

Communities Against Gatwick Noise Emissions (CAGNE)
Gatwick Airport Northern Runway project DCO application
PINS Reference Number: TR020005

SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF CAGNE
DEADLINE 6 (26 June 2024)

INTRODUCTION

1. These submissions are made by CAGNE at Deadline 6. They contain the following:
 - a. CAGNE's Responses to the material provided at Deadline 5 (and some at Deadline 4), concerning:
 - i. Waste
 - ii. Wastewater (see also Appendix 1, CAGNE's consultation response in respect of the proposed Project Change)
 - iii. Air Quality
 - iv. Policy
 - b. CAGNE's Post-Hearing Submissions following ISH 8, concerning:
 - i. Surface Transport (see Appendix 2, Sterling Transport Consultancy Ltd Post-Hearing submissions)
 - ii. Noise (see also Appendix 3, Suono's Post-Hearing submissions, which also respond to some of the Applicant's Deadline 5 submissions)

WASTE

2. Matters relating to waste, and in particular transport impacts of sending waste offsite following the Project Change, merit detailed consideration as part of the Examination but have not been properly assessed by the Applicant in their latest reports on waste.¹

¹ The Applicant's Operational Waste Management Strategy is at REP3-070 and the Project Change Report is at AS-139.

3. The Applicant's Project Change Report² simply states that the removal of the incinerator would not materially increase vehicle trips, with the proposed replacement CARE facility said to be expected to generate no more than six trips a day. However, it is unclear how those figures have been derived.
4. Indeed, those figures appear unjustified, when the difference in tonnage of incinerated waste between "with" and "without" Project scenarios would be some **3,043.90 tonnes** per annum in 2047.³ Already, a variety of waste is transported offsite for incineration, including CAT 1 food waste, which is taken to Newhaven and Chineham.⁴ Significantly more would be transported were the project to go ahead.
5. In addition, the Applicant has given no information about where additional waste would be taken, and at what times. Accordingly, the traffic impacts of the Applicant's updated waste proposals have still not been adequately assessed. This is a matter of significant concern for local residents.

WASTEWATER

6. CAGNE concurs with the Environment Agency's ("EA") Deadline 5 concerns about the Applicant's new proposal for an onsite wastewater treatment facility.⁵ CAGNE made a number of similar points in its consultation response in respect of the proposed Project Change, which for ease of reference is attached to these submissions (Appendix 1). In particular, CAGNE is concerned about the fundamental lack of detail provided, which makes proper assessment of the adequacy of the proposed facility impossible at this stage.
7. In addition, as highlighted in Appendix 1, the removal of 1,162 car parking spaces so close to the airport is unacceptable without detailed plans for alternative accommodation. This must be reflected in the revised carparking figures, which the Applicant needs to update in any event following the ExA's highlighting of inaccuracies at ISH8.

² AS-139.

³ See Nuffield Conservation Society's analysis at REP4-126, which refers back to the figures set out in REP3-070.

⁴ REP3-070 at §3.4.11

⁵ See REP5-058 10.1.12 Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Environment Agency Version 2 (Tracked) at §2.22.3.13 and REP5-090 Environment Agency comment on Change 4.

8. If the Applicant cannot proceed with its proposal for on airport wastewater treatment works, then CAGNE maintains as per its legal submissions at Deadline 4 that it would be appropriate and necessary to include a phasing requirement in the development consent order (“DCO”), as requested by Thames Water (“TW”).⁶ The ExA still does not have available to it critical modelling to demonstrate that TW’s infrastructure can at present accommodate the wastewater from the Northern Runway Project (“NRP”).
9. CAGNE notes that at Deadline 5 the Applicant updated its Statement of Common Ground (“SOCG”) with TW.⁷ The Applicant states that it has now carried out its own analysis of some of TW’s preliminary data. However, as the Applicant accepts within the SOCG, the Applicant’s “*own interpretation*” of TW’s data can be no substitute for TW’s fully reasoned analysis. Until that analysis is provided, no conclusions can be drawn about the capacity of TW’s infrastructure to accommodate the NRP.
10. CAGNE also understands from the updated SOCG that TW has provided some preliminary results to the Applicant. CAGNE requests that this information is made available to the Examination as soon as possible, so that all parties can be kept informed of progress on this key matter. In addition, the SOCG notes that the Applicant coordinated a presentation on drainage to TW on 28 March 2024. It is requested that this information is also put before the Examination.
11. Finally, CAGNE has reviewed the Draft DCO and seeks further explanation from the Applicant as to why Article 22 is (a) necessary in light of the statutory scheme and (b) appropriate in light of the available evidence about the need for a tailored solution, be that diversion to Crawley in a phased manner, or an onsite wastewater facility.

AIR QUALITY

12. The Applicant has provided no robust response to the detailed points made in the air quality reports submitted by Air Pollution Services (“APS”) on behalf of CAGNE.⁸ Until

⁶ CAGNE’s legal submissions on this point are at REP4-094

⁷ REP5-065 10.1.17 Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Thames Water Version 2 (Tracked)

⁸ REP1-140, REP4-095

the Applicant addresses the matters detailed therein, CAGNE maintains those concerns as critical considerations for the ExA.

POLICY

13. CAGNE has reviewed the Applicant's various submissions on points of policy, up to and including the recent response to Heathrow Airport's Deadline 4 Submission.⁹ While the Applicant has addressed policy in a number of documents, it has largely repeated what was set out in the original Planning Statement.
14. CAGNE does not propose to reiterate the points it has made on policy at earlier Deadlines. However, CAGNE still considers that its fundamental analysis, that the NRP is not supported by national aviation policy as it would result in the creation of a new runway in the South East (and not at Heathrow), remains unanswered. CAGNE continues to rely on its previous detailed submissions in this regard.¹⁰

ISH 8 POST-HEARING SUBMISSIONS

SURFACE TRANSPORT

15. The Applicant has still not addressed the substance of the detailed concerns raised by Sterling in their surface transport reports.¹¹
16. Further submissions on transport following ISH 8 are appended to this submission at Appendix 2.

NOISE

17. **Stakeholder consultation:** CAGNE notes that, in relation to noise, the ANPS imposes policy obligations on the Applicant to design the noise envelope in consultation with local communities and relevant stakeholders and that the package of noise mitigation measures

⁹ REP5-076.

¹⁰ For reference, CAGNE's detailed submissions on policy can be found at REP1-137 CAGNE Written Representation and REP3-113 CAGNE's Response to EXQ1.

¹¹ REP1-139, REP3-114, REP4-097, REP5-120.

should be subject to consultation with local communities and other stakeholders (paragraphs 5.57 and 5.60). The Applicant, when describing the changes it proposes to the noise envelope, announced without prior warning at ISH8, said that the proposals were a positive reevaluation of the project and that it showed the Applicant was “moving towards recognising concerns raised by others”. Had the Applicant undertaken policy compliance stakeholder engagement, it would not be “moving towards” this point only at this late stage, more than three months after the examination opened.

18. The Applicant listed the meetings undertaken with stakeholders, but just listing the meetings does not evidence that there was meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the Applicant does not change its proposal throughout the stakeholder engagement process, despite those stakeholders raising significant points, and only changes the proposal at Deadline 6, then that is a failure of engagement and the requirements of the ANPS have not been met.
19. It transpired at ISH8 that the Applicant had undertaken an undisclosed survey of part of the community, with undisclosed questions, for undisclosed reasons, asking about identifying local noise groups, in an apparent attempt to undermine the credibility of the noise groups with whom the Applicant professed to be conducting stakeholder engagement. The Applicant has indicated it will provide a copy of the survey as part of the Deadline 6 submissions, and CAGNE will make further submissions as necessary.
20. **General:** Further submissions on noise following ISH 8 are appended to this submission at Appendix 3.

26 June 2024