



Gatwick Northern Runway Project DCO (Project Reference: TR020005)

Deadline 5 Submission (6 June 2024)

Joint Surrey Councils – Surrey County Council (Ref. 20044665), Mole Valley Borough Council (Ref: 20044578), Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (Ref. 20044474) and Tandridge District Council (Ref: 20043605)

Overview

1. This document provides a response at Deadline 5 (6 June 2024) from the above Joint Surrey Councils (JSCs) on a number of Deadline 4 submissions as well as items requested in the Rule 6 letter:
 - Comments on GAL Deadline 4 Submissions
 - Comments on any other submissions received by Deadline 4
 - Updated PADSS
2. The JSCs have also provided an updated position on the respective SoCGS, which have been submitted by the Applicant.
3. The Joint Local Authorities' have provided collective comment on a range of submissions. These have been submitted by Crawley Borough Council on behalf of the authorities.
4. Crawley Borough Council has also submitted a paper on an Environmentally Managed Growth Framework for the Northern Runway Project DCO on behalf of the authorities.

Outstanding comments on previous GAL Submissions

Draft Development Consent Order – Schedule of Changes [REP3-005]

5. In Schedule 6 (traffic regulations) new rows were added in Part 2 and Part 3 to reflect updated Surrey County Council (SCC) parking restriction information. SCC can confirm that they agree with these additions.

Environmental Statement Appendix 8.10.1 – Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment - Part 1 [REP3-38]

6. Para 1.1.2 states; “A tree survey of the application area was carried out by RPS in October 2023 through to January 2024 in accordance with the requirements of BS5837:2012. Refer to the Tree Survey Plans in Appendix F and G.
7. The authorities are concerned that whilst the Applicant has surveyed and appraised the trees present using the standard approach detailed in the governing British Standard BS 5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction– Recommendations. BS 5837 gives recommendations and guidance on the relationship between trees and design, demolition and

construction processes. As set out in paragraph 4.5.2 of the standard, the purpose of the survey and categorisation, is to identify the quality and value (in a non-fiscal sense) of the existing tree stock, allowing informed decisions to be made concerning which trees should be removed or retained in the event of development occurring. Supporting the data already and given the predominately wooded nature of the existing tree stock the ExA may wish to ask the Applicant to determine the existing tree's benefits and worth, using the i-Tree application. It is considered that this data would allow more meaningful and accurate calculations on compensatory planting.

8. Para 4.2.1 states; "During the survey 129 Individual tree entries were made (multiple entries refer to groups of similar trees) 99 Groups, 3 Hedges and 5 Woodland areas, totalling 236 entries. The majority of these trees consisted of roadside infrastructure planting associated with the existing airport approach roads. It should be noted that individual tree entries were often used to denote a group of trees that have almost identical features but that are not growing in a close cohesive group. See Tree Survey Plans in Appendix F for further detail."
9. The authorities are concerned that the grouping of individual trees under a single record/entity as detailed in paragraph 4.2.3 is a deviation from the governing recommendations of BS 5837:2012 sections 4.4.2.3 and 4.5.5. The consequence of this approach means trees that don't necessarily have the same qualities, are given a single rating in terms of quality and remaining contribution in years, for example record T30-1 includes *Betula pendula*, 1 *Quercus rubra*, 6 *Fraxinus angustifolia*, Silver Birch, Red Oak, Narrow leaved Ash. The consequences of this approach mean that the summarised impacts of tree losses are negatively skewed. Moreover, the consequences, equally feed into the narrative that the loss of the existing predominantly low-quality trees would be compensated by the proposed functional replacement planting. The recommendation is that a cohesive and compensatory replanting strategy is created that seeks to compensate for the value of trees removed in both on and off-site locations, as well as enhancing, mitigating the impacts of the new infrastructure and use thereof.
10. Similar commentary is found at 4.2, 8.0 and particularly 8.1.6 which states that; "There will be large scale tree loss across the proposed development especially within the A23/M23 road corridor. However, the impact of the tree loss is somewhat negated by the low quality of the existing highway infrastructure trees that were planted following construction of the airport roads". Whilst this view is appropriate at some locations, such a broad-brush statement is an oversimplification and under appreciation of the overall contribution the existing tree stock makes. The ExA is asked to consider the appropriateness of the Applicant's approach and if a more fine-tuned approach (see point 9) to tree replacement would better support the project's landscaping and tree replacement mitigation measures particularly along the Zone 6: Surface Access Corridor.

Response to GAL submissions at Deadline 4

GAL response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031]

11. The JSC's note the inclusion of the Applicant's responses to comments submitted by Interested Parties to ExAQ1 of the document. In particular, the Council's wish to raise the following points:

Reference	Question	SCC response
TT.1.17 – do minimum scheme lists	Table 12.2.1 lists the major highway schemes included in the future baseline scenarios. Is this a definitive list of schemes? Provide a status update of the schemes listed?	SCC is already concerned about the congested nature of the M25 around Junction 8 [REP1-097] and need to understand the impacts of removing any improvements to J8 due to congestion on its approaches and impact of that congestion on the local road network.
TT.1.31 – luggage affecting train capacity	It is assumed that air passengers place their luggage in overhead luggage racks. Is it realistic on trains serving an airport that all luggage will fit in overhead racks of luggage storage areas and not on the floor. Has this assumption been checked against actual surveys?	SCC agree with NR comment: <i>Applying an appropriate reduction to the theoretical standing and seated capacity maximum, would be one way of sense checking that there will be sufficient space on trains for passengers and their luggage.</i> This is because rail is such a key component to the provision of sustainable travel and meeting SAC targets that any barrier to its convenience should be reduced.
ISH4 Surface Transport – Action Point 9: Joint Authorities Response to NH annotated commentary on the Surface Access Commitments	The Applicant has met with the Joint Authorities to discuss the matters raised in relation to the SAC and draft Section 106 Agreement. The Applicant will provide a further revised version of the SAC document and revised Schedule 3 of the draft Section 106 Agreement. The updated draft DCO s106 Agreement will be submitted to the examination at Deadline 6 as requested... It is anticipated that a revised SAC document will also be submitted at Deadline 6 to reflect the agreed amendments requested by the Joint Authorities.	SCC await this response, in light of comments submitted at Deadline 3.
DCO1.4 Status of CoCP	If the CoCP is not an outline document, do the RPAs consider that the CoCP is sufficiently detailed to mitigate construction phase impacts?	The JSC's view is that it would be prudent for the CoCP to be an outline document given that detailed design has not been undertaken and that a principal contractor is yet to be appointed. The Applicant's response to the issues raised are noted but none of the questions raised have been answered in sufficient detail that the future principal contractor would have a clear scope of work. The Applicant is referred to previous responses in relation to an integrated construction management plan providing

		<p>suitable commitments including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise management and monitoring proposals • Online noise and dust reporting for local communities • Self-service portal for complaint recording and monitoring • Construction engagement • Dedicated environmental manager with suitable acoustic experience appointed by the airport to liaise between contractors and local authorities • Suitable funding for Section 61 officer
DCO.1.5.2 - Community funding	Please confirm what sums were proposed by the Airports Commission and how these compare with those proposed by the Applicant.	The JSC's do not consider the Applicant to have provided an adequate response to the ExAQ1 in this regard. The authorities recognise negotiations are ongoing regarding the Community Fund as secured in the dDCO Section 106 agreement but still consider the level of funding should be higher to better reflect the residual and intangible impacts of the development, particularly given the very significant increase in flights.
NV.1.10 Noise envelopes	What would other IPs propose for the initial (2029) areas of the 51 dB LAeq,16hr contour and the 45 dB LAeq,8hr contour and any other noise envelopes, including the use of other metrics?	The local authorities' suggestion around the need for the noise envelope at night to have a primary control metric based on the one awakening contour, has been responded to by the applicant with a discussion on N above contours which is largely irrelevant in the context of an awakening contour.

GAL response to Rule 17 letter – car parking [REP4-019]

12. We have reviewed REP4-019 and raise the following comments.

Reference and context	SCC Response
Table 1 - Comparison of Future Baseline and Proposed Development on airport passenger/visitor parking	This Table stops at 2040. In [REP1-097] SCC reported that there is no forecast change in park and fly demand in 2047 as shown in [APP-260] future baseline (Table 70) and with NRP Scheme (Table 133). In both cases approximately 36,000 park and fly passengers per day are forecast for both the baseline and NRP scenarios. SCC would like this table to be

	extended to justify the potential need for the additional car parking spaces.
Off-airport parking	There are numerous references to 'off-airport' parking. SCC would like it stated whether this means authorised or unauthorised parking?
Action Point 6 (bullet 1) Are the 1100 parking spaces actually required	SCC is not sure the response answers the question. If demand is the same in both scenarios, it is not clear why more spaces are required with NRP. If, as stated, the spaces are required to replace others during construction, then SCC wonder why it is necessary re-build those other spaces?
Action Point 6 (bullet 2) It would be helpful if the Car Parking Strategy could provide a more detailed commentary to explain how the mode share targets and uplift in Park and Fly trips, are factored into the calculation...	Not answered.

COCP Annex 8 – Outline Invasive and Non-Native Species Management Strategy [REP4-011]

13. The Authorities welcome the new Outline Invasive and Non-native Species (INNS) Management Strategy in Annex 8 of the CoCP. It is requested that mink is specifically mentioned in this document as this invasive and non-native species was recorded by the Applicant whilst undertaking otter surveys. Since the River Mole realignment will create additional favourable habitat for mink, it is advised that this document should include an outline plan for mink survey and control.
14. According to Section 9.6.155 of the ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-034] the invasive New Zealand mud snail was identified in the River Mole and Gatwick Stream. This species should also be added to Table 1.3 which lists INNS within the Project boundary.
15. It is recommended that all INNS Plans include monitoring of the INNS, both throughout the construction period and post-construction. This should be added as a bullet point in Section 3.1.2.
16. 2.4.4 Section 4.8.4 refers to the use of herbicide, notably glyphosate, to control Himalayan balsam. The Authorities emphasise that any use of herbicides near watercourses or other wetland habitats must be approved by the Environment Agency (EA). Although consultation with the EA is mentioned in Section 3.1.3, it is advised that the need to consult the EA is also highlighted in Section 4.8.4.

Noise insulation scheme (tracked) [REP4-108]

17. The JSCs note the comment in para 4.2.3 that, *'The acoustic ventilators are provided to allow windows to remain closed more often in warmer weather, but not to completely negate the need to open windows in certain circumstances.'*

18. Given the ventilators are a key component of the noise insulation scheme which is based on a summer noise contour, the JSCs would expect any mitigation measure offered to allow windows to remain shut in the summer months especially at night with no risk of the property / sleeping area overheating.
19. The JSCs note the comment in para 5.1.3 that *'The process for schools to apply for consideration for the noise insulation scheme would open upon commencement of routine operations on the Northern Runway as part of dual runway operations, because it may not be possible to carry out the noise surveys to establish if acoustic treatments should be offered until the Northern Runway is in routine use. The Applicant will write to all qualifying schools with the aim of carrying out surveys within 1 year and any remedial works within 2 years'*.
20. It is unclear why a school should have to put up with an unacceptable level of noise for up to 2 years before noise insulation is installed, when the applicant would be aware from the noise modelling work which schools might be at risk, and so could easily proactively insulate those schools.
21. Therefore the applicant must ensure any school identified by its noise modelling as meeting the insulation criteria is insulated prior to the commencement of the northern runway operations
22. The JSCs would also point out that if air conditioning / cooling becomes necessary as a result of the noise insulation measures then this will need to be provided as part of the noise insulation package.
23. Further comments are provided in the Joint Local Authorities Response.

ISH 7 Deadline 4 Submission - 10.26.3 The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH7: Other Environmental Matters [REP4-037].

24. The applicant in its discussion of ultrafines para 17.2.9 again refers to PM2.5 levels as a way of assessing ultrafine particle emissions from aviation i.e.: "However, for the health assessment the relevant relationship is that both UFP and PM2.5 of aviation origin independently correlate with aircraft movements (being the common source)".
25. The JSCs would also point out that aviation NOx emissions also independently correlate with aircraft movements (being the common source) as do aviation carbon dioxide emissions. The key point here is that the applicant has failed to make any meaningful assessment of the likely change in ultrafine exposure as a result to the development, and as a consequence is unable to undertake any meaningful health assessment.
26. Given the JSCs have demonstrated in previous submissions (para 11.109 Surrey Local Impact Report [REP1-097]) that:
 - residents' ultrafines exposure on the Horley Gardens Estate is already classed as 'High' on 50 % of the sampling days using the WHO guideline approach, and
 - that the number of hours when ultrafine concentrations were classed as 'High' was double that of a central London Roadside site considered one of the most polluted sites in the UK.

27. It is clear that there is a high ultrafines exposure on the Horley Gardens Estate that is problematic (i.e. there is already an issue with ultrafine particle exposure) and that this is likely to get worse with the applicant's planned development by 2032.
28. In view of this and as pointed out in our deadline 4 submission on ISH 7 (Joint Legal Partnership Issue Specific Hearing 7 Post-Hearing submission [REP4-058]) the Applicant via the s106 needs to fund **in full** from the commencement of the project ultrafine particle monitoring (number and size distribution) at a site chosen by RBBC for the duration of the project i.e. until the airport is at full capacity.
29. If such as approach is not adopted then we would suggest that, in the event that UK standards are introduced for ultrafines, that the airport funds in full (100%) of the costs of monitoring this pollutant and that the cost is not capped at £30K as currently proposed.

Code of Construction Practice, version 3 [REP4-007]

30. The document states: *"All on-road heavy vehicles will comply with the standards set within the London Low Emission Zone (LEZ) across all sites within the Order Limits for the relevant class of vehicle. All Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) net power 37kW to 560kW will comply with the engine emissions standards set by London LEZ for NRMM across all sites within the Order Limits. From 1 January 2025, NRMM used on any site will be required to meet emission standard Stage IV as a minimum. From 1 January 2030, NRMM used on any site will be required to meet emission standard Stage V as a minimum."*
31. In view of the fact that:
 - the DCO air quality assessment is predicated on as a minimum construction equipment meeting Stage V from 2024 (chapter 13 para 13.6.4) [APP-038],
 - and the applicant at Issue Specific Hearing 7 para 5.1.17 [REP4-033] stated that Stage V NRMM plant would be utilised
32. This means that the applicant's current statement in the code of construction practice will need to be reworded to: *"All Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) net power 37kW to 560kW will comply with the engine emissions standards set by London LEZ for NRMM across all sites within the Order Limits. From 1 January 2025, NRMM used on any site will be required to meet emission standard Stage V as a minimum"*.
33. It is important to note that all generators in the London Low emission zone already (2024) need to be stage V to comply with the London guidance.

Note on acquisition of Special Category Land and provision of Replacement Land [REP4-041]

34. The JSC's welcome this document. The Applicant and the Legal Partnership Authorities are still in dialogue and negotiation regarding how the gap in time between the acquisition of the open space land and its replacement is to be managed so that it does not unduly deprive the public of the benefit of the enjoyment of the open space.
35. The JSCs note that in recent suggested revisions to the draft S106, GAL suggest that they will also take on the maintenance for the Replacement Open Space north east of Longbridge

Roundabout. This revision is welcome and discussions will continue around access arrangements to enable this. Maintenance of the Replacement Open Space will need to be in perpetuity.

36. However, REP4-041 appears silent on whether the Applicant intends to vest the northern part of Car Park B to Reigate and Banstead Borough Council as Replacement Open Space once the works compound has been removed and the landscaping undertaken. Clarity is sought on this matter.

Response to SCC's Airfield Drainage Queries (REP4-026/7)

37. The JSCs wish to highlight that the specific queries referenced were not submitted by Surrey County Council and we have no comments to make.

Zone of Theoretical Visibility of the Temporary Construction Compound (REP4-040)

38. The JSCs note that the Construction Compound ZTV shows potential visibility of Construction Compound 3 (South Terminal Roundabout) elements along and in the vicinity of Balcombe Road, Horley, in locations where existing and proposed permanent airport elements would not be visible; for example, Meadowcroft Close. Construction elements will include infrastructure up to 25m high, such as concrete batching plants. These are likely to be visible on the skyline above the intervening tree line/buildings, and/or in filtered winter views between intervening trees or other vegetation. We consider that such tall construction elements will form a discordant element in views for high sensitivity residential receptors, medium sensitivity pedestrian receptors and low sensitivity workers and people travelling in vehicles, with the magnitude of change varying depending on proximity, and resulting in varying degrees of adverse visual effects over the initial construction period (until 2029) and beyond to 2032, while such elements are in place.
39. The JSCs note that the LVIA Assessment of Effects for Number 275 Balcombe Road (ES Paragraph 8.9.87 APP-033) predicts a minor adverse effect during the temporary construction period, but does not include explicit reference to Construction Compound 3, which would be in close proximity, directly opposite the property on the other side of Balcombe Road. This compound is anticipated to be in use for up to 8 years until 2032. The exact locations of the tall infrastructure elements such as batching plants within the compound are currently unknown. We acknowledge that a noise and visual screening bund/hoarding is proposed around this compound; however, given that the compound's vehicular access is opposite this property and the existing intervening mature highway vegetation is to be removed, we consider that there may be close proximity views of compound infrastructure and HGVs from this property and its private garden/curtilage, which may increase the level of identified adverse visual effects.

Response to other submissions at Deadline 4

NH marked up version of Construction Traffic Management Plan (REP4-076)

40. SCC has already reviewed and set out concerns on the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan in the Surrey Local Impact Report. Broadly SCC supports the comments in the National Highways marked up version but raises the following comments.

Reference	Comment
5.1.4	Add “and Local Road Network” after first instance of Strategic Road Network.
5.6.2	SCC has already objected to the secondary access off Balcombe Road. However, if it is implemented, SCC supports NH’s point about prohibiting public access. NH’s comment about access point being set back should also apply to compound accesses from the local road network elsewhere.
6.1.2	Should also include reference to the local highway authorities
6.1.4	Should also include reference to the local road network / local highway authorities
6.3.1	Should also include reference to the local highway authorities
6.5	Is this not applicable to the Local Road Network as well?
7.3.2	Should also include reference to the local highway authorities
7.5.6 - 7.5.8	Traffic Management Forum could be confused with Transport Mitigation Fund – different terminology required?

NH comments on any submissions received by Deadline 3 (REP4-078)

41. SCC has reviewed REP4-078 from National Highways (NH) and either support the points made by NH or raise the following specific comments:

Reference	Comment
Table 25 Matters Raised by National Highways – SRN works before NRP growth allowed	We may want growth before SRN works
Rights of Way and Access Plans	SCC’s comments in relation to the proposed Active Travel infrastructure are set out in SCC’s Local Impact Report and Statement of Common Ground.
Vanessa Henderson Surface Transport - modelling	SCC remains in on-going discussion with GAL regarding a number of outstanding matters in relation to traffic modelling and the forecast impact on the county's transport network; including the impact of congestion on the M25. It is due to this uncertainty that SCC are seeking that GAL adopt an Environmentally Managed Growth approach

TfL comments on GAL response to ExAQ1 (REP4-082)

42. SCC has reviewed REP4-082 from Transport for London (TfL) and has the following comment. Whilst the table presented on page 3 of TfL's letter is informative, we anticipate that it only tells a fraction of the picture. The CILT publication Policy Paper Aviation Policy Group - Airport surface access (March 2024) is very informative. It highlights that passenger market segment is a key factor in mode choice, such that passengers that are foreign, and or travelling for business and or are travelling alone are more likely to use public transport.
43. It also shows that in 2019, Stansted Airport had a higher public transport mode share than Gatwick (DfT source: [Mode of transport to selected UK airports: 2012 to 2022](#)). As such, SCC

welcome further benchmarking with Heathrow and Stansted airports by market segment to ascertain whether parking provision is being over-supplied by GAL.

Network Rail response to GAL ExAQ1 [REP4-080]

44. We have reviewed REP4-080 and broadly support the points made within the response. The following comment has been raised.

Reference	SCC Comment
<p>ExQ1 TT1.29 Transport Mitigation Fund <i>Given that Network Rail knows now that mitigation measures will be needed to address the impact on rail capacity, it is not appropriate for the funding of mitigation to be at the discretion of such a decision-making body. The decision-making body is made up of representatives of the various surface transport modes. There is a risk that the other representatives (which are local authorities, the applicant and National Highways) have no, or very limited, rail experience and so funding decisions are tilted towards highway-related matters. Whilst the decision makers are required to act reasonably, given decisions must be made unanimously it would nonetheless be possible for one transport body to strategically veto any allocations to any other transport modes.'</i></p>	<p>Whilst we agree with almost all the points raised in the document, there are a number of comments.</p> <p>It is in SCC's interests that rail journeys are used for surface access journeys rather than have cars travelling through Surrey on its network. Like other partners, SCC remains concerned that the TMF would not be large enough to cope with significant rail improvements, such as Croydon area remodelling or similarly large strategic road interventions.</p> <p>SCC would like to ensure that there was a means to fund the large-scale interventions as well as the small. This might be especially pertinent if the staff mode share target was not being met and considerably smaller interventions could resolve those issues affecting local residents on a frequent (daily) basis.</p> <p>Further work is required to establish the decision-making bodies and sums of money available.</p>