



# **GATWICK AIRPORT NORTHERN RUNWAY PROJECT – DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER (DCO)**

## **CRAWLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL - IP Ref: GATW-AFP107 PRINCIPAL AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT SUMMARY STATEMENT**

**6 June 2024**

**Clean Version**

## Contents

	Page
Introduction	
1. Aviation Capacity, Need and Forecasting	4
2. Project Description, Existing Site and Operation	7
3. Design and Access Statement	8
4. Landscape, Townscape and Visual Impact	11
5. Historic Environment	13
6. Agricultural Land use and Recreation	16
7. Ecology / Nature Conservation and Arboriculture	17
8. Water Environment	21
9. Traffic and Transportation	24
10. Air Quality	34
11. Noise and Vibration	43
12. Carbon and Greenhouse Gases	48
13. Climate Change	56
14. Local Economic and Socio-Economic Impacts	58
15. Health and Wellbeing	69
16. Cumulative Assessment and Impacts	70
17. Draft DCO / other Miscellaneous Concerns	73

## Introduction

This Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) document has been prepared by Crawley Borough Council (CBC), with input from the joint authorities and appointed consultants where required. CBC is a host authority for the Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project, which was accepted by PINS for Examination on 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2023. This document updates the PADSS submitted on 26 March 2024 [REP2-040]. It identifies the remaining and some new principal areas of disagreement that have been identified as further work has been undertaken in preparation of the Local Impact Report. The PADSS now includes commentary on Project Changes 1 – 3 reflecting the comments provided via a Written Representation submitted at Deadline 3..

The Council hopes further engagement with GAL through the course of the Examination, including on Statements of Common Ground, will enable these Areas of Disagreement to be reduced when the PADSS is finalised at Deadline 9. Unless a fuller explanation is provided, the following terms have been used in the column headed 'Likelihood of concern being addressed during the Examination':

- **High** – where agreement should be possible, or a relatively simple change is required.
- **Uncertain** – where an issue is being, or will be, discussed and the WSCC intends to provide an update on the position in due course.
- **Low** – where agreement on an issue is unlikely or it is difficult to identify a solution.

## AVIATION CAPACITY, NEED AND FORECASTING

Please note: Work is ongoing between York Aviation and the Applicant regarding a joint local authority SoCG on operations/capacity and needs/forecasting. .

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
ACNF1.	The capacity deliverable with the NRP Proposed Development	The Applicant has produced updated simulation modelling of the future capacity of the runway with the NRP <b>[REP1-054]</b> , 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 NRP is capable of delivering the capacity uplift assumed over the longer term <b>[REP4-052]</b>	Further information regarding the validation of the updated simulation modelling is required	Uncertain –
ACNF 2.	The forecasts for the use of the NRP are not based on a proper assessment of the market for Gatwick, 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 considered too optimistic.	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.  Alternative top-down forecasts have now been presented by GAL <b>[REP1-052]</b> that show slower growth in the early years	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.	Uncertain .

		following the opening of the NRP. These are considered more reasonable than 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.		
ACNF 3	Baseline Case has been overstated leading to understatement of the impacts.	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 <b>REP4-049</b> .	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.	Uncertain
ACNF 4.	Overstatement of the wider, catalytic, and national level economic benefits of the NRP.	The methodology used to assess the catalytic employment and GVA benefits of the development is not robust, leading to an overstatement of the likely benefits in the local area. 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 from other airports, as well as other methodological concerns.	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 airport growth are robustly identified. The national economic impact assessment should robustly test the net impact of expansion at Gatwick having regard to the potential for growth elsewhere and properly account for Heathrow specific factors, such as hub traffic and air fares.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> Although the Applicant provided some further explanation in REP3-78 (pages 100-105), the council remains concerned that the methodology is not robust for the reasons set out at paragraphs 57-60 of REP4-052. It is understood that the Applicant contends that its assessment of the total	Uncertain – subject to remodelling of impacts by GAL.

			<p>employment impact of the growth of the Airport is calculated on a net basis, such that any local displacement is accounted for. As a consequence, it is claimed by the Applicant that, to the extent that the direct, indirect and induced impacts may be estimated on a gross employment gain basis, this effect is neutral in terms of the estimate of total direct, indirect, induced and catalytic employment given that the catalytic employment is estimated as the difference between the total net employment gain and the calculated direct, indirect and induced employment. Given the concerns expressed regarding the catalytic impact methodology, the council do not accept that displacement has adequately been accounted for in the employment estimates, not least as no account is taken of the extent to which growth at Gatwick would be displaced from other airports. When coupled with the concerns regarding the catalytic impact methodology as a whole, little confidence can be placed on the reliability of the estimates of net local employment gain.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION, EXISTING SITE AND OPERATION

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 the Examination
PD1. Existing Site and Operation (CH4 – ES) and Project Description (CH5 – ES)	Clarification of airfield boundaries and what the various plans show.	Lack of clarity about current airport boundary / operational airport boundary and extent of land needed for and controlled by the DCO. The boundaries need to be understood on drawings and in context of drafting of DCO to be clear on airport limits, any permitted development provisions and to ensure drafting of the DCO and requirements are effective and enforceable. These matters were raised at ISH2 and in the West Sussex LIR Section 4. the additional information provided by GAL in response to the ISH2 ExA questions does not satisfactorily address this point.	<p>Revised plans to address these points showing for both existing boundaries and that proposed under the DCO.</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5):</b> - The Council remains unclear as to extent of the operational land boundaries and would welcome a clear explanation of these. CBC notes the Applicant has provided a further paper on 'Excepted Development' at Deadline 4 [REP4-030] which supplements the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 submissions [REP3-106]. CBC will provide its response at Deadline 5.</p>	Uncertain

## DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

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 the Examination
DAS1.	Lack of design quality controls and targets	Document has been prepared without any design ambition or commitment to measurable standards.	<p>There needs to be clear commitments to meet required policies and design standards, ensuring minimum compliance with the adopted Local Plan. This has been explained in more detail in Section 24 of the West Sussex LIR (24.79 - 24.85).</p> <p><b>Deadline 5 update</b> – While there has been some limited revisions made to the Design and Access statement this substantive document is still 'illustrative' and the Appendix 1 – Design Principles (latest version [REP3-056] which is the intended control document is still considered inadequate. Detailed commentary on the design concerns has been provided in the Joint Authority response to ExQ1 GEN 1.21 , GEN 1.22, DCO 1.39, DCO 1.56 and DCO 1.57 [REP3-135]. [REP4-064], [REP4-062] and Section 5 [REP-042]</p>	<p>Uncertain</p> <p>Deadline 5 update – A meeting was held with the Applicants on 30<sup>th</sup> May to discuss the idea of a 'Design Panel' but CBC consider this needs to be part of comprehensive design solution with an improved design control document and additional details provided for consideration and agreement prior to decision on the DCO</p>
DAS 2.	Indicative status of majority of DAS and lack of 'design fix'.	Appendix A1 is an inadequate Control document of insufficient detail. .	<p>Applicant needs to work up more elements of the project in detail to enable more certainty on design of development. The design control document needs to contain much greater detail. (see comments in line 1 above).</p> <p><b>Deadline 5 update</b> – see comments in line 1 of this table above.</p>	Uncertain
DAS 3.	Lack of detail in document including lack of site context analysis, site	Some aspects of development excluded from D and A document, also a general lack	More detailed design work required to ensure design quality, protection of visual amenities and more information to form any	Uncertain



	constraints and opportunities (also lacking from ES Project Description)	of contextual analysis including site opportunities and constraints. Insufficient information on design and visual impacts. This is of particular concern in environmentally sensitive locations.	'control' document. More certainty and detail needs to be agreed now to safeguard sensitive works sites and sensitive environmental assets. (see comments in line 1 above).  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – see comments in line 1 of this table above.	
DAS 4.	Inconsistencies in documents within DAS and in relation to other supporting documents.	Conflicting descriptions and cross- referencing lead to uncertainty over what is proposed and which details should take precedent.	Updates and corrections needed for consistency and certainty. Examples have been provided in Section 24 of the West Sussex LIR.  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – With the lack of track changes on the main DAS , the iterative nature of the DCO process and the project changes introduced these inconsistencies are difficult to keep track of. These are being identified by the Authorities and amended by the Applicant as part of the ongoing process. It is suggested this matter is kept in the list for now until documents reach a more finalised form.	High
DAS 5. Section 7 and dDCO	Lack of defined parameters for some development and lack of on parameter plans and within Schedule 12 Control documents.	All development should have defined parameters for all elements including soil deposition and temporary storage areas	Without agreed parameters for all the development it is questionable how design details can be controlled. The applicants have not explained this. This is a complex project with some build elements being EIA scale development in their own right. Ensuring sufficient control over the numerous design elements of such a substantial project is considered essential. This has been explained in more detail in sections 8, 11 and 24 of the West Sussex LIR in respect of Pentagon Field and larger built elements of the project in general.  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – this point is not adequately addressed by the Applicant . The absence of such detail has been again raised in response to ExQ1 DCO 1.39 and DCO 1.56 [REP3-135]	Uncertain

<p>DAS 6. Section 9</p>	<p>Lack of detail on construction phasing</p>	<p>Need for further understanding on sequencing and co-dependencies between the project elements to ensure appropriate phasing and control of the development and ensure mitigations in place.</p>	<p>Further detail needed to that a comprehensive phasing plan can be agreed and to ensure all impacts from that phasing and implementation are understood and can be mitigated. Updated position (Deadline 5): CBC seeks further information identifying the co-dependencies between project elements to fully understand the comprehensive phasing programme. This is also important to understand the resource implications on the council in discharging many of the detailed plans.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>
<p>DAS 7. Control Document OLEMP</p>	<p>Safeguarding of existing landscaping and protection of visual amenities</p>	<p>Lack of detail on landscape protection measures and zonal approach proposed in document is too vague giving inadequate control to safeguard impacts. This is further explained in Section 8 (8.43, 8.55-8.57 and 8.67) and Section 24 of the West Sussex LIR</p>	<p>Significant detail needs to be added to these documents now to identify all important trees, hedges and landscape assets that could be impacted by the development. Mitigation principles need to be agreed now.  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – The level of detail provided to date is still considered to be inadequate as while there has been work done by the Applicant on tree survey work and tree protection the design principles document is still lacking in detail and the works and parameter plans provided and intended as control documents do not give sufficient certainty. The Council has responded numerous times on this point across various references in respect of responses on general design, historic environment and landscape and visual impacts for example see section 5 [REP4-042] and in detailed design comments to GEN 1.21 and DCO 1.56 [REP3-135]</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

## LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VISUAL IMPACT

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 the Examination
LTVI1.	Absence of tree mitigation strategy or any acknowledgement of CBC requirements under policy CH6 in the adopted Crawley Borough Local Plan	There is no recognition of the landscape impact from the loss of trees within the DCO area and no robust measures to mitigate tree removal. Applicant needs to address this key policy and respond in this document and control documents to provide adequate mitigation. Applicant's development should comply with the requirements of policy CH6. (see West Sussex LIR including references at 8.1C, 8.67 and Section 9).	Applicant needs to address this key policy provide adequate mitigation to comply with the requirements of policy CH6.  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – CBC welcome the Applicant's acknowledgement of this policy however the level of detail provided to date means that it is not yet clear if a policy compliant tree mitigation strategy is being proposed. Recent commentary on this point and tree related matters is set out within section 3.1, section 7.1 and 7.2 [REP4-042]	Uncertain
LTVI 2.	Lack of controls over visual impacts for some key project sites which are in sensitive locations including those near rights of way or close to the site boundary.	Concerns held that there is no control in relation to the townscape /landscape impact (both overall scale, landscape loss and lack of understanding of context) to ensure that future development does not harm the character of the area. These are identified in Section 8 and Section 11 of the West Sussex LIR.	Additional information to be provided and associated mitigation to be reviewed and amended.  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – no additional information provided which addresses this point	Uncertain
LTVI 3.	Draft Development Consent Order, Requirements and Schedule 11 documents	Concern remains in relation to the controls to ensure the visual impacts of the	Applicant to provide further information in relation to proposed landscape and visual impacts and further discussion and agreement needed on DCO wording.	Uncertain

		development are appropriately mitigated.	Further information has now been set out in the West Sussex LIR for the GAL's consideration.  <b>Updated position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC maintains that controls are still inadequate to control visual impacts, due to the limited level of detail in the Project documents see recent references in response to GEN 1.21 and DCO 1.56 [REP3-135].	
LTVI 4.	Planning Statement Para 8.17.11	It is not clear how the mitigation referred to in para 8.17.11 (Artificial Light, Smoke and Steam) will be secured.	Applicant to provide further information  Updated position (Deadline 5) : This matter is still not resolved due to the inadequacies of Appendix 1 of the Design and Access Statement. Based on the response in the SoCG (2.14.4.5)it is not clear how the operational lighting framework ties into the mitigation DCO 1.3 [REP4-062]	Uncertain.

## HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

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 the Examination
HE1. Code of Construction Practice ( <a href="#">CoCP: Document 5.3.2</a> )	Management of Historic Environment effects.	Section 5.2 (Historic Environment) of the Code of Construction Practice does not reflect the work proposed. The objective should be to protect or mitigate the setting of built heritage and the recording of affected archaeological deposits.  Section 6.1 (Roles and Responsibilities) does not detail a Heritage Clerk of Works.	Further information is needed which should be related to the methodology proposed within the submitted Written Scheme of Investigation (Document 5.3, Appendix 7.8.2).  A Heritage Clerk of Works should be appointed to manage the heritage and archaeological facets of the project.	High. - Updated position (Deadline 1): CBC are happy to discuss at the TWG both the wording of the CoCP and the need for a Clerk of Works. The extent of the proposed archaeological programme is at present not agreed but the document proposed under 7.2 will assist these discussions.  <b>Deadline 5 update:</b> No documents submitted to examination to date to address these concerns
HE 2. Environmental Statement ( <a href="#">Chapter 7: Historic Environment</a> )	Lack of historic background to the airport.	No clear understanding or description of the history of the airport development.	Provide an appropriate history of the development of the airport from the first half of the 20 <sup>th</sup> century and relate this to the potential archaeological impact of the scheme and where areas may be disturbed.  <b>Deadline 5 update:</b> The Applicants have shared a draft report with CBC which is to be submitted into the Examination	High - GAL have indicated in SoCG (V1 – March 24) that it will prepare such a report and will discuss this with CBC via Topic Working Groups. <b>Deadline 5 update:</b> A draft report has been shared and addresses the planning history of the airport.
HE 3. Environmental Statement ( <a href="#">Chapter 7: Historic Environment</a> )	Lack of archaeological evaluation within the airport perimeter.	The scheme of archaeological investigation undertaken prior to the submission of the DCO application has been focused on areas within the proposed development that were easily accessible and has not covered all potential areas of impact.	Appropriate commitment (with description and methodology) given within the Written Scheme of Investigation (Document 5.3, Appendix 7.8.2) to undertake investigations in all areas under threat from the proposed development, which have not been shown to have been disturbed/destroyed by previous development.	Uncertain – no progress to date on this issue  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – discussions are ongoing – details to be included in revised WSI.
HE 4.	Proposed mitigation on areas already evaluated.	There is concern that the proposed mitigation identified	Improved and expanded mitigation strategy within the WSI.	High

Document 5.3, Appendix 7.8.2		within the WSI on areas that have been evaluated is not sufficient and will need to be expanded. A list of concerns regarding the proposed mitigation method and extent has been provided within the LIR and we would suggest that these can be discussed and hopefully agreed at the next TWG.(Section 7).		<b>Deadline 5 update</b> – discussions are ongoing – details to be included in revised WSI.
HE 5. Document 5.3, Appendix 7.8.2	Proposed building recording of control tower.	Proposed level 2 recording not appropriate for this type of rare structure.	Needs to be increased to a level 3 record and should be identified as a heritage asset.	High – Level 3 recording has been agreed by GAL but this now needs to be reflected in a revised version of the WSI for West Sussex.  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – The applicants again confirmed verbal agreement to level 3 recording at the meeting held on 31 <sup>st</sup> May 2024, this needs to be incorporated into the WSI.
HE 6. Document 5.3, Appendix 7.8.2 and Code of Construction Practice (CoCP: Document 5.3.2)	No proposals for heritage community outreach which would normally be expected from a development of this nature.	No potential heritage community engagement identified in section 4.12.	Identify an outreach programme to inform the local area and heritage community of the results of the archaeological work.  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – This aspect would be included within the West Sussex WSI	GAL have indicated in SoCG (V1 – March 24) that they are happy to discuss adding a section regarding community engagement into the WSI for West Sussex. CBC are willing to engage and discuss further. Uncertain <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – This matter was discussed with the Applicant on 31 <sup>st</sup> May who agreed to explore this further.
HE 7. Document 5.3, Appendix 7.8.2	There needs to be clarity within the documentation on the role of the local authority archaeologist in signing off the archaeological mitigation.	The submitted documentation fails to define a procedure for the monitoring and signing off of the archaeological and building recording mitigation works.	Clear sign off procedure needed, detailed within Written Scheme of Investigation.	GAL have indicated in SoCG (1 – March 24) that happy to discuss adding this to WSI (matter to be progressed via TWG and SoCG discussions – High  <b>Deadline 5 update:</b> No documents submitted to

				examination to date to address these concerns
HE 8.	Impact on setting of nearby listed heritage assets	There is no evidence in this submission that the setting is not harmed though visual impact or light impacts.	<p>Evidence to be provided and further information needed to understand how the proposed control documents such as the Design and Access Statement and Lighting strategy address these impacts / provide adequate safeguards for these assets. This point has been explained in more detail in Section 7 of the West Sussex LIR.</p> <p>Deadline 5 Update: This point is still unresolved see response to HE.1.1 and HE.1.3 [REP4-065]</p>	Uncertain

## AGRICULTURAL LAND USE AND RECREATION

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
ALUR1	Quality of and impacts upon existing recreational routes affected by the DCO works during and post construction	Lack of detail on the impacts on existing recreational routes as result of the works and the measures proposed to protect users (e.g., lorry routing, dust, damage to surfacing). Lack of detail or acknowledgement of potential opportunities to enhance and improve these routes for benefit of local community and for promotion of active travel. Further detail is set out in Section 11 of the West Sussex LIR (11.22-11.25,11.28, 11.30)	<p>Further detail needed on impacts and mitigations during construction and information on reinstatement and potential enhancements. Detail required to ensure rights of way remain open and safe to use. (See Table 11.1a , 11.1B and 11.1D for suggested mitigation</p> <p>Deadline 5 update - The Applicant has not considered the requests in the West Sussex LIR [REP1-068]. The Council’s position is set out most recently in paragraph 2.80 of the West Sussex Authorities comments to submissions made at Deadline 3 [REP4-042</p>	Low
ALUR 2.	Appropriateness and adequacy of the proposed open space and recreation provision	Car Park B - Whether location is appropriate and lack of detail on the quality amenity benefit, function purpose, use and management. Museum Field – quality of provision/ usability of space and connectivity with surroundings. Further detail is set out in Section 11 of the West Sussex LIR (Car Park B 11.29 and Museum Field 11.26)	<p>Further detail needed on routes and linkages, landscaping, signposting, amenity benefit, function, timing and delivery purpose and management of these spaces. See Table 11.1C for suggested mitigation and 11.31 in relation to Museum Field.</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC consider there is sufficient information provided to understand the proposed delivery and maintenance of the southern part of Car Park B (which is the portion within the Borough Boundary) as open space. Subject to delivery and long term maintenance of the land being secured with appropriately worded provisions in the dDCO and OLEMP the wording of which is still under discussion, this point could be resolved.</p> <p>Museum Field – Concerns remain [see REP4-066], [REP3-135 – page 45] and [REP1-068] - chapter 11 (as referenced above).</p>	High – Car Park B  Uncertain – Museum Field



## ECOLOGY / NATURE CONSERVATION AND ARBORICULTURE

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
ENA1	The extent of loss of mature broadleaved woodland (net loss over 5 ha)	Although some woodland will be re-planted along the new highway alignment it will be years before bat foraging and roosting habitat, and habitat connectivity are fully reinstated. The assessment concludes there is a significant effect on bat behaviour until new woodland planting had established. Current mitigation and compensation measures are insufficient to maintain bat foraging habitat and commuting routes over the short and medium term.	<p>The Applicant should seek additional compensation measures, if necessary off-site, to ensure no adverse impacts on broadleaved woodland habitat and bats.</p> <p>The joint West Sussex LIR (REP1-068 and REP1 – 069) makes recommendations, including advance highway tree planting. It also requests greater clarity on woodland loss and compensatory planting in the Sketch Landscape Concept Plans within the OLEMP, and further explanation of the woodland BNG calculations</p>	Uncertain
ENA2	Lack of approaching assessing and addressing ecological impacts at a landscape scale	Ecological impacts will extend beyond the DCO limits with potential impacts on bat populations, riparian habitats downstream of the Airport and the spread of non-native aquatic species. Disturbance and habitat severance within the Airport will impact the functioning of wildlife corridors, notably bat commuting routes, both within the Site and the wider landscape. Maintenance of habitat connectivity across the airport and wider landscape remains a concern.	The Applicant should adopt a landscape scale approach to assessing and addressing ecological impacts, including the need to provide off site mitigation, compensation and Biodiversity Net Gain. Enhancements are required to green corridors and improved habitat connectivity to extend beyond the confines of the airport, along key corridors such as the River Mole and Gatwick Stream.	Uncertain
ENA3	Lack of opportunities for biodiversity enhancement	Many potential opportunities for biodiversity enhancement, both within and outside the DCO limits, were never explored.	<p>Explore further opportunities for biodiversity enhancement e.g., conversion of 'amenity grassland' on road verges and roundabouts to wildflower grassland, and the improved management of Gatwick Stream and Crawter's Brook.</p> <p>This concern is repeated in the Joint West Sussex LIR. CBC hopes to have further discussions with</p>	Uncertain

			the Applicant, including regarding the landscape design for the internal road network.	
ENA4	Need for security of long-term positive management of the two biodiversity areas - the North West Zone and Land East of the Railway Line.	These areas are of considerable biodiversity value and key components of the ecological network. Any loss or degradation could have significant impacts on the effectiveness and viability of the proposed mitigation areas.	A legal commitment to provide certainty that these two biodiversity areas will continue to be managed for wildlife.  The Joint West Sussex LIR request greater clarity and commitment in the OLEMP regarding the long term positive management of these areas.	Likely
<b>Arboriculture</b>				
ENA5	Evidence for null findings of ancient or veteran trees, as well as important hedgerows.	No demonstration that these receptors have been appropriately surveyed, nor followed appropriate methodology.	Demonstrate the methodology used to survey and identify potential ancient and veteran trees as defined by the NPPF (2021) which could be impacted within or surrounding the project boundary, as well as providing the survey data findings (including for important hedgerows).	Likely
ENA6	Need for further demonstration that the Project proposals have been adequately designed with consideration of arboricultural features through avoidance, mitigation or compensation.	Potential loss or impacts to multiple arboricultural features which may be avoidable, mitigated or better compensated for..	Provide a full arboricultural assessment for all arboricultural features in line with BS5837:2012 (inclusive of an impact assessment, outline method statement and tree protection plans).  Within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (REP1-026): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide further detail of project proposals to demonstrate the need for the proposed tree removals, notably high quality and TPO trees (justify why mitigation measures would not be appropriate).</li> <li>• Provide design principles which may reduce tree loss during detailed design</li> <li>• Identify how Horleyland wood (and other ancient woodland) is impacted at a worst case design scenario (including direct and indirect impacts) and detail any measures proposed in mitigation or compensation (such as appropriate buffer zones specific to the site).</li> <li>• Identify how compensatory tree planting proposals considers Local Plan Policy CH6 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan</li> </ul>	High (if further discussion is initiated)

			2015 – 2030 of the Joint West Sussex LIR0	
ENA7	The Outline Arboricultural Method Statement does not demonstrate sufficient methodology for tree protection including ancient woodland buffer zones.	Potential for adverse impacts to arboricultural features, including irreplaceable habitat, due to a lack of tree protection.	<p>Within the Outline Arboricultural Method Statement (REP1-023; REP1-024 and REP1-025):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide protection measures to be adopted for ancient woodland buffer zones.</li> <li>• Provide affirmative wording throughout (avoiding such words as 'should').</li> <li>• Address conflicting working methodologies (such as 3.2.3 and 4.1.1 conflicting with 3.4.1)</li> <li>• Provide working methodologies for all types of works which may occur with root protection areas of retained trees (including landscape works)</li> <li>• Amend Section 4.4 to ensure monitoring is recorded and accounts for other tree protection measures such as ground protection.</li> <li>• Provide 'heads of terms' and general principles to be included within the detailed arboricultural methods statements which accounts for all working methodologies near trees, tree work operations and provision of physical tree protection.</li> <li>• Identify what will be shown within tree protection plans.</li> <li>• Identify when arboricultural advice or supervision will be required for working methodologies near trees.</li> </ul> <p>Where appropriate, amend the CoCP to reflect any changes as a result of the above.</p>	Likely
ENA8	The OLEMP does not provide sufficient detail to ensure that adequate planting and aftercare plans	Inadequate provision of aftercare for proposed tree planting.	The OLEMP needs to identify what will be included within the detailed planting and specification plans. It also needs to provide adequate aftercare for tree	High

	will be provided within proposed LEMPs.		planting (as detailed within paragraph 9.72 of the Joint West Sussex LIR).;	
ENA9	Inadequate consideration and demonstration for the protection of ancient woodland. Conflicting with the finding of 'no impact' occurring to these receptors.	Potential impact to ancient woodlands receptors where barriers are specified to form buffer zone protection. This is of principle concern for Horleyland Wood due to the adjacent proposed works area for the new foul water pipeline.	Where barriers are specified to form buffer zone protection, spacing/distance of buffer should follow recommendation withing statutory guidance provided by Natural England and Forestry Commission 2022. The specification and methodology for the proposed barriers and need to be demonstrated.	High
1. ENA10	Compensation strategies for tree, woodland and hedgerow loss does not demonstrate adequate compensation.	The net loss of woodland, the fragmentation of habitat connectivity, and the long-term effect from the time required to establish new planting.	The OLEMP lacks demonstration that compensatory tree planting proposals consider local plan policy CH6 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (as detailed within para 9.73 of the Joint West Sussex LIR).	Likely

## WATER ENVIRONMENT

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
WE1.	In respect of the overall drainage strategy CBC remain concerned that the concept designs did not provide sufficient. It would be helpful if GAL could share the Consultee comments from key stakeholders such as the Environment Agency to understand how aligned or otherwise, they are with our views on the drainage and FRA work done to date. It was not clear how all this has progressed from the PEIR consultation.	These need to be circulated in advance before the TWG if meaningful feedback is expected.	CBC would like to see the evidence behind the FRA work that underpin the concept design.	Low
WE2.	Drainage – South Terminal Roundabout substantial modification to surface water pond.	CBC request the design parameters for the new pond are provided if this proposal is to be taken forward along with details of the changes that will be carried out on the existing pond, the impact and mitigation measures and most importantly, of how water quality has been addressed in accordance with the SuDS manual.	CBC and other stakeholders would like to see the design parameters for the new pond and the mitigation measures put in place	Low
WE3.	Evidence to show that the connection between the museum field compensation storage area and the river Mole will not have a detrimental effect on the geomorphology of the watercourse bed.	CBC also requests confirmation of how the possible adverse effect of this connection will be mitigated. GAL in APP083 has proposed to use soft/bio engineering at the connection between the new flood compensation areas and the river Mole. This connection has to be properly managed to prevent further environmental disaster to the geomorphology and the bank of the watercourse Although at this stage GAL's proposal is a generic statement, but a more detailed information of the	CBC would like to see the evidence of the work done in this area and a plan showing how any identified adverse effect on the watercourse geomorphology will be mitigated.	High

		type of soft engineering and how it will be implemented is expected at the sooner rather than later because of the significance of this connection to the overall drainage strategy and future environmental issues		
WE4.	CBC request further information of the likely landscape and visual impacts from the attenuation features proposed at Car Park X and Car Park Y.	Car Park X and Y works may have potential negative impact on nearby buildings	Can further details be provided of what these works consist of and what the impacts are.	High
WE5.	GAL has proposed an additional three hectares of carriageway will be created from the proposed work to the highway and three attenuation basins and two oversized pipes have been planned as part of the highway drainage strategy to mitigate the increase in impermeable area	The proposal can be improved, and this should be an opportunity for GAL has only provided details of how water quantity will be mitigated and that water quality have been reviewed using HEWRAT assessment and DMRB, while these may have considered certain aspect of water quality, but the acceptable approach is the SuDS manual and GAL should provide details of how water quality will be mitigated using the SuDS manual.	A code of construction practice APP083 has been provided by GAL. The measures set out in this document to manage water quality and potential flood risk during the construction phase are generic and a more site specific and design related plan will be required. Most likely more relevant information will be made available after the detailed design. An improved proposal with more done around water quantity and quality mitigation.	Low
WE6.	While it is understood that there is the need for GAL to attenuate water using systems that can be designed to reduce the attraction of birds	The use of concrete attenuation structures if possible be avoided.	the use of a more sustainable approach with reduced carbon footprint will be the preferred option rather than using designs with a high carbon footprint. Although, GAL has proposed in APP 078 to use soft engineering where there is a connection between the new flood compensation areas and the watercourse, but what kind of flood features will be adopted for the FCA is not stated.	Low
WE7.	Residual risk when flood structures are overwhelmed.	While Gal has proposed several mitigation strategies as it relates to flood risk, how they intend to deal with possible residual risks in the event these structures are overwhelmed or a possible blockage on the watercourse should be identified.	The residual risks should be identified, and if possible, this should be considered during the drainage design especially flow paths when the drainage system is overwhelmed	Low

WE8.	The proposed highway drainage strategy will reduce discharge by 38% to the Gatwick stream and 50% to the river Mole	Can GAL have a look at the effect this reduction in discharge will have on biodiversity and provide mitigation where necessary	CBC would like to see the evidence of the work done in this area and a plan showing how any identified adverse effect on the biodiversity of the ecosystem will be mitigated.	Low
WE9.	Overlap between drainage and ecology matters in relation to the northwest area and the impact on the river Mole	It would be good to understand the impact the drainage design and engineering solutions have on ecology in relation to matters such as sediment build up, flood overflow, de-icer storage and pollution control measures.	Further information should be provided on the management of both the drainage features and ecological mitigation measures.	Low
WE10.	Inconsistency with the design life of what constitute a surface access work and an airfield access work	GAL has stated that a joint mitigation approach has been adopted for both the surface access and the airfield structures using a 100-year return period and 20% CC. GAL should be using a 40% CC because the 2080's epoch for GAL is up to 20132, which is 7 years more than the EA's 20125 standard for the 2080's epoch.	GAL's allowance for climate change should be 40% and not 20% because their 2080's epoch exceeds the EA standard by 7 years	Uncertain
WE11.	Water demand mitigation	No specific water use targets, and no commitments to ensure sufficient measures are delivered to mitigate water supply impacts in an area of water stress. This point is explained in Section 24 of the West Sussex LIR para 24.83 and Table 24.1D.	Commitment to specific targets and defined measures  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – No detailed response on this point has been provided on why the water targets set out in policy ENV9 cannot be met.	Uncertain

## TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

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 the Examination
<p><b>The Council also endorses the PADSS submitted by West Sussex County Council as the Highway Authority particularly regarding the transport modelling and mitigation for impacts on the highways which are not repeated here.</b></p>				
TT1.	Surface Access Commitments - target mode shares	<p>Insufficient evidence and justification provided to demonstrate how the target mode shares will be achieved. Stronger commitment to the aspirational mode shares should be made. As per the feedback of West Sussex County Council as Highways Authority, the council retains concerns that it will be challenging to achieve the 55% public transport mode share target through the identified bus and coach measures alone, i.e. without wider bus priority measures nor any changes to rail.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to increase the attractiveness of alternative modes of travel, i.e. through bus priority measures to deliver journey time savings, or a clearer approach as to what rail interventions can be made. Such measures could support delivery of the 55% mode share target for public transport, or enable a greater percentage of staff and passengers to access the airport via sustainable transport modes.</p> <p>West Sussex LIR Paras 17.72 to 17.93 refer.</p>	SACs and associated mitigation to be reviewed with more clarity on specific sustainable travel improvements	Uncertain



<p>TT2.</p>	<p>Surface Access Commitments - rail</p>	<p>High rail mode shares are critical to the SACs but there are no measures to enhance rail services or further improve the station, despite the evidence demonstrating services on the Brighton Mainline are already and will continue to be overcrowded with just standing capacity available and the station will be congested at times.</p> <p>At ISH4, the GTR representative raised concerns about over-crowding/standing for both peak and off-peak services, and advised that increased rail capacity is needed to accommodate additional air passengers on top of domestic passengers as a minimum. GTR suggested that a reasonable, proportionate contribution would be sought towards increasing rail capacity.</p> <p>This reflects concerns raised by the Joint Local Authorities regarding impacts on the Brighton main line, as set out at Paragraphs 17.43 to 17.47 of the West Sussex LIR.</p>	<p>Request that GAL continue dialogue with Network Rail to agree appropriate mitigation and provide funding to support rail improvements.</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5):</b> The Applicant's updated position of April 2024 (as set out in SoCG Row 2.20.4.1) is noted and that an updated version of the Surface Access Commitments (REP3-028) has been submitted at Deadline 3. However, this revised document does not include any further mitigation in relation to bus priority measures. Whilst it makes reference to working with rail operators to increase mode share under 'Further Aspirations', opportunities to maximise the contribution of rail access do not look to have been explored as part of the proposed SACs. Concerns remain that there is insufficient mitigation and controls within the SACs (REP3-028) to ensure that the modal split commitments are delivered.</p>	<p>Low</p>
<p>TT3.</p>	<p>Surface Access Commitments – Active Travel connections</p>	<p>Enhancements to routes beyond the immediate airport connecting to wider networks, particularly improvements to NCR21 south to Crawley are essential to meet staff mode share targets, given how low current Active Travel mode share is. This is discussed at 17.92 of the West Sussex LIR. GAL's commitment to developing an ASAS to support the SAC document, and to engage with the local authorities regarding active travel infrastructure is acknowledged. However, certainty on the delivery of required improvements is needed to determine if the effectiveness of the staff active travel mode share targets are realistic.</p>	<p>Ensure improvements to active travel connections are provided (or funding and agreed commitments for delivering these)</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC welcome recognition (SoCG Row 2.20.4.3) that additional active travel interventions will be delivered by the Applicant as and when necessary to support achieving the mode share commitments, particularly for staff mode share. This is more positive than the response to the same issue raised in 2.1.3.1 of the CBC/GAL SoCG. <b>mult</b></p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

<p>TT4.</p>	<p>Surface Access Commitments– Bus services</p>	<p>Commitments made in relation to bus and coach service provision should include Route 200 (from Horsham, through Crawley’s western neighbourhoods and Manor Royal to Gatwick Airport). The Joint Local Authorities note that the Applicant’s response in the SoCG appears to focus on roads within and close to the airport, but this misses the point that improvements across the whole network should be supported. Bus priority measures across the network to reduce journey times should also be included. This is discussed at 17.32 to 17.36 of the West Sussex LIR.</p>	<p>Provide bus priority measures that achieve improvements on the wider network (or funding for these), not just roads that are within the control of the Applicant. For example, funding improvements to Route 200 continue to be considered necessary.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> The Applicant’s updated position of April 2024 is noted and that an updated version of the Surface Access Commitments (REP3-028) has been submitted at Deadline 3. However, this revised document does not include any further mitigation in relation to bus priority measures or other sustainable transport modes. Concerns remain that no measures are to be implemented that would increase the attractiveness of alternative modes of travel that would offer time savings over use off the private car such as bus priority measures to deliver journey time savings. Concerns remain that there is insufficient mitigation and controls within the SACs (REP3-028) to ensure that the modal split commitments are delivered.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>
<p>TT5.</p>	<p>Surface Access Commitments -Transport Mitigation Fund</p>	<p>The Transport Mitigation Fund, as currently proposed by GAL, would provide £10million over a nine-year period. We question if this is sufficient, and whilst there remains uncertainty as to what projects this is intended to cover, if there is expectation that it is used for Active Travel north/south/ east/west of the Airport, plus bus priority and/or service improvements across the wider network on routes serving the airport, and potentially also rail improvements, then the £10million is unlikely to be sufficient. As an example, improvement of Crawley Route A alone (Gatwick Airport to Town Centre via Manor Royal) is currently estimated through the Crawley Local Cycling and Walking Strategy (LCWIP) to cost between £4.06m and £7.2m. Three other Active Travel Route improvements are referred to in the West</p>	<p>Clarify nature and scale of funding – under discussion as part of S106 agreement</p>	<p>High</p>

		<p>Sussex LIR (Para 17.92) as mitigation for the DCO – these are collectively costed at between £5.09m and £14.22m.</p> <p>This point is not covered in detail in the West Sussex LIR as discussion has been ongoing. We note that the Transport Mitigation Fund remains subject to ongoing negotiation through the S106 agreement process.</p>		
TT6.	Surface Access Commitments – Sustainable Transport Fund	<p>Commitment to continue the parking levy to support the Sustainable Transport Fund is welcomed but the amount per space needs to increase to compensate for the proportionate decrease in staff and passenger parking. This matter is subject to ongoing negotiation through the S106 agreement process.</p> <p>Paragraph 17.86 of the West Sussex LIR refers.</p>	<p>Ensure that the Sustainable Transport Fund methodology provides sufficient funding to support sustainable transport access to the airport in line with passenger growth.</p> <p>This point does not appear to have been responded to by the Applicant in the SoCG.</p> <p>Under discussion as part of S106 agreement.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> This matter is subject to ongoing discussion through negotiation on the S106 agreement.</p>	High
TT7.	Surface Access Commitments – Parking Enforcement	<p>CBC welcome the Applicant's offer to make an annual financial contribution towards airport-related parking investigation/enforcement. We do however have concern that the monies proposed are not sufficient to fund a post at the required level. This matter is subject to ongoing negotiation through the S106 agreement process.</p> <p>Paragraph 17.86 of the West Sussex LIR refers.</p>	<p>Clarify the nature and scale of funding. Under discussion as part of S106 agreement.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> This matter is subject to ongoing discussion through negotiation on the S106 agreement.</p>	High
TT8.	Surface Access Commitments – enforcement	<p>The proposed monitoring framework does not demonstrate how remedial action, should it be necessary, will be secured nor what sanction will be in place should commitments remain unmet.</p> <p>CBC remain of the view that a more robust approach is required to ensure that growth in passenger numbers is suitably aligned with the applicant delivering upon its</p>	<p>Greater certainty should be provided through a 'Green Controlled Growth' approach similar to that progressed at Luton Airport, whereby the growth of the airport is linked to the meeting of the relevant targets associated with surface access transport.</p>	Uncertain

		<p>surface access commitments. Greater certainty should be provided through a ‘Green Controlled Growth’ approach similar to that progressed at Luton Airport, whereby the growth of the airport is linked to the meeting of the relevant targets associated with surface access transport. This would provide a more effective mechanism (as opposed to GAL’s proposed approach of additional interventions and annual review) to ensure that passenger growth is aligned with delivery of the surface access commitments. This is discussed at Paragraphs 17.83 and 17.92 of the West Sussex LIR.</p> <p>We note the Applicant’s response in the Crawley SoCG, which sets out that the proposed SA monitoring strategy is in keeping with the existing process. CBC would however point out that the current process is set through the existing S106 Agreement. That Agreement is not related to any planning permission and is entered into voluntarily by the airport operator. As such, there has been very little, if any scope, for CBC and WSCC to seek substantial changes to the Agreement. Accordingly, although both Authorities have signed the 2022 Agreement, and its predecessors, this should not be taken as an indication of CBC and WSCC being satisfied with its contents and the extent of the mitigation contained within it. This is discussed at Paragraphs 4.6 to 4.16 of the West Sussex LIR.</p>	<p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> Concerns remain that there is insufficient mitigation and controls within the SACs (REP3-028) to ensure that the modal split commitments are delivered. The JLA’s submitted an Introduction to their proposal for an Environmentally Managed Growth Framework at Deadline 4 [REP4-050] and further background information at Deadline 5. This matter is subject to ongoing discussion through negotiation on the S106 agreement.</p>	
TT9.	CoCP and OCTMP	<p>Concern about the lack of detail and clarity in the CoCP and CTMP. Limited information provided by Applicant in SoCG to be submitted at D5 suggesting possible criteria for when contingency routes will be able to be used reaffirms these concerns.</p>	<p>Additional information to address these concerns is required.</p>	Uncertain
TT10.	Methodology used to identify amount of new passenger parking	<p>The Applicant’s Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP4-017] at Table A1 confirms that the Applicant’s car parking calculations factor in only GAL-</p>	<p>The Applicant should be taking account of all on-airport passenger parking in its calculations.</p>	High

		<p>operated on-airport parking, and does not count existing on-airport parking run by other operators.</p> <p>CBC strongly disagree with the Applicant having omitted existing on-airport spaces from its calculations simply because these are not operated by GAL. Whilst not operated by GAL, factually these spaces are situated on-airport (located within the Local Plan airport boundary) and are used by passengers travelling to/from the airport, thereby adding to the percentage of airport users travelling to the airport by private vehicle. These existing spaces should be taken into account by the Applicant in its calculation of future passenger parking spaces to support the DCO, as to ignore existing on-airport spaces simply because these are not operated by GAL will potentially result in an over-provision of passenger parking. This omission brings into question the need for 1,100 further spaces as part of the Project.</p> <p>More broadly, it brings into question the clarity of the SACs, as it is now uncertain if/how non-GAL operated on-airport parking is factored into the Applicant's approach. As it stands, 4,694 authorised on-airport spaces, each of which represents a space being used by passengers travelling to/from the airport by private vehicle, appear to be omitted from calculations. Listed in full, the omitted on-airport passenger parking spaces are located at:</p> <p>Purple Parking (3,265 spaces)          Hilton South Terminal (106)          Travelodge, Povey Cross (623)          Airport Inn Britannia (123)          Sofitel, North Terminal (565)</p> <p>To clarify, the annual Gatwick Airport parking survey counts non-GAL operated spaces, where located within the airport boundary as shown on the Local Plan Map, as on-airport. Whilst the airport operator provides</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>a 'read out' for the number of vehicles parked on sites within its control, the Local Authority also undertakes a count of the number of vehicles parked in on-airport passenger parking located by other operators. This is necessary for the effective application of Crawley Borough Local Plan Policy GAT3, which requires firstly that passenger parking spaces are located on-airport (i.e. within the Gatwick Airport boundary as shown on the Local Plan Map) and secondly that it is justified by a demonstrable need within the context of proposals for achieving a sustainable approach to surface transport access to the airport. The operator of the spaces is not relevant to the effective application of the policy.</p> <p>CBC note the Applicant's confirmation that it is no longer taking account of the lapsed 820 spaces at Hilton Hotel in its calculations. However, relating to the concerns stated above, there would appear to be inconsistency in the Applicant's approach, as it had previously included what would have been 820 non-GAL operated spaces (over which it has no control) as part of its baseline, but at the same time is omitting other non-GAL operated on-airport spaces from its calculations on the basis that it has no control of these spaces.</p>		
<p>TT11.</p>	<p>Staff Parking Numbers and Updated Staff Travel Survey</p>	<p>The council previously noted that whilst supporting the objective to increase staff travel by sustainable modes, it is not clear how the 1,150 space reduction in staff parking relates to sustainable mode share objectives especially since there will be more staff at the airport as a result of the project. The Applicant's Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP4-017] at Table A1 (Action Point 6) appears to confirm that the proposed 1,150 space reduction in staff spaces will be re-provided as part of the project, enabling the number of staff spaces to be flexed whilst not exceeding the existing 6,090 space total. The addresses the council's question on this matter.</p>	<p>Detail should be provided as to how the 2023 Staff Travel Survey has (or will) inform the approach to staff parking that is proposed in the Project. It is important that the most up-to-date evidence on staff travel is feeding into the DCO evidence base to help assess the scope for delivering the Surface Access Commitments.</p>	<p>High</p>

		CBC note that the Applicant has published slides summarising the updated 2023 Staff Travel Survey. However, it remains unclear if/how the updated information on staff travel is being factored into the approach to staff parking proposed through the Project.		
TT13.	Permitted Development Rights	GAL has extensive permitted development rights which include the provision of parking, and the Council is concerned that there is no control through the DCO or proposed s106 agreement to prevent these being used to create an overprovision of parking in the future, undermining the surface access commitments.	<p>It is considered that greater control is needed to ensure that permitted development rights do not result in an over-provision of on-airport passenger parking, undermining the meeting of SACs. This matter is subject to ongoing discussion through negotiation on the S106 agreement.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> The council continues to consider that the removal of permitted development rights is the only way to ensure it can effectively control the provision of future airport parking and ensure that Gatwick provides sufficient but no more parking than is required to support its sustainable strategy for airport access. Concerns remain that there is insufficient mitigation and controls within the SACs (REP3-028) to ensure that the modal split commitments are delivered. This matter is subject to ongoing discussion through negotiation on the S106 agreement.</p>	Uncertain
TT14.	Baseline parking assumptions	Robotic Parking: Do not agree with the applicant's assumption that 2,500 robotic parking spaces can form part of the baseline. This would significantly increase parking capacity beyond the 100 space temporary three-month trial and would significantly increase parking capacity, the full highway impact of which would need to be properly assessed. The Applicant appears to be assuming that all 2,500 parking spaces can be taken as a given at this stage. However, this assumption is made some way in advance of individual Permitted	<p>The applicant should not be assuming for an increase of 2,500 passenger spaces through robotic parking in its baseline – this should form part of the DCO itself.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> The council remain of the view that the 2,500 passenger spaces proposed through robotic parking</p>	Low

		<p>Development Rights (PDR) consultations that GAL advise would be submitted in 2024/25/26. Given that each of those PDR consultations would be expected to be supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate 'sufficient but no more parking' than is needed to ensure GAL's mode share obligations can be met, it is not considered appropriate for GAL to simply assume, without providing justification through evidence, that 2,500 robotic spaces coming forward through PDR can be considered as forming part of the baseline. It would be more appropriate if GAL were to include this parking as part of the DCO. This is discussed further at 17.68 and 17.69 of the West Sussex LIR.</p>	<p>should form part of the DCO. Given that the Applicant has previously advised PDR consultations on robotic parking will be submitted in 2024/25/26, it is questionable whether these parking changes will come forward in advance of the DCO, which (if consented) would likely be in place from 2025.</p>	
<p>TT15.</p>	<p>Hotel parking</p>	<p>The Authorities (particularly Crawley Borough Council) have concerns regarding the need to ensure that Control Documents include adequate controls on the provision of additional on-airport parking at hotels.</p>	<p>The Authorities' view is that any such (i.e. hotel-related) parking should be operational parking only so as to support the Applicant's Surface Access Commitments. This is particularly important as the hotels will, in due course, exist as commercial operations operated by other parties and so there is no reason that they should be exempt from the Local Planning Authorities wider policies in relation to car parking merely by virtue of their conception under the DCO for authorising consent.</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC note the Applicant's response (SoCG Row 2.20.5.6) confirming that no additional parking is proposed or assumed for any new hotels in relation to the Project. The council would re-state its view that controls will be required to prevent hotel parking (except for operational spaces) being created in future, and there would need to be some way any future operator would be signed into the airport surface access commitments.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>



<p>TT16.</p>	<p>Commercial Floorspace</p>	<p>The Applicant's response at Rows 5.3 and 5.24 of AS-060 appears to clarify that no parking is proposed for new offices through the Northern Runway Project. However, CBC consider that there would still need to be controls with regards to parking (to meet the Applicant's Surface Access Commitments).</p>	<p>Controls are needed to ensure that any parking provision associated with office uses is consistent with meeting the Surface Access Commitments.</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC notes the Applicant's response (SoCG Row 2.20.5.7) confirming that no additional parking is proposed or assumed for any new offices in relation to the Project. The council would re-state its view that controls will still be required to ensure any future operator would be signed into the airport surface access commitments.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>
--------------	------------------------------	---	---	------------------

## AIR QUALITY

Please note: For most 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 reviewed and means that Crawley Borough Council is unable to update the resolution status or otherwise on many of the 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.

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
AQ1.	Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex	<p>The applicant has not clearly demonstrated regard to the Sussex Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance or the Defra air quality damage cost guidance in assessing air quality impacts and mitigation measures.</p> <p>The approach taken by the Applicant is not consistent with the principles of the Sussex Guidance, (local Policy ENV12) to address the impact of emissions from the development at a local level proportionate to the value of the damage to health.</p>	<p>Additional mitigation measures to address local air quality impacts, proportionate to damage costs of the scheme to be provided in accordance with the Sussex Guidance.</p> <p>The proposed mitigation to be provided through an Air Quality Action Plan secured by s.106 agreement, or a control document by Requirement in the Draft DCO.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b> The draft Air Quality Action Plan submitted by GAL [REP2 -004] fails to address local air quality impacts in line with the Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex by identifying additional mitigation to the value of the damage cost to health.</p> <p>The JLAs have addressed this point in their D4 response [REP4-042] and detailed review of the AQAP [REP4-053].</p>	Uncertain

			A response from GAL is awaited to further progress this area of disagreement. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline	
AQ2.	Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP)	<p><del>No AQAP has been provided which clearly sets out a range of measures to specifically address local air quality. Instead, the applicant has addressed air quality through the carbon action plan (CAP) and the airport surface access strategy (ASAS). This approach differs from discussions during 2 years of consultation where a draft AQAP was provided in the air quality TWG (21.10.22) and an AQAP was listed in item 19 of Schedule 2 (Requirements) of the draft DCO (28.04.23).</del></p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b> A draft AQAP (Annex 5 of draft s106 [REP2-004]) was provided by GAL on 26 March 2024. Disappointingly, the draft AQAP simply summarises the measures within the carbon action plan, surface access commitments and construction code of practice, with no commitment to additional targeted measures. No additional information has therefore been provided which addresses the Council's concerns.</p> <p>The CAP and ASAS do not specifically or adequately address air quality mitigation measures based on health, and both lack the means to measure short-term exposure or provide monitoring to check compliance.</p> <p><del>CBC has concerns that the lack of a dedicated AQAP will undermine its ability to fulfil its own LAQM requirements and is</del></p>	<p>A combined operational air quality management plan should be provided which specifically focuses on local air quality, and which draws together measures aimed at local mitigation to reduce the health impacts from emissions, in addition to those outlined in the SAS and the CAP.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b> Many of the measures in the draft AQAP are embedded in the design and therefore already accounted for in the modelling (such as surface access mode share). Consequently, the air quality/health impacts of the Project (represented by the £83.5m damage costs) are those impacts that arise after the embedded mitigation has been considered. The Authorities would therefore expect to see an indication of which measures in the AQAP are 'embedded mitigation' so that it is possible to identify how much additional mitigation is needed to offset emissions from the Project at a local level proportionate to the value of the damage to health.</p> <p>The Joint Local Authorities have submitted a detailed review of GALs Draft AQAP [REP2 -004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from GAL further progress cannot be made to update this area of disagreement. It is anticipated that further</p>	Uncertain

		not consistent with Defra's Air Quality Strategy.	progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline	
AQ3.	Dust Management Plan (DMP)	<p><del>No DMP has been provided which clearly sets out specific mitigation measures to ensure potential adverse impacts from construction dust are avoided during all construction stages.</del></p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b> A draft Dust Management Plan [No Examination Ref] has been shared with the JLAs on 26 March 2024. This is welcomed by the Council, however, there are a number of key issues within the draft DMP that are missing or need further clarification. These are outlined in the JLAs detailed review of the DMP [REP4-053]</p>	<p>The applicant proposes a DMP once detailed design plans are available. However, there is no reason why a DMP or outline DMP cannot be produced at this stage since construction compound locations and transport routes have been provided. A DMP is therefore requested for the examination, and to provide additional confidence in the control measures and monitoring for the construction phase.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b> The Joint Local Authorities have submitted a detailed review of GAL's draft DMP [No Examination Ref]. This review [REP4-053] identifies a range of issues that remain unresolved areas of concern, including: identifying high risk locations, monitoring locations, dust soiling assessment techniques, suitably qualified assessors, procedures and data sharing.</p> <p>Without a response from GAL to the DMP review (and any updated DMP committed to by GAL for Deadline 5 [REP4-033]) further progress cannot be made to update this area of disagreement. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	Uncertain
AQ4.	Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)	Section 6.5 of the CTMP (Restrictions and Monitoring) identifies risks associated with construction traffic utilising routes through the J10 M23 and Hazelwick Air Quality Management Areas in Crawley. Reference is made to a monitoring system that 'it is envisaged' will be developed in the full	<p>Further details are requested during the examination on the proposed monitoring system and how this would protect air quality in Crawley's AQMA. More clarification is required regarding the additional traffic that would be expected in the future situation.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b></p>	Uncertain

		<p>CTMP. However, no details on this monitoring system are provided to help understand how this would protect air quality. It is also unclear if the plan takes into account additional traffic associated with the natural growth of airport traffic, or additional traffic growth associated with the additional capacity already created in the first phase of construction.</p>	<p>No additional information has been provided which address these points.</p> <p>Outstanding areas of concern relating to air quality matters (including matters within the CTMP), were provided by AECOM on behalf of the JLAs at Deadline 3 [REP3-117 – Appendix A]. GAL's states [REP4-031 para 3.7.7] that its response to these air quality concerns will be provided by Deadline 5.</p> <p>Without a response from GAL to these technical air quality issues the Council is unable to update the resolution status of concerns relating to the CTMP.</p>	
AQ5.	Operational Air Quality Monitoring	<p>CBC has concerns regarding the measurement accuracy of the AQ Mesh low-cost sensors which the applicant is proposing to use to monitor operational phase impacts. AQ Mesh monitors are not approved by Defra for the monitoring of air quality in line with Local Air Quality Monitoring guidelines (equivalence reference method criteria for continuous monitoring) particularly with regards to short term level exceedances. As such they are not sufficient to demonstrate compliance with air quality standards. This introduces uncertainty on how air quality will be evaluated and reported to the council, which in turn reduces transparency on the effectiveness of measures relied upon to improve air quality.</p>	<p>Further information is requested to understand how air quality will be monitored, evaluated and reported to local authorities, along with the further steps that would be taken should air quality exceed short term limits or deteriorate further than predicted. CBC would welcome a commitment from the applicant to use monitoring equipment that meets the equivalence reference method.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b> Outstanding areas of concern relating to air quality, were provided by AECOM on behalf of the JLAs at Deadline 3 [REP3-117 – Appendix A]. GAL's states [REP4-031 para 3.7.7] that its response to these air quality concerns will be provided by Deadline 5.</p> <p>Without a response from GAL to these technical air quality issues the Council is unable to update the resolution status of concerns relating to operational air quality monitoring.</p>	Uncertain
AQ6.	Funding for Local Ambient Air Quality Monitoring	<p>The ES does not specifically identify which of the existing LA continuous air quality</p>	<p>Further clarification is requested on funding of the LA monitoring stations on and around the airport.</p>	Uncertain

		<p>monitoring stations on and around the airport will be funded.                  The LAQM process requires a LA with a major airport in its district to carry out an assessment of sensitive receptors within 1000m of the airport. Therefore CBC has an air quality monitoring station located on the eastern perimeter of the airport to provide independently measured pollution data for this assessment for Crawley residents living close to the airport who are impacted by airport emissions.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b>                  The Applicant, in expressing a wish to support the understanding of air pollution effects more generally in the local area, has committed to continuing its current funding for monitoring for the local authorities (SoCG 2.2.4.5 [REP1-032] and ISH7 - Part 4, 00:16:07). However, no support is currently provided to Crawley Borough Council for air quality monitoring, and a request for funding for its monitoring station on the eastern border of the airport has been turned down by the Applicant.</p>	<p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b>                  The request from Crawley Borough Council for funding for its air quality monitoring station meets the test for S106 to make the development acceptable. The Council has an obligation to ensure that all relevant air quality standards continue to be met, which is an ongoing obligation, and recognises that standards may change over time.</p> <p>Concerns regarding costs of the Councils monitoring station have not been resolved.</p>	
AQ7.	Surface Access Commitments and Controlled Growth	<p>There is insufficient information and a lack of sensitivity testing to clearly demonstrate how differing levels of modal shift attainment could impact future air quality predictions.</p> <p>CBC has concerns over whether the modal shift can be achieved, and if this is not achieved what the air quality effects may be.                  CBC continues to have concerns that there are no effective control measures in place to restrict growth if mode share targets are</p>	<p>Further information is needed to understand how reliant on modal shift assumptions future air quality predictions are. Further information on the performance indicators to deliver against targets, and how the monitoring strategy should be linked to controls if modal shift targets aren't met.</p> <p>To ensure that surface access commitments are met for mode share, and that air quality is not compromised by unchecked traffic growth, CBC consider that a controlled growth approach, which would restrict growth until</p>	Uncertain

		<p>not achieved. Air quality impacts have been calculated based on the Applicants target surface access parameters, if these targets are not achieved then the predicted air quality and emissions impacts for the Project will be under reported.</p>	<p>mode share targets for surface access are met, should be adopted by the Applicant.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b>                  The Joint Local Authorities submitted a proposal for an Environmentally Managed Growth Framework at deadline 4 [REP4-050] and a further updated EMG framework is provided by the JLAs for Deadline 5. Response from GAL is awaited to progress resolution on the Council's concerns regarding controlled growth.                  It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	
<p>AQ8.</p>	<p>Assessment Scenarios (including 2047 Full Capacity)</p>	<p>The scenarios assessed in Chapter 13 of the ES (Listed para13.5.23) do not provide a realistic worst-case assessment. This is particularly the case for those scenarios where both construction and operational activities are underway at the same time, but the assessment has treated them separately.</p> <p>The same concerns apply to the emissions ceiling calculations as to how realistic these are, particularly when there are construction and operational activities ongoing, and the emissions ceiling calculations treat these separately. In addition, there is no operational assessment for the final full-capacity assessment year of 2047, as per ANPS (para 5.33) which identifies the need to include assessment when at full capacity.</p>	<p>Clarification is required as to how the selection of assessment years and their configuration re operational and construction was made and how this aligns with the requirements of the ANPS.</p> <p>A modelled assessment for the final full-capacity assessment year of 2047 is requested.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5)</b>                  Outstanding areas of concern relating to air quality, were provided by AECOM on behalf of the JLAs at Deadline 3 [REP3-117 – Appendix A].                  GAL's states [REP4-031 para 3.7.7] that its response to these air quality concerns will be provided by Deadline 5. The Council is awaiting a response from GAL to these technical air quality issues.</p> <p>Further concerns have been identified with regards to how the Applicant has conducted its assessment in the ES of the worst-case Project effects on the road network and air quality from the combined operational and construction activities for the 2029 with Project scenario.                  These concerns are outlined in more detail in CBCs Statement of Common Ground</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

			<p>response (Air Quality Table 2.2 reference 2.2.4.3) for Deadline 5.</p> <p>The Council will await a response from GAL to these concerns which have implications not only for the air quality effects of the Project in 2029 but also for other environmental impacts including noise, traffic and the future baseline.</p>	
AQ9.	Ultrafine Particles (UFPs)	<p>The discussion on the health impacts of ultrafine particles (UFPs) from aviation sources within the ES (Chapter 18 para 18.8.66) is welcomed. However, although the applicant supports the monitoring of UFPs and commits to participating in national industry body studies of UFP emissions at airports, it is unclear if their commitments extend to supporting a local monitoring study.</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5)</b> The Applicants response to the Council's request for local ultrafine particulates monitoring, has been considered in the draft S106 Agreement [REP2-004].</p>	<p>CBC would welcome further investigation into the impact of UFPs in the local area, through ongoing monitoring around the airport to help support the case for reducing emissions in line with GALs sustainability statement and protecting health in line with Defra's Clean Air Strategy.</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5)</b> Provision for UFP monitoring within the draft S106 Agreement [REP2-004] is welcomed, however, full funding has not been committed to, and is therefore subject to further discussion with the Applicant.</p>	Uncertain
AQ10.	CARE Facility	<p>There were continuous issues with odour from the current small waste incineration plant at the CARE facility until it was "mothballed" in 2020. The odour was mainly associated with the biomass fuel which produced a sweet-smelling aromatic hydrocarbon odour. There are concerns that this may be repeated at the new CARE facility which proposes to double in size.</p>	<p>Further clarification is requested on the type and size of incinerators that are proposed and how odour will be controlled.</p> <p>Information is requested on what steps have been taken to address inadequacies with the current odour control technology to ensure odour will not be a factor in the new facility.</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5)</b> The Applicant proposes, in its Change Application Report [AS-139], to remove the food waste biomass boiler which would resolve the odour issues associate with this process.</p>	<del>Uncertain</del> Resolved
AQ11.	Technical Details	<p>There are concerns that a realistic worst case has not been assessed due to</p>	<p>Further information is requested on rates of future air quality improvement, pollutants</p>	Uncertain



		insufficient information or clarity on a range of technical details in the ES and associated documents, including how modelled work using ADMS/ADMS Airports is presented.	<p>assessed, construction plant (asphalt plant numbers of modelled concrete batching plants), heating plant and road traffic modelling to help understand if the worst case has been assessed.</p> <p>Further information is requested on the large numbers of air quality monitors excluded from the assessment and why a more up to date baseline year of 2022 was not used compared to the 2018 year utilised (using 2016 extrapolated traffic data).</p> <p><b>Updated position (Deadline 5)</b> The Applicant provided a Technical Note on air quality and a new version of the Environmental Statement air quality figures at Deadline 1. This information was reviewed, and a response was provided by AECOM on behalf of the JLAs at Deadline 3 [REP3-117 – Appendix A] which included a wide range of air quality technical matters.</p> <p>Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) 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 [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5.</p> <p>Without a response from GAL to these technical queries the Council is unable to update the resolution status or otherwise of these air quality matters.</p>	
AQ12 – Project Change 3 - added as new matter at Deadline 5	Proposed Water Treatment Works	CBC notes that the reedbed treatment system would require discharge consents and detailed operating technique approved by the Environment Agency.	CBC would welcome further detail on the operating technique, and how these techniques would manage capacity and odour control at this facility	Uncertain
AQ13 – Project Change 3 -	Proposed Water Treatment Works	Crawley Borough Council has specific concerns that construction traffic accessing	Clarification of the primary construction route to access the reedbed construction compound	Uncertain

added as new matter at Deadline 5		the Radford Road site should not route through Crawley's AQMA. Construction traffic traveling from the M23 should exit at J9 for Gatwick not via J10 for Crawley which would bring additional HGVs through the Hazelwick area of the AQMA.		
-----------------------------------	--	--	--	--

## 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>Legislation, policy and guidance</b>				
NV1.	Local planning policies	Local planning policies are covered in Table 14.2.2 but no information is provided on how these policies are addressed in the ES.	Details should be provided on how local planning policies are addressed in the ES.	High
<b>Assessment of significant effects – Construction Vibration</b>				
NV3.	Assessment of vibration effects from road construction	Potential exceedances of the SOAEL are identified in the assessment of vibration emissions from compactors and rollers.	The Applicant should provide information as to how potential vibration impacts would be managed and levels monitored/controlled to ensure that the SOAEL is not exceeded in practice	High
<b>Assessment of significant effects – Air Noise</b>				
NV4.	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 based on appropriate criteria defined by the Applicant and relevant to non-residential receptors that would be affected by the NRP.	High
NV5.	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; however, identification of significant effects for all assessment years should be provided.	Identify significant effects during all assessment years to help understand how communities would be affected by noise throughout the project lifespan.	Uncertain
NV6.	No attempt has been made to expand on the assessment of likely significant effects through	Context is provided to the assessment of ground noise through consideration of the secondary LAmax, overflight, Lden and Lnight noise metric;	Provide some commentary about how secondary metrics relate to likely significant effects and	Uncertain

	the use of secondary noise metrics.	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.	whether the assessment of secondary metrics warrant identifying a likely significant effect.	
NV7.	No details of the noise modelling or validation process are provided. No details of measured Single Event Level or LASmax noise data from the Noise-Track-Keeping 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. 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.	Details of the validation process, noise modelling process along with any assumptions and limitations applied should be provided. This should include Single Event Level and LASmax noise data for individual aircraft variants at each monitoring location used for validation.	Uncertain
<b>Assessment of significant effects – Ground Noise</b>				
NV8.	The assessment of ground noise should also consider the slower transition case as per the aircraft noise assessment. It is not clear why 2032 is considered worst-case for ground noise. Ground noise contours are not provided.	Higher levels of ground noise will be identified in the Slower Transition Case. Consequently, there is potential for receptors to experience significant noise effects that are identified in the Central Case assessment. Whilst 2032 provides the highest absolute noise levels, there appear to be larger increases in noise as a result of the proposed development at some receptors during other assessment years. Noise contours have been provided for aircraft noise and road traffic noise, but no noise contours are provided for ground noise. These contour plots should be provided to allow better understanding of ground noise effects for each assessment year and scenario. It would be expected that LAeq and LAmx contour plots are provided.	An assessment of Slower Transition Case ground noise effects should be provided to identify the potential for exceedances of the SOAEL at sensitive receptors. Likely significant effects for all assessment years should be identified in the ground noise assessment. Provide LAeq and LAmx noise contour plots to supplement the ground noise assessment. Contour plots should be provided for Do-minimum and Do-something scenarios for each assessment year.	High
<b>Assessment of significant effects – Road Traffic Noise</b>				
NV9.	Noise monitoring duration	One 20-minute survey and one 10-minute survey is not sufficient to provide data suitable	Longer term monitoring, close to the A23 or M23 where road traffic noise can be said to dominate	Addressed

		for validation of the road traffic noise model and indeed these data are not used as such. There is therefore no validation of the road traffic noise model in terms of measured levels.	over aircraft noise, would be preferable. Alternatively, the applicant could explain what steps they have taken to independently validate the road traffic noise calculations.	
<b>The Noise Envelope</b>				
NV10.	Sharing the benefits	<p>Paragraph 14.2.44 – 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> <p>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 opening of the Northern Runway.</p> <p>The Applicant 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>	<p>Details on how noise benefits are shared should be provided in accordance with policy requirements set out in the Aviation Policy Framework.</p> <p>Noise contour area limits should be based on the Central Case.</p> <p>There should be no allowance for the Noise Envelope limits to increase</p>	Uncertain
NV11.	CAA to regulate the Noise Envelope	There is no mechanism for host authorities to review Noise Envelope reporting or take action against limit breaches or review any aspects of the Noise Envelope.	A mechanism should be included to allow the host authorities to scrutinise noise envelope reporting and take action in the case of any breaches	Uncertain
NV12.	Prevention of breaches	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. No details are provided on what kind of actions are proposed for an action plan to achieve compliance.	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. Adoption of thresholds that prompt action before a limit breach occurs would provide confidence in the noise envelope. Slot restriction measures should be adopted in the event of a breach being identified for the previous year of operation	Uncertain

		24 months of breach would be required before capacity declaration restrictions for the following were adopted so it would be three years after the initial breach before capacity restrictions were in place. Capacity restrictions 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.		
<b>Noise Mitigation</b>				
NV13.	Securing of noise mitigation measures and noise limits, including timing of implementation	No clear mechanism is provided for how noise mitigation measures and some noise limits (e.g. plant noise limits) are to be secured. The timing of implementation of such mitigation measures is also important and needs to be appropriately secured. This is important to ensure that new mitigation measures are installed in advance of increased activity, changes in operations, or removal of any existing mitigation measures,	<p>Details of how mitigation measures detailed in the assessments are to be secured should be provided.</p> <p>This should include details of the timing when each such mitigation measure will be installed and how this timing is secured.</p> <p>Where new mitigation measures are being proposed to replace existing measures which are to be removed, an assessment of predicted noise levels and likely impacts during any intermediate phase during the works should be provided.</p>	Uncertain
<b>Noise Insulation Scheme</b>				
NV14.	Noise insulation scheme details	How would the noise insulation scheme prioritise properties for provision of insulation. Residents of properties within the inner zone will be notified within 6 months of commencement of works; however, it is not clear what noise contours eligibility would be based upon. Is noise insulation in the Outer Zone restricted to ventilators or will the occupier have flexibility to make alternative insulation improvements?	<p>Provide details on how the scheme would roll out. Clarify what noise contours would be used to define eligibility.</p> <p>Clarify on the flexibility of the noise insulation scheme.</p> <p>Provide details on what community buildings would be eligible for noise insulation and what level of insulation would be provided.</p> <p>Provide details on how monitoring of ground noise would be undertaken and how a property</p>	Uncertain.

		<p>Schools are included in the Noise insulation Scheme, but it is unclear if other community buildings (e.g. care homes, places of worship, village halls, hospitals etc.) would be eligible for noise insulation.</p> <p>It is unclear how noise monitoring would be undertaken to determine eligibility through cumulative ground and air noise.</p>	<p>would be identified as appropriate for monitoring of ground noise.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

## CARBON AND GREENHOUSE GASES

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>Legislation, policy and guidance</b>				
CGG1. Environmental Statement Chapter 15 Climate Change	It's not clear if the Applicant considers in aviation forecasts used to develop the 'need case' of the impact of ETS/CORISA.	It's not clear if the Applicant considers in aviation forecasts used to develop the 'need case' of the impact of ETS/CORISA.	Can the Applicant please confirm in the need case for the scheme if it considered the impact of ETS/CORISA?  The need case has now been added.	Addressed
<b>Baseline Information review</b>				
CGG3.	GHG emissions from airport buildings and ground operations in the ES [TR020005] (Table 16.4.1) does not appear to include maintenance, repair, replacement or refurbishment emissions.	The scope of the GHG emissions from airport buildings and ground operations does not appear to cover maintenance, repair, replacement or refurbishment emissions. This would under account operational GHG emissions. It is not clear what is captured under "other associated businesses".	Under the IEMA GHG Assessment methodology used in the ES, the Applicant must update the assessment to evidence that exclusions are <1% of total emissions and where all such exclusions total a maximum of 5%.	Addressed
<b>Conclusions</b>				
CGG8. 5.3 Environmental Statement - Appendix 16.9.1 Assessment of Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions	It is not clear if carbon calculations were carried out during the construction lifecycle stage in the ES [TR020005] for well-to-tank (WTT) emissions.	Excluding WTT is non-compliant with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting Standard, referenced in the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005] in Section 16.4.18 where scope 3 emissions were included. This also contradicts the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005] referenced under Section 16.4.24.	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 methodology used in the ES [Chapter 16 of the ES, APP-041].  Under the IEMA GHG Assessment methodology used in the ES, the Applicant must update the assessment to evidence that exclusions are <1% of total emissions and	High



			<p>where all such exclusions total a maximum of 5%.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b>                  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.</p> <p>To contextualise these emissions against the carbon budget, the Applicant references DUKES 2023 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 line with the estimated net zero trajectory.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<p>CGG9.</p>	<p>The RICS distances were referenced in Table 4.1.1 of the ES [TR020005] for the average material haulage distances. However, the RICS transport distances were not applied comprehensively.</p>	<p>Currently, only 100km was considered for construction-related A4 emissions, which is not in alignment with the recommended RICS transport distances. Furthermore, no global shipping emissions were considered as part of the GHG assessment, which is not in alignment with the RICS global transport scenario. This therefore under accounts the construction transport emissions.</p>	<p>The Applicant needs to update the transport assessment in compliance with the RICS methodology quoted in the ES to ensure shipping transport emissions are accounted for. This can then be used to inform appropriate transport efficiency mitigation measures as part of the CAP under Appendix 5.4.2 in the ES [APP-091].</p>	<p>Addressed</p>
<p>CGG10. 5.3 Environmental Statement - Appendix 16.9.2 Assessment of Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Airport Buildings and Ground Operations (ABAGO)</p>	<p>In Table 2.1.1 it is confirmed that the carbon calculations do not include well-to-tank (WTT) emissions, which is not aligned to the GHG Protocol Standard mentioned in the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005].</p>	<p>Not accounting for WTT is non-compliant with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting standard (referenced in the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005] in Section 16.4.18). This also contradicts the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005] referenced under Section 16.4.24</p>	<p>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%.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> 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.</p> <p>To contextualise these emissions against the carbon budget, the Applicant references DUKES 2023 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.</p>	<p>High</p>

			<p>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.</p> <p>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 line with the estimated net zero trajectory.</p>	
CGG11.	In Section 1.2.1, it is not clear if carbon calculations are carried out for maintenance, repair, replacement or refurbishment emissions.	Maintenance, repair, replacement or refurbishment emissions are not indicated to be scoped in the GHG ABAGO assessment. These emission sources could potentially account for a significant portion of the ABAGO emissions.	Under the IEMA GHG Assessment methodology used in the ES, the Applicant must update the assessment to evidence that exclusions are <1% of total emissions and where all such exclusions total a maximum of 5%.	Addressed
CGG14.	In Aviation methodology well-to-tank (WTT) emission sources are not confirmed to be accounted for which is against the GHG Protocol Standard mentioned in the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005].	<p>Not accounting for WTT is non-compliant with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting standard, referenced in the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005] in Section 16.4.18 where scope 3 emissions were included. Furthermore, this also contradicts the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005] referenced under Section 16.4.24.</p> <p>This would result in an underestimation of the GHG emissions associated with aviation since a 20.77% (BEIS, 2023<sup>1</sup>) uplift would be required on all aviation emissions. Therefore, this would result in 1,106,530tCO<sub>2e</sub> not being accounted for in 2028 (the most carbon-intensive year),</p>	<p>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 methodology used in the ES [Chapter 16 of the ES, APP-041].</p> <p>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%.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b></p>	High

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2023>

		<p>where 5.327 MtCO<sub>2</sub>e was estimated to be released (Table 5.2.1).</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>To contextualise these emissions against the carbon budget, the Applicant references DUKES 2023 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 line with the estimated net zero trajectory.</p>	
<p>CGG15</p>	<p>GAL does not identify the risks associated with using carbon offset schemes.</p>	<p>Document 5.4.2, Section 1.14</p> <p>This states that, "<i>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</i></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>In addition, and where reasonably</p>	<p>Addressed</p>

		<p><i>been working hard to reduce carbon emissions under GAL's control (from a 1990 baseline) and 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>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 offsetting principles i.e. that they should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ additional in that would not have occurred in the absence of the project</li> <li>○ monitored, reported and verified</li> <li>○ permanent and irreversible</li> <li>○ without leakage in that they don't increase emissions outside of the proposed development</li> <li>○ Have a robust accounting system to avoid double counting and</li> <li>○ Be without negative environmental or social externalities.</li> </ul>	
CGG16	The unsustainable growth of airport operations may result in significant adverse impacts to the climate.	The increased demand in GAL's services may lead to unsustainable surface access transportation and airport operation growth, which may significantly impact the climate.	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 activities, airport operations and surface access transportation.	Uncertain

			<p>Similar to the London Luton Airport Green Controlled Growth Framework, emission limits and thresholds for pertinent project stages should be established. Should any exceedances of these defined 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.</p> <p>In addition, and where reasonably practical, the airport will 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 offsetting principles i.e. that they should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ additional in that would not have occurred in the absence of the project</li> <li>○ monitored, reported and verified</li> <li>○ permanent and irreversible</li> <li>○ without leakage in that they don't increase emissions outside of the proposed development</li> <li>○ Have a robust accounting system to avoid double counting and</li> <li>○ Be without negative environmental or social externalities.</li> </ul>	
CGG17	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 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.	The Applicant should provide infrastructure within the Airport to support the anticipated uptake of electric vehicles and provide electric vehicle charging infrastructure.	Addressed

	<p>The full impact of the Proposed Development on the government meeting its net zero targets cannot be identified</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 the Gatwick/Crawley area into Mid Sussex with accompanying Infrastructure.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

## CLIMATE CHANGE

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>Mitigation, enhancement and monitoring</b>				
CC5.5.3 Environmental Statement - Appendix 15.5.2 Urban Heat Island Assessment	Mitigation measures should be proposed to reduce the impact of UHI effect.	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 not propose the implementation of any specific mitigation measures, e.g. additional vegetation or water bodies could be proposed at this stage to minimise impacts.	<p>Identification of further adaptation measures that can be implemented in design, construction or operation to further reduce the UHI effect. Updated position (Deadline 1 SoCG): It is acknowledged that the Applicant will monitor UHI. It’s also recommended that where feasible and appropriate additional UHI mitigation measures are incorporated.</p> <p>Updated Position Deadline 5: The Applicant has provided confirmation in April 2024 that where feasible and appropriate, additional UHI mitigation measures could be incorporated if they are required. As stated in paragraph 6.6.5 of the Design &amp; Access Statement – Volume 5 [REP2-036], GAL has a commitment to ensure that climate risks are not increased and climate resilience is considered throughout detailed design; this includes measures related to the UHI.</p>	Addressed
<b>Assessment of significant effects</b>				
CC11.	Lack of consideration of wildfire	Wildfire is not mentioned as a possible climate hazard impacting the airport’s operation. Wildfires in the surrounding area, in particular the smoke they	The Applicant should consider the risks associated with wildfire & associated smoke.	Addressed



		<p>generate, can impact airport operations, e.g. flights can be delayed, or certain planes may have to be diverted. Refer to following incident:  <a href="https://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/1653913/Gatwick-airport-fire-smoke-runway-flights-wildfire-heatwave-drought">https://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/1653913/Gatwick-airport-fire-smoke-runway-flights-wildfire-heatwave-drought</a></p>	<p>Update Position Deadline 5                  The Applicant has submitted in April 2024 the document '<i>Examination Technical Note – Climate Change 2: Wildfire and fog risks</i>'. [REP4-039]</p> <p>This has now addressed the concerns raised with regard to wildfires.</p>	
CC12.	Lack of consideration of fog	<p>Risks associated with fog were not included in the risk assessment. Fog can impact visibility and the ability to perform day to day airport operations. Adequate consideration should be given to this in the risk assessment.</p>	<p>The Applicant should undertake further research to gain clarity around how fog may change in the future as a result of climate change and give further consideration to its risks.</p> <p>Update Position Deadline 5:                  The Applicant has submitted in April 2024 the document '<i>Examination Technical Note – Climate Change 2: Wildfire and fog risks</i>'. [REP4-039]</p> <p>This has now addressed the concerns raised with regard to fog.</p>	Addressed.

## LOCAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS

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>Assessment Methodology</b>				
LESE1.	Confirmation on projects which informed methodological approach	Paragraph 17.4.2 states that the methodology has been based on accepted industry practice, a review of socio-economic assessments for other relevant projects including other airport or significant infrastructure schemes, and feedback received by PINS and local authorities during the consultation process.	<p>The Applicant should clarify which relevant projects were drawn upon, setting out why they are relevant, to inform the development of the methodology for this assessment.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change. The Applicant has named relevant projects but has not explained how they are relevant to informing development of methodology. The expectation is for the Applicant to highlight how specific aspects of these “exemplar” projects were of relevance.</p>	High
LESE2.	No consideration of effects at a Crawley borough level.	Despite being raised as a gap in the assessment at several Socio-economic Topic Working Group meetings, there is still no qualitative assessment of effects undertaken at a local authority level. The impacts of the project on key variables such as employment, labour market, housing (including affordable), and temporary accommodation need to be assessed given they affect both functioning and decision making at the local level.	<p>The Applicant should undertake an assessment of project impacts on each local authority located within the Northern West Sussex Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA), providing a commentary to adequately explain the extent of impacts at a local level.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change. In the absence of detailed local level analysis, it is difficult to accurately gauge the local impacts of the Project.</p>	Low

LESE 3.	Assessment of impacts on property prices	An assessment of project impact on property values has been scoped out of the assessment despite PINS advice on the issue (PINS ID 4.10.3). Unless subsequently agreed otherwise by PINS, an assessment of project impacts on property prices is still required.	At the minimum, the Applicant should undertake a qualitative assessment which robustly assesses the project's impacts on property prices.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	Low
LESE 4.	Clarification on use of pre-Covid data	Paragraph 17.4.14 states that 2019 data was primarily used given concerns with the Covid pandemic potentially affecting baseline data. However, this is a confusing message given some of the data sources used are post Covid and it is not clear why the Applicant has applied this approach.	The Applicant should source up-to-date data to inform the socio-economic baseline. If there are concerns with any of the data sources the Applicant can retain the pre-Covid baseline for context.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC note that the Applicant has in some cases revisited its assessments with more recent data. However, in the absence of detailed local level analysis, it is difficult to accurately gauge the local impacts of the Project.  CBC suggest this Point can be combined with Socio-Economic Points 6, 16, 24, 28 below.	High
LESE 5.	Magnitude of impacts definition	Paragraph 17.4.25 presents tables defining the scale of magnitude of impacts for construction and operational periods of the project. The use of numbers and percentages to quantify impact can be challenging especially given all study areas are different and can be influenced by a number of different factors. It is not clear how these the ranges were defined to inform the assessment.	The Applicant should review these numbers to determine their appropriateness given the study areas for the project. The Applicant should also provide the rationale for the job ranges provided.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	Low
LESE 7.	Consideration of worst-case scenario for employment benefit	Paragraph 17.5.5 states that the construction assessment presented in Section 17.9 focuses on the project's potential maximum effects. Whilst it is important to consider the maximum scale of impacts in terms of potential implications on local areas, it is also	The Applicant should clarify whether they have estimated a worst-case scenario for numbers of construction workers.	Low

		important to present a worst-case scenario in terms of employment benefit.	<b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	
LESE 8.	Workplace earnings trends and impact on affordability	Workplace earnings are shown to be growing at a higher rate than resident earnings and it is implied this may lead to less out-commuting. This trend could impact the affordability ratio, which would have implications elsewhere in the socio-economic evidence, for example, assumptions on future housing growth and demand for affordable housing.	The assumption needs to be evidenced. This should include a trend analysis as well as consideration of likely variances at a local authority level.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	Low
LESE 9.	Assessment of sensitivity of receptors	Paragraph 17.6.121 presents a table setting out sensitivity of receptors. We question the sensitivity grading for employment and supply chain impacts, labour market impacts, disruption of existing resident activities. The sensitivity gradings should be revisited for these receptors.	The Applicant should revisit the sensitivity gradings for identified receptors.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	Low
<b>Assessment of significant effects</b>				
LESE 10.	Assessment of construction effects	Assessment of labour market effects, effects on temporary accommodation, effects on community facilities, and effects on employment during construction need to be revisited. Concerns have been raised about the sensitivity of these effects. The magnitude of effects on construction employment for all study areas is also questioned, and magnitude of labour market effects based on magnitude criteria being used. There are also potential data limitations in relation to construction employment calculations as outlined in the review of Appendix 17.9.1. The Applicant hasn't undertaken any assessment at local authority level.	The Applicant should revisit this assessment based on the comments made. The Applicant should also undertake an assessment of impact at local authority level for those authorities based in the FEMA, providing a qualitative commentary to explain the implications rather than just signposting to numeric tables.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	Low
LESE 11.	Assessment of construction effects during the first year of operation	Assessment of construction effects during the first year of operation (including labour market effects, effects on population, effects on temporary accommodation, construction noise impacts on residents, effects on community facilities, and effects on construction employment) need to be revisited. The magnitude score of 'high' for all study areas is questioned.  Whilst there should be positive employment impacts during the construction phase, any positive economic impacts must be considered alongside related	The Applicant should revisit this assessment based on the comments. The Applicant should also undertake an assessment of impact at local authority level for those authorities based in the FEMA, providing a qualitative commentary to explain the implications rather than just signposting to numeric tables.	Low

		impacts, some of which are negative or uncertain. It should also be noted that the construction jobs calculation appears to be based on a "maximum" scenario. The Applicant hasn't undertaken any assessment at local authority level.	<b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	
LESE 12.	Operational effects	Assessment of operational labour market effects, effects on affordable housing needs to be revisited. We have outlined our concerns above in relation to the magnitude criteria being used for this assessment and the sensitivity grading of this receptor for the LMA and FEMA. The Applicant also hasn't undertaken any assessment at local authority level.	The Applicant should revisit this assessment based on the comments made. The Applicant should also undertake an assessment of impact at local authority level for those authorities based in the FEMA, providing a qualitative commentary to explain the implications rather than just signposting to numeric tables.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	Low
LESE 13.	Commercial Floorspace	Project General Mitigation of the Update on the Development of Local Authority Issues Trackers (Ref AS-060), Row 3.86 confirms that one office block is proposed, principally to replace lost airport-related office space at Destinations Place. Airport-related office use would appear to fall within the definition of associated development, but the Applicant's use of the word 'principally' appears to leave open the possibility that some of the space may be non-airport related.  The Applicant's recent comments at Row 2.19.5.3 of the SoCG with CBC (May 2024) suggest that offices are intended to be used by occupiers not related to the operation of the airport. If that is the case, this would mean that the offices within the DCO are not Associated Development because they could be used by any business with no connection whatsoever with the operation of the airport. Controls restricting use to airport-related uses only are essential, or this element of the Project should be removed.	Applicant to clarify that proposed office floorspace is to be used for airport-related use only (with controls in place to ensure this). Controls restricting use to airport-related uses only are essential, or this element of the Project should be removed.	Uncertain
LESE 14.	Application of assessment issues across all scenarios	With regards to the sections on other scenarios: (1) Interim Assessment Year: 2032 (Paragraphs 17.9.80-17.9.119)	The Applicant should revisit the assessments for all construction and operation phase scenarios.	Low

		<p>(2) Design Year: 2038 (Paragraphs 17.9.120-17.9.142)</p> <p>(3) Long Term Forecast: 2047 (Paragraphs 17.9.143-17.9.165)</p> <p>All of the construction and operational phase assessment scenarios in the chapter have been undertaken using the same assessment methodology. Therefore, all comments made on the initial construction and operation phase scenarios are relevant to the other scenarios.</p>	<p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.</p>	
LESE 15.	Cumulative effects	<p>The conclusion that in the absence of information, it is not possible to provide a cumulative assessment for all construction effects, is simplistic and given the significant concerns raised with the main assessment, a comprehensive cumulative assessment should be undertaken to establish if there are potential issues within the study areas. Furthermore, paragraph 17.11.9 states that the construction period of the project will overlap 'to some degree' with Tier 1 schemes. The statement 'to some degree' is understating the potential labour supply issues. It is clear there will be commonality of skills and trades demanded by the project and other construction projects. The operational cumulative effects (first full year) section is based on projections of future population, labour supply, jobs and housing and is unlikely to have a material effect on the conclusions from the initial assessment. A number of queries related to population, labour supply, jobs and housing have been raised which would have an impact on this assessment.</p>	<p>The Applicant should revisit and undertake a comprehensive cumulative assessment. The Applicant should undertake an assessment at local authority level for those authorities based in the FEMA, providing a qualitative commentary to explain the implications rather than just signposting to numeric tables.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.</p>	Low
<b>Document name: Environmental Statement Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects</b>				
			<p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC suggest merging this with Socio Economic Points 4 and 6.</p>	
LESE 17.	The approach to analysis of housing delivery does not analyse the full range of inputs required when determining local affordable housing need .	There needs to be a more granular assessment of housing delivery in the area, in particular the unmet affordable housing need to inform the assessment.	The Applicant should revisit the assessment and undertake a more granular assessment of affordable housing delivery) to take account of existing constraints. Further	Low

			<p>justification should be provided and reviewed against past performance to substantiate the conclusions.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.</p>	
LESE 18.			<p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> This point has been removed from the SoCG. CBC suggest removing from PADSS also.</p>	
LESE 19.	Assessment of impacts on labour supply	<p>Paragraph 5.2.14 states that the project is only expected to be a determinant in whether there is labour shortfall or surplus in the HMA for one area (Croydon and East Surrey) where the project tips surplus into supply in a single year. The basis for this conclusion does not appear robust, as based on the analysis the project is shown to exacerbate labour shortfall issues across multiple areas. Furthermore, if underlying inputs in the model are changed to reflect the fact that the labour market is already more constrained as has been modelled, it is likely shortfalls would be greater across many of the areas. In particular, the Authorities understand there to be skills shortages across the construction sector in Sussex, including for basic construction skills and more specialist sectors within the supply chain, as informed by Future Skills Sussex in its Local Skills Improvement Plan (2023). This is discussed further in the West Sussex LIR, Paragraphs 18.36 to 18.48.</p>	<p>Given the limitations in its approach, the Applicant justify the basis of the assessment which concludes that the project is only expected to be a determinant in whether there is labour shortfall or surplus in the HMA for one area. The applicant should revisit the assessment which should be undertaken at a local authority level.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.</p>	Low
LESE 20.	Vacant properties	<p>In paragraph 6.2.3-6.2.4 the Applicant provides an analysis of vacant properties, which implies that bringing these back into use will help meet the demand generated by non-home based workers. There is no analysis of why these properties are vacant, length of time vacant and barriers bringing them back into use.</p>	<p>A more robust assessment of the current private rented market is required. The Applicant needs to consider how it can help to bring these properties back into use, both in the short term by the non-home based workers but also by bringing a benefit to local areas and bringing properties back into use by local population once construction is complete.</p>	Low

			<b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	
LESE 21.	Construction Phase Impacts on Temporary Accommodation	In Crawley, GAL's estimation of 119 available properties to rent, derived from Lichfield's interpretation of the 2011 Census data, is considered to be high, as there is in reality limited stock available on the market and increasing demand for private rented accommodation. CBC has insufficient temporary accommodation within its own portfolio and cannot source sufficient short term private accommodation within the borough, resulting in some families having to be housed in accommodation which does not meet their needs, possibly out of the borough and for long periods of time. The unprecedented growth in the demand for temporary accommodation, and the indications of this trajectory continuing along this trend is the main reason for CBC declaring a Housing Emergency on 21 February 2024. Any increased demand and competition from NHB construction workers for the Project seeking short term private rented accommodation in Crawley, or the surrounding areas will increase the demand pressure still further. This is discussed in further detail in the West Sussex LIR Paragraphs 18.49 to 18.56.	The Applicant should review other potential sources that could inform a more up-to-date understanding of available private rented accommodation. This could include liaison with local authorities in the FEMA. The analysis should also take account of other schemes that could need construction workers who may require temporary accommodation.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC note that the Applicant has updated with 2021 census data. Notwithstanding this update, CBC retains concerns regarding the impact of the construction workforce on demands for short-term private rented accommodation.	Low
LESE 22.	Impacts on affordable housing	Paragraph 7.5.1 recognises that the project is likely to generate demand for affordable rented housing which is greater than the number of homes in the existing stock. If this exercise is done at a local authority level, then the figures are very different and the true impacts at local authority level are being hidden.  Secondly, assessment goes on to conclude that despite the demand from the project being skewed towards affordable housing, there are unlikely to be impacts on affordable housing beyond what is emerging or planned for. However, analysis of completions by local authority (Table 7.4.1) has demonstrated that the delivery frequently does not meet the need, and therefore a shortfall is likely. On that basis, the conclusion that the project is unlikely to have any impact on affordable housing demand beyond what is planned for does not appear well founded.	The Applicant should substantiate the conclusion that the project is unlikely to have any impact on affordable housing demand. The analysis should be updated at a local authority level in order to help identify issues which need to be planned for and mitigated.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> The council notes the response by the Applicant in REP4-031 to SE.1.15 but considers it cannot be said with certainty that there will be no increase in the need for affordable housing in the borough, where there is already a significant unmet need, and remains of the	Low



		For Crawley, total affordable housing need is almost as high as its overall housing need of 755 dwellings per annum (12,835 over the plan period 2023-2040), of which only 42% (5,330) can be met within the borough). Only 17% of Crawley's identified affordable housing can be met in the borough. The Applicant acknowledges at paragraph 17.9.68 of the Environmental Statement (APP-042) that potential tenure demands associated with the Project are likely to be slightly skewed more towards affordable housing than the existing employment base. Given that Crawley is unable to meet its existing affordable housing need, it follows that the Project will exacerbate what is an existing unmet need for affordable housing within Crawley Borough. Further detail is provided in West Sussex LIR Paragraphs 18.76 to 18.80.	view that a contribution to affordable housing is appropriate.	
<b>Document name:</b> Environmental Statement Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note				
LESE 23.	Distance travelled to work data	Paragraph 2.1.6 explains that the study draws on data provided by the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) in terms of average distance workers travel to sites for each region of the UK. The application of a regional estimate to capture numbers of home-based workers can be problematic given the considerable differences that exist within local geographies.	The Applicant should review their approach to this assessment and apply relevant assumptions to the modelling to take account of local variations.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	Low
			<b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change. CBC suggest merging this with Point 4.	
LESE 25.	Labour supply constraints	The Gravity Model used to identify the split of construction workers as 80% HB and 20% as NHB does not appear to have taken account of current labour supply constraints within the local authorities located in the FEMA. Given these constraints, an assumption of 80% HB construction workers doesn't appear to be very realistic in practice or indeed a worst-case approach.	The Applicant should revisit their approach and include a worst-case scenario which assumes all construction workers will be NHB.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change.	Low
LESE 26.	Private rented sector (PRS) accommodation	Section 6.3 provides details of allocation of NHB workers by local authority vs supply of private rental sector beds. Table 6-5 presents PRS bed supply for 2021 by local authority but it isn't clear how these figures have been derived given Paragraph 3.5.2 advised the data on bedrooms was gathered from the	The Applicant should review other potential sources that could inform a more up-to-date understanding of available private rented accommodation. This could include liaison with local authorities in the	Low

		<p>2011 Census. In addition, whilst the figures present PRS bed supply, they do not advise on the availability of accommodation. In the light of a declining supply of rental accommodation and feedback from local authorities on limited availability (PADSS Row 21 refers) this would seem to be a significant omission. Further detail is provided in West Sussex LIR Paragraphs 18.76 to 18.80.</p>	<p>FEMA. The analysis should also take account of other schemes that could need construction workers who may require temporary accommodation.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change. CBC note this is a similar point to that raised at Point 21 above, albeit in reference to a different application document.</p>	
<p><b>Document name:</b> Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy</p>				
<p>LESE 27.</p>	<p>Lack of information on implementation plan, performance, measurable targets, funding and financial management, monitoring and reporting. Route map from ESBS to Implementation Plan is not identified.</p>	<p>Options identified in the ESBS are not necessarily directly aligned with local specific issues and need. The document states that performance, financial management, monitoring and reporting systems will be set out in detail in the Implementation Plan. It is unclear why the Applicant is unable to provide further details on these arrangements within the ESBS (which is the control document) in order to provide sufficient reassurance that appropriate systems will be in place. The ESBS also provides no explanation on whether it would differentiate between the provision and outputs offered through the DCO vs. provision and outputs offered in a Business as Usual (BAU) scenario. Furthermore, the ESBS does not set out any process for how the Implementation Plan would be developed. Given the Applicant is currently suggesting that the majority of the relevant content for the local authorities will be set out in the Implementation Plan, it is essential that the Applicant provides further details on the process for delivering this.</p>	<p>The council note that the ExA have requested that the Applicant submit a first draft Implementation Plan at Deadline 3 (19 April), and welcome the Applicant's establishing of an ESBS Steering Group to feed into this work (first meeting 25 March). Outcomes sought by the Local Authorities are summarised below:</p> <p>The Applicant as part of ESBS should provide more detail on potential tailored initiatives that would specifically align with and support local communities. This should include relevant baseline information to demonstrate local need, which should appropriately consider the variations between local authorities.</p> <p>The Applicant should provide some details on performance, financial management, monitoring and reporting which can be developed further as part of an Implementation Plan. The achieving of appropriate and deliverable outcomes will be key.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

			<p>The Applicant should also clearly explain the difference of BAU and DCO scenarios in terms of provision &amp; outputs.</p> <p>A route map should be provided which explains the process from ESBS to Implementation Plan, aligned to areas of identified local need and outcomes.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> The applicant submitted an Implementation Plan (IP) at Deadline 3 [REP3-069]. The applicant has held a further workshop with JLAs to discuss the detail of the IP. It is understood that the applicant will submit a revised IP at a later deadline, taking into account feedback from JLAs. CBC will provide further comments once revised version is available.</p>	
<b>Document name:</b> Environmental Statement Appendix 17.6.1: Socio-Economic Data Tables				
			<p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> No change. This point is similar to several others regarding baseline data, albeit in reference to a different application document. Suggest combining with Socio-Economic Point 4.</p>	
<b>Document name:</b> Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact Assessment				
LESE 29.	<p>Additionality assumptions</p>	<p>It is unclear to what extent additionality assumptions have been accounted for in the estimates of GVA and employment effects including direct, indirect, induced and catalytic effects. Paragraph 6.3.5 states that estimating net direct, indirect and induced impacts requires assumptions on displacement that are difficult to determine robustly. Whilst it is acknowledged that estimating levels of displacement can be tricky, assumptions can still be applied through the application of a precautionary approach and use of benchmarks.</p>	<p>The Applicant to clarify its approach to additionality. The Applicant should apply displacement (and other additionality assumptions) to the various calculations to align with Green Book guidance.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC note that agreement has been reached (please see SoCG Row</p>	<p>Low</p>

		<p>This is further discussed in Appendix F of the West Sussex LIR.</p> <p>Please note: Work is ongoing between York Aviation and the Applicant regarding a joint local authority SoCG on operations/capacity and needs/forecasting. As this is a work in progress, the PADSS for these elements have not been updated but will be at Deadline 5, when the ExA request this is next submitted into the Examination.</p>	<p>2.19.2.1) as to the methodology for operational employment and GVA, i.e. on-site employment, indirect and induced employment and the associated GVA. This element of disagreement can be removed.</p> <p>This is distinct from any issues regarding the local impact of that employment and the implications for housing, employment and training, as well as considerations of construction employment and the wider catalytic impact of the airport on other business growth and employment. These matters are all subject of ongoing discussion.</p>	
LESE 30.	Basis for distribution assessment of direct impacts	<p>Paraph 5.3.9 states that the impact estimates on the basis of residency distribution of direct impacts are presented. GAL has provided pass holder address information to inform this. It is not clear when this information was obtained therefore the local authorities cannot be certain the information used is up to date.</p>	<p>The Applicant to confirm the date of pass holder information used.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> Applicant has confirmed date of passholder information. Whilst there remains an issue as to the date of this data, this specific issue can be removed.</p>	Agreed

## HEALTH AND WELLBEING

Crawley Borough Council have removed this section from its PADSS as the issues contained within it reflect those concerns raised by West Sussex County Council who are the public health lead local authority. CBC supports the concerns raised by WSCC in its PADSS.

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.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				

## CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT AND IMPACTS

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
CA1.	Lack of support for the Crawley Western Multi-Modal Transport Link	It is unclear to what extent the transport impacts of the development at West of Ifield have been considered alongside the construction phase of the Project. The Applicant indicates that it has not been considered necessary to include a cumulative assessment which includes the scheme. The Authorities do not agree with this decision by the applicant and consider there is the potential for unassessed and unmitigated impacts. The Transport Assessment (para 15.5.24 and 18.7.5) acknowledges the modelling shows traffic may take a route on the west side of the Airport from Ifield Avenue in Crawley via Bonnets Lane, these routes are adjacent to the West of Ifield site. There are a number of highways works associated with the West of Ifield scheme, in particular a multi-modal route which the West Sussex Transport Plan and the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023-2040, Main Modifications Consultation Draft February 2024, identify as an Area of Search. GAL's support for the Crawley Western Multi-modal Transport Link is necessary to alleviate this future impact. West Sussex LIR Paras 19.28 to 19.32 refer.	Provide support, in policy terms and potentially financially, for the Crawley Western Multi-Modal Transport Link to enable developers to alleviate this impact should development West of Ifield come forward. Updated Position Deadline 5; No change	Low
CA2.	Safeguarding for a future southern runway should be removed if the NRP is approved	Safeguarding for a potential future southern runway significantly impedes the ability of Crawley to meet its development needs for housing, employment and noise sensitive supporting infrastructure such as	Confirm that GAL will not pursue the requirement for safeguarding Updated Position Deadline 5; No change	Low

		schools. GAL is not actively pursuing this option and, given growth through the Project continues to 2047, it would be unlikely a southern runway would be needed until around 2050. West Sussex LIR Para 18.81 refers.		
CA3.	Gatwick Green Strategic Employment Location	The date of construction of Gatwick Green was assumed in Table 12.11.1 of Chapter 12 of the ES to be 20% complete in 2029, 50% in 2032 and 100% in 2047. However, evidence submitted to the Crawley Borough Local Plan Examination identifies the completion date as 2035. The Crawley Infrastructure Delivery Schedule December 2023 identifying on site delivery from 2027/28, indicating construction could commence in 2025. The Gatwick Green allocation is sited immediately east of the Project, and there is considerable potential for overlaps to occur with the construction of the modified M23 Spur and particularly with the Balcombe Road bridge widening which is in close proximity to the northern access to the Gatwick Green site. This would create unassessed impacts to occur on the local highway network, particularly Balcombe Road, and/or on the operation of this Strategic Site. West Sussex LIR Para 19.27 refers.	The Applicant needs to ensure that access to third party land, for this site and any other, is maintained throughout the construction period as a commitment within the Construction Management Plan. <b>Updated Position Deadline 5:</b> The council notes the Applicant has engaged with the Gatwick Green developers. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan needs to include a commitment to ensuring access to third party land is maintained.	High
CA4.	Capacity of Crawley Sewerage Treatment Works,	The Authorities have not yet been assured by the Applicant that Thames Water has confirmed that the impact of the DCO's increased wastewater flows, together with those from planned development in the area have been taken into account. The Authorities are concerned that the physical design of the Project works, including the new Reed beds, could compromise the ability of the Crawley Wastewater Treatment Works to expand should that be necessary in the future.	If upgrades to the Works are deemed necessary, there is no clarity on whether this could impact on phasing for other developments, Confirmation from Thames Water. <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> The Applicant has now notified the ExA and is consulting on a Change to the DCO to provide an on-airport foul water treatment works. CBC welcomes this in principle and will review the information	High

			with regard to the impact of these works.	
--	--	--	---	--



## DRAFT DCO / OTHER MISCELLANEOUS CONCERNS

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 the Examination
DCO1.	The Council has wide-ranging concerns about the dDCO.	<p>These will be shared with the Applicant in due course and set out in the Council’s LIR.</p> <p>A summary of the Council’s main concerns (which is not exhaustive) is set out below –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the definition of “commencement” and, in particular, the implications arising from certain operations which fall outside that definition and which do not appear to be controlled (article 2(1), interpretation).</li> <li>ii. clarification of other definitions relating to various airport and boundary plans listed in the order and extent of operational land.</li> <li>iii. the drafting of article 3 (development consent etc. granted by Order).</li> <li>iv. the drafting of article 6 (limit of works) which appears to allow GAL to exceed parameters beyond those assessed in the Environment Statement.</li> <li>v. the drafting of article 9 (planning permission) and provisions in relation to existing planning conditions and future planning controls (including permitted development rights).</li> <li>vi. the drafting of article 25, which concerns trees and hedgerows.</li> <li>vii. the drafting of Part 6 (Miscellaneous and General) particularly the impact of article 46 (disapplication of legislative provisions) on</li> </ul>	<p>Amended wording to ensure the dDCO is worded appropriately to ensure they are meaningful and enforceable.</p> <p>Outstanding concerns remain regarding the dDCO and a schedule of changes has been commented upon and attached to the ‘Comments on the Applicant’s Deadline 1 Submission Development Consent Order – schedule of Changes’ [REP1-005].</p> <p>Iterations of this schedule are likely to be presented at appropriate deadlines.</p> <p><b>Deadline 5 Update:</b> Concerns remain about the drafting of the dDCO. Comments are being exchanged at each deadline. CBC will review the expected revised draft DCO due for submission from the Applicants at this deadline.</p>	Uncertain.

		<p>drainage and article 48, which provides a defence to statutory nuisance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>viii. the inclusion of Work Nos. 26, 27, 28 and 29 (which all concern hotels) in Schedule 1 (authorised development).</li> <li>ix. the drafting of several requirements (Schedule 2) including: the drafting of “start date” (R.3(2) (time limits and notifications); the 14-day notification period in R3(2); why some documents must be produced “in accordance with” the certified documents and others must be produced either “in general accordance” or “in substantial accordance” with them; the drafting of R.14 (archaeological remains); and of those which concern noise (e.g. R.15 (air noise envelope), R.18 (noise insulation scheme)); the ambiguous drafting in R.19 (airport operations);</li> <li>x. concerns regarding Schedule 11, including the proposed timeframe for granting approval for the works, particularly those which are complex and for which limited information has been provided. The lack of any fee proposal for the processing approvals etc. is a matter of genuine concern.</li> <li>xi. the limited information contained in the documents listed in Schedule 12 (documents to be certified).</li> </ul>		
DCO2.	Resources, timings and costs involved with discharge of requirements and monitoring and enforcement of ongoing mitigation measures	There has been no discussion with applicant to date on this matter. Schedule 11 in the DCO is not populated. This remains the case as of 26.3.24 (contrary to what might be suggested in the wording in the SoCG 2.7.1.12).	<p>The scale and complexity of the project will require significant LPA resource. CBC welcomes dialogue with the applicant to progress this matter. CBC welcome the opportunity to discuss with GAL.</p> <p><b>Deadline 5 update</b> – GAL have updated Schedule 11 however the fees proposed will not cover the CBC resourcing required to support the delivery of the project. Further discussions</p>	Uncertain

			are needed to address this important point . Various written comments have been provided on this matter including in response to ExQ1 DCO 1.7 [REP3-0135 and REP4-062]	
DCO 3.	Exclusion of Local Plan Policies and lack of consideration of their requirements.	Lack of reference or acknowledgement of the adopted policies and relevant supplementary guidance that should be considered as part of the DCO. Through the SoCG (most recently at Section 2.17), the Applicant has committed to preparing a “Local Policy Assessment Table”, but this is yet to be provided. Related to this, CBC has asked the Applicant to include reference to the policies of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2023-2040, Main Modifications Consultation Draft, February 2024. This is also yet to be addressed.	Amendments to ensure all policies and documents referenced in the main ES are listed in Appendices and demonstration that the DCO works comply with these requirements (or explain why not).  <b>Deadline 5 update</b> – A policy compliance table was provided and has been commented on see Section 7.7 [REP4-042]. To date compliance has not been demonstrated.	Uncertain
DCO 5.	CAA No Impediments	When GAL expects the Civil Aviation Authority to confirm there are no obvious safety related impediments	Applicant to provide CAA letter of No Impediment. GAL comment that letter should be submitted early in Examination stage is noted.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> CBC notes the draft SoCG between the CCA and the Applicant [REP3-068] and draft letter of No Impediment.	High
DCO 6.	Northern Runway operation controls	How the runway operation changes mentioned in paragraphs 1.3.7 and 1.3.8 will be secured and appropriately controlled	dDCO requirement to be added and agreed.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5) - No Change</b>	high
DCO 7. Planning Statement	Airports National Policy relevance to the DCO determination	Whether there is any legal precedent for the statement that it is “appropriate to use the policy framework of the [Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) as the primary framework against which the project as whole should be tested” (para 1.5.19)	Legal Confirmation	Uncertain
DCO 8. Planning Statement (Appendix A)	Planning History	The Applicant has committed to undertake a review of the Planning History. However, as currently drafted this is incomplete, inaccurate and misleading. No details on the current controls and	Reviewed Planning History to be agreed with the LPA. The Applicant has not addressed this request. CBC has therefore provided this key	Uncertain.

		conditions imposed by existing planning permissions have been included, and no evidence is provided to justify the baseline position being relied upon.	information in the West Sussex LIR, and await the Applicant's comments.  <b>Updated position (Deadline 5) :</b> As demonstrated by Appendix C in the West Sussex LIR [REP1-069], the planning history submitted to the Examination (as Appendix A) is misleading and incomplete and the relevance of some of the entries to the DCO submission is still unexplained. The response provided by GAL in December 2023 [AS-115] provided answers to specific detailed questions posed by the Examination Panel well in advance of the submission of the West Sussex LIR in March 2024 and does not respond to the points raised in Chapter 4 of this document [REP1-068] in respect of the existing planning controls currently in force at the airport, incompatible controls and permitted development rights. The response provided is not adequate and GAL have not provided any response to the detailed submission on this matter provided in the LIR. CBC is not satisfied the current airport planning restrictions have been properly considered as part of the DCO.	
DCO 11	Applicant to provide details of case law in respect of making best use (MBU) of existing runways in respect of Stansted and Manston airports.	The Authorities have questioned the applicability of the national Making Best Use of Existing Runways policy to this application as they are not, at this stage, entirely clear as to the scope of the works being proposed.	The Applicant has provided more detail on the scope of the engineering work at D1 through Application Document Ref: 10.9.2 (The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISH1 The Case for the Proposed Development) Action Point 3. The Authorities will come to a view as to whether the works are an alteration to a runway or the creation of a new runway.  <b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> The additional construction details provided by the Applicant at D4 have been reviewed (refer to West Sussex Authorities response provided at D5 for update).	High
DCO 12	Airports NPS and National Networks NPS (position regarding s104 and s105 of the Planning Act 2008 and National Policy Statements).	The Council consider that the application falls within the scope of s.104 PA 2008 and its provisions should be applied. The NNNPS has effect in relation to application in so far as it	The Applicant has provided more detail on the scope of the engineering work at D1 through Application Document Ref: 10.9.2 (The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISH1 The Case for the Proposed Development) Action	High

		<p>comprises the 'highway related development' elements of the proposal. The Airports NPS does not have effect in relation to any parts of the application, but it is an important and relevant matter in so far as the proposal comprises 'airport related development'. Because the NNNPS does not contain any guidance on the assessment of 'airport related development', and that development is a fundamental component of the proposal, the NNNPS does not provide a sufficient guide to determine whether the application, taken as a whole, is in accordance with it. This is discussed in greater detail through the West Sussex LIR (Paragraphs 6.1 to 6.10).</p>	<p>Point 1. The Authorities will review the material submitted by the Applicant and form a view.</p> <p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> Matter under discussion.</p>	
DCO13	Community Fund	<p>The council considers the level of funding in the Community Fund as secured in the dDCO section 106 agreement is insufficient to better reflect the residual and intangible impacts of the development, particularly given the very significant increase in flights."</p>	<p><b>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</b> This matter is subject to ongoing discussion through negotiation on the S106 agreement.</p>	Uncertain