>	
8	Surface Access Commitments (SACs) and target mode shares	Concerns are held about the Surface Access Commitments that underpin the creation of a new Surface Access Strategy and the approach to meeting and monitoring these targets. Some of the concerns include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commitment 1, to ensure 55% of passenger journeys is made by public transport is not considered ambitious or of sufficient</li> </ul>	<p><del>Surface Access Commitments and associated mitigation to be reviewed and amended.</del></p> <p><u>ESCC require GAL to clarify how bus service improvements could be funded through the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF).</u></p> <p><u>ESCC are inclined to seek the securing of bus service enhancements through a legal agreement as part of the DCO process. There is concern that the STF is not legally binding and therefore the bus service improvements as requested run the</u></p>	TBC

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June 2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>challenge. Prior to the Pandemic the airport achieved 47.8% public transport modal share in the 12 months up to March 2020 (Paragraph 12.6.11 ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target mode shares set out as Commitments are only set out as percentages. The percentages masks trends in absolute numbers and permit significant increases in car trips to and from the airport.</li> <li>• Insufficient evidence and justification are provided to demonstrate how the mitigation proposed</li> </ul>	<p><u>risk of not being introduced via the STF approach.</u></p> <p><u>GAL provide a long term Masterplan which will consider surface access improvements to/from East Sussex to Gatwick Airport as airport passenger numbers increase, and as public transport opportunities and demand increases.</u></p> <p><u>Have included in our LIR response (para 4.6.4) that ESCC are: 'supportive of an approach whereby growth of the airport is only permitted when surface access commitments / targets have been met. This could easily fit within the existing SAC framework and would still deliver the outcomes that GAL desire. An approach has similarly been considered in respect of the Luton Airport DCO and is referred to as Green Controlled</u></p>	

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: ~~March~~ June**

**2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>can provide sufficient sustainable infrastructure to successfully meet some of the target modal splits.</p> <p>Commitments are made in relation to bus and coach service provision. Determination of mode of travel takes into a variety of factors rather than just provision of service. The applicant has not assessed or considered the attractiveness of modes or how this could be increased. For example, by providing enhanced bus priority measures to provide journey time savings.</p>	<p><u>Growth, whereby growth is only permitted after targets have been met'.</u></p> <p><u>Such interventions also to include bus priority infrastructure to improve journey times, improved waiting facilities at bus stops en route, and high quality marketing and publicity.</u></p>	

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June 2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
9	<p><u>Impact of increased passenger and employee numbers associated with Gatwick Airport NRP on local road network</u></p>	<p><u>Concern over impact of additional car journeys on the road network to Gatwick Airport, leading to increased congestion, longer journey times, increase in emissions.</u></p> <p><u>Concern over the assessment of transport modal share for air passengers and the impact on the road network, including the knock on effects from other authorities.</u></p>	<p><u>GAL needs to mitigate the impacts of approaching traffic from the surrounding road network, including routes in East Sussex such as the A22 and A264 which feed into the A23/M23 corridor. GAL must also assess the impacts of airport growth on the strategic road network (e.g. M25) and ESCC's highway network beyond the immediate environment of the airport.</u></p> <p><u>ESCC support West Sussex County Council's request for a sensitivity test on the implications of a continuation of the flat public transport mode share of "around 45%" for air passengers prior to the pandemic, which Diagram 6.2.4 of the Transport Assessment [AS-079] indicates has been fairly consistent since 2012. There is concern that the 55% public transport mode</u></p>	<p><u>No longer pursuing</u></p>



Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
			<p><del>share targets are too ambitious. Having a sensitivity analysis will enable WSCC to fully understand the effects on their road network, and for ESCC to consider whether these impacts would have repercussions on the East Sussex road network.</del></p> <p>We are happy to be guided by WSCC's response to the sensitivity testing issue and support their response and engagement with the Applicant on this. No further comments to make on this issue.</p>	
<u>10</u>	<u>Impact of increased airport capacity on the rail network arising from additional employees and passengers</u>	<u>There is concern that rail infrastructure and service provision has not been properly considered by GAL. There is a risk that Network Rail's infrastructure, and the service pattern that may not be able to</u>	<u>There is no funding associated with rail mitigation in GAL's proposals (like there is for highways). As outlined in Table 5 (T3 &amp; T4) in the ESCC LIR. We wish to see Gatwick's level of commitment to highways extended to rail.</u>	<u>Uncertain</u>

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June**

**2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	<p><u>going to and from the airport</u></p>	<p><u>accommodate the increase in demand and capacity from passengers / employees that will arise should the NRP become operational. This must be considered alongside wider demands for rail travel.</u></p>	<p><u>GAL state that the rail network has sufficient capacity. However, we understand NR will be undertaking their own modelling to assess the validity of this statement. ESCC support Network Rail's independent modelling work to identify what the impacts of the NRP would have on the rail network, and consideration will subsequently need to be given as to how the impacts could be mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>In regard to any mitigation being agreed between the applicant and East Sussex County Council, this should be secured through an appropriate legal agreement or condition of the development consent order and introduced prior to the commencement of the operation of the northern runway.</u></p>	

**Air quality**

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023      Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
11	Missing figures and the lack of clear study area information makes it difficult to understand traffic changes in the different scenarios. This in turn makes it difficult to understand if effects predicted at receptors are reasonable over the construction and operational phases.	<p><i>Document 5.1, Chapter 13</i></p> <p>Paragraph 13.5.5 of the ES air quality chapter refers to a 'wider study area' (beyond the 11km by 10km domain), plus the modelled affected road network (ARN) outside this area. This is shown on Figure 13.4.1.4.1.1. The ES Air Quality Figures – Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been reviewed, and this figure cannot be identified.</p> <p>Currently, figures within Part 3 just show a wider study area domain, not the actual roads meeting the ARN criteria (e.g. Appendix 13.6.1 Figure</p>	<p><del>GAL needs to supply further information to clarify the routes affected in both the construction and operational phases. Additionally, the roads within the 11km by 10km domain which have met the ARN criteria should be illustrated separately for the construction and operational phases. This will inform our understanding of where the greatest air quality effects should be anticipated in this domain.</del></p> <p><del>Update:</del></p> <p>Please note: For all air quality matters further information has been provided by the Applicant at Deadline 1, including a 567 page technical note on air quality and a new version of Environmental Statement air quality figures. This information is currently being</p>	Likely

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>MarchJune 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		2.3.1). This figure should be provided to illustrate the affected road network. No further information on the road traffic air quality study was identified in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology. However, reference to the above missing figure is made within this ES Appendix document, suggesting it has been missed in the collation of this ES Appendix.	<p><del>reviewed and means that ESCG is unable to update the resolution status or otherwise on air quality matters within the PADSS. This will be completed and submitted to the ExA at Deadline 3 and separately in further communications with the Applicant. This applies to all points herein for air quality.</del></p> <p><u>The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot</u></p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
			<u>be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</u>	
12	The scenarios assessed in the Environmental Statement do not provide a realistic worst-case assessment.	<p><i>Document 5.1, Chapter 13</i></p> <p>Several clarifications are required to understand the Assessment Scenarios sub-section of the chapter. Paragraph 13.5.23 includes a bullet point list of assessment scenarios, including scenarios covering 2029 for both the construction and operation of the proposed development.</p> <p>Paragraph 13.5.24 provides further detail for the 2029 scenarios, noting there are two</p>	<p><del>GAL needs to clarify how:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>• The use of two parallel scenarios for 2029 provides a realistic worst case for evaluation. A single scenario reflecting the anticipated operation of the increased capacity at the airport with the surface access construction works is the realistic worst case in 2029.</del></li> <li><del>• Operational activities and ongoing construction work in 2032 have been assessed.</del></li> <li><del>• The selection of assessment years and their configuration re operational and construction was made, and how this aligns with the requirements of the</del></li> </ul>	Uncertain

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March/June 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>assessment scenarios for this year. Additional information is provided in paragraph 13.5.25 which reiterates that there are two separate scenarios for operational and construction situations, due to limitations within the traffic modelling.</p> <p>Paragraph 13.5.26 then provides information on a slow fleet transition case (SFT) relating to airline fleet assumptions, referencing 2029 as the first full year of opening, 2032 as an interim year and 2038 a design year. For the 2032 scenario, no mention is made that some construction works will still be ongoing (See</p>	<p><u>Airports National Policy Statement.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. The Joint Local Authorities have also submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2 - 004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review.</u></p> <p><u>Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot be made.</u></p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>MarchJune 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		ES Appendix 5.3.3: Indicative Construction Sequencing).	<u>It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</u>	
13	Operational monitoring should be agreed during the examination.	<i>Document 5.1, Chapter 13</i>  Operational monitoring will be crucial to understand if measured air quality is following modelled prediction. There is no information in either the air quality chapter or the Surface Access Commitments document on how air quality data will be reviewed to check that changes are in-line with predictions, nor what measures would be taken if a significant adverse deterioration occurred.	<del>GAL should agree the details of the s106 operational monitoring, and how this will be used to test the effectiveness of the Surface Access Commitments.</del>  <u>The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. The Joint Local Authorities have also submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2 - 004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from the Applicant further</u>	Likely

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
			<u>progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</u>	
14	Air quality actions are split across multiple documents. A single Air Quality Action Plan is needed.	<del>Document 5.1, Chapter 13</del>  <del>Paragraph 13.9.3 states that the operational phase mitigation measures are set out in two documents: the Carbon Action Plan and the Surface Access Commitments. This makes it difficult to identify measures that focus on air quality improvement. This approach differs from previous discussions, where a draft Air Quality Action Plan was provided in 2022.</del>	<del>GAL should draw up an Air Quality Action Plan. The Joint Local Authorities have submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2-004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</del>  <u>Resolved.</u>	Uncertain Likely



Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
15	Using the application documents, is not possible to relate the figures to the results set out in the appendices tables	<p><i>Document 13.6.2</i></p> <p>The receptor tables include most of the expected information, including a receptor ID reference. However, the tables (e.g. Table 2.1.1 and Table 2.4.1) do not identify which figure the receptor listed is shown, as would be typically expected, to allow readers to move between the appendix, chapter and figures.</p> <p>However, as receptors are not labelled by ID this is therefore not possible in this ES. The reader needs to plot the grid references provided to</p>	<p>GAL should update receptor figures to present receptor IDs. Additionally, a column identifying the local authority location for each receptor would be extremely useful.</p> <p>Note: this links to our concerns over the impacts of air quality on Ashdown Forest (which is an area of European Ecological Importance, Special Area of Conservation, and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Need to consider these impacts as part of the modelling work being undertaken (air quality - nitrogen deposition issues arising from additional traffic through Ashdown Forest).</p> <p><u>The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the</u></p>	Likely

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>MarchJune 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		understand where a receptor is.	<u>Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. The Joint Local Authorities have also submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2 - 004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</u>	
16	Lack of sensitivity analysis on the anticipated modal shift, and the associated air quality impacts.	<i>Document 5.1, Chapter 12</i>  Paragraph 12.8.6 of the traffic and transport chapter sets out a variety of measures to produce the modal shift assumed	<del>GAL should supply further details on their assumptions around off-airport parking (both approved and unapproved), sensitivity of the anticipated modal shift is to any variation in these assumptions, and the air quality impacts of lower levels of modal shift.</del>	Uncertain

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		with the proposed development. Within the assumptions, there are controls on on-site parking numbers, parking charges and forecourt access charges. There is insufficient sensitivity analysis on these figures, including the impact on air quality if they are not achieved.	<u>The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. The Joint Local Authorities have also submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2 - 004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</u>	
<b>Greenhouse gases (carbon)</b>				

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June 2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
17	<p>Failure to consider risks raised by the Climate Change Committee, which warns that the UK Jet Zero policy is non-compliant with the UK's net zero trajectory, and the cumulative effects of airport expansion plans.</p>	<p><i>Document 5.1, Chapter 16:</i>                       Section 16.12.3 states, "Given the overarching contribution to emissions arise from aviation, and the policy context in the UK the reflects the Jet Zero Strategy (Department for Transport, 2022), it is concluded that the overall impacts arising from the Project are not so significant that the Project would have a material impact on the ability of Government to meet its carbon reduction targets, including Carbon Budgets. On this basis the overall assessment concludes that the</p>	<p>GAL needs to analyse and assess the issues raised by the CCG regarding the Jet Zero Strategy and consider how this could compromise the UK's net zero trajectory.</p> <p>To monitor and control GHG emissions during the project construction and operation it is suggested a control mechanism to similar to the Green Controlled Growth Framework submitted as part of the London Luton Airport Expansion Application, is provided. Implementing such a framework would make sure that the Applicant demonstrates sustainable growth while effectively managing its environmental impact. Within this document, the Applicant should define monitoring and reporting requirements for GHG emissions for the Applicant's construction</p>	<p>Unlikely</p> <p><u>Addressed</u></p>

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June 2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p><i>Project has a Minor Adverse Not Significant impact."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>The Jet Zero strategy had a "Reliance on nascent technology. The Jet Zero Strategy approach is high risk due to its reliance on nascent technology—especially rapid SAF uptake and aircraft efficiency savings—over the period up to the Sixth Carbon Budget. The Government does not have a policy framework in place to ensure that emissions reductions in the</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>activities, airport operations and surface access transportation.</i></p> <p><i>Similar to the London Luton Airport Green Controlled Growth Framework, emission limits and thresholds for pertinent project stages should be established. Should limits occur, the Applicant must cease project activities. Where appropriate the Applicant should undertake emission offsetting in accordance with the Airport Carbon Accreditation Offset Guidance Document to comply with this mechanism.</i></p> <p><u>Addressed.</u></p>	

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June**

**2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p><i>aviation sector occur if these technologies are not delivered on time and at sufficient scale.</i></p> <p>The Climate Change Committee have concerns around “<b>Airport expansion</b>”. The Committee's Sixth Carbon Budget Advice recommended no net expansion of UK airports to ensure aviation can achieve the required pathway for UK aviation emissions. Since making this recommendation the Committee has noted that airports across the UK have increased their capacities and continue to develop capacity expansion proposals. This is incompatible with</p>		

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement  
(PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June**

**2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>the UK's Net Zero target unless aviation's carbon intensity is outperforming the Government's pathway and can accommodate this additional demand. No airport expansions should proceed until a UK-wide capacity management framework is in place to annually assess and, if required, control sector CO2 emissions and non-CO2 effects.</p> <p><u>The CCC considered that Jet Zero strategy had a "<b>Reliance on nascent technology</b>". The Jet Zero Strategy approach is high risk due to its reliance on nascent technology — especially</u></p>		

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<i><u>rapid SAF uptake and aircraft efficiency savings – over the period up to the Sixth Carbon Budget. The Government does not have a policy framework in place to ensure that emissions reductions in the aviation sector occur if these technologies are not delivered on time and at sufficient scale.</u></i>		
18	Carbon calculations do not include well-to-tank (WTT) emissions, which is not aligned to the GHG	<i>Document 16.9.1 (table 2.1.1), 16.9.2 (table 2.1.1) and 16.9.4</i>  Not accounting for WTT is non-compliant with the globally recognised GHG	<i>Excluding WTT is non-compliant with the globally recognised GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting Standard, the UK Government's carbon accounting methodology and the IEMA GHG Assessment</i>	Likely



Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>MarchJune 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	Protocol Standard mentioned in the Environmental Statement methodology.	<p>Protocol Corporate Accounting standard, referenced in the GHG ES Methodology in Section 16.4.18, where scope 3 emissions were included.</p> <p>Furthermore, this also contradicts the GHG ES Methodology referenced under Section 16.4.24, which states “GHG factors are drawn from a range of national and international sources. Where these factors are expected to change over the duration of the Project then a time-based factor is used, based on estimating the extent and rate at which the factor will change. This</p>	<p><del>methodology used in the ES [Chapter 16 of the ES, APP-041].</del></p> <p><del>Under the IEMA GHG Assessment methodology used in the ES, the Applicant must update the assessment to evidence that exclusions are &lt;1% of total emissions and where all such exclusions total a maximum of 5%.</del></p> <p><u>In Deadline 4, the Applicant has provided WTT estimates for construction, ABAGO, surface access, and aviation. These updates increase the total emissions from the project between 2018 and 2050 by 3,978,000 tCO<sub>2</sub>e, representing a 19.83% increase.</u></p> <p><u>To contextualise these emissions against the carbon budget, the Applicant references DUKES 2023</u></p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p><i>estimation process draws on industry standards, industry-specific guidance, and a range of other UK and government policy and strategy documents.”</i></p> <p>Additionally, the approach taken goes against the UK Government’s carbon accounting methodology from BEIS (2022)<sup>1</sup>, which recommends that “<i>Well-to-tank (WTT) fuels conversion factors should be used to account for the upstream Scope 3 emissions associated with extraction, refining and transportation of the raw fuel sources to an organisation’s site (or</i></p>	<p><u>Chapter 3: Oil and Oil Products, estimating that around 36% of WTT aviation emissions occur within the UK boundary. Using this justification, the Applicant compares only this portion of aviation WTT emissions to the carbon budget, along with the WTT emissions from construction, ABAGO, and surface access.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant then presents only the net impact, stating it accounts for 0.649% of the UK’s 6th carbon budget, without displaying the total future impact of the airport as done in the ES.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant should further forecast the percentage impact on future estimated carbon budgets using the CCC projections to estimate the project’s impact on future carbon budgets to understand if it is decarbonising in</u></p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March/June 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p><i>asset), prior to combustion."</i></p> <p>WTT emissions represent a significant portion of fuel emissions (around 20%) and need to be accounted for.</p>	<p><u>line with the estimated net zero trajectory.</u></p>	
19	GAL does not identify the risks associated with using carbon offset schemes.	<p><i>Document 5.4.2, Section 1.14</i></p> <p><i>This states that, "In 2016/17, we achieved 'Level 3+ - Neutrality' status under the Airport Carbon Accreditation scheme, which is a global carbon management certification programme for airports (Ref 1.1). GAL has been working hard to reduce carbon emissions under GAL's control (from a 1990 baseline) and</i></p>	<p><del>GAL should show complete transparency and state the offset scheme they intend to use. GAL should state if they comply with the Airport Carbon Accreditation Offset Guidance Document which specifies the type of offsetting Schemes that need to be used. In addition, and where reasonably practical, GAL should seek to utilise local offsetting schemes that can deliver environmental benefits to the area and local community around the airport. Offsets should align with the following key</del></p>	<p>Likely <u>Addressed.</u></p>

**Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council**

**Version Number: 1**

**Submitted at: October 2023**

**Updated: March June 2024**

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p><i>offset the remaining emissions using internationally recognised offset schemes."</i></p> <p>The scientific community has identified various risks around using offsetting schemes to claim net zero or carbon neutrality. GAL should specifically state which offset scheme they intend to use so research can be conducted into the trustworthiness of the scheme.</p>	<p>offsetting principles i.e. that they should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>additional in that would not have occurred in the absence of the project</del></li> <li>• <del>monitored, reported and verified</del></li> <li>• <del>permanent and irreversible</del></li> <li>• <del>without leakage in that they don't increase emissions outside of the proposed development</del></li> <li>• <del>Have a robust accounting system to avoid double counting and</del></li> <li>• <del>Be without negative environmental or social externalities.</del></li> </ul> <p><u>The Applicant, in 2.11.4.1 of the SOCG with East Sussex County Council (to be submitted at Deadline 5) has addressed this issue.</u></p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023      Updated: <u>March June 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
20	GAL indicates it is relying upon Renewable Energy Guarantees of Origin ("REGO") to achieve its Net Zero and Zero Carbon commitments. However, purchasing REGO certificates does not necessarily reduce emissions from grid electricity consumption to zero.	<p><i>Document 5.4.2 (section 3.1.2)</i></p> <p><i>This states "For emissions that occur outside the Gatwick Airport site boundary where GAL can make an impact, we have already taken action, such as electing to purchase 100% Renewable Energy Guarantees of Origin ("REGO") electricity since 2013 and installing 22 charging points for airport ground operation vehicles in 2019 (Ref. 1.6)."</i></p> <p>The guidelines for the UK Government Streamlined Energy and Carbon Reporting (SECR)</p>	<p><del>GAL should address the concerns around relying on REGO's to make the claim that GAL will "achieve Net Zero for GHG emissions under our control (GAL Scope 1 and 2) by 2030. Gatwick will achieve zero emissions for GAL Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 2040 for scope 1 and 2 by 2040".</del></p> <p><u>Updated position March 2024:</u> Aligned with SECR, GAL's reporting should clearly delineate the distinction between market-based emission factor reporting and localised values for REGOs. This clarity is essential to identify the extent of potential residual emissions stemming from electrical energy use.</p> <p><del>GAL should offer clarity regarding the offset schemes it intends to</del></p>	Likely <u>Addressed.</u>

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023      Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		advise, "Where organisations have entered into contractual arrangements for renewable electricity, e.g. through Power Purchase Agreements or the separate purchase of Renewable Energy Guarantees of Origin (REGOs), or consumed renewable heat or transport certified through a Government Scheme and wish to reflect a reduced emission figure based on its purchase, this can be presented in the relevant report using a "market-based" reporting approach. It is recommended that this is presented alongside the "location based" grid-average figures and in doing so, you should also	<p>employ, enabling the verification of their credibility.</p> <p><u>The Applicant, in 2.11.4.2 of the SOCG to be submitted at Deadline 5 has provided an updated position which satisfies our concern on this issue. Therefore, this is can now be classed as 'Addressed'.</u></p>	

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023      Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<i>look to specify whether the renewable energy is additional, subsidised and supplied directly, including on-site generation, or through a third party."</i>		
20	It is not clear if construction electrical energy consumption emissions were considered in the ES.	Document 16.9.1 Calculations or an estimate on electrical energy use during construction should be calculated as part of the construction GHG Assessment. Without this, the energy-related emissions in the ES for construction are potentially underreported.	GAL needs to update the GHG Construction assessment to account for electrical energy use during construction.	Likely
21	BEIS 2023 GHG intensity factors are not used as a data source for	Document 16.9.2 (table 3.2.1) For the Green Book Supplementary Guidance, BEIS (2023) emission factors are	GAL needs to explain why the GHG intensity factors and future grid electricity carbon factors were not aligned from the 2023 database.	Likely

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023      Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	the Future Baseline.	used, contradicting the BEIS (2022) GHG intensity factors stated in Table 3.2.1.		
<u>21</u>	If the Applicant does not provide infrastructure or services to help decarbonise surface transport emissions it may have the potential to result in the underreporting of the Proposed Development's impact on the climate. The full impact of the Proposed Development on the government meeting its net	The Applicant must actively promote the transition to a decarbonised economy, incentivising airport users to adopt low-carbon technologies like electric cars and public transportation systems.	<p>The Applicant should <u>demonstrate how they will provide sufficient charging <del>provide</del> infrastructure within the Airport to support the anticipated uptake of electric vehicles anticipated in the Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan. Charging facilities in the surrounding area may be overwhelmed if there is insufficient charging available at the airport. <del>and provide electric vehicle charging infrastructure.</del></u></p> <p>Additionally, to support this movement, the Applicant should support a Green Bus Programme such as the expansion of the network of hydrogen buses used in</p>	<u>Uncertain</u>



<b>Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council</b>			<b>Version Number: 1</b> <b>Submitted at: October 2023</b> <b>Updated: <u>March/June 2024</u></b>	
--	--	--	--	--

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Principal Issue in Question</b>	<b>Concern held</b>	<b>What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern</b>	<b>Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination</b>
	<u>zero targets cannot be identified.</u> ↓		<u>the Gatwick/Crawley area into Mid Sussex with accompanying infrastructure</u>	

**Climate change (impacts)**

22	Inconsistency and lack of detail in some climate impact statements.	Document 5.1 (tables 15.8.5 and 15.8.6) The climate impact statements (detailed in Table 15.8.5 and Table 15.8.6) are lacking in consistency in the way they are articulated in that some are missing an 'impact.' They have a cause e.g. 'increased flooding' and an 'event' e.g. flooding of electrical equipment' but no end 'impact' e.g. resulting in increased maintenance requirements OR resulting in operational downtime. This result is	GAL should update all climate impact statements to have a clear end impact so that all risks are described in a consistent way.  <u>The Applicant -indicated at Deadline 3 that it is committed to providing charging infrastructure for electric vehicles used to access the Airport (both passenger and staff) to facilitate the use of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles for -journeys made by car, however, concerns remain.</u>  <u>The Applicant should demonstrate how they will provide sufficient charging infrastructure within the</u>	<u>Under discussion</u>
----	---	--	--	-------------------------

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023      Updated: <u>MarchJune 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		what should determine the consequence rating and the approach taken could have led to an underestimation of risk.	<p><u>Airport to support the uptake of electric vehicles anticipated in the Government's Transport Decarbonisation Plan. Charging facilities in the surrounding area may be overwhelmed if there is insufficient charging available at the airport</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant is also committed to investing £1m to Metrobus in hydrogen buses for the local network which we support.</u></p>	
22	Mitigation measures are needed to reduce the impact of Urban Heat Island (UHI) effect.	<p><i>Document 15.5.2</i></p> <p>The UHI Assessment states that 'mitigation of UHI is essential to ensure future resilience as the climate changes' and that that project could 'exacerbate the increase in UHI effect' but does</p>	<p>GAL should identify further adaptation measures that can be implemented in design, construction or operation to further reduce the UHI effect.</p> <p><u>Concerns on this issue have been addressed</u></p>	Addressed

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<del>not propose any specific mitigation measures, e.g. additional vegetation or water bodies could be proposed at this stage to minimise impacts.</del>		
<b>Socio economics</b>				
23	Concern over lack of consideration of economic impacts on East Sussex	It is unclear what the economic impacts of the NRP on East Sussex would be	<p>There is a need for the applicant to fully set out the economic impacts of the Northern Runway proposal.</p> <p>There is a need to further understand the employment and skills offer arising from the NRP. We would expect a substantial number of jobs and apprenticeships ring-fenced for the East Sussex workforce; and that the airport work with local training providers and colleges in East Sussex to ensure that training, pathways and careers opportunities are offered.</p>	Uncertain

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
			<p><u>-In the ESBS [APP-198] and Implementation plan [REP3-069-1], ESCC would like to see:</u></p> <p><u>- East Sussex College included in planned 'Consortium-based Delivery' (5.3.8) in order that any benefits reach local East Sussex residents. Note concern that there is a bias from the ESBS Adviser (2.2.7) due to roles at Chichester and Surrey colleges. The consortium would be better made up of those members of FE Sussex in order to overcome this bias.</u></p>	
24	Concern over lack of consideration of economic	Need for reassurances that the subcontractors are delivering social value and working to the appropriate benchmark	GAL should seek to ensure that subcontractors deliver social value in employment and skills (i.e. subcontractors also to offer	Likely Agreed

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <del>March</del> June 2024	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	impacts on East Sussex	and procurement frameworks	recruitment offers, apprenticeships and upskilling of staff)  Sub-contractors should work to the CITB national skills academy for construction framework benchmarks, and the same in relation to non-construction procurement	
25	Concern over lack of consideration of economic impacts on East Sussex	The Employment Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) should include specific mention of links to Careers Hubs working with schools across Surrey, West Sussex and East Sussex.	<del>Include information in the ESBS to cover this</del>  The current version of the ESBS [APP-198] does not include specific mention of 'links to Careers Hubs working with schools across Surrey, West Sussex and East Sussex' - still only refers to Coast to Capital LEP Careers Hub, which no longer exists and has now been subsumed by WSCC.	Likely
26	Concern over lack of consideration of	In non-construction, the option should include upskilling existing	<del>Include upskilling existing workforce in the ESBS</del>	Uncertain

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>MarchJune 2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	economic impacts on East Sussex	workforce which includes residents of East Sussex	<u>In the ESBS [APP-198] &amp; Implementation plan [REP3-069], ESCC would like to see:</u> - <u>East Sussex College included in planned 'Consortium-based Delivery' (5.3.8) in order that any benefits reach local East Sussex residents. Note concern that there is a bias from the ESBS Adviser (2.2.7) due to roles at Chichester and Surrey colleges. The consortium would be better made up of those members of FE Sussex in order to overcome this bias.</u>	
27	Concern over lack of consideration of economic	There is a need to ensure that SMEs and subcontractors include social value measures in their provision that echo those of GAL's ESBS and	Social value element in SME/Sub-contractor contracts mirror provision in GAL's ESBS	<u>Likely</u> <u>Agreed</u>

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: <u>March</u> <u>June</u> <u>2024</u>	
Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	impacts on East Sussex	that work is undertaken with LA Careers Hubs to engage with schools around the careers agenda.		
28	Concern over lack of consideration of economic impacts on East Sussex	GAL should develop an Inward Investment Service and Strategy, and that the development and delivery of initiatives led by the Sussex Chamber of Commerce and other partners should develop (not just promote) international trade opportunities with destinations aligned to LGW's route network	Development of Inward Investment Service and Strategy by GAL  <u>-There still remains insufficient detail. The response at Row 2.19.3.2. is unclear and does not specifically refer to inward investment. Therefore, we do not feel that this point is satisfactorily answered.</u>	Uncertain

## NOISE AND VIBRATION

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
<b>Noise and vibration</b>				
29	Lack of detail on noise impacts for East Sussex	Concerned that the impacts of noise on East Sussex communities has not been adequately addressed and assessed, and that appropriate mitigations will not be in place	<p>Expect GAL to provide greater clarity on how many more flights would be passing over East Sussex, which locations would be the most affected and how this would be mitigated.</p> <p>This includes paying particular attention to sensitive and protected areas, such as Ashdown Forest.</p> <p><u>2032 is not the worst-case year in terms of overflights. Overflight figures should be provided for all assessment scenarios. Northern runway departures should be included in overflights so impacts can be understood in areas close to the airport. The Deadline 1 position identifies that figures are still too coarse to draw any meaningful information from so this has not been addressed. Overflight figures should show aircraft below 4,000 feet as noise contours are most</u></p>	Likely



			<u>affected by aircraft movements below 4,000 feet.</u>	
30	Clarification on estimated overflight mapping	There is a need for assurances on the accuracy and reliability of the estimated overflight mapping, and we will require East Sussex to be included as part of this.	<p>GAL to respond on this point. If East Sussex has not been included we would wish the overflight mapping to be revisited to include the county, and the results updated and shared as appropriate for consideration.</p> <p><u>2032 is not the worst-case year in terms of overflights. Overflight figures should be provided for all assessment scenarios. Northern runway departures should be included in overflights so impacts can be understood in areas close to the airport. The Deadline 1 position identifies that figures are still too coarse to draw any meaningful information from so this has not been addressed. Overflight figures should show aircraft below 4,000 feet as noise contours are most affected by aircraft movements below 4,000 feet.</u></p>	Uncertain
31	Capping of night flights to protect local communities	Concern that the use of the northern runway will increase the negative impacts of aircraft noise on local communities at	Night flights will need to be restricted / capped, and the Northern Runway should not operate, between the hours of 23:00 and 06:00. We need assurances	<p>Uncertain</p> <p><u>Agreed</u></p>

		night – impacting detrimentally on physical and mental health and wellbeing.	that there are not dispensations that GAL can routinely operate within this restricted night-time period, notwithstanding use of aircraft at night for emergencies.	
<b>Legislation, policy and guidance</b>				
32	Interpretation of the Overarching Aviation Noise Policy	Paragraph 14.2.44 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration – sharing the benefits has been removed from the ES. This is a fundamental part of the Noise Envelope so it should be demonstrated how benefits of new aircraft technology are shared between the airport and local communities.	<p>It should be demonstrated as part of the Noise Envelope how the noise benefits of future aircraft technology are shared between the airport and local communities. This is a policy requirement set out in the Aviation Policy Framework.</p> <p><u>The Applicant’s method for sharing the benefits is flawed as it allows for a substantial increase in noise contour area in the 2032 daytime period over the 2019 baseline. It is hard to understand how it can be justified that any benefits have been shared with the local community in this case.</u></p> <p><u>ESCC’s position maintains that there should be no allowance for any increase in noise contour limits to provide certainty to communities about noise they would experience</u></p>	Uncertain

			<u>in the future should the project be consented.</u>	
<b>Assessment of significant effects – Air Noise</b>				
33	No assessment criteria is provided for the assessment of effects on non-residential receptors	Assessment criteria based around the LOAEL and SOAEL focuses on noise effects at residential receptors. Non-residential receptors should be considered on a case-by-case basis with assessment criteria defined depending on the non-residential use.	Provide an assessment of likely significant air noise effects on non-residential receptors.  <u>It is noted that the Applicant has provided detailed non-residential screening criteria in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101]. The criteria are not agreed as it contains an error and criteria for schools is based on measured noise data at a school near London Luton Airport and is applicable at that location only.</u>	Likely
34	The assessment switches between discussing properties and population depending on whether noise is between LOAEL and SOAEL (population) or	The assessment should cover both properties and population and be consistent when identifying significant effects to aid their understanding.	Provide an assessment of likely significant air noise effects covering both properties and population.  <u>The Applicant has not addressed this request for additional information.</u>	Likely

	above SOAEL (properties)			
35	Identification of population exposed to noise above SOAEL and between LOAEL and SOAEL	It is not clear what population is exposed to changes in noise above SOAEL and between LOAEL and SOAEL in Table 14.9.10 and 14.9.11	It would be helpful to provide tables identifying the population exposed to changes in air noise at absolute noise levels between LOAEL and SOAEL and for population experiencing absolute air noise levels exceeding SOAEL	Likely
36	Properties that are newly exposed to noise levels exceeding the SOAEL are not identified	It is important to identify how many properties are newly exposed to noise levels exceeding the SOAEL to determine compliance with the first aim of the ANPS	Identify how many and the location of properties newly exposed to noise levels exceeding the SOAEL  <u>The Applicant should revisit Table 14.9.10 and Table 14.9.11 as they do not show population exposed to changes in noise between LOAEL and SOAEL and above SOAEL</u>	Likely
37	Paragraph 14.9.98 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration states that there would be reduced movements on the main runway resulting in Minor Beneficial effects	It is not clear if these Minor Beneficial effects would continue through the project lifespan when more capacity is taken up and the main runway may return to current intensity of operations	Identify significant effects during all assessment years to help understand how communities would be affected by noise throughout the project lifespan.  <u>The requested information should be clearly provided by providing a detailed assessment of all assessment years so noise effects can be understood throughout the lifespan of the project.</u>	Likely

38	Only 2032 assessment year is assessed as a worst-case	The assessment of air noise only covers 2032 as it is identified as the worst-case.	<p>Identify significant effects during all assessment years to help understand how communities would be affected by noise throughout the project lifespan.</p> <p><u>-From the Applicant's position – confirming that the assessment years listed should be covered - it appears this matter has been resolved, and therefore this matter can be agreed.</u></p>	Likely
39	No attempt has been made to expand on the assessment of likely significant effects through the use of secondary noise metrics.	Context is provided to the assessment of ground noise through consideration of the secondary L <sub>Amax</sub> , overflight, L <sub>den</sub> and L <sub>night</sub> noise metric; however, no conclusions on how this metric relates to likely significant effects have been made so the use of secondary metrics in terms of the overall assessment of likely significant effects is unclear.	<p>Provide some commentary about how secondary metrics relate to likely significant effects and whether the assessment of secondary metrics warrant identifying a likely significant effect.</p> <p><u>The Applicant does not demonstrate a consistent approach to assessing likely significant effects. ESCC's position remains that secondary metrics should be used to identify likely significant effects. ESCC would also request that the Applicant sets out their methodology for identifying likely significant effects due to L<sub>max</sub> events above 65dB in the day and 60dB at night.</u></p>	Uncertain

**Document name: Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling**

40	Assurances that areas of East Sussex below 7,000 feet have been included in the air noise modelling work	Air noise relates to noise from aircraft in the air, or departing or arriving on a runway, generally assessed to a height up to 7,000 feet above ground level.	It is understood that some aircraft (GAL related air traffic) do pass over parts of East Sussex below 7,000 feet. Therefore we require such areas to be included as part of the air noise modelling work. For example, Crowborough which has areas which are 794 feet above sea level. Also, Ashdown Forest which is a noise sensitive area.	Likely  Agreed
41	No details on the 92-day summer average aircraft fleet for each scenario are provided	It is difficult to understand what has been modelled and how fleet transition would occur without provision of aircraft fleets	Provide aircraft fleets for each modelled scenario  <u>Agreed - now that aircraft fleets have been provided.</u>	Likely  Agreed
42	No details of the noise modelling or validation process are provided	It is difficult to have any confidence in the noise model without any provision of the assumptions and limitation that have been applied in the validation of the noise model and production of noise contours	Details of the validation process, noise modelling process along with any assumptions and limitations applied should be provided  <u>ECRD Report 2002 does not contain the information requested. The information is important to understand the aircraft noise contours has not been provided by the Applicant. The information was initially requested after the ESCC</u>	Uncertain

			<u>review of the PEIR and the Applicant has not fulfilled the request.</u>	
43	No details of measured Single Event Level or LASmax noise data from the Noise-Track-Keeping are provided	Measured Single Event Level and LASmax noise data should be provided for individual aircraft variants as it is key information used when defining the aircraft noise baseline.	Provide Single Event Level and LASmax noise data for individual aircraft variants <u>The requested information should formally be submitted and should include Lmax and SEL data for all aircraft that were validated. There is no dispute on the use of ANCON to model air noise, but it is important that sufficient information is provided such that it can be understood how aircraft fleets are transposed into noise contours. This information has been requested since the PEIR and the Applicant has not yet provided what is important and relevant information that underpins the air noise assessment.</u>	Uncertain
<b>Document name: Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope</b>				
44	Slow fleet transition noise contour area limits	There is no incentive to push the transition of the fleet to quieter aircraft technology. This means that the Noise Envelope allows for an increase in noise contour area on	Noise contour area limits should be based on the Central Case <u>The Applicant's method for sharing the benefits is flawed as it allows for a substantial increase in noise contour area in the 2032 daytime</u>	Unlikely

		opening of the Northern Runway	<p>period over the 2019 baseline. It is hard to understand how it can be justified that any benefits have been shared with the local community in this case.</p> <p>ESCC's position maintains that there should be no allowance for any increase in noise contour limits to provide certainty to communities about noise they would experience in the future should the project be consented.</p>	
45	Annual noise contour limits	Noise contour area limits relate only to the 92-day summer period. There should be additional noise contour area limits in place to control growth during periods of the year outside the 92-day summer period.	<p>Annual noise contours should be included in the Noise Envelope</p> <p>Current DfT night-time controls apply to Gatwick for the summer and winter seasonal periods. The DCO should include a commitment that these controls are retained and maintained regardless of any future changes that may occur as a result of consultation relating DfT night flight restrictions. Night-time QC and movement limits for both summer and winter periods should be reported. It is noted that the Applicant exceeded their summer period night-time movement limit in 2023 so this information is relevant</p>	Uncertain



			<u>and important to the Noise Envelope.</u>	
46	Flexibility of noise contour area limits to account for airspace redesign and future aircraft technology	GAL wants flexibility to increase noise contour area limits depending on airspace redesign and noise emissions from new aircraft technology. If expansion is consented, any uncertainties from airspace redesign or new aircraft technology should be covered within the constraints of the Noise Envelope	<p>There should be no allowance for the Noise Envelope limits to increase</p> <p><u>The Applicant's method for sharing the benefits is flawed as it allows for a substantial increase in noise contour area in the 2032 daytime period over the 2019 baseline. It is hard to understand how it can be justified that any benefits have been shared with the local community in this case.</u></p> <p><u>ESCC's position maintains that there should be no allowance for any increase in noise contour limits to provide certainty to communities about noise they would experience in the future should the project be consented.</u></p>	Uncertain
47	CAA to regulate the Noise Envelope	To date, the CAA have not accepted a role regulating the Noise Envelope. There is no mechanism for local authorities to review Noise Envelope reporting, take action against breaches or review any	<p>A mechanism should be included to allow the local authorities to scrutinise noise envelope reporting and take action in the case of any breaches</p> <p><u>ESCC maintain their position that the Host Authorities should be part</u></p>	Uncertain

		aspects of the Noise Envelope	<u>of an independent group set up to regulate the Noise Envelope.</u>	
48	Adoption of an action plan	A breach would be identified for the preceding year, with an action plan in place for the following year. Consequently, it would be two years after a breach before a plan to reduce the contour area would be in place	More forward-planning needs to be adopted to ensure that action plans are in place before a breach of the noise contour area limit occurs.  <u>The Applicant has not provided any information to support the use of forecasts to prevent contour limit breaches. ESCC maintain that forecasts are not reliable enough to prevent noise contour area limit breaches. An alternative forward-looking method should be adopted that can be applied during scheduling that can provide more confidence that breaches would not occur.</u>	Uncertain
49	Capacity declaration restrictions as a means of managing aircraft noise	This would not prevent new slots being allocated within the existing capacity and is not an effective means of preventing future noise contour limit breaches if a breach occurred in the previous year	Slot restriction measures should be adopted in the event of a breach being identified for the previous year of operation  <u>ESCC maintain their position on this matter.</u>	Uncertain
<b>Document name: Appendix 14.9.8 Noise Envelope Group Output Report</b>				

50	Airbus NEOs (New Engine Option) are stated to be up to 5 dB quieter departure and 3 dB quieter on approach.	This statement is misleading as these levels of noise reductions are not achieved by Airbus A320Neo or A321Neo, which are the main Airbus variants that will be operational at GAL in the future.	Provide a more realistic reduction in noise that is provided the NEO aircraft.  <u>It is requested that the Applicant provide measure SEL and LAm<sub>ax</sub> noise data for each aircraft variant modelled at each monitoring location. This information underpins the air noise assessment and is important for understanding to aircraft fleets are transposed into air noise contours.</u>	Likely
----	---	---	---	--------