

File Name: ISH8 18th June 2024 Part 8.mp3
File Length: 01:23:47

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:04:13 - 00:00:41:19

So the time is now 10 to 4 times to resume this hearing. So now moving on to item eight on the agenda, the draft development consent order. And there are three issues under item eight. The first is the applicants and joint local authorities to be asked about specific articles and schedules of draft DCO. Excluding schedules one and two, where agreement is unlikely to be reached by the close of the examination. Secondly, the applicants and joint local authorities to be asked about their positions regarding the level of detail for individual work numbers contained in schedule one.

00:00:42:13 - 00:00:49:20

And thirdly, the applicants and joint local authorities to be asked about unresolved matters within schedule two requirements.

00:00:52:16 - 00:01:22:24

What I'm proposing to do is to deal with item one, which is. The areas where disagreement, where agreement is unlikely. I'm going to deal with that. Third, because I think the other two areas are probably more significant. I'd like to spend more time on. And clearly we've set out that we'll try and finish by 5:00. So we'll deal with 8.2 first. But before focusing on that, I just want to.

00:01:23:23 - 00:01:58:08

Question whether. The IPS and especially the applicants, have had regard to the latest guidance on discos published on the 30th of April, that the contents of DCO required forensics. I'm not necessarily expecting full response now, but just are people aware of it and is it being taken into account, given that some of the definitions in there are slightly different and it is now, um, government guidance through de look rather than pin's advice?

00:02:04:09 - 00:02:21:09

Slice Scotland for the applicant. In short, sir, yes, we are aware of the guidance we have taken into account and where necessary it's been reflected in the letters drafting. But we're continuing to review the situation of further changes are required. We'll make those in the next forthcoming draft. You.

00:02:23:12 - 00:02:23:29

Mr. Bedford.

00:02:25:21 - 00:02:32:22

So I have to confess that it's not something which has been on my bedside table, so. But it certainly will be taken into account.

00:02:38:18 - 00:02:39:03

Okay.

00:02:40:22 - 00:03:23:25

And then just another introductory matter. A deadline for the West Sussex West Sussex County Council submitted comments on further information and submissions received by deadline three. That was documents reference rep for oh 42. And this referenced appendix C. Which was response to DCL drafting comments from West Sussex authorities, which is Rep 381, and stated that the West Sussex Authority's review of that document would be submitted at deadline five.

00:03:24:23 - 00:03:31:29

Just want to check. Have the West Sussex authorities submitted a review of RIP 381.

00:03:38:12 - 00:03:55:03

So we will confirm, but I don't think we have actually submitted something at deadline five that related to that. So that's but we'll take that away. And obviously if we have done that, we'll tell you where it is. If we haven't done it, we will make sure we address that. Thank you.

00:03:57:19 - 00:04:07:10

Okay, so let's deal with item two. At 8.2, which is scheduled one.

00:04:16:15 - 00:04:37:18

Essentially wants to look at the level of detail that's contained within the descriptions of the various works numbers. I think here it's probably worth taking account of. Obviously the latest version of the draft DCO.

00:04:39:17 - 00:04:43:14

Which is web five.

00:04:46:14 - 00:04:47:19

To blow five.

00:04:49:06 - 00:05:01:20

And Tableau six being the tracked version. Then we've got the. It's planetary memorandum, which is 507 the schedule of changes. 504

00:05:03:18 - 00:05:22:13

And also worth considering the joint local authority's submission at 3135, which is where detailed comments were made in relation to. Um. Various elements of the DCO. But.

00:05:24:24 - 00:05:56:01

With reference to this issue, particularly comments on schedule one. Description. Now, clearly I'm not going to spend the next hour or so going through every single, um, work number in the description, but I'd like to pick out a few, which I think are particularly significant. And let's start with, uh, work number one, which is the, uh, works the runway itself.

00:06:04:12 - 00:06:13:06

So the there has been a change to this. I think since the last. Iteration.

00:06:16:26 - 00:06:37:06

I was warned before that. But there's there's certainly been discussion about the wording of it in relation to whether it should be described as reposition. Or realign. Peace. How are the parties doing on that particular issue? This agreement likely to be reached.

00:06:40:15 - 00:06:42:24

Um, Mr. Bedford can start with you, please.

00:06:43:25 - 00:07:07:16

Um, Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. So I think in relation to work one, um, the updated drafting, together with the amended appendix to the design principles is now sufficient to allay our concerns about that particular work. There are issues on other work numbers.

00:07:08:25 - 00:07:09:25

Okay. Thank you.

00:07:12:14 - 00:07:24:15

And the level of detail that's decent that is included in that description. You did make comments there. Um through rep 3135, I think.

00:07:27:24 - 00:07:44:19

He described the works as brief and sought to suggest that. Um, the wording should be revised. You can go to the full description, but you clearly wanted more detail there.

00:07:45:13 - 00:08:23:10

I think. Sorry, sir. Michael Bedford, joint local authorities. There was an issue, as you will recall, played out in some of the earlier issues, particularly about the extent of works required for the drainage and therefore whether these works could rightly be regarded as alterations to a runway or the replacement of a runway. The applicant helpfully provided in more than one of the, uh, submissions since that point. Further information to us as to what was envisaged by way of the drainage works and how they impacted um on the overall scheme of things.

00:08:23:12 - 00:08:30:23

So we we were able to reassure ourselves that this could be regarded as an alteration.

00:08:34:12 - 00:09:04:25

And I say so. So that provided albeit that the wording in the DCO doesn't provide that further detail. The further reiteration and explanation that's been provided through those subsequent submissions has allowed us to understand more about what works for envisage to construct that alteration so that has met that issue. Um, and so I don't think we are now looking for further detail to be added to the wording of work number one. Quite right.

00:09:04:27 - 00:09:13:07

Yes. Seeing some nods, fortunately, um, but there are separate issues. As I say, we move on to some of the other work numbers.

00:09:13:21 - 00:09:23:24

Okay. Thank you. So you had suggested that deadline three quite extensive changes to the wording. We're not pursuing that now.

00:09:30:29 - 00:09:40:24

I'm being well. We're satisfied that the sufficient detail now in the Das and the design principles in order to meet our terms. Thank you.

00:09:48:22 - 00:09:52:26

Work number two, unless you want to respond on it. Mr. Linus.

00:09:53:08 - 00:10:07:16

Scott, applicant no thank you other than to welcome the clarification on the broader point that had been discussed before in relation to nature of the work to the runway. We're grateful for that. Uh, for that confirmation on the policy related point. Thank you.

00:10:07:18 - 00:10:10:01

Okay. Thank you. So work number two.

00:10:13:20 - 00:10:26:00

Um, which is the discussion about definition of main runway in southern runway that has now moved on. But does runway access track need definition?

00:10:27:20 - 00:10:28:13

It's the lines.

00:11:02:21 - 00:11:28:16

Uh, Scotland. Sorry, I just need to check the position. We understand that refers to an existing feature, which should be sort of readily understood on the ground, as it were. But if there were any outstanding concerns, we could take that away and see if we can include a definition in the in the order. But we don't either up front position think it's necessary given it's an existing feature on the ground. Thank you.

00:11:39:24 - 00:12:04:12

So can I ask the local authorities if we cover works? Generally from work number one through to number seven, which are described as their field works. Are you generally happy with the degree of detail which is used for those descriptions? Each case.

00:12:05:23 - 00:12:37:14

Sir Michael Bedford, the Joint Local Authorities I think the answer is no. If you read the words in conjunction with the works plans, I think the the concern primarily is the lack of detail in the works plans. And it may be, um, particularly with works 4 to 7. There's a related point for works um, 8 to 10 and also 14.

00:12:37:16 - 00:12:45:13

But you asked about from um, uh, 1 to 7. So with 4 to 7, uh, um.

00:12:47:03 - 00:13:29:17

There is, um, a concern. And if I say it may be, um. That to to illustrate it by reference to, uh, work number four. Um and rep five zero 16 is, I think, the current version of the works plans and um, what one has uh, in, um, okay, sheet uh, six, which is revision po three, um, a composite plan which shows a number of elements which are all part of work, uh, for.

00:13:31:04 - 00:13:57:04

Um, but, uh, we certainly find, uh, those works difficult to understand. Uh, difficult to see that there is sufficient detail to understand the scope and extent of those works. Um, and I think we would like to see, uh, further clarity, I think may be helpful if I just bring in Mr. McPherson to comment on that. In a sense, what is driving that concern?

00:14:05:24 - 00:14:08:04

Jay McPherson from Crawley Borough Council.

00:14:09:22 - 00:14:13:20

Yes. I mean, I think if you look at the works plans, they are.

00:14:15:23 - 00:14:41:22

And showing a work number, and then a sort of four, and then a series of sub brackets afterwards a to F or and then G, H and I. Um, I think it's difficult to understand when this is the only detail we've got alongside the schedule as to exactly where some of those elements are. It would be helpful, perhaps, if it could be more clearly labeled, or those sub works could be marked onto the drawings. Thank you.

00:14:54:05 - 00:15:32:24

Mr. Linus Scott for the applicant. So if you look at schedule one, take work forward to the example that's been given. That's obviously been split up by a reference of detailed sub paragraphs. What we've sought to do in the work plans is to attribute areas to the specific subparagraph. So we're not entirely clear what more we can do to correlate the work plans with the description of the works in schedule one. What I might suggest is that perhaps if we can speak to the glaze outside the examination, just to walk them through the approach that we've taken.

00:15:33:22 - 00:15:48:07

Subject to that, though, we're not sure what more we can do, given that the works themselves have been subdivided into different paragraphs and the order. And we've tried to specify that as far as possible in the plans themselves.

00:15:51:28 - 00:15:52:13

That's it.

00:15:55:02 - 00:16:28:00

So I microwave the joint local authorities, I think. Um, an offline discussion is probably the best way to take this forward, but I think the some of the elements are effectively, uh, a composite. You've got a number of activities within the same actual what color you describe it as, like some kind of, um, light, uh, um, yellow wash color on the plan that I'm looking at, which is an extract. Uh, and yet the brackets contain more than one work element.

00:16:28:03 - 00:16:44:19

And so there is, I think, a lack of clarity as to what actually sits where within that, uh, colored area. So I think that's I suspect an offline discussion is probably the best way to clarify what it is the authorities are wanting to see.

00:16:44:28 - 00:16:53:29

So it seems to be it's the labeling of the works rather than description of the works themselves. Yes. So these early.

00:16:54:01 - 00:17:01:15

So there's more specificity about where within those fairly large areas those particular sub elements sit.

00:17:01:23 - 00:17:09:22

Yes. Understood. Thank you. Well yes I think a separate discussion rather than trying to do it here, is probably the way forward.

00:17:09:24 - 00:17:18:08

Scotland can register a degree of skepticism about how far we can refine it further. But as I said, we're happy to take this offline and discuss it with the Glas.

00:17:18:18 - 00:17:19:08

Okay. Thank you.

00:17:31:01 - 00:17:38:25

So then if we take the next group of works, which are airport support facilities, which is work number eight.

00:17:40:18 - 00:18:00:13

Through to 20. Again, they'll ask the local authorities, are you content with the degree of. Detail in the description of those works themselves. I think all these are on airfields works as well. Correct.

00:18:03:18 - 00:18:04:12
Seems to be.

00:18:08:17 - 00:18:09:03
Mr. Bedford.

00:18:10:21 - 00:18:17:08
So I think the answer is yes in principle, provided, uh, that, um.

00:18:19:02 - 00:18:27:12
We have got, um, works plans which better relate, or at least better identify the individual components.

00:18:30:16 - 00:18:31:01
Understood.

00:18:32:08 - 00:18:36:29
And Scotland can refer to the response to give him a month ago, sir. Thanks. Thank you.

00:18:56:06 - 00:19:26:11
And sorry, I'll just make it clear that work A-Team. Which is in that. Category. There is, um. As more detail on the works themselves. I think we would wish to see so that if you look at work 18. Uh, the description is limited to. If we remove the existing western noise band, construct the replacement noise band. And.

00:19:28:02 - 00:20:12:16
But although the existing fund is to be removed, we don't see it sufficiently clear how the applicant will be able to then mitigate the noise from the airport, which will have its impact on nearby businesses, and we need to understand the sequencing of how those works take place so that the acoustic barrier or the acoustic protection provided by the existing band is maintained. Uh, we do note that requirement 32 has been added, um, albeit that that suggests that the commencement of the dual runway operations is not to take place until work number 18 B has been completed.

00:20:12:29 - 00:20:35:00
Obviously, the airport is continuing to operate in its existing mode, um, during the period when the existing Western noise band has been removed. So it doesn't really address the concern. Um, that you're removing an existing protection and it's not clear what the phasing will be for its replacement.

00:20:37:05 - 00:21:04:24
It's always, uh, Scott Linus for the applicant. We're happy to discuss that point further outside at the examination, but we don't think it's really a point for the drafting of work number 18. Maybe we need to explain the sequencing or any potential concerns about impacts of the glass at half. We don't accept for now, though, that that would require any change. The wording of work it in itself.

00:21:06:17 - 00:21:07:17
Okay. Thank you.

00:21:09:09 - 00:21:12:12
I think at this point, I just want to introduce something that's, um.

00:21:14:03 - 00:21:48:21

As a panel we've been thinking about, given that both the applicants and the local authorities have made reference to the Luton Airport TCO case. Now, clearly we need to be cautious about the reference to that because, um. That report is with the, uh, Secretary of state. So none of us know what the panel recommended on that, or how the Secretary of State might judge the DCO. But since both sides have referenced that, I thought I'd bring that up now.

00:21:49:07 - 00:22:28:06

And it's to do with the level of detail that's contained in the description of works there. There does seem to be a lot more detail, and I think we would welcome views from both sides as to whether that approach would be appropriate here. Given some of the other things we've talked about over the last couple of days. Again, I'm not expecting comments now. I think something to go away and think about. But, um, just having looked at what was put in that draft, DCO clearly there are different ways of doing things.

00:22:28:08 - 00:22:35:26

The different schemes are not saying we should go down that route, but as a reference point, it might be useful to have the party's views on that.

00:22:41:26 - 00:22:48:24

If he's envisaging Michael Bay. Of the joint local authority. That would be an action point from today for the parties to take away. I think so, yes.

00:22:49:20 - 00:23:21:22

Uh, Scott, for the applicant. Uh, that's understood, although we would make the point. So obviously every case is different just because the level of detail has been provided there does not automatically carry across here, particularly in circumstances where, as we understand the general position, there isn't a great deal of disagreement between the glas uh undersells on the wording, particularly of the, uh, of the schedule. But, um, obviously, if it's a matter which you would like to hear further representations on, we can consider that in that context.

00:23:22:08 - 00:23:25:18

Yes. Um, is deadline six too soon for that?

00:23:28:17 - 00:23:33:23

I'm looking to my side, sir, because I'm not going to be the person that's poring over the document.

00:23:42:26 - 00:23:51:06

That will certainly provide an update at deadline six as to what we think, and if we think we need more time to give you a more considered response, we'll say so in our deadline.

00:23:51:08 - 00:24:05:23

Six submissions Scotland is the applicant. Yes, we hope to be able to say something at deadline six. Yes, perhaps we can do that. The Glas can see our position that we can then reach agreement on the basis of that. We can reflect that in future representations. Yeah.

00:24:05:27 - 00:24:07:04

That's helpful. Thank you.

00:24:09:11 - 00:24:22:15

So then let's move on to. Um. Next group of works. Terminal Works, which is 22 to 25.

00:24:25:20 - 00:24:34:09

Again, question is, is an adequate level of detail provided? Behind those, Mr. Bedford.

00:24:36:21 - 00:25:08:00

So I think Michael paper for the joint local authorities. The answer is no. We don't think there is an adequate level of detail in various of the representations. We've set out concerns, particularly with the construction of car parks, and that that's item G in work at 22. Um, and um, we don't see, for example, reference to the capacity car park and we are um.

00:25:09:19 - 00:25:29:11

Having seen. Also, you will recall from our discussions yesterday on design matters. The limited nature of detail in the design principles. So we're not really sure, as it were, what what animal we might expect would come forward. Because under that work, simply from the way in which it's described.

00:25:31:07 - 00:25:42:01

And would you be looking for the amount of new floor space to be provided for works number 2223.

00:25:45:00 - 00:25:45:15

Um.

00:25:48:27 - 00:25:50:14

Yeah, just those two in this category.

00:26:01:12 - 00:26:06:17

So the short answer Michael Bedford Joint Local Authorities is yes for 22 and 23.

00:26:11:05 - 00:26:11:27

Mr. Linus.

00:26:13:23 - 00:26:58:28

Yeah. Scotland is for the applicant. We don't think that any change is required to the works number, or the description of the work number itself, as a general proposition. Um, we already have parameters, uh, plans, deviation, uh, set out within the DCU, as well as the design principles which we discussed yesterday. Get back to the point I raised. Yes. If there are specific details that the JLA want to add to the design principles for content to consider those, but we think that that would be the appropriate vehicle for doing so, rather than adding what we would regard as unnecessary detail to the description of the works in the DCU itself.

00:27:00:06 - 00:27:00:24

Okay. Thank you.

00:27:09:26 - 00:27:23:21

To work numbers 26, 27, 28. Which are works to construct hotels. Car park. What Twin Cities put in that but can.

00:27:26:03 - 00:27:33:10

Level of detail. Maximum number of rooms per hotel. Maximum amount of floor space.

00:27:33:15 - 00:27:48:26

Mr. Bedford again, sir. Yes. Michael Bedford, joint local authorities. Similar position that we think that these are very open ended. And we think that there needs to be a greater degree of specificity as to what is likely to come.

00:27:54:03 - 00:27:57:09

Then works 28 through to 34.

00:27:59:06 - 00:27:59:21

Um.

00:28:02:04 - 00:28:15:07

For each of those that there seems to be. I'm sure the applicant wishes a degree of flexibility for each work. Is that the appropriate level of flexibility? My question.

00:28:16:07 - 00:28:35:03

Well, we consider there's too much flexibility. We don't disagree with the principle of having some flexibility, but that can be expressed by reference. For example, maximum capacities for the car parks listed in those works, for example. So one knows what it won't exceed, albeit obviously the applicant is perfectly free to provide less.

00:28:35:05 - 00:28:35:20

Yes.

00:28:36:24 - 00:29:06:25

Linus asked the applicant. Similar response to before. If we think that the level of control within the DCO is adequate. It gives the flexibility that that is appropriate. The need to comply with parameter plans. We've set out informative maximum parameter height within schedule 13, as well as the debate we've had already on the degree of listed works that appear in schedule 12, where detailed design approval is required, plus design principles.

00:29:06:27 - 00:29:20:06

As I've mentioned, if there are any specific points which the authorities would like us to consider as part of the design principles, we can consider those, but we don't think that the sort of information the GLR are looking for is appropriate for schedule one.

00:29:22:13 - 00:29:22:28

People.

00:29:43:03 - 00:29:53:15

I'm not going to ask any further questions on the other work numbers, I think. Surface access works. Um, I might have some written questions on those, but.

00:29:55:02 - 00:29:59:23

Um, on the matter of clarification, the degree of.

00:30:01:14 - 00:30:34:19

Detail in description is that this seems to be in line with what you'd expect for highways DCO. So. Clearly, the amount of description for each of those works is greater than what? The books have just been talking about. But I understand why that is the case. And it's split into highway works structures and drainage again, as expected. So don't propose to spend time on that unless, Mr.

00:30:34:21 - 00:30:40:00

Bedford, you have any particular comments on any of those? Highway works.

00:30:40:15 - 00:30:45:22

Sir Michael Bedford joined local authorities not on the highway works. It was on work 39, which I think.

00:30:48:14 - 00:30:56:00

Highway works because it works associated with the River mall. But, um, yes, we did comment on that in rep 3135.

00:30:56:05 - 00:30:56:26

Yes he did.

00:30:56:29 - 00:31:24:26

And we suggested that further detail should be provided. Demonstrate how the works, when delivered, would address the assumptions and mitigations to deal with drainage and ecological issues. Now, whether that needs an amendment to the way that the works are described in schedule one, or whether that needs to come forward in, uh, and supporting documentation is perhaps a moot point. But we did obviously raise some concerns about that particular.

00:31:26:06 - 00:31:29:15

Yes. Um, there were comments made.

00:31:31:23 - 00:31:40:13

Step three. That line three is the lines that I'm not sure of seeing. Your response to those comments. The applicant.

00:31:41:15 - 00:32:12:05

Uh, Scott Linus for the for the applicant. Um, as far as the substandard point is concerned. Um, sir, we can take that way. Again, we're not convinced that this is really a matter for the description of the work in schedule one. It may be that, um, either need to resolve the point that's been raised in terms of explaining what the position is, but if any drafting changes are required, it may be to a different control document rather than to the wording of the DCU itself.

00:32:12:12 - 00:32:16:14

But we can, uh, we can we can have a look at that. Um, sir.

00:32:17:06 - 00:32:17:22

Thank you.

00:32:21:00 - 00:32:25:09

Yes. I'm not sure if he provided a response, but in any event, we will we will look at that.

00:32:25:11 - 00:32:33:08

So I think it works. 38 3940. And 41.

00:32:36:12 - 00:32:37:01

And.

00:32:41:09 - 00:32:45:24

43. Quite detailed comments made by local authorities.

00:32:48:27 - 00:33:00:19

Which again would be helpful to revisit if they haven't been looked at already. Okay, I think that's that covers the main work numbers. Um.

00:33:04:03 - 00:33:15:03

Book them 43. Very straightforward description, which potentially could be covered by more detail.

00:33:17:02 - 00:33:20:05

But I'll leave that for now. Um.

00:33:22:02 - 00:33:22:18

There was a.

00:33:24:24 - 00:33:33:02

Party made comments in response to our written questions about ancillary or related developments.

00:33:34:21 - 00:33:35:15

Pitch.

00:33:38:29 - 00:33:45:03

There's one thing the parties could explain their latest position on that whether there is agreement.

00:33:48:28 - 00:33:49:17

Mr. Bedford.

00:33:51:12 - 00:34:25:29

Thank you, sir. I think our position remains as we'd set it out in rep 3135. Sorry. Michael Bedford, for the local authorities, uh, the, um, this list of ancillary or related development includes some pretty substantial works. And, for example, the construction compounds. And, uh, we think that they they ought to be brought into being individual work items rather than listed in a, um, a general list of matters, so that one can be very clear where they are, what they are.

00:34:26:20 - 00:34:31:01

Um, so I think we are expecting to see further detail, um, on those.

00:34:34:04 - 00:34:34:25

It's the lines.

00:34:39:18 - 00:35:06:12

Scotland is the applicant. We think the real point here is that the relevant players, for any controls over those works, or in the control documents themselves, we don't think that necessarily requires you to shift them from this part of the DCU into another part of the of the DCU. We think if further explanation is required about what those works actually involve and how they control, there are other places to do it, not here.

00:35:10:02 - 00:35:35:15

Michael Bay for the joint local authorities. I don't necessarily disagree with that as an approach, whether it's an aspect of the cockpit that provides the further detail of particular construction compounds. Um, you know, it's it's really just a question of ensuring that it is adequately captured somewhere. But I say I don't think it matters necessarily that it has to be in schedule one. In the description of work.

00:35:36:04 - 00:35:44:23

That sounds like it's possible to move forward on that, which is good. Thank you. And then order limits. Um.

00:35:47:08 - 00:36:04:15

Oh yes. This was something that we had raised in the written questions again. And it's basically it's why the order limits were drawn so widely as shown on. Well, if you turn to sheet four of seven.

00:36:06:03 - 00:36:07:21
Latest work plans.

00:36:09:15 - 00:36:11:01
And work number.

00:36:12:27 - 00:36:14:23
41, for instance.

00:36:16:14 - 00:36:32:05
Is in the corner of it. And that work number is bounded on the east and south by the Red line. But then the red line goes a lot further south and includes all the land up to the railway. And.

00:36:34:20 - 00:36:45:07
We're not clear why the red line wasn't drawn further north towards the next set of work numbers, which are, uh, 25. I think it's a good example there.

00:36:47:27 - 00:36:48:24
Can that be seen?

00:37:03:13 - 00:37:04:00
Take it away.

00:37:05:05 - 00:37:09:21
In Scotland for the applicant. Sorry. Sorry. Can I just confirm the sheet number that you're referring to?

00:37:09:25 - 00:37:10:12
Four.

00:37:10:17 - 00:37:11:25
Seven. Four. Seven.

00:37:28:10 - 00:37:30:14
So just to be absolutely clear, is it?

00:37:33:06 - 00:37:37:20
Just trying to locate the area on the plan so I could just confirm again which area it is.

00:37:37:22 - 00:37:39:24
Yeah. Work number 41.

00:37:44:01 - 00:37:59:10
Which is. So you've got the red line boundary on the eastern side, and there's a whole area between the western boundary and the railway line. Well, yes. So simple question about why you've included all of that lands within the order limits.

00:38:03:21 - 00:38:04:06
People.

00:38:14:29 - 00:38:28:18

Ask the applicant. Uh, so it has been included because existing car parking is part of the operational land in the airport. Um, which is why it's been included in that in that way. Okay.

00:38:30:04 - 00:38:30:19

Okay.

00:38:41:17 - 00:39:13:10

So on. That actually leads on to my next question. Action point seven from issue two as the applicant, to consider whether maximum number of car parking spaces for each car park should be specified. The applicant's response stated it was not necessary or beneficial to specify the precise number in the work descriptions, as the overall level of provision would be regulated by the need for the applicant to achieve and sustain the mode share commitments.

00:39:14:12 - 00:39:33:12

Um, Mr. Bedford, I haven't seen a response from the local authorities to that answer that the applicant gave. Although you have just said in relation to a number of the work numbers that you would like to see numbers of car parking spaces specified.

00:39:35:13 - 00:40:26:03

Sir Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. Uh, I think we think that the capacity of the car parks, uh, it's not just. What is the implication of that capacity for surface access? Uh, it also has a bearing on the design, shape and visual impact of the car park, particularly in multi-storey form. Uh, and so I think we think that, uh, it is appropriate to have specification on the maximum numbers that can be provided because the as it were, the SAC commitments and the uh, mode share split is a very high level troll as opposed to that, more as it were, site specific local control as to how much car parking will be in this location or that location.

00:40:26:16 - 00:40:29:23

So I think we would still like to see, uh, car park numbers.

00:40:30:02 - 00:40:30:17

Thank you.

00:40:32:24 - 00:41:04:06

And the final point I had under this agenda item, again related to um. Action points from issue two. And this was where we asked the applicants consider whether the schedule of parameters should be included in the DCO to control the maximum numbers and dimensions of structures that would be applicable to specified number of works. The applicant's response before no.

00:41:04:08 - 00:41:36:22

63 stated that the use of article six and the associated plans was a clearer and preferable approach to limits of works than specifying parameters in tabular form. Um, again, I'm not sure that local authorities have responded specifically to that and related to that. We now have a schedule. I think it's 14, and I'm guessing which includes the illustrative heights.

00:41:37:00 - 00:41:38:06

Is it 14, 13.

00:41:38:12 - 00:41:38:27

13.

00:41:39:09 - 00:41:45:15

Illustrative heights of buildings? I wonder if you could comment on that, Mr. Bedford.

00:41:46:26 - 00:42:02:19

So I think, in fairness, probably the best thing to do is to take that away and provide you with a considered response so that the various members of the team who've got a view on that actually participate in that, rather than me giving you my instinctive response.

00:42:03:21 - 00:42:36:28

So that would be what I think. What we'd like to see is comments on whether the new schedule is appropriate, whether it should be illustrative or in the covers indicative, informative, whether that's an appropriate label to apply to it and whether it should also include, um, width and depth, which is a common approach in some Tsdgeos. So leave that. Do that action point for action for deadline six.

00:42:37:22 - 00:42:38:10

Okay. Thank you.

00:42:40:12 - 00:42:42:07

Yes. Um.

00:42:44:00 - 00:43:24:26

Schedule 13. Achieve recognized refers to informative maximum parameter heights. The reason for it being put in that way is that when one looks at the parameter plans, heights differ across different buildings, so one cannot be prescriptive within this schedule or particular height, which is why the words informative has been used. We recognize that at first blush you have parameter plans and then the introduction of the word informative might look unusual, but that's the reason why it's there is having to cater for a request we think was purpose of jazz, but one has to think through the consequences of that and reflect that in the way the schedule has been presented by reference to the detail on the work plans.

00:43:24:29 - 00:43:25:14

Okay.

00:43:25:16 - 00:43:37:27

Well, I think it'd be useful from your point of view to have the response of local authorities anyway to that approach. So thank you. Okay. So are there any other comments or questions in relation to item 8.2?

00:43:42:02 - 00:43:45:24

So in which case, let's move on to item 8.3.

00:43:47:28 - 00:44:25:04

Um, and this is to ask questions about unresolved matters within schedule two, which is requirements. Again, I'm not going to go through them all. And important to say at the start that we recognize that the Jlab are proposing an environmentally managed growth framework approach. Um, and as a result of that, they could be proposing significant changes. But until we've seen the wording on that and we understand that different parties positions don't, there's any pointing in going over that again this afternoon.

00:44:25:06 - 00:44:42:15

So we can probably go out to avoid having to deal with the requirements, dealing with those particular matters. But let's just pick up on a few, um, requirements in themselves. And.

00:44:48:08 - 00:44:54:24

Let's start with requirement one, which is obviously the interpretation. Just to clarify.

00:44:56:10 - 00:45:08:12

What is the difference between commence. In article two and begin in requirements one. It's the Linus.

00:45:14:03 - 00:45:19:21

At Scotland for the applicant in simple terms. So begin is before commence.

00:45:22:10 - 00:45:22:25

They.

00:45:26:05 - 00:45:27:16

Do you want to expand on that?

00:45:29:29 - 00:45:53:01

Thank you, sir. Ian. Mark, on behalf of the applicant. So the, um, the intention of the distinction between begin and commence, as you'll see, activities that are accepted from the definition of commence that would be captured by the definition of begin. So it's intended to make a distinction between when the DCO is begun or implemented and when development activities are commenced, which then trigger some of the additional controls within schedule two to the DCO.

00:45:54:23 - 00:45:55:09

Okay.

00:46:16:24 - 00:46:17:09

Okay.

00:46:22:23 - 00:46:27:23

You still have the CIA as. The.

00:46:29:18 - 00:46:49:23

Independent Air Noise reviewer. And there was something provided. Deadline five, which I think confirmed that they had agreed to that position. Is that something that you could you provide confirmation from the CIA to the examination? Would that be appropriate?

00:47:00:05 - 00:47:09:06

As Scotland's applicant, there is a statement of common ground with Sia, and they're going to sign it at the appropriate stage of the examination with us. Suffice her it.

00:47:09:08 - 00:47:13:07

Would do if they if it is signed today to it, that would be fine. Yep.

00:47:13:09 - 00:47:13:24

Very well.

00:47:13:26 - 00:47:14:11

Thank you. Yeah.

00:47:17:00 - 00:47:32:04

By the joint local authorities. You'll be aware from some of the comments that Miss Lane made this afternoon. That's still a live area of disagreement between us. Yes, about that. But you're aware of that? Yes.

00:47:34:14 - 00:47:35:16

Okay. Um.

00:47:37:18 - 00:47:56:19

There is a new requirements which is currently listed as two A, which is to do with phasing, I think responds to um, early comments from local authorities. Do you want to say anything at this point on that? Mr. Bedford, I'm going to respond at d6.

00:47:58:16 - 00:48:29:06

I think we we are welcoming of the principle of the introduction of, uh, requirement to a, uh, but we're still taking instructions within the various authorities about the detailed wording. And we think that there are some refinements, uh, that are needed. Uh, we think there needs to be a notice period for submission of the phasing scheme. I think the scheme should be reviewed annually, not only five yearly basis.

00:48:29:24 - 00:48:57:04

Uh, and we're also concerned about the um, duration, i.e. the long stop, the 15 year, because the long term project, we don't know. And presumably the applicant doesn't know what external commercial, uh, factors may interfere with, uh, implementation over the period of the, the life of the project. So so I think we think it needs refining, but we will respond fully at deadline six. Thank you.

00:48:59:00 - 00:49:09:19

Yeah, Scotland. I guess we understand as far as the larger concern, this is heading in the right direction. So we'll receive that specific feedback and respond in due course. Thank you.

00:49:10:00 - 00:49:10:15

Thank you.

00:49:19:27 - 00:49:37:20

The next one I wanted to raise was requirement three, which is time limits and notifications. Um, I think. Have been further changes. Deadline five. To wish to comment further on that Mr. Bedford now.

00:49:38:10 - 00:50:20:03

So I think again, there has been some dialogue with the applicant on this. It's it's one of the issues where one's balancing different considerations. On the one hand, for those affected by the DCO certainty, uh, as to what is the time during which the project can be implemented and therefore potentially, um, is casting its shadow? Um, that's important. And obviously, you know, the position that we've made, particularly about the Horley Strategic Business Park and so on, but there are clearly other parties affected by simply the, um, potentiality of the DCO being implemented.

00:50:20:05 - 00:51:03:02

On the other hand, as one will have seen from recent court litigation, where DCS are made and then are the subject of legal challenge through judicial review, that process itself can take a certain amount of time. And so we recognise that from an applicant's point of view that there are issues I think the dialogue has been working on. Is there a middle way of managing that? I don't think the drafting at the moment, we think has got the balance quite right, but we think that we should be able to, working with the applicant, come up with something which, since both sides can think is a reasonable reflection of those two, as it were, different competing pressures.

00:51:03:08 - 00:51:04:08

It's good. Thank you.

00:51:06:11 - 00:51:10:22

Got last applicant. We can discuss that outside the examination with the JLR goods.

00:51:10:24 - 00:51:11:09

Thank you.

00:51:12:26 - 00:51:32:26

I'm not going to, um, raise. Requirement for. I think I understand from yesterday's discussion about the issues there, in terms of the recent changes that have been made. We can come back to that if we need to. Uh, next one was.

00:51:34:17 - 00:51:35:09

Um.

00:51:37:02 - 00:51:38:27

Those requirements. Six. But.

00:51:40:12 - 00:52:07:02

Use the relationship to schedule 1213, I think informative maximum parameter heights. We've dealt with that for now. Requirements and also related to requirement for. So I think we can pass over that. Now let's move on to requirement 15 which is the air noise envelope.

00:52:10:23 - 00:52:11:08

Um.

00:52:19:01 - 00:52:25:15

Yes. So this is where there's been some change in relation to the air noise reviewer.

00:52:28:22 - 00:52:53:21

Um, Mr. Bedford, I suppose you'll be responding to this at Deadline's six. Um. For you to join. Local authorities had made comments at deadline five 593 anyway, so um, sort of comments going backwards and forwards at the same deadline, but hopefully you'll be able to contribute further on that.

00:52:54:17 - 00:53:24:13

Certainly that will be our intention. Obviously there are. Key point of principle about the nature of who should be, uh, um, approving any, um, noise envelope and any review of it and any monitoring of it. And what a position, uh, from us on that. And then there are points on the detailed drafting, and we note there have been some amendments to the precise wording. So yes, we'll try to fix that.

00:53:24:20 - 00:53:25:09

Thank you.

00:53:28:06 - 00:53:29:00

It's the Lions.

00:53:29:06 - 00:53:41:09

Scotland. Yes, it was a broader point of principle. It won't go over again. We just know that the changes that have been added in at the latest iteration of the Desu reflect input of the CAA themselves.

00:53:41:11 - 00:53:42:07

Yes. Thank you.

00:53:43:24 - 00:53:44:15

Okay.

00:53:48:10 - 00:53:48:25

Um.

00:53:50:21 - 00:54:13:14

We passed over requirements 18 as well, which is the noise insulation scheme. We've talked about that today. There's obviously unresolved issues there. But with Covid 19, um, again, local authorities suggesting green controlled growth approach. So we won't spend time on that.

00:54:15:11 - 00:54:17:19

Generally. Um.

00:54:21:16 - 00:54:35:07

Hope that that requirement has moved on from the original version, which was submitted with the application in a number of ways, and local authorities can comment. Next iteration.

00:54:38:19 - 00:55:01:08

We know there are issues from local authorities in relation to requirements 20 and 21, in terms of what is contained within those or the SAC and the carbon action plan. So, um, presumably the discussions going on about those like daughter documents. Yes.

00:55:01:25 - 00:55:24:00

Uh, Scott, the applicant. Yes. A little to the extent that there are still points of principle remaining between the parties on the approach to surface access and carbon commitments. Obviously, uh, we resist those and we respect any other more detailed comments would probably relate to the detail of the control document itself rather than the requirement. We can obviously take those on board as and when they come.

00:55:24:04 - 00:55:26:18

Yes. Thank you. And then, um.

00:55:28:05 - 00:55:43:26

Requirement 24, 25 and 26 have all been modified to a degree, but I think most of those changes are. To respond to local authorities comments.

00:55:45:12 - 00:55:45:27

Um.

00:55:52:04 - 00:55:54:24

Is there anything you want to add to those, Mr. Bedford?

00:56:01:24 - 00:56:07:06

So I'm just checking my briefing notes and the answer is no. I'm not, uh, wishing to add any comments. Thank you sir. Thank you.

00:56:07:16 - 00:56:15:13

And then we have new requirements 27 through to 32. Um.

00:56:17:00 - 00:56:21:24

Can miss the path to understanding now, or you're happy to leave your comments until deadline six.

00:56:22:07 - 00:56:46:19

Sir, I think the position is Michael Bay for the joint Local authorities. The various authorities are still reviewing those material. Obviously, the principle of some of the matters which have been, um, discussed, in particular the arboriculture or vegetation method statement, we welcome the principle as to the detail of the wording. I say, well, we're still taking instructions and we'll comment at deadline six.

00:56:46:22 - 00:56:47:07

Thank you.

00:56:50:19 - 00:57:14:08

There have been a number of other suggested requirements from various parties during the examination. Um, I'm not going to go through them all. Some of them have been addressed, but one I couldn't find to respond to was to provide an odor management and monitoring plan. Has that been addressed?

00:57:28:19 - 00:57:41:25

Sorry and Mark on behalf of the applicant. I think that requirement has dropped away because of modifications that have been made to the scheme, but I will we'll double check that for you and point you in the direction of where we've responded to that before. Confirm otherwise.

00:57:41:27 - 00:57:42:29

Thank you. That's helpful.

00:57:47:04 - 00:57:54:28

Are there any other comments from anyone on? The requirements themselves. Do.

00:57:57:00 - 00:58:01:29

Oh, sorry. Yes. Uh, yes, Mr. Latif. Ramesh.

00:58:05:15 - 00:58:36:05

Good afternoon, sir. Um, I will be very brief, mindful of the time. Um, we we have an update to provide. And then just three short comments on schedule two. Um, just by way of update, we've, uh, in general terms, national highways and the applicant have been working constructively together. And we are, uh, broadly pleased with the progress that's being made on the side agreement which touches on these issues. Um, we're not quite there yet, but we're hoping to provide an update, uh, in the next two deadlines.

00:58:36:07 - 00:59:08:27

Uh, on on where we are to turn to, um, the the three comments on on schedule two. Two of them relate to requirements which are not in the DCO at the moment. One relates to one that is in the draft. Uh, DCO before you to take the latter first, requirement six, which deals with the National Highways works. Um, you'll recall that issue specific hearing for we raised a concern about the timing under, um, subparagraph three.

00:59:09:14 - 00:59:52:18

Uh, as it stands, those have to be in place on the third anniversary of the dual runway operations. National highways are not yet in a position to confirm that. That is an appropriate timing for the delivery of of those particular works. We are working with the applicant. Um, and as I said, the

discussions are moving in the right direction in terms of the two requirements, which are not in the draft order as it stands. The first relates to another point that we raised at issue specific hearing for, which was the, um, security provided for the Signalization scheme, which is not a work number under the DCO, but is assumed in the traffic modelling.

00:59:52:20 - 01:00:23:24

It's often referred to as the Bayu Signalization scheme or the BA works. Um, following constructive discussions, we have reached a form of wording that we have provisionally agreed with the applicant and we are just awaiting confirmation of when that will be inserted into the draft order. But I thought I'd flag it now and then the final point, which, um, we could have raised in agenda item seven, but I thought I'd wrap everything together.

01:00:24:04 - 01:00:57:06

Uh, relates to biodiversity, net gain and biodiversity loss, specifically on the strategic road network. Um, at issue specific hearing one, we raised concerns that there was actually a net loss on the strategic road network. And the Department for transport and the Secretary of State gives national highways, uh, particular KPIs in terms of biodiversity on the SRN. And as a result of the project, um, those KPIs are potentially somewhat affected.

01:00:57:08 - 01:01:26:05

Again, we are having constructive discussions with the applicant about resolving this issue. Um, but on those, uh, last two, in the event that also in the case of all three, in the case where an agreement is not reached by, um, the end of this month, will will be making submissions, um, to, uh, assist the examining authority with our position and how we think those matters should be secured. Thank you.

01:01:26:17 - 01:01:32:09

Thank you very much. Mr. Linus, do you want to respond on that Scotland applicant?

01:01:32:16 - 01:01:55:02

I don't at this stage need to respond in any detail to the suggestions are made because we note that the discussions between the parties have been constructive and continue to be, uh, if further submissions are made by natural and natural national highways, we can respond to those in due course. But as I say, the discussions have been progressing very well and we don't need to deal with any of the points of detail at this stage. Thank you.

01:01:56:19 - 01:01:58:12

Okay. Um.

01:01:59:28 - 01:02:41:10

Before we finish on that item, what I would say is just to remind all interested parties that if they wish to see changes to the wording of the draft DCO or additional matters included, they should provide specific wording for the examining authorities. Consider. Um, those still opportunities to do that until time for us to consider and for the applicant and other parties to consider. We talked about environmentally managed growth framework, and we understand that joint local authorities will be providing a draft outline at deadline six.

01:02:41:12 - 01:02:59:02

Is that correct? Yes. Thank you. Um. So I think time is running out really to. Go back to item 8.1 in any detail. But are there any?

01:03:00:27 - 01:03:01:12

Um.

01:03:02:26 - 01:03:33:20

Obstacles within. The draft TCO. But parties wish to raise at this point where? Agreement is unlikely to be reached. The only thing you want to draw to our attention at this point, I tell you that on the whole, you'll be trying to. There are downtown differences, and we will have a number of written questions when they are, um, issued, I think on the 1st of July.

01:03:33:29 - 01:03:37:29

But if anyone wanted to raise anything now. Boswell.

01:03:38:11 - 01:04:11:16

Scotland for the applicant, sir. Thank you. Just to summarize where we understand we are since deadline five, where we submitted a further update to the draft DCU, uh, along with the explanatory memorandum, the schedule of uh changes, but to helpful and constructive meetings with the with the JLA to discuss the provisions and the draft issue, which we thought they had some issues with, and understand whether further drafting provided addressed those points or what remained.

01:04:11:29 - 01:04:45:12

Uh, as far as we're concerned, we don't think there's an in-principle reason why any of the drafting around the articles and the schedule, the DCU would be incapable of being agreed for the close of examination. And obviously there is some disagreement between the parties on elements of the schedule, such as the listed works issue. There's a broader principle, em, about energy. Um, as uh, but we would hope that, uh, certainly as far as the listed works are concerned, they aren't so fundamental is preclude agreement being reached.

01:04:45:22 - 01:04:56:28

Um, EMG will not be agreed unless the JLA is decide to drop this proposal. Um, but our discussions will continue and will provide for other updates as appropriate.

01:04:58:05 - 01:04:58:29

You, Mr. Bedford.

01:05:00:15 - 01:05:01:00

Yes.

01:05:01:11 - 01:05:32:03

Mark Webb will join local authorities. There are obviously some, uh, key areas of disagreement which you are likely to have to adjudicate on. But broadly speaking, on the drafting, there has been constructive dialogue and whether it's further iterations of the drafting, whether it's dealing with a problem in a slightly different way, and, for example, discussions about planning performance agreements and matters of that nature. Those things are in the mix, as it were, in the melting pot.

01:05:32:05 - 01:05:57:17

I don't think I can say anything beyond that because there are still discussions and negotiations ongoing. But in a sense, at this stage of the examination, I think both sides feel that there is, um, reason for confidence that most of the issues should be able to come to some form of satisfactory arrangement as we move closer towards, uh, the later stages of the examination.

01:05:57:24 - 01:06:31:11

Thank you, thank you. That's helpful. Um, so I think that's, uh. Back to second round of questions. 1st of July we're likely to have. Quite a number of. Some very detailed questions about the DCO. Um, it may be that the answer to those is that issues have been resolved, but I think we will ask them anyway. Um, then you'll be able to see to a degree what our thinking is on those matters.

01:06:31:19 - 01:07:06:21

And then. We will also be expecting to publish our proposed schedule of changes to the draft DCO on the 14th of August. It's just for the record, we have said this at the start of the examination. We are required to produce a recommended DCO for the Secretary of State, whether or not we recommend that the application should be approved standard practice. So the reason why we're going through all this today is we have to finalise a form of a DCO.

01:07:06:23 - 01:07:18:18

So. It's clear. So I think that's all on um, item. Eight. If I can now hand over to Mr. Hockley, who will deal with that. And nine.

01:07:20:20 - 01:07:21:17

Thank you, Mr. Gleason.

01:07:22:01 - 01:07:38:03

Um, item nine is action points. A number of action points, um, from yesterday and today. Um, mainly for the applicant and the glas. Um, given the technical nature of them, especially those ones today. Um, we'll double check them and publish them on the project web page as soon as possible.

01:07:40:08 - 01:07:57:13

Scott Fabricant grateful for that indication. So obviously, given the deadline next week, we've taken our own note of actions we anticipate so we can take work in hand. Now. We're very grateful for that list being published, given the deadline coming up next week.

01:07:57:15 - 01:08:01:09

Yeah. No problem. We were aware of the urgency in the in the deadline on Wednesday. Very grateful.

01:08:01:11 - 01:08:01:26

Thank you.

01:08:01:28 - 01:08:35:13

Thank you. Um, item ten is any other business? Um, we've identified two matters, um, which we wish to raise under this, which hopefully you'd have seen on the agenda. Um, those are examination closing statements and consolidate environmental statement. Um, both of these items refer to additional information we'd like to receive at the final substantive deadline. Which deadline? Nine the 21st of August. Um, hopefully. Both are fairly self-explanatory, but in terms of closing statements, um, we'd like to request closing statements submitted by all relevant parties who wish to do so.

01:08:36:07 - 01:08:48:07

Um, closing statements will be familiar to many here, as often used in section 78 planning application appeals, and should detail the closing position of the main parties at the close of the examination on all relevant main issues.

01:08:50:20 - 01:09:10:19

And for the Consolidated Environmental statement. There have been various amendments to the environmental statement throughout the examination process, and at deadline nine, we'd wish to see a consolidated environmental statement submitted by the applicant so that any changes or amendments which have taken place throughout the examination are easy to read and understand.

01:09:14:09 - 01:09:53:00

Mr. Linus, let's go on and thank you, sir. In terms of what that is going to involve in practice or what we had envisaged that we would prepare and submit, um, a clarification signposting document, which would provide a list of all the documentation associated with the environmental um statement and the

appropriate document references where they have been included into the examination. So there's a clear route map from the chapter and the environmental statement to where it has been amended, or whether it's for other information provided for subsequent examination and document.

01:09:53:10 - 01:10:19:03

So we anticipate that that, um, that we can keep track on that as we go through the examination. But that's the way we would, uh, approach the issue of a consolidated, um, is primarily through effectively signposting where work is superseded or added to existing chapters in the appendices. Yes. And that would be made a certified. That would be made a certified document, obviously.

01:10:20:04 - 01:10:22:09

Okay. Thank you. We'll take that away. Thank you.

01:10:24:00 - 01:10:29:14

Okay. Uh, are there any. We've just dealt with those two items. Any questions from yourself, Mr. Bedford?

01:10:31:10 - 01:11:03:14

So only just by way of clarification in terms of the closing statements, I'm taking it that you would be perfectly content that obviously it would be a document which would be overarching, but it would. Signpost to earlier submissions where some of the detail is set out, rather than itself having to be freestanding and provide all that detail, so long as there was clear signposting to the relevant documents and the relevant parts of the documents, you wouldn't expect it all to be repeated in one.

01:11:03:18 - 01:11:07:27

Of course, that would be fine, obviously, provided that was your final position on those. Yeah. Thank you.

01:11:10:03 - 01:11:11:14

Okay, Mr. Linus, sir.

01:11:12:14 - 01:11:31:26

Uh, Scotland. That's the approach we're going to take ourselves. We're working on the assumption that you're going to be most assisted by these submissions, effectively setting out where the issues lie between the parties insofar as they do, rather than necessarily originating documents and in large form earlier. So we're content with authentication. Thank you sir.

01:11:31:28 - 01:11:32:13

Thank you.

01:11:33:02 - 01:11:33:17

Okay.

01:11:33:19 - 01:11:36:14

Is there any other business anyone wishes to raise today? Yes, sir.

01:11:38:03 - 01:11:43:02

If you could put your microphone on, please. Thank you. My name is Nigel Turner.

01:11:43:04 - 01:11:44:20

I'm a local resident.

01:11:44:22 - 01:12:20:22

I just wanted to raise a number of issues about what I'll call the applicant's proposal, because it is, as we've seen, a very vague document, and I've noted the lack of concise answers today. My main concern is that the runways are too close together to even consider this proposal. They're below the minimum width required. This airport carries Emirates three 80s the 80m wide.

01:12:21:11 - 01:13:14:00

The runways are less than 200m apart. This proposal kind of sits between bloody dangerous and reckless. And on those grounds alone, I would strongly suggest that this proposal is rejected out of hand. Um. I also want to raise awareness that we will all be aware of that, that the current generation of aircraft from Boeing that are not wholly viable or safe, and that anything that raises the airport's requirements to allow more flights inevitably will cause the risk of more dangerous aircraft arriving over the area.

01:13:14:12 - 01:13:47:08

And the airport seems totally unaware. And the airlines do. If you look at the response of the airlines to the issues that arisen at Boeing, you will see that Willie Walsh International Airlines Group or Ryanair are saying, oh yeah, we'll buy more. Well, those aircraft are going to be flying over the residences of the counties represented, and they are fundamentally unsafe. I could explain why, but I won't take your time.

01:13:47:10 - 01:13:52:02

But that is quite clearly a major issue.

01:13:54:02 - 01:14:27:15

I would also draw attention to the amount of overflying already occurs from the F spot, and I actually can't tell you whether it's the airport or the CAA that are full. But if any resident can complaints, contacts about noise or low flying, there is no response. And I assume there's no record. And I simply don't understand how this is or how the applicant would put in their proposal.

01:14:28:12 - 01:14:38:03

When they are totally disconnected with the realities of what the residents are experiencing and are clearly unable to collect the data.

01:14:40:10 - 01:15:13:11

Furthermore, I would draw attention to the issue of safety on the airport. There is, and has been for a decade, sat next to the north by an aircraft called I think, and at least in 62 it may be something else. It is never moved. And this is the Jason to a runway. I would suggest that the applicant is not really able to operate a safe airport.

01:15:14:06 - 01:15:36:21

And it's certainly beyond its capability to operate an enlarged airport. And again, I would say on those grounds, this application should be rejected. And I draw attention to my friends comments about the water table when you look at the environment.

01:15:39:24 - 01:15:45:08

If each aircraft carries or uses about 1000l of de-icing.

01:15:46:24 - 01:15:51:20

Um, material on it, but prior to takeoff on a winter day.

01:15:53:12 - 01:16:10:05

Their crops get diced. That all that stuff falls into the runoff area. That has been an issue for the last 30 years. That is around 10,000 days.

01:16:12:13 - 01:16:37:00

The applicant submission says we will look at this on the 7th of June, 30 years, 10,000 days, and they have not addressed this issue. And today they turn up and say, we still can't answer the questions about what happens with the sewage and wastewater treatment centre.

01:16:39:21 - 01:16:43:22

The the the submissions in response.

01:16:44:17 - 01:16:59:21

To the applicants submission race. You know, it's like a blast of red dots about over overflowing of, um, the wastewater system around.

01:17:01:23 - 01:17:36:19

The airport environments for quite a distance. And yet the applicant has no answer and doesn't seem to be able to address it. And yet we are asked to believe that the applicant will consider these proposals will come back. And I put it that there is no credibility in that. Assertion it cannot be accepted and the same is true for infrastructure. The applicant appears to think that somehow out of heaven.

01:17:38:14 - 01:18:11:17

The airport can cope with more people. It come on the rail system. In fact, in the news yesterday Kent were advising all they they could not get another line into Gatwick, although they'd asked for it there that their route terminates up the road at Redhill. So where the capacity for rail is meant to come from. The applicant said oh, we'll put a roundabout in for better access.

01:18:12:02 - 01:18:45:19

£10 million. It's not realistic. The smart way. Motorway system. That is only, what, ten miles, £157 million it cost. And it was only putting in an extra lane and some signs. What happens the other side of the airport? What happens? Are you going to put in the four lane motorway down south? You realistically probably should be looking at a budget of around £1.5 billion.

01:18:45:21 - 01:19:09:10

And what I'm saying is that that under costing has caused the applicant to put in an unproven business case that they probably wouldn't even consider if they had accurate costs. And again, I encourage that this proposal is. Rejected out of hand. And the same goes on all I mean.

01:19:11:10 - 01:19:50:12

Discussion around the trees, I mean. If we can't get plausible answers around the trees, where are we going to get plausible arguments around the fuel that is dumped from aircraft, or energy consumption or power usage that this fast thing is going to use? And if the applicant really, really wanted to make their airport more efficient, they would start by getting rid of all the shops that are actually slowing the throughput people and actually start to build a efficient airport, and then you get to parking.

01:19:50:17 - 01:20:22:27

If you choose to drive out of this and leave this area going up towards Coquitlam, you will find wooded areas full of parked cars, airport parking because the whole system doesn't cope. The airport itself has put in parking charges for drive through £5 to discourage people to come from coming to the airport. Is that an airport with capacity? But oh no, it's not £5.

01:20:22:29 - 01:20:34:15

It's gone up 20% this year. Now it's £6, presumably an indication that the airport at its current capacity is unable to cope.

01:20:36:27 - 01:21:13:26

This is a massively bad idea. It's ironic. We're by the by, um, Hazel roundabout because that roundabout cannot cope with the local traffic. That's why we didn't get an Ikea. But did the major use of resources and infrastructure make any mention of the local infrastructure that would need to be upgraded to cater? The local environment? No, because the airport is like a bad neighbor is grabbing resources.

01:21:14:05 - 01:21:49:25

Grabbing. And at the same time stunting local growth, and we end up with no no Ikea losses of major employment. And so I think. The committee will find when you look at this proposal. It is unsubstantiated. It is uncosted. These unsupported. It is vague. It is disingenuous. I've sat here asking, watching people, asking questions and not getting answers.

01:21:49:27 - 01:22:22:13

And at the end of the day, it is downright bloody dangerous. You get a major accident on that airport with too many planes in two can find an area and it will be a catastrophe. And people don't like that. And if you want proof, go to Croydon and see the edge room. Oh no, it's not there because it got shut down. You pursue this reckless path to too much and you will have no airport.

01:22:22:19 - 01:22:23:04

Thank you.

01:22:23:19 - 01:22:43:05

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. We've noted your points there. Um, many of the we've also obviously read your relevant representation. You made, um, many of the points you made have obviously been brought up in the examination and have been examined and will continue to be examined. Thank you. Um, I suggest, uh, Mr. Linus, if you wish to respond, perhaps in writing.

01:22:45:01 - 01:23:03:10

Uh, Scotland. As for the applicant, we note this a wide ranging review of the application. The points that have been broadly raised or covered in our submissions to date, but obviously, if any further submissions are made in writing, will respond to them. I think to the extent we think it's necessary, I think we've addressed these points already. Thank you.

01:23:03:20 - 01:23:08:09

Thank you. Okay, I'll now move to the close of the hearing. Um.

01:23:10:09 - 01:23:39:24

If I could remind you that the timetable of this examination requires a party to provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline six, which is the 26th of June, 2024. And if I could also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the Inspectorate's website as soon as practicable after this meeting. Thank you very much for attending yesterday and today, um, and for everybody's participation, which we have found very helpful. Time is now 1714 and issue specific hearing eight is closed. Thank you.