



Horsham  
District  
Council

# Gatwick Airport Northern Runway

National Infrastructure Project: TR020005

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement  
Version 3 (clean version)

Deadline 5 submission 6th June 2024

Interested Party Reference: 20044739

---

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



This statement has been prepared by Horsham District Council (“the Council”) with input from the joint local authorities, technical consultants and legal specialists. The Council is one of the local authorities identified by Section 43(2) of the Planning Act 2008. This Statement identifies the principal areas of disagreement and is considered to be a live document.

This iteration of the PADSS follows the submission of Version 2 ([REP2-045](#)) to the Examining Authority (“ExA”) in March 2024 and has been updated to reflect the progress made to date.

The Council appreciates this document is long; however, its length is a reflection of the scale of its major concerns with the application. In the light of these concerns, the Council considers the length of the document to be reasonable.

## PLEASE NOTE

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 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. Without a response from GAL further progress cannot be made for most air quality matters in this PADSS. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline. Where it has been possible to update the PADSS for air quality text has been added below.

In considering the “*likelihood of concern being addressed during the Examination*” the Council has assessed this based on the following terms:

<b>Likely</b>	Where agreement is considered possible, or a relatively simple change is required.
<b>Uncertain</b>	Where an issue is being/will be discussed and the Council intends to provide an update on the position in due course.

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



<b>Unlikely</b>	Where agreement on an issue is unlikely, or it is difficult to see what a solution could be.
-----------------	--

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## Contents

1. BASELINE, FORECASTING AND ECONOMIC CASE .....	4
2. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT .....	7
3. AIR QUALITY .....	13
4. NOISE AND VIBRATION .....	17
5. WATER ENVIRONMENT .....	24
6. SOCIOECONOMICS .....	26
7. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS AND INTER-RELATIONSHIPS .....	31
8. CARBON AND GREENHOUSE GASES (GHG) .....	36
9. CLIMATE CHANGE .....	41
10. ECOLOGY, LANDSCAPE AND HERITAGE .....	42
11. OTHER MATTERS .....	43
12. DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER AND SECURING MITIGATION .....	46
ACRONYMS .....	48

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 1. BASELINE, FORECASTING AND ECONOMIC CASE

HDC 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
1.1	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 [REP1-054], which uses more appropriate assumptions about the separations required between departing aircraft but, nonetheless, indicates lower levels of delay. Further information has been sought regarding the calibration of this model to verify that it does not understate delays before it can be agreed that the NRP is capable of delivering the capacity uplift assumed over the longer term [REP4-052]	Further information regarding the validation of the updated simulation modelling is required.	Uncertain
1.2	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	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 [REP1-052] that show	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

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC 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
	forecasts are considered too optimistic	slower growth in the early years 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.		
1.3	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
1.4	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	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.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC 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
		effects, as well as other methodological concerns.		

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 2. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
<p><b>The Council endorses the PADSS submitted by West Sussex County Council, as the local highway authority, in relation to transport modelling, impacts and mitigation on local highways.</b></p>				
2.1	Absence of an Airport Surface Access Strategy	ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (paras 2.1.9 and 5.1.2) highlight that an ASAS has not been prepared to support the NRP proposals. Ch.12 Traffic and Transport, Table 12.3.2, p.20 also details that the Car Parking Strategy will be part of the future ASAS and it is not clear how the proposed parking numbers fit within the wider surface access strategy. The Council is concerned that the lack of a clear strategy risks the Applicant's objectives and commitments not being secured through the DCO.	Applicant needs to demonstrate how the mode share targets and mitigation will be secured.	Uncertain
2.2	Passenger and staff parking	<p>The methodology to derive the proposed parking provision of an additional 1,100 spaces for passengers is not clear, nor how this fits with the wider mode share targets. Similarly, the loss of 1,150 spaces for staff parking also needs to be explained given the increase in staff numbers in both the with and without project scenarios.</p> <p>A review of the Car Parking Strategy submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 1 has raised concerns about the acute loss of staff spaces, as opposed to the gradual reduction referred to previously by the Applicant. The Council considers further analysis, taking account of the</p>	<p>The Applicant is asked to clarify how the car parking provision has been reached and fits within its wider modal shift commitments.</p> <p>Clarification is required around the approach to staff parking reduction. The most up to date staff travel data must be taken into account to inform an approach to staff parking which meets the aspiration to increase staff travel by sustainable modes.</p>	Uncertain



# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC 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
		updated Staff Travel Survey 2023, is key to any staff parking strategy.		
2.4	Surface Access Commitments (SACs) and Target Mode Shares	<p>Concerns are held about the Surface Access Commitments that underpin the creation of a new Surface Access Strategy and the approach to meeting and monitoring these targets. Further detail is set out in the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report, however in summary some of the concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Commitment 1, to ensure 55% of passenger journeys is made by public transport is not considered ambitious or of sufficient challenge. Prior to the Pandemic the airport achieved 47.8% public transport modal share in the 12 months up to March 2020 (Paragraph 12.6.11 ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport).</li> <li>– Target mode shares set out as Commitments are only set out as percentages. The percentages masks trends in absolute numbers and permit significant increases in car trips to and from the airport.</li> <li>– Insufficient evidence and justification are provided to demonstrate how the mitigation proposed can provide sufficient sustainable and active travel infrastructure to successfully meet the some of the target modal splits.</li> <li>– Commitments are made in relation to bus and coach service provision. Determination of mode of travel takes into a variety of factors rather than</li> </ul>	<p>Surface Access Commitments and associated mitigation to be reviewed and amended.</p> <p>The Council notes that an updated version of the Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028] was submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 3. This revised document does not include any further commitments in relation to bus priority measures. While the update states the Applicant intends to work with rail operators to increase mode share under 'Further Aspirations', opportunities to maximise the contribution of rail access do not appear to have been explored further as part of the proposed SACs. The Council remains concerned at the lack of mitigation and controls within the SACs [REP3-028] to ensure that the modal split commitments are delivered.</p> <p>Furthermore, concerns remain over the Applicant's Active Travel commitments and the Council supports the view of WSCC that improvement of local provision is insufficient to promote active</p>	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>just provision of service. The applicant has not assessed or considered the attractiveness of modes or how this could be increased. For example, by providing enhanced bus priority measures to provide journey time savings. There are no proposed enhancements for services connecting locations within Horsham District to Gatwick Airport which is very disappointing. As a minimum support for Route 200 which operates between Horsham and Gatwick Airport should be included as part of the service enhancements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Funding for services should be expanded and enhanced, both with a commitment to fund beyond the short-term (i.e to ensure the coach services running to the airport are viable) and with some investment in indirect journeys to and from the airport, such as journeys from home to coach terminals, with a view to minimising the use of private vehicle.</li> <li>- Commitment 8 indicates that there will be support for local authorities affected by unauthorised car parking in areas near to the Airport, however, there is a lack of details around the nature and scale of funding and how any monies will be distributed.</li> <li>- The timescale within which the Applicant will meet the mode share commitments are inadequate, and the Council considered these should be met, where appropriate, at the time the second runway becomes operational. As the Surface Access</li> </ul>	<p>travel away from the road network and also additional recreational routes for walkers and, cyclists are necessary.</p>	

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>Commitments stand, the second runway can be operation for three years without these targets being achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the SACs not be met the proposed approach allows for higher levels of vehicular traffic than is targeted by the SACs for a substantial period of time. The Applicant will produce an Action Plan to address the failure to meet the targets. This does not provide sufficient control and the Highway Authority advocate a Green controlled Growth approach, similar to that adopted by Luton Airport.</li> </ul>		
2.5	Modelling inputs	<p>The Council has a number of concerns with regard to the core modelling scenario. There is concern that the exclusion of certain developments, such as Land West of Ifield and Heathrow R3, but the inclusion of transport improvements such as the SMART motorway improvements on the M25 (J10-16) (which has now been cancelled), may skew the results of the transport assessment. The concern is that the scenario assessed may not provide a realistic worst-case assessment.</p> <p>The Council does not agree that sites, such as Land West of Ifield, should be excluded from the core modelling scenario while growth from future housing trajectory is being relied upon in the socio-economic assessment.</p>	Applicant should provide a realistic worst-case assessment and ensure consistency in the assessments across the different topic areas.	Unlikely

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
2.6	2,500 robotic parking spaces should not be included in the future baseline	<p>The Council endorses the view of Crawley Borough Council that the proposed 2,500 robotic parking should not be included as permitted development and therefore part of the baseline. The current temporary trial for 100 robotic spaces is not comparable. It would significantly increase parking capacity and the highways impact will need to be considered in full.</p> <p>The full 2,500 spaces are included in the parking baseline on the assumption of a successful Permitted Development consultation that would be required by the Applicant. This is not considered to be a robust approach given the uncertainty that the Applicant could provide evidence of the spaces being required.</p>	The 2,500 robotic car parking spaces should be removed from the baseline and be included under the scope of the Project.	Unlikely
2.7	Transport impacts, mitigation and commitments: lack of wider improvements to the sustainable transport network in Horsham District.	The mitigation as proposed is insufficient and there is inadequate detail on the level of funding associated with the various funds detailed in the Mitigation Route Map and how this will be distributed to fund improvements e.g., no indication of scale of funding associated with the Transport Mitigation Fund. Commitments are currently considered to lack robustness, sufficient to be secured as part of the DCO e.g., Commitments 5, 6 and 7 in the SAC detail that the Applicant will “provide reasonable support for services” but it is not clear what constitutes “reasonable support”, nor who will be responsible for determining this. As currently proposed the details are not sufficient to provide assurances to those responsible for delivering the services or to secure meaningful provision of improvements.	<p>Consideration of meaningful enhancements and improvements to encourage active and public transport in direct and indirect journeys to the airport from Horsham District.</p> <p>Discussions on the funding arrangements under the S106 agreement are ongoing.</p>	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>The Applicant has not addressed the potential for improvements to access to the airport by active and public transport from Horsham District.</p> <p>Walking, wheeling and cycling connectivity in adjoining development, to improve the ability of residents living to the west of Crawley to access existing public transport networks has not been fully explored.</p> <p>The Applicant has also not considered the provision of a more attractive bus route from the north of Horsham to the airport, considering improvements to bus routes which would lead to time saving on bus journeys to the airport.</p>		

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 3. AIR QUALITY

HDC 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
3.1	Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex (2021)	<p>Clarification from the Applicant is requested to explain the extent to which the Sussex Guidance was given consideration in preparing the air quality mitigation plan.</p> <p>The overarching principle of the guidance is to, as far as it is possible, design emissions out of a scheme, and mitigate or offset any residual emissions. Thus, the guidance aligns with the aims of Defra's Clean Air Strategy on reducing emissions to protect health and protect the environment, and the HDC environmental policy, which is why it is essential applicants adhere to its principles.</p>	The Applicant should consider and respond to the Sussex Guidance, as is the expectation for any major development	Uncertain
3.2	Health Damage Cost Calculation	<p>The emissions calculation and total calculated value of emissions' health damage cost were not included in the DCO documents.</p> <p>Understanding costs is essential to effective and necessary mitigation and Chapter 13.12.6 states the costs associated with air pollution are considered under the Socio-Economic Effects of Chapter 17. However, there is no mention of such costs in Chapter 17.</p>	The Applicant should undertake the emissions calculation and health damage cost calculation and commit to meeting the costs to ensure effective and necessary mitigation is provided	Uncertain
3.3	Air Quality Mitigation Plan (Operational)	Lack of a stand-alone operating Air Quality Plan. The guidance requires that each application is supported by an air quality mitigation plan detailing measures to mitigate and/or	The Joint Local Authorities have submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2 -004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>offset the impacts and setting out itemised costing for each proposed measure.</p> <p>It is recognised that air quality mitigation measures have been set out in the Carbon Action Plan (Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan) and Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments.</p> <p>Although they may contain the same measures, the aim of a Carbon Plan is reducing emissions on a larger scale, such as a region, whereas the aim of an air quality plan would be to reduce/offset emissions locally. Furthermore, an effective air quality plan would contain the following elements for each proposed measure: Costings; Performance Indicators; and Delivery Timescales.</p> <p>These are the essential mechanisms that can enable the Authorities and the Airport to respond accordingly for the benefit of communities and public health. It is essential that there is confidence that proper monitoring mechanisms and indicators are established at the outset and reviewed as necessary. The Carbon and Surface Access plans do not address any of these criteria.</p>	<p>Without a response from GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	
3.4	Air Quality Mitigation Plan (Construction)	<p>Construction traffic will use the strategic route network in the District.</p> <p>Although commitment to adopting London Low Emission Zone standards was made at the PEIR stage, Appendix 13.8.1 advises the standards will be used “where applicable” while</p>	<p>Insufficient information provided in the DCO evidence base in relation to the London LEZ, which does not accord with what has been advised by the Applicant previously, and the construction phase monitoring strategy. The Applicant is</p>	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	<p>Appendix 13.8.1: Air Quality Construction Period Mitigation</p> <p>Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice Annex 3 - Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</p>	<p>Paragraph 7.2.15 of Appendix 5.3.2 states that “Low emission plant would be encouraged and used where practicable [...]” but provides no further details and makes no commitment to using London Low Emission Zone standards and adopting a Fleet Recognition Scheme.</p> <p>Lack of Emissions Monitoring Strategy for the Construction Phase.</p> <p>No specific details for the construction phase monitoring strategy were provided. Although it is expected that a dust monitoring plan and a monitoring plan will be provided at a later date, key points and decisions should have already been made available.</p>	<p>therefore requested to provide this information.</p> <p>The Joint Local Authorities have submitted a detailed review of the GAL Dust Management Plan [No Examination Ref]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review.</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. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	
3.5	Model Set Up and Methodology	<p>Regarding model verification, Appendix 13.6.1: Air Quality Data and Model verification is missing details on how model verification factors for the selected zones were established. Details are required of the initial verification including Monitored Road NOx Contribution versus Unverified Modelled Road NOx, which monitoring sites were used, and which were removed from the verification process.</p> <p>To facilitate the scrutiny of the model set up and any assumptions used, it is requested that a complete set of input files be shared for 2018 (Base Year) and 2029 (nearest future year). In addition, Operational and Construction impacts for</p>	The Applicant should provide further details in relation to the model verification	Uncertain



# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC 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
		2029 should be modelled jointly as one scenario, in order to enable the evaluation of all impacts associated with the development.		
3.6	Model results – 2047 scenario	Despite previous commitments to including a 2047 scenario, this scenario has not been modelled.	The 2047 scenario should be modelled	Likely

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 4. NOISE AND VIBRATION

HDC 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
4.1	The Applicant's interpretation of national policy and the effect this has on the communities affected by the airport operations  (Air Noise)	The Council disagrees with the Applicant's interpretation of national policy in respect of noise and aviation noise policy statements. This has influenced their approach to the work. In consequence, the benefits of technological improvements are not being shared sufficiently with affected communities and the total adverse impacts of noise are not being mitigated. The approach does not appear consistent with the Noise Policy Statement for England.	The relevant chapters and appendices need to be updated so that assessment of impact, mitigation and compensation is suitably revised.	Uncertain
4.2	Local Planning Policy  (Air Noise)	Local planning policies in relation to noise are briefly referred to in sections 14.2.61 to 14.2.62 of Chapter 14 the Environmental Statement. There is no explanation of the policies, the weight given to them and how they have influenced the design, assessment of impact and mitigation of the proposal. This is contrary to the 'Balanced Approach' required by UK and international policy.	The Applicant needs to clearly explain how they have had regard to (or otherwise) local planning policy. This is not only in relation to noise but also for wider impacts on land use planning including provision for housing and other noise sensitive development that will be affected by the NRP.	Uncertain
4.3	Threshold and scope of LOAELS and SOAELS  (Air Noise)	The ES only considers the Leq metric for LOAELs and SOAELs. In doing so it makes reference to national policy. The consideration only of Leq as a metric is too narrow and other metrics should be applied to the decision processes within the Project to inform impact and mitigation. In determining the LOAELs and SOAELs more recent data, including planning decisions and revised health assessment criteria need to be	Inclusion of assessment for a wider range of criteria, including but not exclusively, awakenings, N above contours in addition to the Lden and Lnight.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC 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
		applied. The consideration only of the Leq metric does not represent all the effects of air noise across the District.		
4.4	Modelling  (Air Noise)	The forecast modelling is only partially complete for the future years. There is no information for 2029. Local authorities have requested a sensitivity analysis showing the 2019 base year movements with the predicted 2029 fleet mix to determine actual improvements that might be experienced with technology. A number of datasets are incomplete including missing overflight information (14.9.30 simply shows a cropped image of proposed flight paths but is listed as departure overflights). No consideration is made of arrivals as well as departures.	Additional modelling needs to be completed. All years must be scenario tested for all metrics and this must relate to departures as well as arrivals. Modelling uncertainty needs to be included, as do all assumptions (including runway usage, fleet mix (including quota count information) and anticipated SID usage on an hourly basis.	Uncertain
4.5	Quantification of effects based on limited threshold information  (Air Noise)	Chapter 18 – Health and Wellbeing for the significant effects of noise is based on the disputed thresholds contained in ES Chapter 14 – Noise and Vibration. As the thresholds are disputed this calls into question the calculation of the significance of effects.	Significance of effects is calculated using more recent data including updated WebTAG and most recent review of effects of noise on health. In addition, consistent use of datasets and data populations is required to aid understanding and analysis. Full monetisation of effects needs to be provided to properly understand impacts.	Unlikely
4.6	Assessment of significance of effects – the disregard of total effects of noise on health and annoyance by referring only to marginal	The Environmental Statement takes into consideration only the marginal increase in noise as a result of the additional capacity of the NRP. Given this, it disregards the existing health effects of the otherwise uncontrolled and unmitigated growth. For example, awakening data	An existing baseline for all metrics needs to be established with sensitivity testing for baseline and cumulative impact with the Northern Runway in operation to understand total effects of the operation and whether this is a)	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
	impacts of the NRP over a rapidly increasing baseline  (Air Noise).	for the NRP part of capacity is below the Heathrow SOAEL of one additional awakening. However, this disregards the awakenings that occur now and the increase in awakenings that will occur with purported increase in baseline growth without the Northern Runway.	acceptable and b) appropriate mitigation is in place to address the impacts.	
4.7	Assessment of changes in sound levels  (Air Noise)	There is insufficient consideration of the impacts of changes to noise levels for a range of metrics that lie between the LOAEL and SOAEL or above the SOAEL. An assessment of significance of the changes is required to determine if it is acceptable and if so, what mitigation is required in such circumstances.	Additional clarification is required for changes in exposure to an agreed range of metrics including N above, awakenings and overflights to understand impacts then determine if this is acceptable and if so, how they can be mitigated.	Uncertain
4.8	Assumptions on WIZAD (Route 9)	WIZAD (Route 9) is a tactical offload route with prohibition on use between 23:00 and 07:00. Under the proposals the local air traffic control at Gatwick Airport would have no choice but to schedule aircraft on this route thereby making it a planned permanent use. The impact on Horsham town has not been assessed and the periods of greatest impact have not been made clear. This impacts existing dwellings, those currently under development and proposed new development. Whilst this route is one of a number of options under FASI-S it cannot be relied upon and the application should not pre-determine the FASI-S process.	The use of WIZAD (Route 9) should remain as it is. The Council would also expect further discussions on the use of arrival and departure routes.	Uncertain
4.9	Noise Insulation Scheme	The noise insulation scheme is not sufficient to protect those who will suffer adverse effects of noise and deal	The Applicant will need to improve the offering based on consideration of a wider range of	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		<p>with the unintended consequences of the installation of noise insulation. There are multiple issues with the scheme, by way of example, the Council:</p> <p>(i) disagrees that the thresholds of qualification are set at the correct level and within the correct parameters;</p> <p>(ii) considers the Applicant has had no regard to overheating created as a result of the installation of noise insulation measures;</p> <p>(iii) disagrees that once installation is complete all ongoing maintenance and running costs are borne by the householder or person in charge of the premises; and</p> <p>(iv) considers that everyone should be eligible for the scheme whether or not they have qualified previously.</p>	<p>determinants and having regard to multiple use types: make separate provision for prevention of overheating; define qualifying areas based on single mode noise contours; be predicated on predictive work; and start as soon as possible before commencement.</p> <p>The requirement to use predictive work to determine future noise levels to qualify for insulation relates to both air and ground noise.</p> <p>Noise exposure exceedances against which grant qualification is determined must be based on air noise, ground noise or the cumulative effect of both whichever is the greater noise level at the receiving property.</p>	
4.10	Noise Envelope	The Council does not consider the noise envelope is fit for purpose on multiple grounds	The noise envelope needs to be redesigned from first principles to provide a responsive, preventative, self-regulating mechanism that incentivises the use of quieter fleet and shares the benefit of technological improvements with the local community through a range of operational and outcome-based measures. It needs to be governed by a steering committee that includes local authorities and provides them with a balanced range of intervention and enforcement tools.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)



Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024

HDC 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
4.11	Draft DCO	The control of air noise, by metric and operational limitation, is under-represented in the DCO including (but not exclusively) the noise envelope requirements, use of routes, night flying restrictions, limitation on passenger numbers and freight movements; and conditional slot management.	A substantial review of the DCO to ensure there is adequate representation of, amongst other things, noise and associated operational controls, enforcement mechanisms, access to information, noise envelope scrutiny group, full funding of local authority costs including staff and specialists as required to oversee the DCO in construction and operational phases.	Uncertain
4.12	Lack of ongoing research to test adequacy of proposals	<p>The ES utilises models to predict noise levels, the impacts, the locations of the impacts and inform mitigation. All decision-making is based on the knowledge described in the ES at the time of the determination of the application.</p> <p>There are no proposals for research to improve understanding as part of an iterative development of an environmental impact and management system.</p>	The Council expects the Applicant to fund a range of research work, that is commissioned by the local authorities or the Applicant (at the discretion of the host authority) into a wide range of matters including improving the prediction of noise contours so that lower noise levels can be effectively modelled; establishing local population attitudes to noise; validating effectiveness of noise insulation works; techniques to tackle overheating in noise insulated properties. Once the work is completed, it is then used to improve systems or adapt the mitigation appropriately or both dependent on the nature of the research in a timely fashion.	Uncertain
4.13	Ground noise	There seem to be little new provisions to control the ground noise from the Airport. During construction the noise bund is due to be removed but aircraft taxi-ing will continue. The creation of a flood area to the West of the runway will change the propagation characteristics of	Alternate noise barrier provision during works and consideration of use of barriers elsewhere around the aerodrome to mitigate ground noise.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
		the sound and the Council is concerned about increases in ground noise as a result, particularly the lower frequencies.		
4.14	Modelling (Ground Noise)	Absence of ground noise modelling procedures and results to show contours of ground noise associated with airport operations, as existing during the baseline and then under future scenarios.	Production of ground noise contours under appropriate modes including but not limited to single mode Easterly and Westerly for LAeq 16h and LAeq8, N above for day and night as well as awakenings (including cumulative with air noise). The model should be developed to inform the ground noise management plan to prevent and progressively reduce noise exposure. Ground noise LAeq,T predictions should include contributions from engine ground running, auxiliary power unit, fire training ground activities and engine around taxi noise	
4.15	Ground Noise Management Plan	There is insufficient consideration given to the control of ground noise within the NRP application.	A ground noise management plan is required, as a certified document, for the purpose of preventing and where this cannot be achieved minimising the impacts of ground noise on the local community. The Best Available Techniques should be adopted within the plan to prevent or minimise the impacts occurring on the local community.	

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC 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
4.16	Compensation	The scheme of compensation is inadequate.	The airport needs to provide a fair and equitable scheme of compensation to affected individuals and the wider community. Such a scheme should be clearly stated, in part as a requirement with supporting information in a certified document.	Uncertain



# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 5. WATER ENVIRONMENT

HDC 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
5.1	Wastewater capacity of the wider network and implications for current and emerging Local Plan development	As the Applicant has identified, the capacity of the public sewer network to which the Gatwick wastewater system discharges is the responsibility of Thames Water. The Council has also been advised by Thames Water that an assessment of the impact of wider projected development in the local area on their sewage treatment works at Horley and Crawley is being undertaken, however this information is still awaited. Given the cumulative impact of the Project and current and emerging Local Plan growth in the area, the Council is concerned about the capacity of the Crawley Wastewater Treatment works to meet this growth and what implications any necessary network reinforcement may have on the timescales for development coming forward.	<p>Thames Water are requested to input into this process or in the absence of Thames Water's input the implications of capacity issues will need to be considered in more detail (along with the cumulative impacts of other development) and any necessary phasing and mitigation secured as part of the DCO.</p> <p>The Council is aware that the Applicant has notified the ExA of an intention to submit a change to the Project which would allow wastewater treatment on site. This is welcomed in principle, and the Council will review the information provided as part of the Applicant's consultation and submit comments on the impact in due course.</p>	Uncertain
5.2	Requirement for synergy between flood mitigation strategies	Land West of Ifield is a strategic site promoted by Homes England through the Council's Local Plan Review. Given the proximity of the site (1km) to the Airport - and should development come forward in both locations - it is important that there is	The Applicant should work with Homes England to ensure their respective flood mitigation strategies are not progressed in isolation, should both developments come forward.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



		synergy between the respective flood mitigation strategies. This does not appear to have been sufficiently considered in the CEA.		
--	--	---	--	--

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 6. SOCIOECONOMICS

HDC 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 address during Examination
6.1	No consideration of effects at a local authority level and concerns with the approach to the assessment of effects	<p>Despite being raised as a gap in the assessment at several Socio-economic Topic Working Group meetings between the Applicant and the Authorities and the Council's formal response to the Applicant's section 42 consultation, there is still no 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), social infrastructure and temporary accommodation need to be assessed given they affect both functioning and decision making at the local level.</p> <p>Assessment of effects on the labour market, population, temporary accommodation, construction noise impacts on residents, community facilities, and construction employment need to be revisited. The Council holds concerns in relation to the magnitude criteria used and sensitivity grading for identified receptors. Assessment based on the different study areas are unlikely to fully capture the impacts on Horsham District. There are also concerns with the Cumulative Effects Assessment for the local authority areas in the FEMA, including Horsham District.</p>	<p>The Applicant should undertake an assessment of Project impacts on each local authority area located within the Northern West Sussex Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA) (which includes Horsham District) to adequately understand the extent of impacts at a local level.</p> <p>In the absence of local level analysis it remains difficult to gauge what local impacts the Project will have.</p>	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



6.2	Water neutrality implications for affordable housing delivery and incorrect AMR details used for Horsham District	<p>It is not correct for the Applicant to surmise at 4.3.11 that the Local Authorities (as of August 2021) would have been able to take account of water neutrality implications on housing delivery through their trajectories. Whilst there was at the time an awareness and emerging understanding of water neutrality, work was being undertaken to address these issues through the Local Plan process. Issue of the Natural England Position Statement in September 2021 instantly applied water neutrality requirements to planning applications, effectively stopping development as planning applications could not be consented without having demonstrated water neutrality. As such, the housing delivery implications of water neutrality were not fully understood as of August 2021. Furthermore, the Applicant has not used the latest housing delivery reports which would take account of these issues (the 2020/21 Authority Monitoring Report for Horsham District Council has been used despite the more recent 2021/22 report being publicly available from December 2022). The implications of the recent <i>CG Fry v SoS and Somerset Council</i> High Court judgment (June 2023) will also need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>This has an inevitable knock-on impact on the amount of affordable housing, and overall affordability, as the housing market is more constrained than the assessment indicates.</p>	<p>This is an important clarification that should be made, as the Applicant's current wording infers that water neutrality implications were factored into August 2021 housing trajectories, when in reality the 'stop' on development came after issue of the Position Statement in September 2021. Furthermore, in the instance highlighted above, the Applicant should use the latest information available to inform the analysis.</p>	Uncertain
6.3	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	The Applicant should substantiate the conclusion that the Project is unlikely to have any impact on affordable housing demand.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>The analysis should be updated at a local authority level in order to help identify issues which need to be planned for and mitigated.</p> <p>The Council notes the recent updates to evidence submitted by the Applicant in response to ExQ SE 1.15 [REP4-031] making use of 2021 Census data, however concerns remain in relation to the impact construction workforce could have on wider access to affordable housing without suitable mitigation. While the Council accepts to some extent the Applicant's position that a proportion of the construction workforce will be existing residents therefore will not place increased demand on the housing market the Council still has concerns. The Applicant has not demonstrated that the draw of airport employees from the larger Labour Market Area (not just the Local Study Area) will not be reflected in the construction workforce, therefore the position that a contribution to affordable housing within Horsham District is appropriate.</p>	
6.4	Impact of the Project on residential and commercial property prices	<p>The Council does not agree with the scoping out of the impact on property prices as a result of the Project. The reference to the PPG and the Land Compensation Act 1973 (LCA) have been arbitrarily applied – indeed an assessment of the impact on residential and commercial properties should have been undertaken to determine whether payment is required under the LCA. The references to National Planning Practice Guidance are inconsistent, relying on the PPG on the one hand to discount the scoping in of the effect on property prices and then suggesting in the Planning Statement that the “NPPG does not set policy tests for NSIPs” (para 6.4.5). In the Second Scoping</p>	<p>The Applicant should be required to undertake an assessment of the impact on residential and commercial property prices as a result of the Project.</p>	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)



Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024

		Opinion dated October 2019, PINS stated: “ <i>The ES should assess any likely significant effects associated with the Proposed Development in relation to [the Project’s effects on property value]</i> ”.		
6.5	Use of out-of-date data sources	<p>Census 2011 data being relied upon for a number of different assessments, for example, data on dwelling vacancy and economic activity, amongst other data, which is significantly out of date.</p> <p>Several Baseline Data Tables are out of date and do not use the most recent data sources available at the time.</p>	<p>The Applicant should be using the most up-to-date sources, including data from the 2021 Census which is available.</p> <p>While the Council acknowledges that the Applicant has, in some cases, revisited the assessments with more recent data, in the absence of local level analysis it remains difficult to gauge what local impacts the Project will have.</p>	Likely
6.6	Assessment of impacts on labour supply and labour supply constraints	Some aspects of the conclusions drawn in relation to the impacts on labour supply do not appear to be robust and should be re-visited to ensure a realistic assessment (including a worst-case scenario for construction workers) and should be undertaken at a local authority level	<p>The Applicant should revisit the assessment which should be undertaken at a local authority level.</p> <p>In the absence of local level analysis, it remains difficult to gauge what local impacts the Project will have</p>	Uncertain
6.7	Lack of information on ESBS Implementation Plan, performance, measurable targets, funding and financial management, monitoring and reporting. Route map from ESBS to Implementation Plan is not identified.	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 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	The Applicant as part of the 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. 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 Applicant should also clearly explain the difference of BAU and DCO scenarios in terms of provision & outputs. A route map should be provided which explains the process from ESBS to	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



		<p>outputs offered in a Business as Usual (BAU) scenario.</p> <p>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>Implementation Plan, aligned to areas of identified local need and outcomes.</p>	
6.8	<p>Alignment with local needs - Lack of clarity around how the ESBS will deliver benefits to Horsham District residents and businesses</p>	<p>It is noted that the focus for ESBS investment and actions will be directed towards the areas most likely to be affected by the construction and operational phases of the development. The Applicant is asked to clarify which “<i>parts of Horsham</i>” (para 1.1.9, ES Appendix 17.8.1) would see the delivery of these activities. The Council would expect that the ESBS would seek to deliver activities across the entire District – there is concern that the spatial context described in this paragraph relates to the Local Study Area which is not sufficient in reflecting Horsham District as it contains only a small rural part of the District. The strategy should ensure that the Project delivers economic benefits to Horsham District.</p>	<p>The Applicant, as part of the ESBS, should provide more detail on potential tailored initiatives that would specifically align with and support Horsham District residents and businesses.</p> <p>The applicant submitted an Implementation Plan (IP) at Deadline 3 <a href="#">[REP3-069]</a> and has held a further workshop with the JLAs to discuss the detail of the IP. It is understood that the applicant will submit a revised IP at a later deadline, considering feedback from JLAs. The Council will provide further comment once the revised version is available.</p>	<p>Uncertain</p>

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 7. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS AND INTER-RELATIONSHIPS

HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
7.1	Concerns about CEA methodology and rationale and consistency of assessment across topics	<p>The Applicant appears to have assumed a high level of certainty around other development sites in the District in order to support favourable socio-economic outcomes, while simultaneously citing lack of certainty or information as justification for excluding these same developments from various topics assessments.</p> <p>The methodology and rationale used for the CEA has not been made clear, leading to concerns that the assessment of individual sites may have been applied inconsistently or incorrectly. There is an inconsistent approach applied across the various topic assessments that have the potential to skew the assessment results. For example, Land West of Ifield has been excluded from some assessments, i.e., Transport during its construction phase, despite the Project relying on future Local Plan development coming forward to mitigate housing need arising from the Project. It is also difficult to understand</p>	<p>There needs to be a clearer, more transparent, and consistent approach to the CEA.</p> <p>While the approach to the CEA has been the subject of a number of submissions the Council's position, that the Applicant has not demonstrated that assessment provides a full and robust appraisal of the cumulative impacts of development, remains unchanged.</p>	Uncertain



# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



		the extent to which key developments have been considered without more transparency in how the CEA has been carried out in more detail.		
7.2	Rationale and information underlying the Zones of Influence is unclear.	<p>There are a number of concerns with the thresholds used and the ES does not adequately explain the rationale behind them. While it is accepted that professional judgement is necessary, further detail should be provided. Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport states: "The Zone of Influence for considering cumulative effects related to traffic and transport is the same as that used for the core assessment described in previous sections." It is not made clear which previous sections the reader should refer to. Chapter 11: Water Environment states "The Zone of Influence (Zol) for the water environment has been identified based on the spatial extent of likely effects." Other topic chapters are similarly vague. It is unclear exactly how these Zols have been set, and it is disappointing local authorities have been unable to scrutinise the rationale.</p> <p>There are concerns more specifically with the Zol boundaries. The current Zol used for the assessment of cumulative socio-economic impacts does not reflect the likely impacts on</p>	<p>The rationale for all Zols should be explained in full detail</p> <p>While the approach to the CEA has been the subject of a number of submissions the Council's position, that the Applicant has not demonstrated that assessment provides a full and robust appraisal of the cumulative impacts of development, remains unchanged.</p>	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



		conurbations in the north of the District meaning potentially significant impacts are not properly understood.		
7.3	Rationale and assumptions underlying the shortlist of other developments is unclear	A number of assumptions and reflections made in relation to other developments are not considered accurate or consistent throughout the assessment	Now that local authorities have had sight of the outcomes of the CEA work, comments should be taken into account and assessments updated.	Uncertain
7.4	Lack of support for a Western Multi-modal Transport Link west of Crawley	It is unclear to what extent the transport impacts of the proposed 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 Council disagrees with this decision by the applicant and considers 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,	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.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 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.		
7.5	Treatment of temporal boundaries is unclear	The assessment appears to assume that only development occurring at the same time will interact or combine. No mention of how impacts not occurring at the same time as the Project have been assessed.	The Applicant should either explain how they have considered "past, present and reasonably foreseeable" actions in compiling a shortlist and assessing cumulative effects or conduct an assessment encompassing an appropriate range of effects.	Uncertain
7.6	Treatment of Heathrow expansion (R3).	<p>The Council has several concerns around the way the Heathrow expansion proposals have been considered across the CEA.</p> <p>While the assessment of Heathrow's expansion (R3) alongside the Project is supported, it is disappointing that this has been undertaken in isolation and has not been explored in combination with other developments. As currently presented the assessment is unlikely to capture the realistic worst-case scenario should expansion at both airports occur.</p> <p>In addition, the Council questions the use of future baseline data published as part of the 2019 DCO consultation for a third runway and whether this data is</p>	The approach to assessing possible cumulative impacts were Heathrow to come forward should be reviewed and clarified.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



		still relevant. It is also unclear on what basis the assumption that air traffic levels at Gatwick would decline if Heathrow R3 is operational by the mid-2030s.		
7.7	Further assessment of cumulative impacts on health and wellbeing are necessary	The Applicant has not addressed the potential for several impacts considered, when reviewed in isolation, not to have significant effects, to interact and have significant effects on health and wellbeing when considered in combination. For instance, noise impacts coupled with air quality impacts and traffic impacts may combine to have significant detrimental impacts.	The assessment of cumulative and inter-related effects between topic areas should be considered holistically to establish the combined impact on the health and wellbeing of receptors.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 8. CARBON AND GREENHOUSE GASES (GHG)

HDC 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
8.1	No consideration is provided in the ES around the risk of the Jet Zero Strategy and the impact this would have on the significance of the assessment. There is also no assessment of cumulative UK airport expansions and how this will impact the UK's net zero trajectory	<p>The GHG Assessment fails to consider the risks of the Jet Zero Aviation Policy and how this could compromise the UK's net zero trajectory in alignment with the concerns raised to the UK Government by the CCC and in the judicial review.</p> <p>Additionally, the GHG Assessment does not assess the cumulative impact of the Project in the context of the eight of the biggest UK airports planning to increase to approximately 150 million more passengers a year by 2050 relative to 2019 levels.</p>	The Applicant should update the GHG Assessment to adequately consider the risk of the UK Aviation Jet Zero strategy and the cumulative impact of the Project.	Likely
8.2	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].	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.	The Applicant should confirm if WTT was applied to the Aviation GHG assessment. If it was not, the Applicant is required to update the GHG assessment to account for WTT emissions.	Addressed

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



		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>2</sub> e not being accounted for in 2028 (the most carbon-intensive year), where 5.327 MtCO <sub>2</sub> e was estimated to be released (Table 5.2.1).		
8.3	It is not clear how or if the Applicant converted CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from aircraft to CO <sub>2</sub> e.	It is not clear if the Applicant undertook a conversion from CO <sub>2</sub> to CO <sub>2</sub> e as this would impact the aviation emissions by around a 0.91% increase BEIS (2023) <sup>2</sup> . Therefore, if not accounted for, this would increase aviation GHG emissions by approximately 48,441 tCO <sub>2</sub> e in 2028 in the most carbon-intensive year where 5.327 MtCO <sub>2</sub> e was estimated to be released (Table 5.2.1).	The Applicant is asked to confirm if a conversion was undertaken from CO <sub>2</sub> to CO <sub>2</sub> e. If not, the Applicant should update the GHG Aviation Assessment to account for this.	Addressed
8.4	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	Uncertain

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

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/greenhouse-gas-reporting-conversion-factors-2023>

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)



Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024

			<p>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.</p> <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> </ul> <p>Be without negative environmental or social externalities.</p>	
8.5	If the Applicant does not provide infrastructure or services to help decarbonise surface transport emissions it	The Applicant must actively promote the transition to a decarbonised economy, incentivising airport users to adopt low-carbon technologies like	The Applicant should provide infrastructure within the Airport to support the anticipated uptake of	Addressed

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



	<p>may have the potential to result in the underreporting of the Proposed Development's impact on the climate. The full impact of the Proposed Development on the government meeting its net zero targets cannot be identified</p>	<p>electric cars and public transportation systems.</p>	<p>electric vehicles and provide electric vehicle charging infrastructure.</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>	
8.6	<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, "In 2016/17, we achieved 'Level 3+ - Neutrality' status under the Airport Carbon Accreditation scheme, which is a global carbon management certification programme for airports (Ref 1.1). GAL has been working hard to reduce carbon emissions under GAL's control (from a 1990 baseline) and offset the remaining emissions using internationally recognised offset schemes."</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</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 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>	Addressed



# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



		so research can be conducted into the trustworthiness of the scheme.		
--	--	--	--	--

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 9. CLIMATE CHANGE

HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
9.1	Expansion of the Airport at a time when the environmental impacts associated with air travel are of local, national and global concern	The Council asks for careful consideration of airport expansion and whether the expansion proposed as part of this DCO application can be justified and supported at this time. The Council is also disappointed at the lack of acknowledgement of local authority positions on Climate Change and what an expanding airport adjacent to Horsham District's boundary means for locally set climate strategy objectives.	The Applicant has given insufficient consideration to a "mitigate to grow" or controlled approach to growth which would provide greater environmental protection and assurance and this should be addressed	Unlikely

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 10. ECOLOGY, LANDSCAPE AND HERITAGE

HDC 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
10.1	Concerns in relation to potential impacts on sensitive species and habitats, the High Weald AONB and heritage assets in the District	The full extent of the Bechstein bat roosts to the west of the Airport have not been shown and there is concern around the noise impacts on Bechstein and Barbastelle bat populations. The Applicant's Ecology and Nature Conservation Figures do not show the Ancient Woodland, St Leonard's Forest SSSI or Local Wildlife Sites within the 15km buffer from the Project Site Boundary nor are the noise impacts / flight paths overlain, including WIZAD (Route 9) which affects the AONB. The impacts of increased overflight on WIZAD (Route 9) on heritage assets in the District also do not appear to have been assessed.	Noise impacts on sensitive receptors should be considered in greater detail. The Applicant is requested to provide more detailed data and assessment of the impacts of the intensified use of WIZAD (Route 9) on sensitive receptors as there is a lack of clear data as currently presented.	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 11. OTHER MATTERS

HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
11.1	Incomplete and inconsistent consideration of local planning policies	The Applicant has failed to include Horsham District Council's local planning policies in the Planning Statement. In the ES chapters, local plan policy has been applied inconsistently. For example, for the Socio-Economics chapter paragraph 17.2.14 provides a table which lists adopted and emerging local planning policies relevant to Socio-Economics based on the local study area for this assessment and provides further detail in Appendix 17.2.1. The table of policies is considered incomplete. Furthermore, both the chapter and appendix provide limited analysis of how the Project aligns with the policies of Horsham District Council. Notably, consideration of some of the potential constraints brought about by the Project on the local authority area is absent from any of the analysis produced.	<p>Applicant should include a full list of adopted and emerging policies. A more detailed analysis of how the Project aligns with local policy and strategies should also be provided. Consideration of some of the potential constraints brought about by the Project on Horsham District should be included in the analysis.</p> <p>The Applicant provided a policy compliance table and this has been responded to in <a href="#">REP4-042</a>. The Council does not consider that compliance has been demonstrated.</p>	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
11.2	Safeguarding of land for a wide-spaced additional runway	The land safeguarded for an additional runway is a very large area of land, around 700 hectares, some of which falls within Horsham District, although the vast extent is within Crawley Borough. The continued safeguarding of land reduces Crawley Borough Council's ability to meet the Borough's own housing and employment needs which has implications for neighbouring authorities, such as Horsham District. The Applicant is not actively pursuing this as a growth option and should therefore review the safeguarding of land, given the scale of development proposed as part of the future baseline and Northern Runway Project as part of the DCO process.	The Applicant should commit to removing the land currently safeguarded for a wide-spaced additional runway should the NRP receive development consent	Unlikely
11.3	Justification by the Applicant regarding what forms part of the 'Authorised Development' in the NSIP and what parts are 'Associated Development'	There are 4no additional hotels proposed as part of the DCO but within the description of development outside of the DCO no additional hotels are proposed as part of the future baseline growth. The Council also notes that the hotels are not defined as operational use.	The scale of physical works associated with the Project is extensive. The Applicant is asked to justify and make clear what it considers is part of the 'Authorised Development' in the NSIP and what is considered to be the 'Associated Development' and how this does / does not relate to the future baseline	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC Ref.	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change / be amended / be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern?	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
11.4	Lack of acknowledgement by the Applicant of the interaction between the NRP and Airspace Modernisation	Whilst it is accepted that the simultaneous use of the northern and southern runways do not require airspace change, it is noted that the Applicant's FASI South airspace change options are applicable for both northern and southern runways. Realising the overall growth in aircraft movements envisaged, particularly when growth in activity at other airports across the South of England is taken into account, will necessitate some changes to airspace in the vicinity of Gatwick as part of the modernisation process. The Applicant should acknowledge this overall dependency as part of the application.	The Applicant should acknowledge the linkages between Airspace Modernisation and the Project,	Uncertain

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## 12. DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER AND SECURING MITIGATION

HDC 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
12.1	Lack of effective controls and enforceable measures to sustainably manage the growth of the Airport	The growth of the Airport should be contained within agreed environmental parameters and managed through control mechanisms, which will ensure mitigation is sufficient and effective.	<p>The Applicant should take a “mitigate to grow” approach that controls growth in a sustainable manner protecting the environment both locally and globally. Such an approach should be secured through the DCO.</p> <p>Further detail has been provided by the Authorities at Deadline 5 in the form of an Environmentally Managed Growth proposal document.</p>	Uncertain
12.2	Limited engagement on the proposed Section 106 and an overall lack of acknowledgement of the Airport’s expansion on Horsham District’s infrastructure, facilities and services and the quality of life of the District’s communities	To date, there has been very limited engagement on the draft Heads of Terms and any potential Section 106 contributions. It is expected that there will be a significant discrepancy between the Applicant and Horsham District Council (along with the other affected local authorities) on the scope and scale of funding required to mitigate the impacts of the Project.	<p>Meaningful engagement between the Applicant and local authorities must take place which is also informed by accurate and updated assessments, given the concerns raised across the various topic assessments.</p> <p>S106 negotiations are now underway.</p>	Uncertain
12.3	Community Fund	The level of funding proposed through the Community Fund which would be secured through the draft DCO S106 is insufficient and does not reflect the residual and	This is subject to ongoing discussion through S106 negotiations.	

# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



HDC 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
		intangible impacts of the Project, in particular given the significant increase in flights.		



# Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS)

Version Number: 3

Submitted at: Deadline 5: 6 June 2024



## ACRONYMS

AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
BAU	Business as Usual
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment
DCO	Development Consent Order
ES	Environmental Statement
ESBS	Employment, Skills and Business Strategy
FASI-S	Future Airspace Implementation Strategy
FEMA	Functional Economic Market Area
HDC	Horsham District Council
LOAEL	Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level
LSA	Local Study Area
NRP	Northern Runway Project ("the Project")
SOAEL	Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level