

Concerns about Governance of open-ness and transparency

Can I repeat a point that I have made at deadline 1, but which still has not been investigated.

On March 15th 2024 I wrote a submission that included this point -

"It is fact that many of the scheme attributes to do with economic forecasting and noise harms have been dribbled out by GAL, so as not to provide the public with a transparent case early enough for the public to make an informed response. Instead information-in-part was provided in 2021 leaving it only until now during the examination stage for GAL to be submit last minute 'clarifying' information that should have been given months/years ago. This means the wider public in the 2021 public consultation did not have the full facts and were unable to form a balanced informed view. This supports the argument that the 2021 consultation was deficient and should be voided."

It is ridiculous that the DCO inquiry is delving into the minutia nuances of the scheme yet is ignoring the elephant that is already sitting there - that being that the wider public is now effectively excluded from being able to judge the merits of this scheme and it has been reduced to an undemocratic process as transparent information was not made available to the wider public during the 2021 consultation. The DCO enquiry is now reaching a tiny numbers of the general public and I still do not understand why the whole process is not voided because of the underhanded way Gatwick has used to deliberately omit information at early stages of the process so that damaging information is only given to a diminishing number of people in the later stages of consultation/inquiry.

Where is the governance here in this whole process? Who has deemed that the 2021 and DCO process is legal from a transparency point of view or public service/value point of view?

GAL continues to deliver information at later and later moments in this process, further and further excluding the interests of the public at large. The inspector has to call this out and request that the process is voided - it is now not fit for purpose.

It is a legal responsibility of Public Organisations to provide open and transparent consultations, it is accepted the same standards apply here and yet they seem not to be held to account. Open-ness is a key principle of consultation and I quote " While a staged process may be acceptable, this should not be designed to limit discussion of all the options."

I argue that GAL from 2021 HAS used an orchestrated staged process to limit discussion and awareness of issues. I urge the inspector to review these points (all detailed in my first submission document) which prove GAL is not being open. The inquiry should be halted whilst these points are considered.