



**Application by Gatwick Airport Limited for the Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project  
The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)  
Issued on Monday 1 July 2024**

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA) second round of written questions and requests for information (ExQ2). Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex C to the Rule 6 letter of 5 January 2024. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IP) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with an alphabetical code and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on general matters is identified as 'GEN.2.1'. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, an [editable version of this table is available in Microsoft Word](#).

The deadline for responses to ExQ2 is **Deadline 7** in the Examination Timetable (**Monday 15 July 2024**).



## Abbreviations used:

<b>ANPS</b>	Airports National Policy Statement
<b>APF</b>	Aviation Policy Framework
<b>AIPUT</b>	Airport Industrial Property Unit Trust
<b>Art.</b>	Article
<b>BC</b>	Borough Council
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition
<b>CAGNE</b>	Communities Against Gatwick Noise and Emissions
<b>CBC</b>	Crawley Borough Council
<b>CC</b>	County Council
<b>CCEP</b>	Construction Communications and Engagement Plan
<b>CoCP</b>	Code of Construction Practice
<b>CRWMP</b>	Construction Resources and Waste Management Plan
<b>D</b>	Deadline
<b>DAS</b>	Design and Access Statement
<b>DCO</b>	Development Consent Order
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft Development Consent Order
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement
<b>ESBS</b>	Employment, Skills and Business Strategy



<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority
<b>FASI-S</b>	Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South
<b>GAL</b>	Gatwick Airport Limited
<b>GG1</b>	Gatwick Green 1 Limited
<b>HA</b>	Highway Authority
<b>HRA</b>	Habitat Regulations Assessment
<b>HRAR</b>	Habitat Regulations Assessment Report
<b>IP</b>	Interested Party
<b>ISH</b>	Issue Specific Hearing
<b>JLAs</b>	Joint Local Authorities
<b>LAS</b>	London Airspace South
<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report
<b>MAMGF</b>	Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP
<b>m</b>	metre
<b>mppa</b>	Million passengers per annum
<b>MSCP</b>	Multi-Storey Car Park
<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>NERL</b>	NATS (En Route) Ltd
<b>NH</b>	National Highways
<b>NNPS</b>	National Networks National Policy Statement
<b>NPPF</b>	National Planning Policy Framework
<b>NRP</b>	Northern Runway Project
<b>oAVMS</b>	outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement



<b>oLEMP</b>	outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan
<b>PADSS</b>	Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement
<b>PSZ</b>	Public Safety Zone
<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>REAC</b>	Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments
<b>ROS</b>	Replacement Open Space
<b>RR</b>	Relevant Representation
<b>s</b>	Section (of Act)
<b>SAC</b>	Surface Access Commitments
<b>SCC</b>	Surrey County Council
<b>SoCG</b>	Statement of Common Ground
<b>SONA</b>	Survey of Noise Attitudes
<b>SPA</b>	Special Protection Area
<b>SRN</b>	Strategic Road Network
<b>SWMP</b>	Site Waste Management Plan
<b>TA</b>	Transport Assessment
<b>Work No.</b>	Work Number
<b>WR</b>	Written Representation
<b>WSCC</b>	West Sussex County Council
<b>WSI</b>	Written Scheme of Investigation



## The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The [Examination Library](#) will be updated as the examination progresses.

**Please Note: These Written Questions have been prepared based on submissions made up to and including Deadline (D) 5. They do not necessarily reflect submissions made at D6. Consequently, if you consider that your answer to any question has been provided at D6, please do not repeat the information in detail but provide the appropriate reference to where the answer can be found.**



## CONTENTS:

<b>GENERAL AND CROSS-TOPIC .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>AIR QUALITY .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>CASE FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE GASES .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>COMPULSORY ACQUISITION AND TEMPORARY POSSESSION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>CUMULATIVE EFFECTS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER AND CONTROL DOCUMENTS.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>GEOLOGY AND GROUND CONDITIONS.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>HEALTH AND WELLBEING .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VISUAL RESOURCES .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>LAND USE AND RECREATION .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>MAJOR ACCIDENTS AND DISASTERS.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>NOISE AND VIBRATION .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>RESOURCE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>WATER ENVIRONMENT .....</b>	<b>49</b>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>GENERAL AND CROSS-TOPIC</b>		
GEN.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Second runway to the south</b></p> <p>Your answer to ExQ1 GEN.1.5 states that the release of safeguarded land [for the potential second runway to the south of the Airport] would be contrary to Government Policy as set out in the Aviation Policy Framework (APF) 2013 (para 5.8 and 5.9), Aviation 2050 Dec 2018 (para 3.66) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023 (para 110).</p> <p>Paras 5.8 and 5.9 of the APF states that land that may be required for airport development in the future should be protected until Government has established relevant policies and proposals in response to the findings of the Airports Commission (2015). This could be considered to have been established by the publication of the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS). Para 3.66 of Aviation 2050 refers to the NPPF seeking to protect where there is robust evidence, sites, and routes.</p> <p>Given the publication of the ANPS in June 2018 and the proposals within the Northern Runway Project (NRP) for development up to 2047, is there still a need to safeguard land for a second runway to the south of the Airport?</p>
		<b>Design &amp; Access Statement</b>
GEN.2.2	Applicant	<p>Para 5.10.11.6 of the Design and Access Statement (DAS) Volume 4 [REP2-035] appears unfinished and the Figure reference in para 5.10.11.7 seems to be incorrect.</p> <p>Please provide an updated version.</p>
GEN.2.3	Applicant	<p>Bullet point one of para 6.12.2.5, DAS Volume 5 [REP2-036] appears incorrect.</p> <p>Please provide an updated version.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
GEN.2.4	Applicant	<p>Deck parking in the DAS Volume 5 [REP2-036] is described as generally being constructed in an open, galvanised, painted metal frame with no external cladding. However, some of the proposed deck parking would occupy what could be considered sensitive locations, close to the Airport boundaries and within other constraints.</p> <p>Would such utilitarian designs be appropriate in such places?</p>
GEN.2.5	Applicant	<p>Volume 5 of the DAS [REP2-036] assumes in section 9.1 that construction will start in 2024. While the text notes that this is indicative, consider this dateline and provide an updated version of the DAS (and Figure 71) showing realistic timelines for development given the programme for the consideration of this application.</p>
GEN.2.6	Applicant	<p>Built form Project Wide Design Principle BF1 [REP5-031] states that all new buildings will be designed and constructed to achieve Net Zero emissions during operation.</p> <p>Should this be widened to consider environmental impacts during construction?</p>
GEN.2.7	Applicant	<p>Various Design Principles [REP5-031], including BF3, N1, N2, RW1, LA1, LA3, LA5, LA8, LA9, LA10, DBF22, DDP4, DDP5, DDP19, DLP1, DLP2, DLP3, DLP4, DBF8, DBF9, DLP11, DLP13, DLP14, DLP15, DLP16, and DLP176 use phrasing including the word 'should'.</p> <p>In the interests of certainty and precision should this be altered to more definite wording, such as 'shall' or 'will'? If so, please provide an updated version.</p>
GEN.2.8	Applicant	<p>The National Infrastructure Commission published new guidance on developing and implementing design principles for major infrastructure projects on 21 May 2024.</p>



**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Explain how the DAS and Design Principles Annex A accords with this guidance or make changes if required.</p>
<p>GEN.2.9</p>	<p>Applicant NATS (En route)</p>	<p><b>WIZAD</b></p> <p>Section 4.4 of the ‘<i>Applicant’s Response to Deadline 5 Submissions – Response to York Aviation</i>’ [REP6-091] concerns the implications for WIZAD of growth. The Applicant’s position with regards to Airspace Change and the FASI-S process is noted; however, section 4.4 states that the use of WIZAD will increase in the baseline case and with the Proposed Development, due to congestion of the London Terminal Control Area airspace. This suggests that the increased use of WIZAD is directly linked to expansion at the Airport (in either baseline or NRP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the Applicant and NATS (En route) Limited (NERL) [REP5-066] states that Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) and NERL are co-sponsoring the London Airspace South (LAS) airspace deployment which can be put into operation earlier than Future Airspace Strategy Implementation South (FASI-S). Do the LAS proposals have any impact on the usage or potential for usage of WIZAD?</li> <li>b) Confirm (or otherwise) that the increased use of WIZAD caused by the Proposed Development would not require an airspace change.</li> <li>c) Given the statement that WIZAD usage would increase in the baseline case and with the proposed development due to congestion in the London Terminal Control Area airspace, would the implementation of FASI-S allow for WIZAD usage to decrease or cease?</li> <li>d) Would the baseline case result in a greater use of WIZAD than the proposed development – and if so, why?</li> </ul>
<p>GEN.2.10</p>	<p>Applicant</p>	<p><b>Design Principles Annex A [REP5-031]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Action Point 12 of the ‘<i>Applicant’s Response to Actions – ISH 8: Good Design</i>’ [REP6-086] states that a CV for the proposed Design Advisor is attached as Appendix A. However, there is no appendix appended – please submit one.</li> </ul>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) Should the Design Advisor need to be replaced (for whatever reason), what would be the replacement process for such an Advisor? What qualifications would they require and would there be an opportunity for Local Authority input into the procedure?</p>
GEN.2.11	Applicant Interested Parties (IPs)	<p><b>Environmental Statement</b></p> <p>At Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) 8 the ExA asked the Applicant to provide, at D9, a consolidated Environmental Statement (ES) incorporating all the various amendments to the ES throughout the Examination. In response the Applicant indicated that it would provide a signposting schedule document which would identify the relevant chapters and other aspects of the ES submitted as part of the DCO Application, and where any aspect of the ES as submitted needed to be read subject to other documents that had been submitted during the Examination [REP6-083].</p> <p>The ExA notes that the updated navigational document which is provided at each deadline [REP6-002] provides information in relation to updates and ES Addendums that have been submitted including Appendices to the ES but that ES Chapters themselves are not necessarily updated (eg Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope was updated at D5 [REP5-029] by ES Chapter 14 [APP-039] has not been revised to incorporate this or any other changes).</p> <p>The ExA requires the ES to remain up to date throughout the Examination to ensure that all parties are provided an opportunity to comment on any information which updates and therefore becomes part of the ES. The Applicant is requested to consider whether all relevant chapters, appendices and figures of the ES are up to date and to provide the ExA with a complete list of changes at D7. Interested Parties (IPs) are then requested to provide comments on any of these updates to the ES at D8.</p>
GEN.2.12	Applicant	<p><b>Planning History</b></p> <p>The Crawley Borough Council (CBC) Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) [REP5-085] states that the Applicant has undertaken to review the planning history but that no response to CBC's detailed submissions on the matter have been provided.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		The Applicant is asked to respond to CBC’s concerns and to paragraphs 4.1-4.18 of the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-068].
GEN.2.13	Applicant	<p><b>Future Baseline - Hotel Provision</b></p> <p>The Applicant’s response to GEN.1.24 [REP3-091] states <i>“the Future Baseline is based upon developments that are currently consented or under construction and would proceed in the absence of the Project. There are no hotel or office developments on-airport that meet this criteria and therefore are not included in the Future Baseline.</i></p> <p><i>It is likely that further hotels will be required as the airport passenger numbers grow in the baseline and these could be provided on or off-site and applications will be made by the Applicant or the market as appropriate.”</i></p> <p>Explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If hotel capacity will be required to accommodate future baseline growth in passenger numbers and no planning consent exists for such an increase is this not a practical constraint on the ability of the airport to accommodate any theoretical increased passenger growth represented by the future baseline position?</li> <li>• The Indicative Construction Sequencing [REP2-016] shows that all the proposed hotels will be constructed in advance of the opening of the dual runway. Is this a further indication that the airport in either scenario needs additional hotel accommodation to satisfy demand in any significant passenger growth?</li> </ul>
GEN.2.14	Applicant	<p><b>Car Park Y – Indicative Construction Sequencing [REP2-016]</b></p> <p>Action Point 4 of ‘<i>The Applicant’s Response to Actions – ISH8</i>’ [REP6-086] states that <i>“The site for Car Park Y will be used as a temporary construction compound in the early years of construction to support the airfield works and also the surface access works. The construction of the attenuation storage facility will be sequenced in a phased manner and the construction of the multi-story car park will take place following that to avoid any conflict with the provision of the attenuation storage facility.”</i> This response does not deal with the issue of overlap in construction sequencing. The construction compound is shown as being operational from 2024 to the end of 2032. The flood storage facility to be constructed from 2026 to the end of 2028 and phase 1 of the car</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>park constructed in 2031 to the end of 2032. All of these activities are shown occupying the full site of the current car park Y.</p> <p>Explain how the construction compound can be present at the same time as the other construction activities set out.</p>
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
		The ExA has no further questions on this topic at this point in the Examination.
<b>CASE FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>		
CS.2.1	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Statements of Common Ground on Forecasting &amp; Need and Capacity &amp; Operations</b></p> <p>The ExA note the issues regarding the submission of the above SoCG referred to in the D5 Cover Letter [REP5-001] and the references within the '<i>Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 Submissions – Response to York Aviation</i>' at D6, including the intention to submit an updated version at D7.</p> <p>Please ensure that such documents are submitted at D7. Even if such documents are still in a state of flux, the agreed differences between the parties on these issues would be of assistance to the ExA.</p>
CS.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Permitted Development Rights</b></p> <p>The Applicant's answer to ExQ1 CS.1.23 [REP3-084] states that no runway in the proposal is being constructed or extended.</p> <p>How does this statement equate with the contents of the DAS Volume 1 [REP2-032] which discusses extending the existing northern runway north by 12 metres (page 55) as the chosen option for the project.</p>
CS.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Sensitivity testing</b></p> <p>In their D6 submission '<i>Response to the Applicant's Deadline 5 Submissions</i>' [REP6-099], the Joint Local Authorities (JLAs) note in Appendix III that it is not possible to comment further [on the Applicant's consideration of the environmental implications of adopting a lower Baseline throughput] as the outputs in</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>[REP5-081] are based on the original Slow Transition case fleet mix and not the revised Fleet Mix now proposed by the Applicant at ISH8. They also refine their consideration of the capacity of the existing runway under the Future Baseline case to 57 million passenger per annum (mppa) and for the capacity of the Proposed Development to 75-76mppa.</p> <p>a) Provide an assessment on the implications on the Fleet mix as used in [REP5-081] as opposed to the revised ISH8 Fleet Mix and any differences this may cause.</p> <p>b) [REP5-081] provides a Future Baseline Sensitivity analysis. Does the revised position of the JLAs as to their view of the likely capacity of the future baseline and the proposed development at 57mppa and 75-76mppa respectively require a separate analysis? These figures provide a range/delta between them at 18-19mppa. If not please justify your answer.</p>
<b>CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE GASES</b>		
CC.2.1	Applicant IPs	<p><b>Finch v Surrey County Council</b></p> <p>The Supreme Court has recently (20 June 2024) handed down judgment in the case of R (on the application of Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group) (Appellant) v Surrey County Council and others (Respondents). At ISH6: Climate Change the ExA noted that the Applicant had responded to comments made by IPs relating to downstream emissions by reference to the Finch case in written submissions (see [REP3-072]) [REP4-032].</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court judgment, all parties are invited to comment on the relevance or otherwise of this decision to the Applicant’s DCO application.</p>
<b>COMPULSORY ACQUISITION AND TEMPORARY POSSESSION</b>		
CA.2.1	Gatwick Green 1 Limited	<p><b>Permanent acquisition of land</b></p> <p>Please expand on the statement made in section 2.0 of ‘<i>Comments on the Applicant’s second update to the Land Rights Tracker</i>’ [REP6-125] insofar as the extent of land sought for permanent acquisition is considered excessive.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.2	Applicant	<b>Gatwick Green 1 Limited</b> In respect of the proposed agreement with Gatwick Green 1 Limited (GG1), please confirm how the land located outside of the proposed Order limits is to be secured? Is it necessary to extend the existing red line boundary to include this land?
CA.2.3	Applicant	<b>Gatwick Green 1 Limited</b> Please signpost to comments made in respect of the draft protective provisions submitted by GG1 as part of their Relevant Representation [RR-1500]. If no response has been made, please review, and respond accordingly.
CA.2.4	Applicant	<b>Permanent acquisition of land</b> In Table 1-1 of NH's ' <i>Comments on any Submissions Received by Deadline 5</i> ' [REP6-114], in respect to the need for the permanent acquisition of land which already forms part of the existing Strategic Road Network (SRN), NH have maintained their position that the blanket and broad approach to compulsory acquisition is unjustified and non-compliant with the Government's guidance on compulsory acquisition.  Please provide additional plot specific justification as to why temporary powers would not suffice for the land in question.
CA.2.5	Applicant	<b>Book of Reference</b> A significant number of amendments/ additions were made to the Book of Reference (BoR) at D5 ([REP5-009] and [REP5-011], with reasoning detailed in the Schedule of Changes [REP5-013]. Whilst the ExA acknowledges the large size of the BoR, and accepts changes are inevitable, please confirm whether any further changes to the BoR of this magnitude are anticipated prior to the close of the Examination?  It is further noted that in [REP6-113], NH state that there remains a number of discrepancies in land parcels. Please confirm whether it is likely such issues will be resolved prior to the close of the Examination.

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
CA.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Engagement and communication</b>                      Airport Industrial Property Unity Trust (AIPUT) [REP6-117] and Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP (MAMGF) [REP6-128] have raised concerns regarding lack of engagement and/ or slow communication by the Applicant, particularly in relation to responding to correspondence and returning or sending documentation.</p> <p>AIPUT [REP6-117] also noted that the status update provided in the Land Rights Tracker v3 [REP5-033] did not accurately reflect their position.</p> <p>The ExA acknowledges the scale of the Proposed Development but is keen to ensure effective engagement for all parties. Please advise if there are any specific barriers facing the Applicant in respect of continuing to undertake meaningful engagement and communication with Affected Persons?</p>
CA.2.7	Local Authorities	<p><b>Permanent acquisition of land</b>                      The ExA notes both the comments made in CAH1 ([EV14-001] and [EV14-002]) and the CAH1 post-hearing submission [REP4-056] in respect of the issue of proportionality. In the '<i>Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions</i>' [REP5-072], at section 2.5 of Table 3 the Applicant reiterates the point that by allowing the Applicant the power to compulsorily acquire land required for the widened highways this would ensure that contrary rights could be extinguished using the DCO powers where required, which would facilitate the securing of clean title and thus ensuring the deliverability of the scheme. The Applicant further states that, to the extent possible, they will use temporary possession powers in carrying out the highway works.</p> <p>Additionally in Table 3 [REP5-072], the Applicant considers it important to retain compulsory acquisition (CA) powers over all land required for the improved highways to ensure that, if the ownership of plots of land required for the scheme proves to be different to that currently identified by the parties (e.g. a plot of land which a highway authority considers it owns proves to be in third-party ownership), the Applicant would be able to acquire this land and ensure the deliverability of the scheme.</p> <p>Noting this approach, please confirm whether this provides an adequate explanation in respect of the Applicant's approach in meeting the relevant statutory and policy tests?</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.2.8	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Protective Provisions</b> Noting the Legal Partnership Authorities' response to ExQ1 CA.1.17 [REP4-070] and the subsequent response by the Applicant in '<i>The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions</i>' [REP5-072], please confirm if draft protective provision wording has been submitted in respect of local highway authorities?</p>
CA.2.9	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Management of Replacement Open Space</b> Please can all parties provide an up-to-date position in respect of the management of all replacement open space (ROS).  Can the Applicant confirm if Horley Town Council are to be involved in the management of Church Meadows ROS?</p>
CA.2.10	Local Authorities	<p><b>Bayhorne Farm – drainage attenuation pond</b> The comments made by the local authorities to the Applicant's answer to ExQ1 CA.1.11 [REP4-070] regarding the drainage attenuation pond are noted. The Applicant has confirmed they have reviewed possible alternative locations at the northern end of Bayhorne Farm. However due to technical constraints this location has not been progressed [REP5-072].  Please confirm whether the Local Authorities are satisfied with justification given and if not, is it possible to identify an alternative location for the pond which would be technically feasible?</p>
CA.2.11	Applicant	<p><b>Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP</b> The ExA notes that at section 6.2 of their submission, Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP (MAMGF) state they are still awaiting the assessment results at the Holiday Inn hotel in respect of the anticipated A23 Bridgeworks activities during the day and night, inclusive of piling works [REP6-128].  Please signpost to where this information is located or if it has not been provided to date, please confirm when it will be provided?</p>
CA.2.12	Applicant	<p><b>Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP</b></p>



**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In section 4 of Appendix 3 [REP6-128] MAMGF state that during construction works their internal noise criteria would be exceeded at all stages of the works and as such, they consider the proposed mitigation to be inadequate. Section 4 of [REP6-128] also identifies mitigation which would be acceptable during construction by MAMGF.</p> <p>Please review and provide comment as to whether the Applicant considers the proposed mitigation both technically feasible and reasonable?</p>
<b>CUMULATIVE EFFECTS</b>		
		The ExA has no further questions on this topic at this point in the Examination.
<b>DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER AND CONTROL DOCUMENTS</b>		
<p><b>Please note: all references to the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) and the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) are to the versions submitted at D5 [REP5-005 and REP5-007] respectively unless otherwise indicated.</b></p>		
DCO.2.1	Local Authorities Applicant	<p><b>Art. 2 (Interpretation) Definition of commencement</b></p> <p>The SoCGs between the Applicant and Surrey County Council (SCC) [REP5-051] and between the Applicant and West Sussex County Council (WSCC) [REP5-055] describe discussions in respect of the definition of commencement as under discussion.</p> <p>The local authorities are asked to clarify their current position with particular reference to which of the items (a) to (o) are still in dispute.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to provide specific reasons for the inclusion of items (a) to (o).</p>
DCO.2.2	Local Authorities	<p><b>Art. 2 (Interpretation) Definition of maintain</b></p> <p>The local authorities previously raised a concern about the definition of maintain [AS-029].</p> <p>Do the local authorities still have a concern about the listed actions in this definition? If so, explain what changes would be required.</p>
DCO.2.3	Local Authorities	<p><b>Art. 3 (Development consent etc granted by the Order)</b></p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The SoCG between the Applicant and SCC [REP5-051] and between the Applicant and WSCC [REP5-055] describe discussions in respect of the term '<i>adjacent to the Order limits</i>' as under discussion.</p> <p>In the light of the Applicant's comments in paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 of the EM [REP5-007] the local authorities are asked to explain any outstanding concerns.</p>
DCO.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Art. 6 (Limits of Works)</b></p> <p>Art. 6(3) of the dDCO seeks to ensure that the maximum heights on the parameter plans are not exceeded. Why are heights only subject to this control and not other dimensions such as width and depths?</p> <p>Amend Schedule 13 to include these other dimensions and provide further justification for the heights being '<i>informative</i>' or exclude this term.</p>
DCO.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Art. 8 (Consent to transfer benefit of Order)</b></p> <p>Art. 8(4)(b). Include '<i>office areas</i>' after Work Numbers (Work Nos.) 10(g) for consistency?</p>
DCO.2.6	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Art. 9 (Planning permission)</b></p> <p>In respect of Art. 9(4) the Applicant has stated that no prescribed mechanism is required as regards potential incompatibility under this sub-paragraph [REP5-037].</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to provide further justification for the inclusion of this sub-paragraph and any precedent for it.</p> <p>The local authorities are asked to confirm and explain whether any modifications to the sub-paragraph could be made to make it acceptable or whether they wish to see its removal.</p> <p>In respect of Art. 9(5) the Applicant and the local authorities are invited to expand on their positions as set out during ISH8.</p>
DCO.2.7	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Art. 10 (Application of the 1991 Act)</b></p> <p>The SoCG between the Applicant and SCC [REP5-051] indicates that the Applicant is considering the implications of the highway authority's permit scheme.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		The Applicant and the local authorities are asked to provide an update on discussions on this matter and should its incorporation within Art.10 not be possible, the Applicant is to provide its reasons.
DCO.2.8	Applicant	<b>Art. 11 (Street works)</b> The Applicant is asked to provide a schedule of the streets affected by Art.11 in lieu of ' <i>any of the streets as are within the Order limits</i> '.  The Applicant is also asked why Art 11(1) is not 'subject to the consent of the street authority'?
DCO.2.9	Applicant Local Authorities	<b>Art. 12 (Power to alter layout, etc. of streets)</b> The Applicant's position is that deeming provisions (included in Art.12(4) and elsewhere) are justified and appropriate [REP3-081]. The local authorities wish to see all deeming provisions removed from the DCO.  The parties are requested first to identify any way in which deeming provisions could be modified in a way which may be acceptable to either party and secondly, if agreement cannot be reached, their final position in respect of a deeming provision.
DCO.2.10	Applicant Local Authorities	<b>Art. 14 (Temporary closure of streets)</b> The Applicant is asked to consider whether Art. 14(1) should be amended to specify the streets affected in a Schedule. If not, why not?  The Applicant and local authorities are asked to provide further justification for their respective positions in respect of the local authorities' suggested additional sub-paragraph after Art. 14(5) as set out in AS-029.
DCO.2.11	Applicant	<b>Art. 22 (Discharge of water)</b>

ExQ2: Monday 1 July

Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Thames Water states that there has been a change of wording from the standard wording from 'construction' to 'carrying out'. It indicates that this new phrasing creates unnecessary ambiguity and may lead to the inclusion of the operation of the development which Thames Water would object to.</p> <p>Explain why non-standard wording has been included.</p>
DCO.2.12	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Art. 25 (Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows)</b></p> <p>Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) 'Guidance on the content of a DCO required for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project' (April 2024) states that Applicants may wish to include an article to allow the removal of hedgerows without the need to first secure consent under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997. It states that such an article can either refer to the specific hedgerows intended for removal described clearly in a Schedule or drafted to include powers for general removal of hedgerows subject to appropriate controls and mitigation being included.</p> <p>Should there be a schedule referencing specific hedgerows? Does Art. 25 provide appropriate controls and mitigation? If not, what additions should be made to the article?</p>
DCO.2.13	National Highways Local Authorities	<p><b>Art. 27 (Compulsory acquisition of land)</b></p> <p>The Applicant and NH disagree about the inclusion of 'use' within Art. 27.</p> <p>What specific change would NH wish to see in this article and why?</p> <p>Is the inclusion of 'construction, operation and maintenance in Art. 27(1) necessary/ appropriate?</p>
DCO.2.14	Applicant IPs	<p><b>Art 31 (Time limit for exercise of authority to acquire land compulsorily)</b></p> <p>The Applicant is seeking to exercise its powers to acquire land or interests within 10 years beginning on the start date.</p> <p>Is there a precedent for the inclusion of the 'start date' within Art. 31?</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>As both the time period and use of the start date rather than the date on which the Order is made are uncommon features of made DCOs, is there a potential compromise between the time period and exercising of the authority?</p>
DCO.2.15	Applicant	<p><b>Art. 40 (Special category land)</b>                      The Applicant is asked to explain why the vesting of the open space land in the undertaker should not wait until a scheme for the provision of replacement land as open space has been implemented.</p>
DCO.2.16	Applicant	<p><b>Art 49 (Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance)</b>                      The Statement of Statutory Nuisance [APP-265] cites various types of statutory nuisance and provides the Applicant's justification for their inclusion in Art. 49. The SoCG with CBC states that the Applicant is <i>'unlikely to need to rely upon article 49, but it is appropriate and necessary (for the reasons immediately above) that it is available if required'</i>.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to provide further justification for its position and specifically for all of the sub-sections of section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection Act which the local authorities object to.</p>
DCO.2.17	Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 (Authorised development)</b>  <u>Work Nos. 26, 27, 28 and 29</u>                      On what basis is parking to be provided at the hotels and how would this relate to CBC's policies in relation to parking. Accordingly, justify why these Work Nos. should not specify the number of hotel bedrooms and the number of parking spaces.</p>
DCO.2.18	Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 1 (Authorised development)</b>                      Various Work Nos. use the term <i>'approximately'</i> eg Work Nos. 30, 31, 35-38 and 41.</p> <p>Why should the more precise wording of <i>'no less than'</i> as used in Work No. 40 not be used in each case?</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
DCO.2.19	Local Authorities	<p><b>Schedule 2 (Requirements)</b> <u>R3 Time limit and notifications</u> The Legal Partnership Authorities have stated that the timeframes under R3(2) are not long enough [REP2-042].</p> <p>What time periods would be acceptable to the local authorities? Justify your position.</p>
DCO.2.20	Applicant National Highways	<p><b>Schedule 2 (Requirements)</b> <u>R6 National highway works</u> The Applicant and NH are engaging on the matter of reference to a '<i>provisional certificate</i>' which is not defined in the main body of the DCO or Schedule 2.</p> <p>As the term is used in Requirement (R) 6(3) why can it not be defined? Is there a relevant precedent for the definition of terms. NH may wish to comment.</p>
DCO.2.21	Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 2 (Requirements)</b> Explain how operational odour management and monitoring would be secured. The Applicant's response to AQ.08 in section 3.11 of its Response to LIRs [REP3-078] indicates that this would be through a draft AQAP forming an Appendix to the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).</p> <p>Why is this not covered by a separate requirement in the DCO in the same way as construction dust (R27) for example?</p>
DCO.2.22	Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 7 (Land in which only new rights etc. may be acquired)</b> The ExA notes the Applicant's response to ExQ1 CA.1.38 in respect of Schedule 7 of the dDCO [REP3-087].</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Nevertheless, the ExA maintains the position that it would be helpful if Schedule 7 could be further populated with additional detail. Reference is drawn to The Sizewell C and Drax Bioenergy with Carbon Capture and Storage Project made Orders. Additionally, both final draft versions of the Lower Thames Crossing and London Luton Airport Expansion Development Consent Orders contain additional detail in their equivalent, relevant Schedules.</p> <p>Additionally, it was noted by the ExA in CAH1 ([EV14-001] and [EV14-002]) that when National Highways (NH) referred to a specific plot within Schedule 7, the Applicant verbally provided additional detail to that currently contained within Schedule 7.</p>
DCO.2.23	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Schedule 11 (Procedures for approvals, consents and appeals)</b></p> <p>Schedule 11 provides for the payment of fees in respect of a requirement.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to clarify why paragraph 3(2) of Schedule 11 provides for the repayment of any fee paid to the discharging authority within 35 days of (a) the application is rejected as invalidly made or (b) the authority not determining the application within the determination period when the discharging authority will have incurred costs.</p> <p>The Applicant is additionally asked to explain why this provision should not apply to other consents addressed within the dDCO. Further detail beyond that contained within section 2.7.1.10 of the SoCG between the Applicant and CBC is required [REP5-037].</p> <p>The Local Authorities are asked to confirm what they would consider an acceptable quantum of fee.</p>
DCO.2.24	Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation Route Map/ Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments</b></p> <p>At D4 [REP4-062] the Legal Partnership Authorities commented on the Applicant's response to ExQ1 DCO.1.6. The Authorities indicated that they would like to see the development of the Route Map from its current form into a Register of Environmental Actions and Commitments (REAC) document.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		The Applicant is asked to produce a REAC which is a common feature of other DCO applications or explain why this should not be done.
DCO.2.25	Applicant	<p><b>Approach to Securing Mitigation</b></p> <p>At D4 [REP4-062] the Legal Partnership Authorities commented on the Applicant's response to ExQ1 DCO.1.45. The Authorities' position is that the CoCP should be considered an overarching construction management plan that sets out the principles for the construction of the Project. The CoCP should be an outline document that sets out specific management plans the Applicant should prepare. The CEMP approach could then be adopted for each individual stage/works number, to provide the relevant suite of construction information to inform the mitigation required during construction for distinct geographical areas.</p> <p>Why would this approach not be a suitable way of addressing the local authorities' concerns?</p>
DCO.2.26	Local Authorities	<p><b>Status of Code of Construction Practice</b></p> <p>At D5 [REP5-072] the Applicant responded to the Legal Partnership Authorities' response in respect of ExQ1 DCO.1.46 [REP3-135 and REP4-062]. The Applicant's position is that the CoCP and its Annexes cover the items listed in the JLA's response to DCO.1.46.</p> <p>The local authorities are asked if there are any issues identified in its response to DCO.1.46 which are not addressed in the CoCP or its Annexes and if so, what additional information is required and how should it be secured?</p>
DCO.2.27	Applicant	<p><b>Draft Section 106 Agreement</b></p> <p>At D1 [REP1-057] the Applicant stated that when it submitted the draft Section 106 Agreement at D2 [REP2-004], it would also submit a comparison document showing the relationship between existing and proposed obligations, with appropriate commentary.</p> <p>Can the Applicant signpost to where this document has been provided and/or provide an update at D7.</p>



**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
DCO.2.28	Applicant	<p><b>Draft Section 106 Agreement</b></p> <p>Section 6 of Schedule 3 of the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] lists the restrictions on the Povey Cross Access. It does not mention pedestrian or cycle access. The ExA understands why public access may not be desirable here, but staff who live locally being able to use this access may considerably reduce their journey times to the airport.</p> <p>Does this section need to be amended to allow controlled access for pedestrians and cyclists?</p>
<b>ECOLOGY AND NATURE CONSERVATION</b>		
EN.2.1	Natural England	<p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain land included in calculation</b></p> <p>Natural England (NE) stated in its Relevant Representation (RR) [RR-3223] that it agrees with the Applicant's approach to Biodiversity Net Gain calculations based only upon land impacted during the project (230.09ha) instead of all land within the Order limits (735ha). Since NE made its RR, DEFRA guidance on calculating biodiversity value with the statutory biodiversity metric was updated in February 2024 and states:</p> <p><i>"If you are making an on-site calculation, you will need to include everything that exists within a development's red line boundary. This includes all features, whether or not they may be lost, retained or improved."</i></p> <p>Given the updated guidance from DEFRA, NE is asked to confirm whether its position has changed from its RR?</p>
EN.2.2	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Biodiversity Opportunity Areas</b></p> <p>At ISH8 the Applicant stated that it had not considered ecological enhancement within surrounding Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) (other than Gatwick Woods and River Mole) because the surrounding BOAs were too far from the Order limits. The ExA notes that Ifield Brook BOA is shown very close to the Order limits on figure 9.6.2 of [APP-048] and both Grattons Park BOA and the Glover's Wood and Edolph's Copse BOA are within 2 kilometres of the Order limits.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) The Applicant is asked to clarify the distances from the Order limits that opportunities for ecological enhancements were considered?</p> <p>b) The Applicant and Local Authorities are asked to comment on whether opportunities for woodland enhancement to mitigate the loss of woodland within the Order limits should be considered within the Ifield Brook BOA, Grattons Park BOA and the Glover's Wood and Edolph's Copse BOA?</p>
EN.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Multi Storey Car Park light spill</b></p> <p>The ExA note the Applicant's response to ExQ1 EN1.12 [REP3-090]. However, light spill from Multi Storey Car Parks (MSCPs) is typically not limited to lighting design but also due to car headlights within the MSCP and the open façade areas required for ventilation.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked if there should be a design principle relating to the design of MSCP façades minimising light spill into adjacent habitat areas?</p>
EN.2.4	West Sussex Joint Local Authorities	<p><b>Realistic worst-case tree removal</b></p> <p>In response to comments from the West Sussex Joint Local Authorities, the Applicant has reduced the extent of tree removal along the surface access corridor in the outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement (oAVMS) submitted at D6 [REP6-018].</p> <p>The West Sussex Joint Local Authorities are asked to comment on whether it is satisfied that the proposed tree removal represents a realistic worst-case? And, if not, identify where requirement for removal has not been demonstrated.</p>
EN.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Horleyland Woods - Alignment of surface water/ foul water works</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that the oAVMS [REP3-022] states the proposed surface water/ foul water works will be changed during detail design to be outside of the 15m buffer zone for Horleyland Woods.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Applicant is asked if Appendix B of the oAVMS [REP3-026] will be updated and submitted into the Examination showing the indicative route of the works outside of the 15m buffer zone?</p>
EN.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Inspection and monitoring after flood events</b></p> <p>In the SoCG between the Applicant and the EA [REP5-057], the Applicant states that the re-aligned River Mole and its open lidded culvert channel should be inspected post a significant storm event for 10 years after construction. However, the updated outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) at D4 [REP4-012] states in paragraph 11.19.7 that the monitoring is carried out over a period of between 3 to 5 years, and data is collected at intervals of 3 to 6 months, and after flood events.</p> <p>Can the Applicant clarify this apparent discrepancy and update the oLEMP if required.</p>
<b>HABITAT REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT</b>		
EN.2.7	NE	<p><b>Ammonia Modelling Data</b></p> <p>Through ExQ1 EN.1.19 the Applicant was asked to provide or signpost to the ammonia modelling data which informed the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) conclusions.</p> <p>NE is asked if it considers that the Applicant's response to ExQ1 EN.1.19 [REP3-090] provides sufficient information to support its conclusions in the Habitat Regulations Assessment Report (HRAR) [REP3-043]?</p>
EN.2.8	NE	<p><b>Thursley, Ash, Pirbright &amp; Chobham Special Area of Conservation</b></p> <p>In relation to Thursley, Ash, Pirbright &amp; Chobham Special Area of Conservation, NE is asked to confirm if it is content with the favourable / unfavourable statuses provided by the Applicant and that the information provided in the HRAR is specific enough to the parts of the sites affected?</p>
EN.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Noise and Bats</b></p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>The SoCG between the Applicant and Horsham District Council [REP5-042] mentions a review of potential impacts of noise on bats which is ongoing with NE.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to confirm when this will be available to submit into the Examination? Furthermore, when the review is submitted, the Applicant is asked to outline the implications on the ES and/or HRAR and confirm that the review is agreed with NE.</p>
EN.2.10	Applicant NE	<p><b>Draft Licences</b></p> <p>The SoCG between the Applicant and NE [REP6-061] states that a draft licence for badgers has been provided to NE and great crested newt surveys would be complete by mid-May with a draft licence sent to NE by D5.</p> <p>The Applicant and NE are asked to provide an update on the status of the draft licenses and whether NE would be in a position to issue Letters of No Impediment before the end of the Examination.</p>
EN.2.11	Applicant	<p><b>HRAR mitigation measures</b></p> <p>It is not clear whether or at which stage mitigation measures have been identified and considered in the HRAR [REP3-043]. The Applicant is asked to clarify whether it considered mitigation measures in the HRAR, what mitigation measures were considered, the stage they were considered and signpost where this can be evidenced in the HRAR.</p>
<b>GEOLOGY AND GROUND CONDITIONS</b>		
		The ExA has no further questions on this topic at this point in the Examination.
<b>HEALTH AND WELLBEING</b>		
HW.2.1	Applicant	<b>Mitigation Route Map</b>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>In respect of residual lighting effects and in-combination effects, rows HW-6 and HW-8 of the Mitigation Route Map [REP2-011] state that the Community Fund could be used to provide discretionary support for any vulnerable groups experiencing effects.</p> <p>Given that such funding is the subject of an application and therefore funding for mitigation is not guaranteed, are rows HW-6 and HW-8 of [REP2-011] a suggestion of what may be achievable rather than specific mitigation?</p>
HW.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Accident and Emergency Department</b></p> <p>In the submission by Martyn McCormack [REP3-174] he states that Crawley Hospital no longer has an accident and emergency department.</p> <p>Please confirm which is the nearest hospital with an accident and emergency department and the distance from Gatwick Airport?</p>
HW.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Design Principles</b></p> <p>Please provide further detail as to how the detailed built form design principles DBF2 and DBF3 [REP5-031] would have regard to both health and wellbeing and accessibility for all. Should DBF7 also have regard to these aspects?</p>
HW.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Design Principles</b></p> <p>In respect of design principles DLP1 and DLP2 [REP5-031] please give specific examples as to how the proposed replacement open space would be accessible by all sectors of society and also be versatile for different age groups and interests?</p>
HW.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>West Sussex Integrated Care Board</b></p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		<p>Row 2.12.2.1 of the CBC SoCG [REP5-037] states that discussions with the West Sussex Integrated Care Board have taken place in respect of improving access to healthcare for workers at the airport, for example when shift work makes it hard to attend medical appointments or screening checks.</p> <p>Please confirm the outcome of these discussions and if recommendations were made, how/ when will they be included within the Proposed Development?</p>
HW.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Feedback from vulnerable groups</b></p> <p>At row 2.12.2.2 of the CBC SoCG [REP5-037] it is stated that the Applicant is open to discussing plans for the new green spaces to encourage activities such as nature trails, exercise apparatus, child activities trails, and the use of sustainable, natural and recycled materials, that will enhance the experience of using the space and encourage wellbeing.</p> <p>Given the importance of ensuring the new green spaces are suitable for all users, why are discussions not scheduled to commence until the detailed design stage? Please confirm who will be engaged with in respect of these matters?</p>
HW.2.7	Applicant Crawley Borough Council	<p><b>Crawley Borough Council Statement of Common Ground</b></p> <p>Please can row 2.12.3.2 of the CBC SoCG [REP5-037] be reviewed and confirmation provided as to whether this row deals with lack of evidence, adverse noise impacts, air quality or all three topics?</p>
HW.2.8	Crawley Borough Council	<p><b>Data sets</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that at row 2.12.5.2 of the CBC SoCG [REP5-037], CBC has requested that a Health Impact Assessment is undertaken which would robustly assess the potential effects, including physical and mental, on the health of the population, analysis of some of the data on smaller geographies to highlight inequalities, and to make clear the mitigations or that need further consideration.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Given that the Applicant has stated that ES Chapter 18 [APP-043] provides data and analysis at ward level, please can CBC confirm which groups they are particularly interested in when they reference 'smaller geographies'?</p>
HW.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Draft Section 106 Agreement</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the recent addition of Schedule 7 - Health within the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063]. Please can the Applicant provide reasoning for the inclusion of this new Schedule and why it wasn't included within the initial draft?</p> <p>In respect of the proposed Hardship Scheme please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Confirm how the sum of the Fund of £10,000 was calculated?</li> <li>b) Confirm that if two households put in applications for the maximum grant of £5,000 and were successful in their application, then the Fund would only aid two households per annum?</li> <li>c) If multiple applications were received for the Fund, which all were deemed to meet the required criteria, and were requesting the maximum funding available, how would eligibility be determined?</li> </ul> <p>In respect of the proposed Ambulance Information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Does ambulance monitoring already take place at Gatwick Airport? If so, is this data shared with any other parties and is the data publicly available?</li> <li>b) If the monitoring shows a significant increase in passengers requiring transfer to hospital what, if any, action would GAL take?</li> <li>c) Should this action be secured and if so, how?</li> <li>d) What is the proposed period of monitoring?</li> </ul> <p>In respect of First Responder Provision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How is the number of Responders in relation to passenger numbers calculated?</li> <li>b) What is the current number of Responders at Gatwick Airport currently?</li> </ul>
HW.2.10	Applicant	<p><b>Health Impact Assessment</b></p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Noting West Sussex County Council comments at row 83 of their PADSS [REP5-115], please confirm whether the Applicant considers it necessary to undertake a standalone assessment for West Sussex? If not, please provide a justification.
HW.2.11	Applicant	<b>Health Damage Cost Calculation</b> Has a health damage cost calculation been provided in ES Chapter 17 [APP-043] as per the request made by Horsham District Council at row 3.2 of their PADSS [REP5-091]? If not, please confirm if such a calculation is considered necessary?
HW.2.12	Applicant	<b>Overheating Assessment</b> Please confirm whether the Applicant considers it necessary to undertake an 'Overheating Assessment' as requested by Mole Valley District Council at row MV12 of their PADSS [REP5-101]? If not, please provide a justification.  Additionally, please confirm how the proposed Noise Insulation Scheme proposes to address overheating issues?
<b>HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT</b>		
HE.2.1	Gatwick Aviation Museum	<b>Loss to the Gatwick Aviation Museum</b> Your RR [RR-1496] states that any compulsory purchase of the land occupied by the museum would result in the loss of historic and educational resources to the nation.  Please provide further details regarding such loss and confirm whether your previous comments are still valid.
HE.2.2	Applicant	<b>Hever Castle</b>



**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Provide clarification over the likely numbers of flights and ratio of such flights (arrivals and departures) likely to overfly Hever Castle as a result of the Proposed Development.
HE.2.3	Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	<p><b>St Bartholomew’s Church</b></p> <p>Please confirm or otherwise if the revised oLEMP submitted at D6 [REP6-032], [REP6-034], [REP6-036] has mitigated your concerns regarding the impact of the A23 London Road/ River Mole bridge and road widening proposals on St Bartholomew’s Church, Church Meadows, and the associated Conservation Area.</p>
HE.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Written Scheme of Investigations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Confirm at which deadline the Surrey Written Scheme of Investigations (WSI) [REP2-017] will be updated to incorporate the recommended sampling strategies of SCC.</li> <li>b) Respond to the concerns of WSCC raised in their PADSS [REP5-115]. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Will a Heritage Clerk of Works be appointed. If not, why not?</li> <li>ii. Will the WSI [REP2-019] be updated to provide further commitment to undertake investigations in all areas affected by the Proposed Development? Provide justification if not.</li> <li>iii. Provide further information regarding proposed mitigation in areas already evaluated or provide such details in a revised WSI.</li> <li>iv. Provide further clarity regarding sign off for archaeological mitigation in a revised WSI (or justification if not proposing to do so).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
HE.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Heritage Outreach Programme</b></p> <p>Provide an update on a potential outreach programme for heritage matters, including how such a programme (if appropriate) would be controlled. Would such a programme be best suited in the WSI(s) or the CoCP?</p>
HE.2.6	Surrey County Council	<p><b>Historical background to the Airport</b></p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
	West Sussex County Council	Confirm if the report submitted at D6 by the Applicant titled 'The Historical Development of Gatwick Airport Including a Review of the Extent of Past Ground Disturbance' [REP6-070] is acceptable, or if not, what changes are sought.
<b>LANDSCAPE, TOWNSCAPE AND VISUAL RESOURCES</b>		
LV.2.1	Applicant	<b>WIZAD</b> ExQ2 GEN.2.10 concerns the use of WIZAD. Providing links or cross references to the answer to that question (and ExQ1 LV.1.6), please provide further information and assessment over how the increased use of this route (if relevant) could affect landscape and heritage assets, including St Leonard's Forest Site of Special Scientific Interest, the High Weald National Landscape, and designated heritage assets.
LV.2.2	Applicant	<b>Surrey Hills National Landscape</b> While noting the answer to ExQ1 LV.1.8 and Appendix B to that answer, please provide further information concerning the likely extent of overflying (in terms of numbers and increase) which may occur over the proposed extended areas of the Surrey Hills National Landscape as a result of the Proposed Development.
LV.2.3	Applicant	<b>Visualisations</b> The visualisations provided with the proposal show wireframe visualisations superimposed onto existing baseline viewpoint photography. Consider whether more detailed visualisations/ photomontages would be useful for certain sensitive viewpoints where visual effects would be most pronounced (including visualisations at certain times, for instance during construction, year zero, year fifteen) and provide them if appropriate or provide justification if not.
LV.2.4	Applicant	<b>A23 works</b> Further to the answer to ExQ1 LV.1.5 [REP3-097], provide more detailed information (plans and elevations/visual representations) showing the likely extent of vegetation loss along the A23 during construction works or signpost to where such information can be found.

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
<b>LAND USE AND RECREATION</b>		
LU.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Public Rights of Way management and temporary diversions during construction</b></p> <p>Row AR-3 of the Mitigation Route Map [REP2-011] states that <i>“Improvements to National Cycle Route 21 from the western edge of Car Park B to the south of the airport will be considered”</i>.</p> <p>Please signpost to information regarding improvements which are being proposed/ considered.</p>
LU.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Public Rights of Way Management Strategy</b></p> <p>In respect of Table 4.1.1 of the Public Rights of Way Management Strategy [REP2-009], please confirm how long West Sussex 346_2Sy is to be temporarily closed/ diverted?</p>
LU.2.3	Local Authorities	<p><b>Pentagon Field</b></p> <p>Noting your response to ExQ1 DCO.1.39 [REP3-135] and further detail provided in Comments on Responses to ExQ1 - Response to Development Consent Order and Control Documents [REP4-062], are you satisfied with the amends made to the wording of Work No.41?</p>
LU.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Pentagon Field</b></p> <p>Please provide comment in respect of the statement made by the Local Authorities at row 116 of the ‘Response to Applicant’s Schedule of Changes to the dDCO’ [REP6-103] insofar as the proposed works potentially relate more to land raising rather than the creation of spoil bunds.</p>
LU.2.5	Crawley Borough Council	<p><b>Museum Field</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the comments made by CBC at row 2.1.4.2 of the SoCG [REP5-037] in respect of the view that a footpath link direct onto Horley Road would be beneficial to allow public access to the land. The Applicant confirmed in response to ExQ1 LU1.13 [REP3-096] and at row 2.1.4.2 of the SoCG [REP5-037] that a review in respect of the provision of such a pedestrian access was undertaken but would not be feasible for several reasons, including pedestrian safety.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Taking these factors into consideration, does CBC still consider a direct pedestrian link onto Horley Road to be necessary?
<b>MAJOR ACCIDENTS AND DISASTERS</b>		
MAD.2.1	Applicant Civil Aviation Authority	<p><b>Public Safety Zone</b></p> <p>The Applicant's answer to ExQ1 MAD.1.2 notes that the public safety zone (PSZ) for the Northern Runway would stay the same in dimensions and shape but will shift 12 m to the north to correspond to the realigned northern runway centreline. The ExA note the plan shown on page 47 of [REP2-032].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Will the PSZ remain the same size despite the proposed significant increased use of the Northern Runway?</li> <li>b) The eastern end of the repositioned PSZ appears to extend over an airport building at its point. Are there any implications arising from this?</li> </ul>
<b>NOISE AND VIBRATION</b>		
NV.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Noise Thresholds</b></p> <p>As noted in the Communities Against Gatwick Noise and Emissions (CAGNE) D2 submission [REP2-070], Stansted and Bristol airport expansion schemes used an adverse effect level of 69 L<sub>Aeq</sub> day and 63 L<sub>Aeq</sub> night, and the same values were not contested during the Examination of the Luton DCO.</p> <p>Why should the same values not be used for the Proposed Development?</p> <p>How would the Applicant propose to modify its off-site mitigation proposals through Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme [REP4-017], if these noise levels were to be regarded as unacceptable?</p>
NV.2.2	Applicant	<b>Off-site mitigation</b>

ExQ2: Monday 1 July

Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>As a general principle is it accepted that once a premises is predicted to be eligible for off-site mitigation the aim is to ensure the necessary mitigation is in place before the noise occurs that would otherwise be likely to cause the significant adverse noise effect on occupants of the premises?</p> <p>Is it also accepted that the internal living environment must remain acceptable, including with regard to ventilation and overheating?</p>
NV.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Noise insulation inner and outer zones</b></p> <p>Given that the 2013 APF says “<i>We will continue to treat the 57dB LAeq 16 hour contour as the average level of daytime aircraft noise marking the approximate onset of significant community annoyance</i>” and that post Survey of Noise Attitudes (SONA) the ANPS 2018 refers to 54 dB day, would not a single noise insulation scheme, aligned at least with the timescales of the proposed zone 1 scheme, starting at 54 dB achieve greater consistency with ANPS 5.68?</p> <p>Could not the same argument apply to night-time noise, recognising attention drawn to night-time noise and sleep disturbance in policy wording?</p>
NV.2.4	All IPs	<p><b>Off-site mitigation</b></p> <p>To what extent could relevant authorities, including local planning authorities, play a role in, for example, reviewing the forecasts of premises identified as eligible, involvement in community engagement including support with special cases, and approving proposed designs with regard to relevant standards, to assure consistency with the first aim of noise policy as set out in the ANPS at para 5.68?</p>
NV.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Noise limit values</b></p> <p>Para 5.60 of the ANPS states that “<i>The benefits of future technological improvements should be shared between the applicant and its local communities, hence helping to achieve a balance between growth and noise reduction.</i>” The Applicant summarised at D3 a benefits sharing calculation in relation to Bristol airport, provided an updated central fleet transition case at D4, introduced its revised noise limit proposals at ISH8 and would submit these revised proposals at D6.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Comparing 2029 with 2019 how much quieter is the aircraft fleet expected to be in terms of source noise levels? Please provide sufficient details to support the response provided.</p> <p>If the noise limits for air noise only were expressed as follows:</p> <p>From the commencement of dual runway operations, the forecast change in air noise level caused by the operation of the airport at any residential premises shall be no greater than:</p> <p><math>x_1</math> dB in terms of <math>L_{Aeq}</math> day summer period  <math>y_1</math> dB in terms of the <math>L_{Aeq}</math> night summer period  <math>x_2</math> dB in terms of <math>L_{Aeq}</math> day non-summer period  <math>y_2</math> dB in terms of the <math>L_{Aeq}</math> night non-summer period</p> <p>compared with the 2019 forecast values for the same parameters, where <math>x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2</math>, are real numbers.</p> <p>Whilst the comparison is between values of the same parameter, which parameter is considered most appropriate in this context and why?            Are limits in terms of other parameters considered necessary?            What would be the proposed values of <math>x_1, y_1, x_2</math>, and <math>y_2</math>?            How do the values proposed demonstrate consistency with the ANPS statement above?            Please provide sufficient details to support the response provided.</p>
NV.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Noise limit compliance</b></p> <p>Despite the Applicant's assurances at ISH8, and considering the submissions made by the Joint Local Authorities, does the Applicant accept that once capacity has been declared it may not be able to prevent a forecast breach of a noise limit because of, for example, slot allocations that have already been made</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>through existing rights? Is this what is meant by “<i>including respecting, for example, historic slot rights</i>” at 7.2.3 of the Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope Version 2 [REP5-029]?</p> <p>To what extent would a requirement within the DCO carry sufficient weight to overcome any or other such constraint that may interfere with compliance with any noise limit?</p> <p>Would it be possible to factor in any constraints imposed by ‘<i>other laws and international obligations</i>’ with reference to R15(3) of the dDCO [REP5-004] into the forecasting process, in addition to the noise limits, to determine capacity that could be declared that would be consistent with meeting the noise limits?</p>
NV.2.7	Other IPs	<p><b>Independent noise reviewer</b></p> <p>Provided the compliance process is detailed sufficiently within the requirement(s) of the dDCO would other Interested Parties accept that the Civil Aviation Authority, acting as the independent noise reviewer, would be a relevant authority to review the Applicant’s analysis and forecast and confirm compliance with the requirement(s)?</p>
NV.2.8	All IPs	<p><b>Noise limit reviews</b></p> <p>Whilst routine periodic reviews and extraordinary reviews are considered in R16 in conjunction with Section 8 of Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope Version 2 [REP5-029] to what extent could this be sufficiently detailed in requirement(s) that allows for both routine periodic reviews and the extraordinary reviews?</p> <p>How often should routine reviews take place?</p> <p>Who should be able to initiate an interim/extraordinary review?</p> <p>Who should participate in them and how?</p> <p>What would be the scope of such reviews?</p>
<p><b>RESOURCE AND WASTE MANAGEMENT</b></p>		

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
RES.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Site Waste Management Plan</b></p> <p>In relation to R30 of the dDCO [REP5-005] and the Construction Resources and Waste Management Plan (CRWMP) [REP4-009], the Applicant is asked the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) R30 appears to refer to a singular Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) that is to be submitted to WSCC and SCC, whereas the CRWMP [REP4-009] states that SWMPs will be prepared for each project area. Would there be an overall SWMP submitted for approval or a SWMP for each project area?</li> <li>b) The CRWMP states that the SWMPs will be internal documents but will be made available to the relevant planning authority for information during the construction process on request. Should this be updated to reflect that the SWMP is subject to approval?</li> <li>c) It is clear from Annex A of the CRWMP that the SWMP, specifically the information in Table A5. 1 (Waste Management Data Sheet), would be updated through the construction period as a live document. Can the Applicant confirm which parts of the Annex A SWMP template would be included in the SWMP that will be submitted for approval?</li> <li>d) Given that, until the quantity of types of waste are known, it cannot be confirmed if the capacity of the local waste management infrastructure is sufficient to manage waste from the Project. Should the CRWMP and/ or R30 of the dDCO include wording to make it clear that the SWMP needs to include an assessment of the capacity of the local waste management infrastructure?</li> </ul>
RES.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Effects of transportation of waste</b></p> <p>The Waste Management Signposting Document submitted at D6 [REP6-017] describes how the effects associated with the transportation of waste have been considered within other topic areas.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked how the effects of transportation of waste can have been considered in the assessments under other topic areas when the quantity of different waste types, and therefore amount of associated transportation of waste, is not yet known?</p>
<b>SOCIO-ECONOMIC EFFECTS</b>		
SE.2.1	Applicant	<b>Construction Communications and Engagement Plan - stakeholders</b>



**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 2.1.2 of the Construction Communications and Engagement Plan (CCEP) [REP2-015] states that reasonable steps will be taken to engage with the local community, particularly focusing on those who may be most affected by construction impacts. Please confirm how such would groups be identified?</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.1 of [REP2-015] further states that in implementing the CCEP, the Applicant will work with the Community Liaison Officer and the Principal Contractor(s) to identify the stakeholders to be targeted by the communication and engagement activities, and which will be kept under regular review in line with the construction programme. Again, please confirm how such stakeholders would be identified and how the review would take place?</p>
SE.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Construction Communications and Engagement Plan - communication</b></p> <p>Bullet 4 of paragraph 6.1.2 of the CCEP [REP2-015] states that community newsletters 'may' be prepared and bullet 5 states that a helpline will be provided 'when required'. What are the trigger points for these communication methods?</p> <p>It is noted that the other proposed methods of communication listed appear to focus on the assumption of individuals having access to social media and websites. Please review and comment.</p>
SE.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation Route Map</b></p> <p>Please review the 'Potential Impact' columns for rows SE-3 and SE-4 of the Mitigation Route Map [REP2-011].</p> <p>Should the impact refer to construction traffic rather than the name of the proposed mitigation plan?</p>
SE.2.4	Applicant	<p><b>Mitigation Measures – Healthcare Practitioner</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that in response to ExQ1 SE.1.3 [REP3-103] the Applicant confirmed that the occupational healthcare support needs of the construction workforce would vary over time with the size and composition of the workforce.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please confirm how the healthcare support would be determined?
SE.2.5	Applicant	<p><b>Local Economic Impact Assessment – Gateway Gatwick</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that in response to ExQ1 SE.1.11 [REP3-103] the Applicant states that ‘Initiatives could encourage additional inbound international passengers facilitated by the Proposed Development to spend more nights in the region’.</p> <p>Please confirm how this would be measured?</p>
SE.2.6	Applicant	<p><b>Employment Skill and Business Strategy - Implementation Plan</b></p> <p>In response to the Joint Surrey Councils LIR [REP1-097], it was acknowledged by the Applicant in Table 3.10 of [REP3-078] that training opportunities, as detailed in the draft Implementation Plan should be accessible and consideration was to be given to the funding of travel associated with training.</p> <p>Please signpost to where this is reflected in the draft Implementation Plan.</p>
SE.2.7	Applicant East Sussex County Council	<p><b>Employment Skill and Business Strategy – mitigation and compensation</b></p> <p>Please review row 2.19.4.2 of the East Sussex County Council SoCG [REP5-039] and confirm whether the status of ‘agreed’ is correct?</p>
SE.2.8	Applicant	<p><b>Employment Skill and Business Strategy – securing mechanism</b></p> <p>At row 17 of the Kent County Council PADSS [REP5-096] it is stated that the Employment Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) should be secured either in the form of a Requirement, or a control document such as a Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register.</p> <p>Please provide draft wording for a Requirement and provide additional detail in respect of a draft Stakeholder Actions and Commitments Register.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
SE.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Draft Section 106 Agreement – Explanatory Memorandum</b></p> <p>Noting the response by the Applicant to ExQ1 SE.1.5 [REP3-103], discussions held at ISH3 ([EV8-001] and [EV8-002]) and on-going dialogue between parties, paragraph 4.24.4 of the draft Section 106 Agreement EM [REP6-096] refers to the ESBS as being a package of enhancement measures.</p> <p>At paragraph 4.24.9 of [REP6-096] it is further stated that the obligations are considered necessary to make the Proposed Development acceptable in planning terms. As such, should the ESBS therefore not be secured via a requirement in the dDCO?</p> <p>In addition, noting paragraph 4.24.10 of the s106 EM [REP6-096] please provide more detail as to how, if the ESBS was secured via the dDCO, this would result in a layer of complexity and administrative challenge to parties involved.</p>
SE.2.10	Applicant	<p><b>Commercial Floorspace</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the comments made at row LESE 13 of the CBC PADSS [REP5-085]. In addition, the ExA noted the comments made by the Applicant during ISH8 regarding this matter ([EV17-001] to [EV17-005]).</p> <p>However, at row 2.19.5.3 of the CBC SoCG [REP5-037] it is stated by CBC that the commercial space may be occupied by users not related to the airport and as such the offices would not fall under the definition of ‘<i>Associated Development</i>’.</p> <p>Please confirm if it is intended that the commercial space is to be occupied by airport-related companies/ individuals and if so, is it necessary to secure the use in the dDCO? If occupation does not relate to airport use, how is the definition of ‘Associated Development’ complied with?</p>
SE.2.11	Applicant	<p><b>Property Values</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant’s responses to both ExQ1 SE1.13 [REP3-103] and CA.1.22 [REP3-087] in respect of property values and compensation. Additionally, in Table 17.4.2 of ES Chapter 17 [APP-042] the Applicant confirms that the Proposed Development could result in negative effects on some property values. To date no supporting data has been submitted into the Examination to support this statement.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The ExA accepts in this instance it is not appropriate to share commercially confidential information in respect of individual residential property values. However, as external advice and/ or studies have been undertaken on behalf of the Applicant please submit an executive summary of this information, without specific property values, to support the assessment findings.</p>
SE.2.12	Applicant Local Authorities	<p><b>Local Authority Level Assessments</b></p> <p>In respect of local level effects, the ExA notes the response to ExQ1 SE1.18 [REP3-103] by the Applicant and the content of ES Appendix 17.9.2: Local Economic Impact Assessment [APP-200]. The responses given by the Applicant during ISH3 regarding this matter ([REP1-058], [EV8-001] and [EV8-002]) insofar as the assessment was undertaken at the functional market area level is also noted. Additionally, the content of ES Appendix 17.6.1 Socio-Economic Data Tables [APP-197], in respect of the context of potential impacts within specific administrative boundaries, is acknowledged.</p> <p>The ExA also acknowledges that ES Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201] contains a housing assessment at the local authority level and construction employment at the local authority level is provided in ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note [APP-199].</p> <p>The ExA understands that the Applicant is maintaining their position insofar as the functional market area level is considered the correct level to undertake the socioeconomic assessments. Despite this, the ExA remains concerned that several of the local authorities consider that the assessments undertaken to inform ES Chapter 18 [APP-042] do not provide sufficient information at a local level to satisfactorily inform of specific local level socio-economic effects. This remains a recurring theme raised by the several of the local authorities at each of the Examination deadlines. Related to this is also a level of concern raised by local authorities in respect of the sensitivity and magnitude criteria for several socio-economic receptors.</p> <p>The ExA notes that discussions in relation to these issues are ongoing and is aware of the details provided by all parties in answer to various ExQ1 questions, the discussions held during ISH3 and the content of the SoCGs and PADSS. The ExA however requests that a high-level update is provided by all parties in respect of these issues, to include details of whether future meetings are planned to discuss these matters</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		and a realistic view as to whether this issue is capable of being resolved prior to the end of the Examination.
SE.2.13	Applicant	<p><b>Distance travelled to work data</b></p> <p>Please confirm whether the data used within ES Chapter 18 [APP-042] and associated appendices in respect of distance travelled to work considers variations within local geographies? In addition, as detailed at row 2.19.1.6 of the CBC SoCG [REP5-037], please expand on your consideration that the assumptions used for non-home-based workers are sufficiently precautionary.</p>
SE.2.14	Applicant	<p><b>Gatwick Airport staff survey</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that the Applicant referred to a recent staff survey during ISH8 ([EV17-001] to [EV17-005]) and this is also referenced in row 2.19.1.9 of the CBC SoCG [REP5-037].</p> <p>Please confirm how or if the survey results are to be used, for example is it necessary to update any of the assessment findings? If the results are not being utilised, please confirm why not.</p>
SE.2.15	Horsham District Council	<p><b>Cumulative assessment</b></p> <p>The ExA notes Horsham DC's continuing concern that the local impact on labour supply issues resulting from cumulative developments has not been adequately explored by the Applicant (Row 2.20.3.7 of [REP5-041]).</p> <p>In response to this, the Applicant has stated that a bottom-up cumulative assessment of construction activity over the next 10 years would show significantly more labour available than there is demand because most construction projects over that time period are not yet planned (Row 2.20.1.3 of [REP5-041]) and that construction employment detail is listed in ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note [APP-199] and an assessment of effects provided is at different spatial levels including FEMA is provided within Table 17.6.6 and Section 17.9 of ES Chapter 17 [APP-042]. Additionally, the Applicant has also provided a labour supply analysis at different spatial scales in Section 5 of ES Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201].</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Please can the Council confirm the specific inadequacies in the information provided to date and specify what assessment they consider necessary in respect of cumulative effects.</p>
SE.2.16	Applicant	<p><b>Catalytic impact methodology</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant’s response to ExQ1.SE.1.20 [REP3-103] and also the comments made in the CBC SoCG at row 2.19.2.1 [REP5-037] and the ESCC SoCG at row 2.19.3.1 [REP5-039]. It is noted that the Applicant stated they would be preparing a further explanatory note in respect of this matter.</p> <p>Please signpost to this note or advise by which deadline it will be received and the likely content.</p>
<b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT</b>		
<p><b>These questions do not relate to the revised car parking analysis submitted at D6. Any further questions arising from D6 car parking submissions will be addressed via a Rule 17 letter.</b></p>		
TT.2.1	Applicant National Highways	<p><b>National Networks National Policy Statement 2024 (2024 NNNPS)</b></p> <p>NH’s response to ExQ1 GEN.1.33 [REP3-138] in the last bullet point highlights that <i>“Paragraph 5.283: “The Applicant should provide evidence that the development improves the operation of the network and assists with capacity issues.” Importantly, this sentence does not appear in the 2015 NNNPS and National Highways considers it is relevant to the Applicant’s proposals. In light of the specific matters relating to the proposed expansion, and the assessments provided, National Highways does not consider such evidence has been provided.”</i></p> <p>Although the 2015 NNNPS has effect for this application, the 2024 NNNPS could be an important and relevant matter. What evidence has been provided that the development improves the operation of the network and assists with capacity issues?</p>
TT.2.2	Applicant	<p><b>Future Baseline Sensitivity Analysis</b></p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July****Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

<b>ExQ2</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
		Explain what is meant in para 5.10.21 of the Future Baseline Sensitivity Analysis [REP5-081], as it seems to suggest traffic data to inform other topics has not been derived from additional modelling. Is the ExA to assume that this is a commentary of what the Applicant considers to be the outcome of any additional sensitivity modelling if it was undertaken?
TT.2.3	Local Authorities	<b>Future Baseline Sensitivity Analysis - Traffic and Transport</b> Are the local authorities satisfied that the commentary on the effects of the future baseline sensitivity analysis [REP5-081] provides an accurate assessment of the possible effects on all factors that are covered within Chapter 12 of the ES.
TT.2.4	Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP	<b>Pedestrian Access to Holiday Inn</b> Currently there is no footway connecting the hotel entrance to the pedestrian network on the adjacent highways. The only hard surfaced routes are the vehicle entrance carriageway directly from the A217 or via the car park carriageway exit onto Povey Cross Road. There is no hard surfaced segregated pedestrian or cycle access to the hotel. The Applicant's highway improvements to the Longbridge Roundabout include pedestrian and cycle circulation.  The ExA would like to understand given that active travel to the Airport may become a realistic option should the highway improvements take place, whether your client will be considering pedestrian and cycle access on the hotel site.
TT.2.5	Applicant West Sussex CC Crawley BC Reigate and Banstead BC	<b>Draft Section 106 Agreement Schedule 3 – Transport Mitigation Fund Decision Group</b> Explain how any disputes in respect of Schedule 3 of the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] the Transport Mitigation Fund Decision Group would be resolved and also the likely timescales for dispute resolution.
TT.2.6	Applicant	<b>Surface Access Commitments – Commitment 16</b> Paragraphs 6.2.8 to 6.2.11 of the Surface Access Commitments (SAC) [REP6-030] sets out the involvement of the Secretary of State in the case where there is disagreement between the Transport

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Forum Steering Group (TFSG) and the Applicant in terms of the Surface Access Commitments Mitigation Action Plan. Explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The minimum timescale for the Secretary of State to be involved after the dispute has been identified, between the TFSG and the Applicant;</li> <li>• If there are any limitations on the Secretary of State in terms of response timescale; and</li> <li>• Whether as well as directing that the Mitigation Action Plan is amended, would this process make it possible for the Secretary of State to direct controls on factors affecting mode share at the airport. These possibly may include passenger numbers, aircraft movements and/or parking numbers.</li> </ul>
TT.2.7	Applicant Network Rail Govia Thameslink Railway	<p><b>Rail Capacity and Mitigation</b></p> <p>Network Rail’s PADSS [REP5-107] and Govia Thameslink Railway [REP6-126] highlight the outstanding issues around some elements of the rail modelling and also the mitigation required. The ExA are aware that discussions are ongoing, but would like parties’ comments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of outstanding issues relating to rail modelling;</li> <li>• Outline of any mitigation that may be required;</li> <li>• How any required mitigation would be secured; and</li> <li>• The likelihood of agreement on the above being reached during the Examination.</li> </ul>
TT.2.8	Applicant	<p><b>Surface Access Commitments – Commitment 16</b></p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.6 of the SAC [REP6-030] in Commitment 16 limits the need for action in failing to meet mode share commitments must have regard “<i>to any circumstances beyond GAL's control which may be responsible.</i>” Prior to a decision on the DCO, if no agreement can be reached about the rail modelling and any necessary mitigations, would these be circumstances beyond the control of the Applicant in the context of Commitment 16?</p>
TT.2.9	Applicant	<p><b>Surface Access Commitments – Car Travel</b></p>



ExQ2: Monday 1 July

Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In the SAC [REP6-030] is the mode of car travel being monitored and reported the last mode of travel to and from the airport site or the main mode of travel for the whole trip? (e.g., car travel to remote parking and shuttle bus to site being recorded differently to car travel to the site)</p>
TT.2.10	Applicant	<p><b>Surface Access Commitments – Traffic Sensitivity Testing</b></p> <p>The Joint Surrey Councils [REP6-101] have indicated that sensitivity testing shared with them about lower sustainable modes shares than required in the SAC [REP6-030]. The Joint Surrey Councils state that “<i>The results inevitably lead to more vehicles on the SRN and LRN, (approximately 7% more GAL related road traffic in 2032). The analysis presented traffic impacts, there was no associated air quality and noise assessment.</i>”</p> <p>Given this the ExA would like to understand what sensitivity tests have been undertaken and details of the outputs so the impacts of lower sustainable mode shares can be understood.</p>
TT.2.11	Applicant Joint Surrey Councils	<p><b>Active Travel Access to Airport</b></p> <p>The Joint Surrey Councils [REP6-101] in response to [REP5-072] TT.1.23 p181 express a number of outstanding concerns with respect to the inadequacy of the active travel infrastructure being proposed. The ExA noted the response [REP3-104] to TT.1.27, but also understands the concerns of the Joint Surrey Councils. The ExA notes the improved shared route from Longbridge roundabout but also appreciates that this is along a busy dual carriageway. In terms of tree loss, the ExA notes that there will be considerable impact along the A23 on the boundary of the Riverside Park.</p> <p>Is this therefore the right time to look at increasing permeability and active travel access that could be realised by the new crossing on the A23?</p>
TT.2.12	Applicant National Highways	<p><b>Active Travel Access to Airport</b></p> <p>The North and South Terminal Roundabouts BAU Improvement Scheme Plans [REP6-012] show concept designs for signalisation of the north and south terminal roundabouts.</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
	Highways Authorities	Should there be controlled pedestrian and cycle crossings on any elements of these design layouts to enable safe active travel around the airport?
<b>WATER ENVIRONMENT</b>		
WE.2.1	SES Water	<p><b>Water Supply</b></p> <p>The Applicant [REP4-037] submitted a copy of an email of 9 February 2024 setting out that SES Water’s water sources and infrastructure would be able to meet the predicted demands from the Project.</p> <p>The ExA would like direct confirmation from SES Water that it is satisfied the company will be able to meet the water supply requirements of both the possible Future Baseline and the Proposed Development scenarios.</p>
WE.2.2	Applicant Thames Water	<p><b>Crawley and Horley Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW)</b></p> <p>In the SoCG between the Applicant and Thames Water [REP5-064] at item 2.22.5.2 the Applicant provides an interpretation of the position with respect to the capacity of the Thames Water infrastructure.</p> <p>The ExA wants to understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When an accurate assessment of the ability of Crawley and Horley WTW to accommodate additional flows from both the Future Baseline and Proposed Development scenarios will be available;</li> <li>• An understanding of any upgrade works that would be required to accommodate both scenarios and the likely timescales for delivery; and</li> <li>• How any necessary works would be secured.</li> </ul>
WE.2.3	Applicant Thames Water	<p><b>Public Sewer Network Capacity</b></p> <p>In the SoCG between the Applicant and Thames Water [REP5-064] at item 2.22.5.2 the Applicant provides an interpretation of the position with respect to the capacity of the Thames Water infrastructure. The ExA wants to understand;</p>

**ExQ2: Monday 1 July**

**Responses due by Deadline 7: Monday 15 July 2024**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• When an accurate assessment of the public sewer network to accommodate additional flows from both the Future Baseline and Proposed Development scenarios will be available?;</li><li>• An understanding of any upgrade works that would be required to accommodate both scenarios and the likely timescales for delivery; and</li><li>• How any necessary works would be secured?</li></ul>
WE.2.4	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Change Request – New onsite Wastewater Treatment Works</b></p> <p>The Environment Agency position as set out in the SoCG [REP5-057] in item 2.22.3.13 states that, “<i>The new treatment facility would require a bespoke environmental permit with a full assessment.</i>” It goes on to state that, “<i>The Environment Agency will not normally give you a permit for use of a private sewage treatment system based on the nearest public foul sewer not having enough capacity.</i>”</p> <p>Explain whether a permit would be likely to be granted and if so would any restrictions be imposed on the permit relating to the public sewer network being upgraded.</p>