



## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Gatwick Airport Northern Runway
<b>Hearing:</b>	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) - Part 2
<b>Date:</b>	30 July 2024

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

## **Gatwick\_30th July\_ISH9\_PT2**

Created on: 2024-07-30 14:54:05

Project Length: 01:22:16

File Name: Gatwick\_30th July\_ISH9\_PT2

File Length: 01:22:16

### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:09 - 00:00:14:21

Welcome back to this issue specific hearing nine on environmental matters. Um, it's now 1530 and the hearing will resume.

00:00:17:05 - 00:00:52:23

So I will, um, in what time remains today make a start on noise and air quality. Um, I think looking at what I've got, um, and the level of interest that I expect this will carry on into tomorrow and we will just attempt to finish it around 5:00. Um. Oh, sorry. My apologies. Is that better? Is that better? Happy? Good. Okay. Um, so just to recap, um, there are quite a few number items to get through, so, um, we will see how we go, but we still intend to finish about 5:00.

00:00:53:20 - 00:00:57:27

and will resume outstanding matters tomorrow morning.

00:01:00:03 - 00:01:14:24

So I intend here to deal with, um, the exact draft requirements in the order they appear in annex B, um, starting with our 15 and our 16, which concerned noise envelopes, limits, and associated processes.

00:01:16:11 - 00:01:50:11

Um, just to remind us all of the importance of this, I think there is agreement that these requirements are considered necessary for the proposed development to be consistent with the policy. Um, the applicant has already put forward, um, various proposals on this, on these, on these requirements. The JLS have put forward proposals. Cagney have put forward proposals. Um, GCHQ put forward proposals and others, I think. And, um, as I'm sure you're all aware, just over a week ago, the EXR added added to that, um, list.

00:01:53:16 - 00:02:22:12

To be clear, I just want to say that. So this is the start. This is not easy. I don't think, um, if we were to compare this with a proposed development that was, uh, an extension of a fixed facility. Then there are standards that can guide promoters and regulators to determine noise limits if they're considered necessary. Um, but it's not. And the impasse calls for a consultative process to develop something that then informs the requirements that go into the DCO.

00:02:23:29 - 00:02:50:20

Anyway, to start with, I'd like to hear the applicant's comments on the draft and then other IPPs. Um, I propose we take it power BI Power Annex B initially in relation to requirements 15 and 16, and I think that will help structure the submissions today and provide the EXR with clarity in relation to the specific points that I'm sure will be raised and made.

00:02:53:04 - 00:03:02:15

So starting with, um, I've got page B3 sub power one under er noise limits in that middle column.

00:03:04:05 - 00:03:11:03

And also just, um, having some uh, um, regard to the reasoning and information and the final column.

00:03:13:22 - 00:03:20:19

I'll invite the applicant to, um, start. Start us off really with their comments on on that.

00:03:21:25 - 00:03:40:24

Uh, Scott Linus for the applicant. Um, so I can set out an introduction. And then there are a number of points which actually cut across different paragraphs that are probably best to introduce. Now may take a little bit of time as an initial contribution, but I can set out our introductory position.

00:03:40:28 - 00:03:42:15

That's okay. Yeah. And then fine.

00:03:42:23 - 00:03:43:08

Yes.

00:03:43:10 - 00:03:43:25

Carry on. Yeah.

00:03:44:17 - 00:04:16:05

Uh, in short, we don't think, uh, these requirements are necessary. Um, um, with respect, we were surprised to see them as proposed as we understand them. Um, we do not think those controls are based upon any detailed evidence that's been presented or substantiated on behalf of any interested party. And, uh, the informative explains that the noise limits are based upon an ICAO document that hasn't been relied upon, or even mentioned at any stage earlier stage of the examination.

00:04:16:27 - 00:05:11:12

Um, as we'll go on to explain, sir, we do not think that that document gives any proper basis for the controls being suggested, amongst other reasons, that confirm that are neither appropriate nor necessary. And as we understand the amendments, they appear, in effect, to reject the entirety of the requirements as currently proposed in the draft DCU, along with the entirety of the noise envelope document itself. For reasons which we haven't seen or had the opportunity to address, and we haven't seen any explanation, uh, partly because this hasn't been advanced, particularly by any other party, of why these controls are necessary to achieve compliance with policy or guidance, including policy and guidance, which establishes policy themes of striking a balance between noise effects and positive economic benefits drawn from the APF.

00:05:11:22 - 00:05:54:03

Paragraph 3.3 um or policy or guidance relating to proportionality, i.e. controls should be proportional to the effects that are caused. That's APF 3.24. Or thirdly, sharing the benefits of growth between operators and communities. The APF at three point. Um uh, one two. Um, our view is that the noise envelope proposed with its limits, as stated, complies with policies and the changes to the noise limits, which appear to be proposed by these amendments, are simply not, um, uh, required.

00:05:54:16 - 00:06:28:18

Um, we've acknowledged the reasons for the noise envelope limits to be set as required pursuant to Amps 560, and we've demonstrated in our responses to the examination, including a response to EC2 rep. 7089 question env 2.5 the degree of noise benefit sharing provided to the community by the lower revised noise limits based on the updated central case. And those figures effectively involve an increase from 2032 to 2038.

00:06:28:20 - 00:07:03:23

The day goes from 31% 58%, the night 50 to 69%. And we say we provide a substantiation as to why our existing noise envelope doors share the benefits in accordance with policy. We should note as well, that policy doesn't preclude the noise level increasing, um, uh, that there isn't any policy guidance on the degree of sharing, but our view is that the noise envelope limits demonstrably comply with policy, and we have not seen any evidence to suggest that our data noise doesn't achieve that.

00:07:05:14 - 00:07:43:12

As I've mentioned, the basis for the limits that are in this suggested requirement, um, uh, aren't uh, given. Um, part of the difficulty, uh, we have, sir, is that, um, we do not know what the position is on. Key factors, such as your reference to noise levels in 2019 is used rather than account of policy loopholes or so else. We don't know anything about the rate of fleet renewal, it's been assumed, or the rate of growth in the baseline of the project cases, or the extent of noise reduction due to new technology that these limits aim to share with the community.

00:07:43:22 - 00:08:16:25

So I think for for those who have introductory reasons, I'm afraid we do have very fundamental, uh, concerns with, um, this suggested, uh, amendment, not least because we haven't seen any evidential, uh, justification, uh, for it. Um, there are some more detailed issues which I can ask Mr. Mitchell to address, which, as I've said, do cut across the different paragraphs. It's probably worth dealing with those.

00:08:16:28 - 00:08:31:02

Um, now I can ask him to start by by dealing with the AC ICAO paper that's relied upon as a justification for the limits, because they reflect, at least in part, the fundamental concerns we have.

00:08:31:15 - 00:08:39:21

Can I can I just, um, intervene there? Um, that's your sort of overall, um, response for the applicant?

00:08:40:10 - 00:09:22:18

Um, it's part it's the introduction to, as I say, um, we have points to raise on the IQ global trends. Um, at paper we have, um, other points to raise on the, uh, uh, approach, which we think is assumed in the

controls, but it's not entirely clear which appear to look at placing noise limits on levels at spot locations. Um, uh, there are issues, um, dealing with requiring noise reductions everywhere in the manner that the limits appear to suggest.

00:09:22:29 - 00:09:41:06

Um, as far as implications for routine operations, uh, are concerned. Um, so what I have said is merely the introduction. There are still fundamental difficulties with this, which I think Mr. Mitchell needs to explain beyond what I've mentioned.

00:09:42:03 - 00:09:43:01

Okay. Um.

00:09:45:29 - 00:10:03:11

Before we do, I'd rather just. Can I invite some introductory sort of similar introductory comments from other interested parties? And then before I get into the detail, I'd like to do that first. Um, if the jazz would like to just give some initial thoughts.

00:10:03:13 - 00:10:40:20

Thank you, Sir Lois Lane, for the joint local authorities. Um, just by way of introduction, we are, uh, broadly very supportive of these proposals. Uh, we think that the mechanism being proposed by the EXR addresses a number of the, uh, the concerns in substance that the JLA has been raising throughout the process. Um, as regards the need for certainty around sharing of benefits with communities, um, and the the progressive reduction over time, we think would be in line with with the Aprns and other national policy around the sharing of benefits.

00:10:40:24 - 00:11:40:11

Um, we have some outstanding areas where we have additional comments, which I'll come back to in due course. But just to flag our, our major, um, area that we have additional comments on at this stage would be an issue of sequencing, and this is maybe more of a detail point, but it's essentially mirrors what Mr. Bedford was talking about in respect of surface access and the sort of the forecasting mechanisms in that. Uh, while we we generally support the idea of, of this progressive reduction, uh, we are concerned to make sure that the requirement would allow for operational plans to be put into place far enough in advance that it could actually affect the slot allocation in a meaningful way for the following year, because the requirement, as sort of currently proposed, has that happening at the end of the summer season, by which point capacity will already have been allocated for the following year? But the other points of detail we can, we can come back to in due course.

00:11:41:03 - 00:11:48:04

Thank you for that. I've got some other hands, actually. Um, I'll take the hand in the room first, please. Thank you.

00:11:49:03 - 00:12:22:27

Or shall it be for Cagney and Cagney? Again, like the joint local authority supports the principle of this approach. And in light of the massive growth that is planned, including what will be inevitable changes to flight paths through airspace modernization, Cagney is very clear that the noise envelope and the noise approach here needs to be very stringent to comply with policy, and this is certainly a

step forward in the right direction. And the applicant does itself rely for its own case on future fleets being far quieter due to modernization and upgrade of the fleet.

00:12:22:29 - 00:12:58:21

And as set out in the Central Aircraft Fleet report, the updated Central Aircraft Fleet report and and Cagney considers that justifies the approach the Shays taken here and Cagney's noise consultants who are online today, have previously raised concerns that some of the noise levels for modernized aircraft that the applicant have put forward have not been justified. But the TSA's new proposed requirement would ensure the applicants promises in relation to quieter, modernized aircraft will have to be realised in all Cagney's supports the TSA's approach.

00:12:58:23 - 00:13:34:24

It accords with policy that supports noise reduction over time and sharing of benefits. And that policy includes the NPS, but also the Aviation Policy Statement at section 3.3. And Cagney has a specific point, again, that arises in relation to the monitoring and oversight. And it's a point that's been made a number of times, but it's not in relation to the details. So it might be worth making now, which is simply that the, the request is that the XYZ draft wording leaves oversight by the CAA, not the local authorities.

00:13:35:01 - 00:14:10:27

And the CAA, as Cagney has made the point before, is not seen as independent by local people. It's partly financed by the aviation sector, and Cagney considers it's the local authorities that best understand noise impacts on the local area, including the R and B here. The Castle and Cagney's consultants have stated in their expert experience, having regard to what's happened at Luton, and it is the local authorities that the appropriate body to deal with any breaches, and the CAA has never done such tasks before, and that's set out most recently at reps 7128.

00:14:11:11 - 00:14:11:28

Thank you.

00:14:13:11 - 00:14:20:24

Thank you. I also got another hand. I saw a hand online. Um, I don't see the name very well. Charles Lloyd, is it please.

00:14:22:10 - 00:14:54:06

Thank thanks very much. It's Charles Lloyd for the Gatwick area conservation campaign. Um, uh, that there are a thank you for this proposal. There are some aspects of this that we, um, find attractive, particularly the emphasis on a progressive reduction, uh, in noise and the absence of what I think we'd characterized as get out of jail free cards, uh, that the, uh, the applicant would be able to take advantage of under its own proposals. Um, but there are also some aspects of these proposals that I think are concerning.

00:14:54:08 - 00:15:30:22

And I'll just briefly run through those. Um, first of all, these proposals use a metric like an average noise metric that has little meaning to communities. Um, and it uses that metric alone. Uh, when all advice and guidance is that that metric should not be used on its own in circumstances such as this. So

that includes the aviation policy framework, the CaaS guidance on noise envelopes. That's cap 1129, the airport National Policy Statement and so on. So it's very concerning that that a single average noise metric is the one proposed to be used.

00:15:31:05 - 00:16:02:25

Um, I think we'd also, unless we misunderstood, this would take the view that the noise reduction is being proposed. So that's half a decibel every five years are relatively trivial. Um, now, I'm not an acoustician, but my understanding is that three decibels is about the point at which the human ear is capable of discerning a difference between two different noise levels, and if that is the case, then it would take about 25 years of half a decibel reduction every five years for these proposals to become noticeable to, to communities.

00:16:02:27 - 00:16:40:25

And in that time the number of aircraft would increase enormously. Um, And we're also concerned that the point five DB every five years is based on, I think, an excessively narrow and partial interpretation of policy. So the policy is simply that the benefits of growth should be shared, not that only the benefits of technology change should be shared. So I think our view is that the EA's interpretation of policy is is excessively generous to, to communities. So we don't think that this proposal, whilst it might be structurally attractive, is going to achieve the sharing of benefits that would be consistent with policy.

00:16:41:09 - 00:16:56:28

And the final point I'd make is that these proposals only addressed noise in the summer, so it would leave the airport capable of increasing noise without constraint of any sort whatsoever in other periods, particularly the whole of the winter. Thanks very much.

00:16:58:21 - 00:17:03:26

Thank you. Is that if there's nobody else, are there is Mr.. Mr. Tanner.

00:17:04:02 - 00:17:23:08

So, Nigel Tanner, resident, I just wanted to support, um, the comment that the CAA has not proved itself capable of monitoring noise and whatever happens moving forward. I hope the Hksar will recommend that noise monitoring is moved to an independent authority. Thank you.

00:17:24:10 - 00:17:36:16

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. So I think I think it's just helpful to get those opening introductory comments out of the way. Um, and I'll return to the applicant. They may. I'm sorry. As somebody else.

00:17:38:18 - 00:17:41:19

Yeah. So, um. Lisa. Scott. Sorry I didn't see your hand. Sorry.

00:17:42:02 - 00:18:26:24

Apologies. It was a late hand. Lisa Scott Fitzgerald parish council, and, um, I raise again the point that the noise envelopes don't address ground noise. And this is the type of noise that's most impacting the residents that are closest to the airport, particularly in Hook Wood. Um, this the impact on this residency village seems to have been, um, overlooked. Um, quite a number of occasions we've

measured on informal devices, um, noise levels up to 90dB in the local park, and there doesn't seem to be anything in this, um, application that really looks at addressing ground noise apart from denying that it happens.

00:18:30:26 - 00:18:31:14

Thank you.

00:18:33:05 - 00:18:57:06

I'll return to the applicant. If there's no more contributions from other IPS at this stage, you have a chance to say more later. But I just want to sort of try and keep this structured. Um, I think the applicant wanted to expand down to some detailed, um, comments. Um, and perhaps we'll take it from there. Um, if that would be helpful. Yes. Scotland.

00:18:57:13 - 00:19:38:10

Applicant. Um, uh. Thank you. Before I ask Mr. Mitchell to go into further, uh, detail, I just want to remark upon the support that's been offered by the other parties. They do so with absolutely no evidential basis for for that. They have not produced any evidence which substantiates why those noise levels at those reductions, at those times, by reference to 2019 base level are justified as necessary rather than hours. So they may say they support them, but they're doing so without any evidential foundation whatsoever to support the drafting of those, um, uh, requirements.

00:19:38:18 - 00:20:02:04

It follows, then, that they have done absolutely nothing to demonstrate why a requirement in that form would adhere or be necessary to comply with policy, and including one that shares the benefits. Not all one way between communities, but both ways between an airports allowed to grow and communities that are experiencing the noise. No assessment whatsoever about whether this would allow that to be achieved.

00:20:03:28 - 00:20:13:28

I think it's important to note that because it's not simply insufficient for parties to turn up at the examination and support a proposal which hasn't been substantiated in evidence.

00:20:16:04 - 00:20:20:19

You're assuming there is a mutual benefit. I would like to challenge that.

00:20:21:00 - 00:20:28:02

Can we come? Mr.. Thank you. But can we just, um, try and, um, I'll take our turn if you'd like.

00:20:28:13 - 00:21:03:07

I'll pick up on a couple of other points for hand Mr. Mitchell. As far as cognitive points on the CEA are concerned, I think we reject those entirely. The suggestion that the CIA is not in a position to serve as an independent noise reviewer is just completely wrong, and there's simply no evidence to suggest that some form of local oversight is necessary in the circumstances where, as an entirely adequate reviewer, able to look at the noise monitoring that we are carrying out.

00:21:03:18 - 00:21:35:21



As far as GAC is concerned, um, obviously the use of the LEC metric we've adopted, but ourselves, albeit in the context of, um, a noise envelope that we have proposed, we don't take issue with that. We don't see there's any reason at all to move beyond the summer months, given that the noise is going to be experienced most, uh, in the summer months itself, there is no need for, um, anything further to be done by way of our controls. But I can ask Mr. Mitchell to pick up on that, um, as necessary.

00:21:36:00 - 00:22:10:04

Before he does that, though, I think we just need to deal with the other the other concerns, and perhaps I can frame them for him. So that we deal with the ICU paper, which, as I've said, appears to be relied upon as a basis for coming up with the figures in the in the requirement they do without. First of all, um, we need to deal with the practicality of um or the practicality of this controls based on what we understand, the noise envelope, the noise limits to apply to.

00:22:10:28 - 00:22:43:27

Um, we need to look at what effectively the implications of these reductions would be for the airport. Um, if they're implemented, as suggested by reference to the 2019, uh, operations. That's the third point. And bearing in mind this appears to jettison the entire noise envelope that we've prepared. And we need to look at how, um, the monitoring anticipated within this requirement compared with the five year forecasting that we are proposing in our envelope.

00:22:44:04 - 00:22:47:13

I can ask them to deal with those. And any other points, please.

00:22:48:29 - 00:23:30:07

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. I think I'll start now. Um, I'll certainly talk about the ICAO, um, Global Trends document that was produced in the summer of 2022. In just a moment. Um, before that, just to make two to introductory comments. Um, first of all, yeah, the the applicant welcomes clarity on the metric that the, um, XR examining authority have have chosen in their proposal, being the summer average leak 16 hour and the summer average nighttime leak eight hour noise levels.

00:23:31:01 - 00:24:02:29

Um, but it would be helpful in in giving this response, just to understand a little bit more about the proposal itself, which is obviously written down quite concisely in annex B, Um, and I think it kind of relates back to the examiner's questions, too, which, which made a raised a question about what would the noise level limit be. And I think the examining authority referred to, uh, actual noise levels x1, x2, y1, y2.

00:24:03:01 - 00:24:35:22

What would those noise levels be in such an envelope? Um, and it's not clear in my mind, and I don't know if it's possible to, to have it clarified now whether the proposal is for noise levels, which are either measured and the recommendation does refer to measurement or monitoring at a location or locations, or if in fact, um, the proposal is that these noise reductions are implied by a noise contour area in the way that we've proposed.

00:24:37:25 - 00:24:40:08

I will try to respond to that. I realize this is.

00:24:40:10 - 00:24:40:25

Thank you.

00:24:40:29 - 00:24:58:19

For hearing. Um, I've got a hand up as well. Um, can I come back to you in a moment, please? Yeah. Um, in a sense, um, let me ask you a question, then. I mean, do you. Does the applicant agree or disagree that, um,

00:25:00:07 - 00:25:14:14

there is a general reduction in aircraft noise, fleet noise from not 2019 to the first year of operation in which will take us 2020, 2029. Does does does the applicant accept that proposition?

00:25:15:13 - 00:25:42:01

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Um, I know I'm not supposed to ask a question, but I realize I just did, and just to acknowledge that I didn't get the answer to it. Um, you asked me that question in the previous hearing. Um, and I went away to give you a more detailed answer, which we did give in the response to examiner's questions. And the answer was, it depends where you are around the airport, because as.

00:25:42:18 - 00:25:58:05

I just mentioned, I mean, we did give the. So can I just try and clarify the question then or clarify this. I mean, you've got I think you've said a number of occasions that let's try let's try and agree what let's try and establish what we agree on if you like and and take it from there. Um,

00:25:59:22 - 00:26:04:12

uh, the flight paths will stay the same. I think that is that is correct, isn't it?

00:26:05:01 - 00:26:05:22

Yes.

00:26:06:20 - 00:26:20:12

And as a result of, um, dual runway operations, you anticipate or will expect to, um, have a greater number of aircraft utilizing those flight paths.

00:26:22:21 - 00:26:28:03

Is that that's that's. Yes. Correct. So I'm just going through this very, very deliberately. Um.

00:26:30:06 - 00:26:31:23

So fundamentally then the.

00:26:33:09 - 00:26:46:15

if you keep a few things the same, it's the it's the if you like, the footprint or the noise output from all those aircraft that will determine the noise impact in the communities, won't it?

00:26:47:13 - 00:27:17:15

Steve Mitchell for the applicant, I mean, with respect, this is something the applicant has been studying for about five years, which is why we had an initial central case fleet transition forecast. Then the pandemic struck and we revised that to a slower fleet transition forecast based on all the knowledge of the airlines that operate at this airport and all the the aircraft order books that they have and this, that and the other, which is beyond me.

00:27:17:18 - 00:27:28:07

And then more recently, you've heard that we've updated the Central Coast fleet forecast for the same reasons. So we have been studying this at length for 5 or 6 years now.

00:27:29:18 - 00:28:00:15

I don't doubt that at all. I don't doubt that. Um, but the question we're trying to ask, the question that we are faced with is in the essay is what does the policy say in terms of this balance between growth and technology benefits or sharing the benefits of technology with the communities. Um, I would describe as a win win outcome. On the face of it, shouldn't it? It should be. It should be a way of enabling communities to benefit from technology as well as the as well as the, the, um, airport.

00:28:00:21 - 00:28:19:24

Um, so I might just repeat the same question. Um, well, okay. But I mean, you've got let me point you to information in the in the key facts. I think at the start of the APF, um, it talks about a 7 to 9 DB reduction in aircraft, doesn't it?

00:28:23:01 - 00:28:24:14

It may do I'm not sure.

00:28:24:19 - 00:28:26:03

Well, I thought you'd be sure because it's.

00:28:26:09 - 00:28:28:00

I accept that, yes. Yeah.

00:28:28:02 - 00:28:50:05

So, um, I'm just forgive me, but I'm just going to sort of say if you approach this looking at the APF, if you look at your own application, um, in relation to engine ground running, I think also it uses a, it suggests a, um, I can't find it my notes, but I think again, it refers to a, you know, a 7 to 9 DB reduction in engine noise.

00:28:52:29 - 00:28:56:19

I think yeah, I can find that reference, but it's, um.

00:28:57:06 - 00:29:08:02

Sir, I think you were just saying that, you know, next generation aircraft are quiet and current generation aircraft, which, of course, I agree with. That's fundamental to the noise modeling that's been done.

00:29:08:14 - 00:29:10:21

That's good. So I think we're making some progress. So,

00:29:12:13 - 00:29:12:28

um.

00:29:15:08 - 00:29:26:01

The scenario three of the corps explicitly mentions, doesn't it. The, the it factors in the Covid delay. She was. Nothing happens between 2019 and 2024, I think. Is that correct?

00:29:27:28 - 00:29:58:18

Perhaps we could turn to the ICAO Global Trends in Aviation Noise, a document, because I have been asked to comment on it, and I would ask you to bear with me in answering your question, if you don't mind, because at the moment I haven't been able to comment. Um, I was fortunate to attend a conference on this paper in November 2022, organized by the American Institute of Noise Control Engineer, where one of the ICAO officials presented the paper. And I asked a few questions and I was aware of it.

00:29:59:07 - 00:30:02:13

And, um, I think the key

00:30:04:02 - 00:30:08:17

there's a number of things in here. The scenario two, um, talks about.

00:30:11:02 - 00:30:47:27

Which is the or we can turn to scenario three if you like, which is the one you've you've quoted the examining authority of quoted in the, in the in the reference or the informative. Uh, I don't disagree with that, but let's just explore what it actually says. It says, uh, scenario three was meant to capture post-Covid delay where no noise technology improvements for aircraft entering the fleet between 2019 and 23. Technology improvements of 0.2dB MP and DB per annum for all aircraft entering the fleet from 2024 to 2050.

00:30:48:24 - 00:31:23:22

What that means is that the what we call the next generation of aircraft, year on year, will continue to get very slightly quieter, as we heard from Miss Deloitte. Those are small reductions, but ICAO are forecasting that for the next 30 years we accept that as a proposition. That's the ICAO view of the global fleet of aircraft that are operating in the world. But that that that's to do with the noise level that comes out at the back of a brand new aircraft. What we need to do is to look at how that might affect the overall leak.

00:31:23:24 - 00:31:56:20

Noise levels that arrive on the ground from all the aircraft. And the first thing to do is to turn probably to the the second page of that paper. And I'm sure you've looked at this. There's a graph which is called figure 1.10. And what it does is it plots the total contour area. This is not the noise emission level. This is the contour area against time. And the contour area is in day night levels because that's what they use in America. But it's a it's based on an LEC contour area.

00:31:56:28 - 00:32:23:24

And it plots how the global trend and it looks at 319 airports rather than any particular one. It says how is that contour area likely to change in the next 30 years? Given the assumption that we just discussed in scenario three, and given all the other things, including the growth in passengers travel around the world, etc., and in all cases, all scenarios, that contour area goes up.

00:32:26:01 - 00:33:02:23

I'll just repeat that even in scenario three, which is actually a very faint dotted line, the contour area across the worldwide trend of airports goes up. That's what the ICAO tells us to expect. And when I heard that because I was quite interested, I said, that's interesting because government policy in this country actually assumes the opposite. And that was a bit of a surprise to me. But that's because different airports have different trends. But first of all, if you just take it on face value, the okay document tells us contour areas in terms of look will go up,

00:33:04:19 - 00:33:18:22

not down. That means noise levels in Lech will go up, not down. So that is counter to the deduction that you've drawn in terms of setting a noise cap which should go down.

00:33:20:28 - 00:33:22:22

Um, I thank you for that. Um,

00:33:24:07 - 00:33:38:09

so if it was turned, if we return to the, um, aviation policy framework and what I mentioned before that it was, um, asserting that there would be this 7 to 9dB reduction. Are you. Why aren't you, uh, do you disagree with that?

00:33:39:28 - 00:33:49:14

Um, yes. I think you were reminded me that the fleet will get quieter in time. Sorry. The noise. New aircraft will get quieter in time. Yes.

00:33:50:23 - 00:34:07:29

So hang on. So you see what it says at the APF? Uh, I think it's key facts, isn't it? I think it's under the key factor section. Um, at the start at 7 to 9 DB, which happens to be the same as you've mentioned in your own application with regard to engine ground running, which also mentioned 7 to 9

00:34:09:16 - 00:34:10:22

DB reduction.

00:34:12:11 - 00:34:35:09

Um, are you saying that is not translated through to in your context? You know, I think your, your critique or analysis of the core paper was very interesting and no doubt. Yeah, very, very helpful. Um, but but we're looking at this in the context of the UK Gatwick, the proposed development.

00:34:37:12 - 00:34:45:27

So I don't quite see the if you like. I'm struggling to reconcile if you like these these differences.

00:34:46:15 - 00:34:53:25

You're struggling to reconcile the relationship between VPN noise levels dropping each year and Contour Air is going up.

00:34:55:14 - 00:35:01:28

I'm if if the APF says something in your own submission, says the engines are getting quieter. To put it in simple terms.

00:35:02:08 - 00:35:03:09

Um, okay.

00:35:03:24 - 00:35:16:29

Then then I'm struggling to understand why that doesn't get translated, given that you've got the, um, the the the the, um, same flight paths with more aircraft on the way that actually translate into reductions. Okay.

00:35:17:01 - 00:35:51:10

So let me let me answer that, that question. Um, the aircraft are operating generally operate for between 20 and 25 years. So what happens each year if you is about 5% of the fleet is retired, roughly speaking, on average, because we're talking about a long term situation here. So if you like, in a given year, say, 5% of the fleet are retired and they all tend, they will be the oldest ones for sure, which tend to be the noisiest ones.

00:35:51:15 - 00:36:28:00

They are replaced with a next generation aircraft, which may be 3 or 4dB quieter than the one it replaced. Typically because I think we're trying to average arrivals and departures noise. Um, and that will reduce the noise from that 5% of the fleet, which will reduce the total fleet noise level by a small amount. And the second year, the same thing will happen. The next 5% of generally oldest aircraft will retire from the fleet, and they'll be replaced with ones that are 3 or 4dB quieter as well.

00:36:28:16 - 00:36:59:09

And all the ICAO trend is telling us that the ones that they will be replaced by will actually get 0.2dB quieter each year compared with the year before. So how that flows through into leak contour areas. You can see that in any one year, 95% of the fleet is completely unchanged, which is why this trend is quite slow. So the fleet average noise level, if you like, which incidentally, is one of the supplementary metrics that we propose in our noise envelope.

00:37:00:07 - 00:37:36:05

The fleet average aircraft noise level should trend downwards as that happens, but it won't trend downwards by 0.2dB a year because it's only addressing 5% of the fleet each year. So if you look at the forecasts for the nighttime baseline, you can actually see how this technology transfer relates to contour area because in the application, if you look carefully, you if you look at the ES table, 14 .7.1, you will see that the nighttime baseline future has no growth.

00:37:37:00 - 00:38:07:01

And the reason for that is that we have the night flight restrictions, which prevents us growing in the core area. But in the baseline, the eight hour growth in ATMs is flat. So if we look at that contour area in going forward in the assessment years, we can see how that fleet transition using our updated Central Coast fleet forecast gives us a noise reduction in terms of contour area. And actually if we use a rule of thumb, we can convert that contour area into a decibel reduction.

00:38:07:08 - 00:38:45:06

And I can give you the answer of that if you like. But when you do that analysis, you do not get half a decibel reduction after five years. Half a decibels. Another five years and a half a decibel another five years, you get something less than that. And what that tells me is that using the updated central case fleet, which is what the forecast is for this airport, not 319 other airports for this particular airport have done the forecast. And they tell me that the noise reduction in terms of like noise levels will not be as much as 0.5dB even with no growth.

00:38:46:00 - 00:39:07:12

So that means to meet your noise envelope proposal, we would have to reduce flights from the 2019 level. Going forward. We couldn't have any growth. We'd actually have to reduce flights, which actually we can't do. And it's for that reason that, um, the noise limits that are proposed are not workable for this airport.

00:39:10:14 - 00:39:16:14

Thank you. Thank you for that. Um, I've got a couple of contributions, I think, in the Nigel Tennant resident.

00:39:16:16 - 00:39:37:01

I just wanted to point out we have arrived at your win. Win. If the EXR rejects the applicant's proposal, therefore, the noise will fall in line with government policy because the number of flights will reduce and the costs will also reduce. So that is the preferred government outcome.

00:39:38:22 - 00:39:42:03

Thank you for that, Mr. Tanner. Um, I mean,

00:39:43:27 - 00:39:46:15

I've got I can't always see the people in the room. I'm sorry.

00:39:46:24 - 00:39:47:28

So, Councillor.

00:39:48:00 - 00:40:05:15

Kristina Coleman from Wealden District Council, representing the Green Party. I just wanted to challenge the assumption that, um, noise was only significant in the summer months because obviously there are very significant peaks at Easter, Christmas and the half term. And I wondered what the evidential basis for that was.

00:40:10:23 - 00:40:13:24

Paul asked the applicant then to respond to that question, please.

00:40:14:08 - 00:40:23:23

Scott asked. Asked Mr. Mitchell to cover that. But in short, you're setting a control which deals with the noisiest time of the year, which is in the summer.

00:40:25:15 - 00:40:44:06

You're setting your controls by reference, the noisiest time of the year, which is the summer months. This is a straight answer. I ask him to elaborate and, um, in case there's anything further, I just want to make the two fundamental points, which I take from what Mr. Mitchell has said is that it's important to draw a distinction between

00:40:46:03 - 00:41:19:00

the fact that you will have new aircraft entering the fleet, which are quieter in any year on the overall fleet. And one cannot assume that figures which might relate to new aircraft coming into the fleet can somehow be applied to the entire fleet. Two things are very, very different, and that's what lies at the heart. Part of our part of our concerns. And the second point is to emphasise that if we have understood this correctly, the airport could not operate at levels higher than 2019.

00:41:19:15 - 00:41:47:01

And as a consequence of that, again, if we've understood this correctly, um, the airport would not accept a control and would not implement, uh, a DCO with a control in this form for that reason, because rather than conducting an exercise whereby there's an understanding of how the benefits are shared between the airport and communities, this would this simply wouldn't allow the airport to grow even in the absence of the project.

00:41:49:27 - 00:41:52:10

Thank you. I thank you for that point. Um.

00:42:00:06 - 00:42:03:12

So was there something I wanted to add? Um, from the applicant side.

00:42:05:09 - 00:42:41:13

Uh, Steve Mitchell for the applicant. Um, I think the, um, interested party asked why we set the noise limits in the summer season. We have talked about that quite extensively in written material. Um, it's a long term tradition in this country, which doesn't make it right, of course, but what you do find is when you do the research as to what's the best indicator of annoyance, it turns out to be the summer noise levels that result in long term annoyance. Um, and the best correlation with long term annoyance. Unsurprisingly, because that is the noisiest part of the year, particularly at airports such as Gatwick.

00:42:41:16 - 00:43:13:15

And what we do know is that there's no prospect of of that changing the summer will always be the noisiest part time of the year. There's also a small element of the fact that when it's warm, like today, windows are open, people are outside more and they're more affected by noise to some extent. So that's a short answer. But the research has been done over quite a few studies, and we've stuck with



that tradition. And it's a it's a it's a DFT policy that we should assess the summer 92 day average noise levels for that for those reasons.

00:43:15:12 - 00:43:46:21

I'm Scott Lonsdale because I'm conscious that, um, some time ago this started with a question from Mr. Mitchell about how these limits were supposed to, uh, operate. And perhaps I can ask them to deal with that point. Um, uh, alone, insofar as we're trying to tell whether those limits are intended to apply at particular locations.

00:43:47:00 - 00:43:53:00

And I was wondering if it might be worth just dealing with our discrete point, given that's where we started, Mr. Mitchell.

00:43:54:22 - 00:44:16:14

Steve Mitchell For that, I would like to, um. And since, you know, when I posed that question, there wasn't a clarification. I should deal with the point that it may be that the, um, XR are suggesting these should be noise levels applied at particular locations on the ground, be those measured or forecast.

00:44:16:27 - 00:44:22:00

And yes, so I'm trying to respond to that because if you ask that question, okay, I think the, um,

00:44:23:24 - 00:44:54:04

I was just trying to be clear really on whether one could express it in that way or whether the the modelling is limited to the extent that it would always need to be expressed as a contour. Um, such as you've done in the um, um, existing, um, draft echo, because in the sense I'm coming from the point of view. Well, if you could say on average the fleet would be quieter by a certain point in time, then you could at least understand how it could be shared.

00:44:54:06 - 00:45:11:21

Whereas when you convert it into a contour, it's a slightly more of a calculation which which we can't basically do without a bit more. You know, we can use a rule of thumb. I think we've read the rule of thumb in the, um, um, submissions, but, um, rules of thumb can sometimes, um, break down. Um.

00:45:12:13 - 00:45:14:09

So yeah.

00:45:14:11 - 00:45:17:25

So I'm. Yeah, that's okay. I'll come to the hands. I'll come to the hands.

00:45:17:27 - 00:45:19:14

Shall I answer the question now then.

00:45:19:16 - 00:45:25:27

So, um, so what could briefly, um, summarize the answer. Then we have a thank you.

00:45:25:29 - 00:46:04:06

So Steve Mitchell for the applicant once again. So we're dealing with the possibility of setting noise limits in the noise envelope that are measured or modeled like noise levels not contour areas. Now is that is that feasible? Does it work? How would it play out. And we're also dealing with the fact that the suggestion is that they would be always lower than 2019 by graduation each five years. We actually gave some comments on this, um, when in response to the examining question examines questions.

00:46:04:08 - 00:46:16:14

Number two, when the you asked for noise levels at  $x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2$ , Um, but I think it's probably worth expanding on it. So the first thing is, um,

00:46:18:07 - 00:47:06:05

when the northern runway opens, there will be areas that inevitably will have increases in noise. The obvious example is off the northern runway, extended runway centreline. When we begin operations there, the noise levels will have to go up before they can come back down again to some extent. So if this is a universal requirement to be quieted in 2019, at every point, if fundamental isn't achievable for for that reason, the next one might be how would you actually monitor this? What would the process behind such a noise envelope look like? You might say, have, I don't know, a scattering of noise monitoring or noise modeling sites around the flight paths under each of the routes, for example.

00:47:06:07 - 00:47:37:01

So you can check each year if the noise level under route four has gone up or down, if it's trending in the right direction, you would need them under their rivals swathe, which is a swathe, not a route. Because aircraft are vectored there, they have depending on air traffic control, they spread out um in that area or they are spread out. Where would you actually put those noise monitors? Because wherever you put them, particularly in the arrivals area, um, that's where the limit would apply, not anywhere else.

00:47:37:03 - 00:48:14:03

So there would be a tendency, perhaps for flights to avoid the noise monitors. And we've seen this on projects in the past. And fundamentally the communities would find this rather inequitable, that some places have a noise limit and other places don't have a noise limit. So these are some of the reasons why. And furthermore than that, it might actually imply that you could only use a particular route by a certain amount, which I understand. It gives the Nats en route a fundamental problem, because they can't necessarily safely and expediently manage the air traffic that's presented to them in a given day or season.

00:48:14:05 - 00:48:21:14

So there are lots of problems with suggesting noise limits at locations. Um.

00:48:24:05 - 00:48:49:11

And that's why we don't think that that's a proposition. It's also why no airport of comparable size has such a system. No airport in this country has noise limits based on location points. Um, and yes, it's not something that we think is is actually implementable. So therefore we would we would suggest contour areas of are the way to go.

00:48:49:29 - 00:48:54:25

Thank you. Okay. Thank you, thank you. Um, I've got several hands up. Um.

00:48:58:15 - 00:49:02:22

I can't, I can't. I've got Mr. Lloyd. Are you there still?

00:49:02:24 - 00:49:03:15

Yes.

00:49:03:26 - 00:49:40:05

Mr. Lloyd, for the Gatwick area conservation campaign. I just wanted to respond to a couple of points that the applicant had made. Um, I mean, first of all, Mr. Linus argued that it was not possible for in the context of this project for noise to reduce from 2019 levels. And Mr. Mitchell indeed supported that view a moment ago. He said it would simply not be achievable. Um, I think that perspective is simply wrong. Of course it is achievable for noise to reduce from 2019 levels. All that would mean is that the rate at which the airport is able to grow is constrained by the rate at which it is successful in reducing noise.

00:49:40:21 - 00:50:11:23

Um, and indeed, that's precisely what the policy says. So the aviation policy framework talks about sharing the benefits of growth, and then says this means that the industry must continue to reduce and mitigate noise as airport capacity grows. So a situation where noise reduces from 2019 levels is entirely feasible and is entirely consistent with policy. And the second and last point I wanted to make was around the lack of proposed controls in any period other than the summer.

00:50:12:01 - 00:50:46:06

Now, I think it is probably true that community annoyance is highest in the summer. Um, but but I don't think Mr. Mitchell is at all right in sort of asserting or appearing to assert that there is some kind of policy backing for only having controls in the summer period. I'm not aware of anything at all in policy, which implies that that is the right thing to do, and I think it would absolutely be the case that there would be enormous community annoyance if winter noise levels began to approach anything like the level of summer noise proposals.

00:50:46:12 - 00:51:03:22

Uh, and if this if this expansion had been approved, if the planning process had done nothing to control winter noise levels, it seems to me that is entirely an inappropriate thing to do. It's the job of this process to control adverse impacts, and it should be focusing on on doing so. In our view. Thank you.

00:51:05:25 - 00:51:10:15

Thank you. I've also got um Nicola Peel on online please.

00:51:14:21 - 00:51:19:01

Hello, everybody. Um, yeah, I am a local resident in Pilbara.

00:51:19:07 - 00:51:49:15

And my, the last few years we have seen a massive increase in a new flight path coming over Pilbara. We have an eco retreat site here where people come to escape the city and have some time quietly in the South Downs National Park. However, it is affecting my business already because every minute I have flight paths straight over the top of of our head.

00:51:50:23 - 00:52:21:25

The two questions I have. One is how are we going to mitigate or how are we going to deal with the impact in mine and many other people's mental health? I haven't really heard anything spoken about the impacts of people's mental health, but also the data on the impacts to the wildlife. If I can be woken up in the morning in my house by planes, how does that actually affect the.

00:52:21:27 - 00:52:42:05

I am right next to the RSPB. One of the most important migrating bird sites in the world. How is an increase in air traffic going to affect that? I still haven't seen any data on the impact on wildlife and the impact on local people's mental health. Thank you.

00:52:44:19 - 00:52:46:06

Thank you. Um,

00:52:48:04 - 00:52:55:10

I can't see anymore. I do have some hands on them. I think that's fine. I'll work my way around from the joint authority side, please.

00:52:55:16 - 00:53:27:27

Hi, Eddie Robinson, on behalf of the joint local authorities. Um, just following on from what Mr. Mitchell said, um, we we've also tried to interpret how, uh, the suggested noise control limits would work with a half DB reduction every five years. So the way we did that was we took the 2019 baseline contours. And, um, although we don't have access to the applicant's noise model, we try to in some way to replicate some Gatwick knowledge contours.

00:53:27:29 - 00:53:50:15

And then, uh, we took half a decibel of the 2018 values and then plotted the contour area. So, um, we've, um, we had to go, uh, just trying to see what the noise control limits would look like, uh, for the duration of the project. So, um, we'd just like to put them together and submit that at deadline eight, just for your notice.

00:53:52:01 - 00:53:54:21

That'd be welcome. That would be welcome. Yes, please.

00:53:57:19 - 00:54:00:15

Somebody else in the room, I think, wasn't there. Um, yes.

00:54:01:23 - 00:54:25:01

Um, just Councillor Coleman. Um, given that, uh, the intention is to increase long haul flights to India, China and the Far East as opposed to the bulk of flights which now go to European destinations. It's likely that the increases will take place in the winter months, much more so than in

the summer months. And so I think that the winter months should very much be taken into consideration.

00:54:26:18 - 00:54:45:08

Okay. I think I think we've covered that, um, point. Um, thank you again. Can I just, um, I think we do need to move on to the to some of the points the joint authorities made about the sequencing and the review. Um, can I just clarify something with the applicant first? Um.

00:54:48:06 - 00:54:59:27

Which is? I think it's just to go back to, um. What's the written word? The the draft DCO version nine, your rep 7006.

00:55:02:14 - 00:55:22:19

Um, if you want a moment to locate it, I'm happy to pause for a second or two. Um, but that still shows the requirement 15 at one for 6.7km<sup>2</sup> compared with the the one for 5.5. The applicant told us about the resumption of issue eight on 18th of June. Um.

00:55:25:16 - 00:55:37:21

So whereas previously the the, the noise envelope document was replicated in the requirement. The requirement has stayed at the higher level. Is that is that deliberate? I mean, is that a.

00:55:37:29 - 00:55:43:07

Steve Mitchell fabricant. If that is the case, it's not it's not it shouldn't be. So if that is an error.

00:55:43:09 - 00:55:43:24

We will.

00:55:43:26 - 00:55:44:11

Correct a.

00:55:44:13 - 00:55:44:28

Mistake.

00:55:45:21 - 00:55:47:20

We will correct it if there's a mistake. Um.

00:55:48:08 - 00:55:50:18

It's really helpful if those things could be

00:55:52:03 - 00:55:58:27

quality assured before they come to us, because that's obviously a very important point that's informed this hearing.

00:56:05:00 - 00:56:22:27

And I think, ish, you said that. I mean, I think I looked at the numbers at the time, those contour areas. Um, but 130 5.5 is a daytime one that I think is correct. And is that that was, as I recall, very, very similar to 2019.

00:56:23:16 - 00:56:58:04

So yes, the updated Steve Mitchell, again, the updated central case fleet forecast that we discussed at the last hearing for the daytime LQ 51 DB 51dB contour. It has an air of 135.5, and as you correctly point out, that is just a shade less than the baseline was, um, 13 years before it in 2019. So we are able to say from that that the daytime noise contour will always be smaller than they were in 2019.

00:56:59:06 - 00:57:01:17

That's how that clarifications helpful.

00:57:01:19 - 00:57:10:13

That that that's yeah parity if you like. Whereas I think your proposal for 2030 um

00:57:12:06 - 00:57:44:09

34 is that. No hang on for 2034. Yes. It should be one decibel quieter. Not the same as 2019. One decibel quieter. Um, um is about um, 20% of area, less so under your proposal, instead of one, two, three, five, it would have to be. I'm doing it in my head about 105. So we're way off that we have no chance of meeting your proposed one decibel reduction by 2032.

00:57:44:11 - 00:58:16:19

And if you look at the baseline forecast for 2032 without growth, you'll find we don't meet it either I think. So it just illustrates the point that the noise reduction of 0.5 DB every five years, I would describe as arbitrary. It's not based on a calculation. No one anywhere has suggested it's achievable, although it would be very interesting to see the results of the JLS modelling. And we're in a situation where what's being proposed is a is an arbitrary noise reduction or noise limit.

00:58:16:21 - 00:58:43:17

And we do have some examples of another airport that tried to do the same thing. And this was a Stansted proposal, and we have the inspector's report from May 2021 which reads in paragraph 145, noise restrictions beyond condition seven are suggested by SE, but these seek arbitrary limits with no certainty that they would be achievable. They are not necessary and not reasonable.

00:58:45:05 - 00:58:46:21

So there has to be

00:58:48:09 - 00:58:58:08

some certainty that these noise limits could be delivered. Otherwise, there's there is no planning precedent for inflicting them on the applicant.

00:59:00:02 - 00:59:02:00

which is the case that we're in today.

00:59:03:24 - 00:59:08:15

Thank you. I've got just the hand in the room. I'll take Mr. Tanner's. Um. Uh, yeah.

00:59:08:17 - 00:59:35:22

I just wanted to say that the Nigel Tanner resident, the applicant, is trying to sow the thinking that noise levels increases are inevitable. Looking at the figures, 2019 to 2022, there was a massive fall of 27% in noise levels. So we should not buy the assumption that we have to live with ever increasing noise.

00:59:38:14 - 00:59:42:17

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. Um, I think I had a hand from the authorities.

00:59:42:20 - 01:00:11:26

Thank you, sir. Lois Lane is the joint local authorities. Just very briefly, um, with the caveat that obviously the full modeling will be coming and that we don't have access to the applicants modeling systems, but we make the figure for, uh, 2034. So for the first sort of drop, as it were, a contour area of 114.8km<sup>2</sup>. So, um, according to Mr. Robinson's modelling, it is it's above the core baseline. And at that stage, it's essentially sort of tracking the slow transition baseline.

01:00:14:22 - 01:00:16:15

Thank you for that. Um.

01:00:19:24 - 01:00:28:24

Does anybody else want to talk to this particular item? Although then we'll go on perhaps to the assurance processes. RC Cagney, you've got a hand.

01:00:30:03 - 01:00:54:19

Again, just very briefly. I mean, Cagney is listening to what the applicant is saying, and our consultants will respond in due course by deadline eight. But what's clear from our consultants is that the applicant's current approach to the noise envelope is deficient in a number of respects. And so even if the applicant doesn't agree with the TSA's proposal here and the problems that Serrano have identified, for example, in Rap 7128 do need to be addressed in some form.

01:00:58:15 - 01:01:26:12

Thank you. Yes, I'm aware of those issues that you've raised in that. Um, can I come back? I'd like to come back to the authorities on what I think you mentioned sequencing and assurance, because I think we've spoken quite a bit about the, the values, which is helpful. Um, and what may or may not be reasonable, um, from the applicant's perspective, but can I invite you to go into more detail what you what you alluded to earlier, please?

01:01:27:12 - 01:02:01:00

Uh, yes. Lois Lane for the joint local authorities. Um, essentially the the concern here is that and this is moving on from, uh, paragraphs one and two in the proposed text of the requirement down to to three and onwards. Um, but the concern is that by the time uh, one reaches the end of a summer season. So the 15th of September, the current suggestion is that that an operational plan be submitted, and that then a sort of monitoring report be produced at the end of a summer season with a view. If there were exceedances to affecting what might happen the following year.

01:02:01:02 - 01:02:38:00

And our concern essentially is that because of the mechanics of how slots are allocated, by the time one gets to the 15th of September, it's too late to do anything about the slot allocation for the following year, and it would in fact be a sort of relatively tight turnaround to do anything about the allocation for the year ahead of that. So essentially it's it's simply a matter of timing. Um, and we would suggest that there needs to be some kind of mechanism built into the requirements such that any potential exceedances are dealt with sort of two years in advance rather than than one year in advance.

01:02:38:04 - 01:03:20:22

Um, in terms of of how that might be addressed, um, we'll put again, we can put more detail, uh, in on this in writing at deadline eight. Um, we've previously, as part of our environmental growth growth managed framework submissions suggested uh, made submissions on on QC budgeting systems, um, as a potential option for dealing with these kinds of sequencing issues. That's rep 5093, and the applicant did respond to those in reps 6093 and push back on the idea of mandatory QC budgeting, but noted that QC budgets might play some kind of role in informing capacity declaration and slot allocations.

01:03:20:26 - 01:03:35:21

Um, at this point, we are sort of take the view that the logic of the examining authority's suggested criteria for monitoring sort of tends to suggest some kind of, of quota account budgeting system. Um.

01:03:38:13 - 01:03:38:28

Pardon me.

01:03:43:21 - 01:03:45:23

Thank you. That's all. We need to hold it for the moment.

01:03:45:25 - 01:03:51:06

Okay, fine. Um, just the applicant wants to respond to anything they've they've heard. I think it might be useful.

01:03:51:08 - 01:04:27:28

Yes, it's Martin Jarvis. On behalf of the applicant, I think we've recognised that there are practicalities in terms of the time it takes to analyse the previous summer season, for that to be put in a report to be reviewed and verified, and that that possibly will run past the next declaration window. For that very reason, it's why we've proposed the forward looking envelope we have that always looks five years ahead. For the same reason we've proposed that that starts two years before the northern runway project opens, because then you're always predicting the amount of flights and therefore the amount of noise from the northern runway after three years of operation.

01:04:28:00 - 01:04:51:09

And by having that rolling five year looking forward forecast, you will always be identifying problems before they arise. So it will be, in fact, more than two years before the problem arises that you will be addressing it. It will be ideally five years or four years. There are circumstances where



there could be actual breaches, and we've previously addressed that in other submissions, in particular in our action points response to issues in appendix A to that document, sir. Thank you.

01:04:52:24 - 01:05:11:08

Scott Lang applicant I think part of the problem we have with not only the point that has been made by the JLR, but the apparent approach to these limits is that it effectively jettisons that five year forecasting approach that we have sought to develop through the noise envelope process.

01:05:14:17 - 01:05:30:24

Is there anything else on this? Because I'm. I think I'd like to move on. Um, I think I've covered most of my points in a rather haphazard way, but I think I'm grateful for the contributions. Oh, there is more. There is more from one authority side.

01:05:31:06 - 01:06:00:06

Louise Condon for the joint local authorities. And just to clarify, I think we we welcomed the approach to two year advanced forecasting that was put forward in 687. And I think what we'd like to see in the proposals for the modification to the requirement is something in the operating plan definition that specifies the components that may be built on the good work that was in that paper. And then I think that would go a long way to addressing our concern about the sequencing.

01:06:03:24 - 01:06:05:00

Thank you. Scott. Scott.

01:06:05:10 - 01:06:37:25

For the applicant, I mean, the welcoming of our latest work is itself, um, welcomed. Of course, that was prepared to apply to our own noise envelope. And we're interpreting that intervention with the Glas as welcoming the approach that we're now taking to our noise envelope, given that extra work that we have done. So we, um, we welcome it and we, we understand from that that the glas now, uh, treat that as a positive element of our noise envelope proposal.

01:06:42:09 - 01:06:49:27

And Mr. Mitchell just has one extra comment on on QC, given that that was mentioned in the JLS response as well.

01:06:50:09 - 01:06:55:27

Would it be appropriate, sir, to comment on the usefulness of QC forecasts? I'm happy.

01:06:55:29 - 01:06:57:09

For you to respond to that.

01:06:57:11 - 01:07:30:09

Point. Yes. So Steve Mitchell, um, I'll try and keep it brief. So QC is a measure of the noise emission level coming out of the back of the aircraft, not the noise level arriving on the ground in service. The first thing is, um, they're about three decibels wide, so they're not very accurate. And when the CAA carried out a quota validation study at Heathrow, the reference is cap 1869. In 2020 they found that various aircraft were not in the right QQ band when you actually measure them on the ground.

01:07:31:18 - 01:08:04:03

That's the first point. So she's not accurate in that sense. The second point is I got three points. Um, it doesn't incentivize operational procedures, which are one of the strands of the ACO balanced approach. So if an airport develops with its air traffic control provider, a quieter way of flying the aircraft so it makes less noise on the ground, that gets no credit in the QC system. And the obvious area is of arrivals, where we know there are better and better ways to fly arrivals more quietly.

01:08:04:06 - 01:08:37:11

Those benefits which this particular airport are studying, um, they've had a six month night noise trial going on earlier this year pursuing ways of reducing arrivals, noise, those the benefits of that kind of study, um, would not show up at all in a QC budget. So we don't think it's a good incentive at all. And finally, just dealing with this relationship between QC budget forecasts and contour area, which I think we are alighted on, the fact that contour area is a good measure of the noise impact.

01:08:37:29 - 01:09:13:14

Um, we heard that the Luton um, expansion project has, has been talking about that and they themselves deposited a paper and the reference is, um, 8.36 the noise envelope improvements and worked examples. And they studied the correlation between QC and contour area over the last five years. And they noted that during the, um, night time, the correlation between contour area and QC was about 0.961 being a perfect match, it was rather good during the nighttime.

01:09:13:16 - 01:09:54:05

However, during the daytime, sorry, that was during the daytime. However, during the night time the squared correlation was 0.86. Not so good and in fact between 2017 and 2018, if you had done a forecast based on QC, the QC went up but the contour area went down. So I just put it to you as a matter of acoustics that you were probably, as an examiner qualified in acoustics, understand, if you see what I mean, that QC is a rather blunt forecast of noise emission on the ground or noise emission on the ground.

01:09:54:07 - 01:10:06:12

And it's for those reasons which are summarized in appendix 14 .9.5, that we don't think QC is the right way to incentivise a good noise envelope performance for this airport.

01:10:07:09 - 01:10:50:01

Scotland is just a place that, in the wider context of what the Glas glas position is. And there are deadlines. Seven documents on the m g uh, approach. It's rep 7-102, paragraph 7.24. References made to the proposal to commence the monitoring of noise on the AMF r process for the noise envelope, two years ahead of the NRP operation, as we now propose. And it said there that assuming that process is rigorous and effective and separate point about LGAs, this would address many of the Jelas concerns regarding the effectiveness of the noise control regime.

01:10:51:15 - 01:11:20:00

So I'm grateful that that has been confirmed today. But if that's the case, then it underlies why we feel mystified that the jails are now suggesting that the approach that's included in this jazz recommendation is now necessary in circumstances where the amendments we'd made, our noise

envelope process, um, had addressed many of their concerns regarding the effectiveness of the noise control regime.

01:11:23:01 - 01:12:04:04

So so can I just. Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities to respond to that. Obviously there is a danger of taking things out of context. You have got all of our representations. You can quite clearly see the overarching position that the JLR have taken as to what we think are the effective controls. Within that context, we have obviously looked carefully at what the applicant has said in various documents and where they've said something which is positive. We have sought to welcome that, but it would be quite wrong for you taking our representations and reading them properly as a whole to cherry pick, which is effectively what I think Mr.

01:12:04:06 - 01:12:37:26

Lynas is seeking to do a particular element and suggest that that therefore is a change of our position, or that that is somehow inconsistent with the position that we're adopting. Uh, in terms of our comments on your, um, uh, suggested noise changes. Um, and obviously we can pick up on some of the detail points that, uh, have been, um, made this afternoon. Uh, but in, uh, in terms of just one matter of puzzlement on our part, uh, we do notice that what Mr.

01:12:37:28 - 01:13:18:12

Mitchell has just been saying, uh, about, uh, um, QC budgets and his phraseology of a blunt tool, but obviously that needs to be seen itself in the context of what the applicant put forward in Rap. 6087, which is their response to the actions arising from issue eight on noise, where at paragraph 4.1.3, as part of their explanation to reassure the EXR of what would happen in the event of a breach to bring the airport back into actual or forecast compliance.

01:13:19:11 - 01:13:50:02

The author of that document, at paragraph 4.1.3, expressly referred to the introduction of QC quotas and allocations for airlines to limit an airport to seasonal total total QC as a proxy for the noise envelope. So one needs to read everybody's comments in context. And we would obviously we know that you have seen everything and will read it all together. But we will say we will address some of Mr. Mitchell's comments in our, um, uh, responses at deadline eight.

01:13:50:08 - 01:13:50:23

Thank you.

01:13:52:14 - 01:13:55:18

Thank you everyone, I think oh, sorry. Mr.. Do you want to come back on that?

01:13:55:20 - 01:14:41:15

Just very briefly. No dispute that everything has to be read in context. And when you look at that reference to QC and are in the dock and that Mr. Bedford mentioned, you'll see that it's adopted as one of a range of potential measures that would be open to the airport in order to ensure that it kept within the limit. By contrast, don't need to take much time in at nine. But if you look at paragraph 7.24, as I've suggested, the only qualification there is that the Jlab are continuing to believe that their EMG proposal is effective. We understand that, but then it simply goes on to say that, as the words I've

mentioned at the new proposal would address many of the JLA concerns regarding the effects of the noise control regime, and we invite you to read that paragraph in the context of everything else and reach your own conclusions.

01:14:45:19 - 01:15:04:06

Is there anything else anybody wants to say on this before we move on? Um, obviously you can comment on on these things in writing at deadline, and I think that'll be helpful. And as much information and evidence to support any positions you wish to take would be valued by us. Um,

01:15:05:27 - 01:15:07:23

so given the time, um.

01:15:10:18 - 01:15:19:05

I'm going to. Well, I'm inclined to press on to see if we can. If we can, um, complete noise.

01:15:21:08 - 01:15:22:26

I realise it's 1645.

01:15:24:12 - 01:15:26:06

Sorry about our question. Yes.

01:15:27:00 - 01:15:58:09

Yeah I agree. For the joint local authorities. Um, just to go back to noise contours for, for a moment, I mean, we've had a lot of information about aircraft fleets, and that's been, uh, well received, but we've never had any information about aircraft noise levels that underpin the noise contour areas in combination with the aircraft fleets. So, we've consistently requested this data in the form of sound exposure level, uh data and EI Max data.

01:15:58:11 - 01:16:30:16

So for example, in the West Sussex County Council statement of Common Common ground, which is 1033, we've we made this request and we've made it consistently throughout the examination process. We have not received any data today. Uh, other than, uh, some details on the Boeing 737 800, which was received in rep. 5079 mm. So if I could refer to the CIA's document, the minimum standards for Aircraft noise modeling, which is cap 2091.

01:16:30:21 - 01:17:02:15

They say that aircraft making up 75% of the total noise energy should be verified against local noise measurements. So we've continually requested for this information in the form of the noise wandering locations and the cell and max noise measurements, along with the predicted noise levels from the noise model. So we can understand the uncertainty, uh, from the noise contour area outputs. Um, so we would like to see this information from the applicant.

01:17:03:16 - 01:17:06:01

From the applicant respond to that please.

01:17:10:03 - 01:17:44:21

Steve Mitchell for the applicant. So, um, Mr. Robinson will remember during the topic working group, we had the CAA come in some time ago and explain the noise model and give some examples of the SQL and the EI Max noise levels that are the exact ones you're asking for. For some of the most common aircraft. Um, and they also explained how the. The environmental research and development can um and consultancy department OECD um validate those measurements by measurement every year.

01:17:45:07 - 01:18:16:04

Uh because of the 20 or so noise and track keeping monitors that are around Gatwick airport, The majority of those feed into the OECD and they analyse that painstakingly. And I know that because I used to work there about 20 years ago, and they use those measured levels to validate their noise model every year. And when you look at the annual noise monitoring reports, it describes if they had to recalibrate any of the aircraft at all, perhaps they shift it by a fraction of a decibel because of the monitoring results that they find.

01:18:16:11 - 01:18:42:12

That's the process that the Ka goes through. Um, the databases that sit behind that are in fact confidential to the CIA. But you will be familiar with the Badr database that exists in the ADT noise model, which is a similar thing to it. So you'll be familiar with, um, the noise emission levels that can be used in these models. And I'm sure those are the ones you've used for your own noise modeling.

01:18:47:08 - 01:18:48:22

Do you want to come back on that? Uh.

01:18:49:18 - 01:19:05:10

Um, yeah. I mean, the, uh, the noise data was used to validate the noise model. Uh, it my point of view is incredibly important to understand the noise content areas, and we simply request this data be provided. That's so.

01:19:06:05 - 01:19:22:10

Thank you. I think that and this was misunderstood, that I think that plays into my theme of earlier discussions was, which was about the fundamental, how noisy the airplanes and how that is fed into this and how we have confidence in the the trends. If you like, I'm going.

01:19:22:12 - 01:19:22:27

Steve.

01:19:22:29 - 01:19:23:14

Mitchell.

01:19:23:16 - 01:19:53:08

For the applicant. Just very, very briefly, the reason that Gatwick Airport Limited chose the civil aviation authorities, OECD department to do this noise modelling is because they're a world leader in this area. They carry out noise modelling for all the many of the major airports in this country. When I was there, I modeled noise levels at Luton Airport, strangely enough, many years ago. Um, they're a world leader in the research, in modeling.

01:19:53:10 - 01:20:40:23

And there. And convoy's model is recognized globally as a very accurate noise model. And as I just explained, they don't sit idly on that sort of pinnacle. They actually monitor thousands of data points every year to recalibrate the model. Now, I'm sorry that the database is it's under that because they did ask them is confidential and cannot be released to you. But we did show you examples of it, and they did explain the process. And given that they are commissioned by DFT amongst other people to do research and carry out noise modelling as the Civil Aviation Authority, I would hope and I certainly hoped at the beginning of this entire process, that the one thing we wouldn't be arguing about in these hearings was the accuracy of the noise model.

01:20:41:02 - 01:21:18:00

This is the best noise model because it's best calibrated for this airport, and the JLR advisers will know how difficult it is to really do that calibration, particularly on a commercial basis. The CA do it on an on an annual basis previously for the DFT. Um, they've modeled noise at Gatwick for, I think, at least 20 years. I forget when they started, it used to be done for the DFT under the Department for transport funding. More recently that shifted to the airport, so I'm as confident as I could possibly be that it is the best noise model for Gatwick Airport.

01:21:18:02 - 01:21:25:18

So I, as I say, apologise. We can't release the database, but I'm quite sure it's the most accurate model we can have.

01:21:28:01 - 01:21:31:05

Thank you. I think I've got perhaps one final note.

01:21:31:09 - 01:21:52:06

Nigel Tanner, resident. That's outrageous. The applicant can't assert that an authority is independent when that independent has already been questioned, and then say, we're not going to release any of the data and also fail to respond to the JLS persistence request. That's simply unacceptable.

01:21:56:19 - 01:22:08:00

I don't know if anybody wants to respond to that, but if they don't, I propose we adjourn and we continue this tomorrow. Given that we're now time is now 1652 and this hearing is adjourned. Thank you very much.