



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Gatwick Airport Northern Runway
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) - Day 3 - Part 7
Date:	01 August 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_1st Aug_ISH9_PT7

Created on: 2024-07-31 16:17:14

Project Length: 01:35:08

File Name: Gatwick_1st Aug_ISH9_PT7

File Length: 01:35:08

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:09 - 00:00:36:26

Can everybody hear me clearly? Thank you. Can I confirm that the live streaming of this event has commenced? Thank you. It's now 10 a.m. and time to resume this issue. Specific hearing nine. In relation to the application made by Gatwick Airport Limited, who we will refer to as the applicant for an order granting development consent for the Gatwick Airport northern runway project. Yesterday we considered items 3 to 4 on the agenda. Today we shall be addressing item five. Um, just before we move on to these items, just the usual housekeeping matters that I need to deal with.

00:00:38:04 - 00:01:14:01

Firstly, could everybody please set all devices and phones to silent? Um, there are no fire alarm tests or drills scheduled for today, so in the event of a fire alarm, please exit the room. And the evacuation assembly point is outside the hotel main entrance. Toilets are located on this floor on the ground floor. Car parking charges won't apply to anyone attending this meeting, but any issues please contact hotel reception or the team and when using the microphones, please ensure their position close enough to your face. In addition to this in-person event, the hearing is taking place on the Microsoft Teams platform and is being live streamed and recorded.

00:01:14:03 - 00:01:51:10

For those persons joining online, you may switch cameras and microphones off if you're not participating specifically in discussion. If you wish to raise a question, please raise the Microsoft Teams hand function and when invited to turn your microphone and camera on. We'll look to take a break at around 1130. Break for lunch around 1 p.m. and if needed, we will also take an afternoon break around 315. Close the hearing no later than 5 p.m.. Yesterday I promised to read out, um, yesterday's action points. Um, you may be relieved to hear that it's no longer required, as they were published around half an hour ago, so you don't have to deal with any more of my dulcet tones.

00:01:53:00 - 00:01:56:18

Um, the same applies today to, um, jackets.

00:02:03:26 - 00:02:08:11

Okay. Are there any questions at this stage about the procedural side of today's resumed hearing?

00:02:10:28 - 00:02:17:12

Nope. Okay. We'll now commence our agenda item five, and I'll pass to Miss Cassini. Thank you.

00:02:18:18 - 00:03:00:23

Thank you, Mr. Hockley. So if we look at agenda item 5.1, which looks at compliance with paragraph 4.5 of the airport's National Policy statement, I have noted both the applicant's and the JLR responses to EC2 SE 2.12 and the examination reference numbers for the two responses are up 791 and seven 110, and I am also aware of the content of other documents, such as the planning statement and various submissions into the examination in respect of the socio economic assessment, it still appears that parties are quite a distance apart with respect to this issue.

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

I do not need either party to rehearse your responses to EC2 SE 2.2 in full, but I would like to get your views on the proposed developments. Compliance with paragraphs 4.5 of the amps in respect of the assessments undertaken to inform the Environmental Statement chapter for socioeconomics, which is EP 42. So I'd like to turn to Mr. Bedford first in this instance, please.

00:03:35:15 - 00:04:16:17

Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford, joint local authorities. Madam, in terms of paragraph 4.5 of the Airports National Policy Statement, obviously to be read in the context of the preceding paragraph 4.4, um, and, um, the issues that are of concern, uh, to the joint local authorities, um, within paragraph 4.5, it draws attention to the need for um, economic benefits and adverse impacts to be considered at national, regional and local levels.

00:04:17:00 - 00:05:09:14

Uh, and two points, first of all, to make about that aspect. Uh, in simple summary, there is a disagreement between us about the adequacy of assessment at local level, which you're aware of a disagreement about what properly is a local level, um, and the position that we've now arrived at at this stage of the examination is the applicant has provided within the material supporting, uh, the environmental statement, the raw data at district level, which obviously you've seen and have referred to, but no analysis or assessment of that raw data, um, as to what the implications are at the local authority level.

00:05:09:27 - 00:05:56:01

And we think that that is an important omission from the assessment of economic effects, positive or negative. And if I can just give one example as to why we think it's important. Uh, certainly if you take at a local level, let's say a district, a district such as Crawley, and you take an area of the local economy which currently, um, uh, provides relatively low paid, uh, employment, let's say, within one or other of the care sectors, whether that's childcare or whether that's adult care.

00:05:56:27 - 00:06:27:24

Uh, if there is the provision of, um, significant new employment opportunities, which are higher wage opportunities being provided at Gatwick. Obviously, for the individual people concerned, it's a good thing that we should have people moving to higher wage employment. But there are implications then for the labour market and the availability of labour to supply what are important jobs within the local economy and particularly in the caring sectors.

00:06:28:02 - 00:06:58:03

Now, obviously, if you look at a wider pool as your study area for the assessment of those effects, you may say, well, within the bigger area, uh, the amount of, um, as it were, employment being created at Gatwick is relatively modest compared to the churn within that wider area, such that there's unlikely to be a material effect, um, which would be a negative effect on labour market. That doesn't apply when you come down to the smaller areas.

00:06:58:12 - 00:07:31:16

Um, and yet we don't see from the applicant's material analysis of how that works through. Uh, we think that there are reasons for being concerned about those issues because of what we think will be the local pressures, particularly on, um, I say areas which are dependent on lower wage jobs, to provide the economic services they do provide. So that's the concern. But we then come to the position of where are we in the examination because we've made that point repeatedly.

00:07:31:18 - 00:08:01:29

We know the applicant hasn't responded positively to it. And we we come to the position that realistically, with only deadlines eight and nine to go, um, it's not going to be practical, uh, or at least practical and fair for new information to come in from the applicant now, because it's unlikely to come in at deadline eight. And if it came in at deadline nine, it would be effectively too late to allow us to meaningfully consider it and respond to it.

00:08:02:10 - 00:08:35:12

So we think that there are two sort of consequences of that. One, which I touched on very lightly. Now is a point that we will deal with in our closing submissions. We do think it then goes to the weight that can be given to benefits, the economic benefits, because if there are aspects of the economic assessment which have not adequately taken into account negative impacts, then that has to temper the weight that can be given to positive impacts. So that's a I say that's the point we can cover in our closing submissions.

00:08:35:14 - 00:09:15:27

But then practically we know that there is further work being done in relation to the employment skills and business strategy and its implementation plan. We did receive, uh, late yesterday evening, I think, from the applicants on an informal basis. some further detail about thematic plans. But we've already discussed yesterday, uh, our concerns that there is a need, really, to treat ISPs as it is at the moment, effectively as an outline plan, which will then come forward with more detailed plans for approval by the local authorities post consent.

00:09:15:29 - 00:09:32:25

And we think that the what we've seen is the omission in the assessment work to date in terms of local level impact assessment is capable of being picked up through the further work that would follow

00:09:34:21 - 00:10:19:21

in order to support an implementation plan and targeting which sectors of the local economies may need measures taken to ensure there are no adverse impacts, and what steps can be taken to encourage employment in particular areas or other areas, and so on. So we think the situation is from a, as it were, an s assessment point of view, I should say. We're not saying that this is an omission from the

ES, which would be of a magnitude that would mean that it doesn't qualify as an environmental statement, so that it would be, as it were, a legal proficiency.

00:10:19:23 - 00:11:02:17

But we do think it's a shortcoming in the adequacy of this, all of it. And therefore that goes to the weight that you can give to benefits. And we see that in practical terms given where we are now in the examination, that it really is ensuring whether it's done by a requirement, which we talked about yesterday or through the section 106 securing the ESB as the detail that comes forward post consent will be the way in which this issue then has to be grappled with, and we would expect it to be grappled with and therefore we would expect to have a consenting role in that, to ensure that it is properly grappled with at a post consent stage.

00:11:02:19 - 00:11:48:01

So that's the that was the local issue within paragraph 4.5 of the. And if I can just briefly mention, uh, the national uh issue, uh, I have matters been looked at appropriately at the national scale? Uh, and you'll be aware, uh, again, it's been a recurrent theme in our, uh, representations in terms of the, uh, over assessment of, uh, the, um, benefits, the aviation benefits at national level, because what we say are methodological, um, errors in the approach that's been taken to the treatment of, uh, the, uh, the Gatwick growth.

00:11:48:10 - 00:12:20:05

Uh, to what extent it's new growth and to what extent it's substitution of, uh, people otherwise flying in from other using other airports at present, but then would substitute to Gatwick. And that's been played out in a number of the representations. But again we say that, as it were, it's not been remedied by the applicant in any material to date. It plays out in terms of the weight that you can give to their benefits, because we think that the benefits have been overestimated, um, for that reason.

00:12:20:13 - 00:13:08:14

And then, um, the third uh, issue, uh, on uh, paragraph 4.5 is that it goes on to indicate that Secretary of State will have regard to the manner in which such benefits are secured and the level of confidence in their delivery. And that, um, I say chimes with the need to ensure whether it's done by requirement or whether it's done by section 106, that there is a strong enough mechanism to lock in what would be any benefits delivered by the scheme? Um, so that's that's how we see the, uh, these employment socio economic issues bearing on, uh, paragraph 4.5.

00:13:08:24 - 00:13:09:09

Thank you.

00:13:10:02 - 00:13:16:00

Thank you. That was very useful. Before I turn to the applicant, is there anybody else who'd like to make comment on this agenda item?

00:13:18:08 - 00:13:20:03

Nope. Yeah. Mr. Tanner?

00:13:21:22 - 00:13:48:27

Yeah, I'd like to. Picking up on the point that you raised yesterday. Like to start asking some questions that maybe the examining authority would like to consider about when the social funding appears. because I believe there's a strong indication that it needs to start now.

00:13:51:01 - 00:14:26:27

And I believe it should come from two forms, one in step with the investment in any future investment by the applicant, and also from the footfall of people using the airport, and I believe that should be set at 10%. Now to outline my reasons for saying that, I'm looking at the plan of the runways and one of my concerns is the emergency runway if a plane fails to achieve takeoff.

00:14:26:29 - 00:14:52:18

It, to my mind, either embeds itself in aircraft waiting to move on to the tacked onto the takeoff ways, or ends up in the south terminal. Now, apart from the obvious concerns there, there would be a major incident and the fire authorities would attend and start pumping.

00:14:54:19 - 00:15:37:21

Fire retardant onto the scene of the catastrophe. Now, my point is, and it hasn't been addressed by the applicant, and I did raise it last time, is that we know from around 2000, there was an issue with the water treatment center and its inability to cope with the de-icing material coming off aircraft. The applicant now wishes to increase the number of aircraft and therefore the amount of de-icing material will increase, but that Thames Water is staying at current state.

00:15:38:25 - 00:16:20:13

The sewage and treatment plant can't cope and it certainly can't cope with future usage. Now I'm going somewhere with this. Now if you have a major incident with fire retardant, you will have even more pollution. And if you reference 2005, the Bunce Field disaster, which was aviation fuel, it's highly explosive. It took out a warehouse wall half a mile away. So you're talking about in an incident like this or possibly a major explosion? Interestingly, at Bruntsfield, they realised they'd got a problem and addressed the fire by emptying a lake.

00:16:20:15 - 00:16:56:26

And then after two days, when it reignited, they left it to burn. Now, given the catastrophe, we're looking at the authority fire authorities would be compelled to completely cover the whole site continually with fire retardant. Now, all of that is then going to drain down and arrive at the sewage and treat water treatment statement, because that's what it does now. And that's where the problem is. And if you look at every submission, there is a massive drainage problem.

00:16:58:17 - 00:17:29:11

If you allow this to go ahead, that drainage problem will increase and it will be full of dangerous, toxic material that will be waiting to make its way into the far side, into the water supply. So where is it? Barnes Field. They realized they were going to cause the catastrophe as they carried on. And as I said, in the end, they left the fire to burn. This whole conversion plan aisle to

00:17:31:01 - 00:17:33:19

turn the emergency runway into.

00:17:33:21 - 00:17:46:08

Mr. Tanner, I'm very sorry to interrupt. This is does this have relevance to the agenda item in terms of compliance with the amps. Yep. Thank you. You'd like to continue then.

00:17:46:18 - 00:18:18:11

So what we need to address all these issues. And the issue that the, um, JLR have raised is we need a Gatwick environmental authority that will take governance be created under the funding from what I suggested, because at the moment JLR is saying they will not be in a position to assess whatever whenever the information arrives.

00:18:18:13 - 00:19:01:09

And actually what we're dealing with is a problem that the examining authority is being asked to assess something without the data. And there needs to be a bridging point the economic, the the environmental authority needs to be established now to start to vet the data so that the JLA or any other authority like Charnwood or wherever, that are not getting a say, if you like, so that they can start to assess a real, proper, well thought out proposal rather than the mixture of we might do something this and we might do that, that the examining authority is being asked to look at.

00:19:01:11 - 00:19:54:01

So what I'm saying is to make this proposal compliant, there needs to be a middle step to start now under an examining authority. And you've heard you've heard the applicant say, we don't think this needs mitigation. This doesn't matter. We don't want this monitored. We we. We will not accept that there will be enforcement of penalties. And yet, when I drive up the motorway, everyone accepts that as norm except the applicant. So that's my comment to the JLA or anyone else cannot reasonably pursue this forward without a much more rigorous examination of the data in order that when an application, if an application goes to the Secretary of State, it is actually sound, viable, reasonable and understood.

00:19:54:03 - 00:19:54:22

Thank you.

00:19:55:01 - 00:20:00:18

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. Did you get an opportunity to look at the community funding I made reference to last night.

00:20:00:20 - 00:20:08:16

I did try and look. I was sent a link. I asked for a link, but I didn't locate the information. So now.

00:20:08:18 - 00:20:15:24

Okay, well if you if you do have problems and you do wish to find it, if you could speak to one of the case team and they will assist you.

00:20:16:06 - 00:20:17:04

Thank you very much.

00:20:17:06 - 00:20:20:15

Thank you. Is there anybody else who wish, Mr. Popey?

00:20:23:09 - 00:20:25:15

Thank you. Good morning, Sally Pavey for Cagney.

00:20:25:29 - 00:20:47:11

Um, we would just like to reiterate the document we submitted at deadline one on, um, employment, skills and affordability of local housing, which I appreciate we will come on to, but we do address all the areas that Gatwick identifies, where staff will come from and the lack of workers, and we don't see that being addressed at all. Thank you.

00:20:47:29 - 00:20:50:21

Thank you as anybody else before I turn to the applicant,

00:20:52:06 - 00:20:53:05

Mr. Linus.

00:20:53:25 - 00:21:34:12

Uh, Scotland. As for the applicant. Um, I don't need to address anything that's been said by Mr. Tyler. Or not least, the card need points, which I was recognized will come up later in the agenda. Um, as far as the Glas position is concerned, I'll make some introductory points and then hand over to Mr. Jones to deal with the local situation. Uh, and then Mr.. Um, hunt my right to deal with, um, the national opposition. Um, starting point to paragraph 4.5 refers to impacts being considered at national, regional and local levels.

00:21:34:22 - 00:22:33:09

And in terms of the policy itself, uh, dealing with the local point. I think our first submission would be that that paragraph refers to local levels, not specifically local authority levels. So we don't think that there is a policy issue here. Um, as far as the approach taken by the applicant to local levels is concerned, they shouldn't be conflated in policy terms. And secondly, um, that has been identified, um, at various points within statements of common ground, We've highlighted to the Glas, and it's been recognised that data has been provided to show information at local authority level, and we're not aware of submissions beyond the principles that have been received since then to indicate that the JLR disagree with the figures and we don't understand it to be any alternative analysis placed before you by the JLR, which take those which take those figures.

00:22:34:00 - 00:23:08:12

And third point is, on that basis, we just don't accept the proposition that the weight to be given to economic benefits should be reduced because of the alleged failure to assess matters at local levels, the assessment within the EIS entirely adequate for its purpose. There's no policy issue, um, either, and there simply isn't any case for you to justify reducing the weight that should be given to the benefits that we've assessed, not least because the local authorities have not advanced any positive evidence to counteract it.

00:23:09:00 - 00:23:44:18

Um, as far as points are made regarding the um, SMEs, um, both generally and with respect to paragraph 4.5, I don't need to repeat what was said before. The SBS is under discussion whether in a section 106 context or requirement context with the Glas, including the matters of detail that need to go into that. I understand the meeting is going to take place and we can we can take up points of detail, generally with the Glas in that, in that meeting, in that context, I can hand over to Mr.

00:23:45:01 - 00:23:55:06

Jones, just to explain briefly the position on the local assessment, and then I'll ask after that, Mr. Hunt, to deal with the national position. Thank you.

00:23:58:15 - 00:24:32:13

Thank you. Kieran Jones, on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the local authority level assessments question, I think we would start by reminding everybody that the ES chapter 17 app oh 42 does specifically refer to paragraph 4.5 of the airport's NPS. It does so at paragraph 17 .4.7. So, um, we were very much cognizant of that, um, in defining the approach to the assessment that was undertaken, uh, for submission purposes.

00:24:32:15 - 00:25:03:14

And as Mr. Linus has already alluded to. Um, that paragraph refers to those assessments being undertaken at local level. It does not say local authority level. And that is clearly a very important distinction. So we would certainly refute, therefore, that the absence of a local authority level assessment in any way could be regarded as an omission from the assessment that's been prepared, or even, as Mr. Bedford described, actually a shortcoming.

00:25:03:20 - 00:25:44:25

Um, it is neither of those things. Um, and we believe that paragraph 4.5 isn't is not intended to be prescriptive in that way. If we consider it in the context of the guidance set out in the annex to Pin's advice. Note seven, 2017 on preparing Environmental assessments. And ma'am, we refer to that in our Q2 submissions. But just in summary, that requires that the extent of study areas should be established in accordance with recognized professional guidance and best practice whenever this is available and determined having regard to the extent of the likely impacts.

00:25:44:27 - 00:26:20:19

So again, no specific reference to that. That must include local authority areas. Um, so very much against that backdrop, we um, in the assessment cite the relevant provisions of the planning practice guidance on functional economic market areas and housing market areas. That was something that we discussed at ish three and have set out in other submission. So I won't repeat the specific elements of those here, but those are, if you like, some of the guidance that is available to us on some of the topics that we are considering as part of the socio economic, uh, assessment.

00:26:21:15 - 00:26:56:22

Um, so taken together, we say the approach and continue to say that the approach taken in the assessment, that is to adopt a number of different study areas that are related to the likely nature and extent of the effects being considered is entirely appropriate, and is consistent with the expectations of both the amps and also the relevant pins guidance. But it is perhaps worth me also going further to say

why we think the use of effectively arbitrary local authority boundaries for such an assessment would not be appropriate or meaningful.

00:26:57:02 - 00:27:34:22

And this very much goes to the heart of the process we've been through with the joint local authorities thus far, um, particularly trying to apply those boundaries in the highly interconnected location that Crawley is, and it's very well established interdependencies with surrounding areas. And just to, I suppose, illustrate what that point on the ground looks like, so to speak. For example, of the 80 or so thousand jobs in Crawley, only around 37,000 of those jobs are filled by Crawley residents.

00:27:34:24 - 00:28:13:04

Or, to look at it the other way around, only about 65% of Crawley residents actually work in Crawley. So it illustrates that really that effectively measuring things against local authority boundaries is not a reflection of true reflection of how the labour market, housing market and other sectors in this area are generally operating. And indeed, in that context, it's important to highlight that the Crawley Borough Council's own evidence for local plans over many years has highlighted, and indeed made a virtue of Crawley's role within this wider geography.

00:28:13:07 - 00:28:46:07

So, for example, the Local Plan housing topic paper states taken as a whole. The towns within northern West Sussex complement one another, offering housing opportunities for the local population and workforce for each stage and socioeconomic position within lifestyles, and providing housing for employees working at Gatwick Airport, Manor Royal and within and beyond the Gatwick Diamond. This highlights a critical interdependence and reliance between areas with regard to housing and economic growth.

00:28:46:09 - 00:29:27:27

And those are the words of Crawley Borough Council. Now, notwithstanding all of that, um, as Mr. Bedford has accepted, um, we have been entirely transparent in providing the, quote unquote raw data, if you like, and what the potential impacts could be down to the individual local authority level. And I think it's worth saying in relation to that, that firstly, those figures which have now been available for for some time have not been the subject of any meaningful challenge or significant dispute, as far as we can see in the submissions that have been received.

00:29:28:16 - 00:29:58:22

And similarly, those figures have not been used as the basis for any alternative assessment being offered. That would suggest a different conclusion from the one that we have drawn. Now, today is the first time we are hearing about the specific issue in relation to the health and social care sector that has previously been mentioned in submissions, and the potential competition for labour or otherwise, in relation to low paid jobs.

00:29:58:24 - 00:30:32:20

So we're not at liberty at the moment to comment on what that might mean and what the Glas might be considering in relation to that. What we would observe, however, is that that contention does run counter to some of the arguments set out in the Glas local impact report, where, for example, quote unquote, the authorities note that many of the new jobs at the airport will be lower paid. So our

position or the position of the joint local authorities in respect of this particular issue is, to our mind, less clear.

00:30:33:17 - 00:31:05:25

And it continues to be or appears to be, uh, evolving. Uh, finally, I should recall that and as we stated in our Q2 response, um, a further topic, working group on socioeconomic matters. It has been arranged that is taking place next Tuesday, the 6th of August, at which I'm sure that we will continue to discuss at that point, and indeed other points arising today with the local authorities. That process is very much continuing in parallel to this.

00:31:08:02 - 00:31:21:24

Thank you. Just just before you move on, can we revisit the local level definition? If surely local level includes local authority level.

00:31:23:19 - 00:31:29:02

If not, can you explain to me what what your definition of local level includes?

00:31:32:17 - 00:32:04:22

So? So we would say there is no fixed definition of local. Effectively, the definition of the area that is local has to have regard to the nature of the effect and the receptor that's being considered. And so within the socioeconomic assessment, there are a range of different assessment areas considered depending on the nature of the effect that is being appraised. So and that is based on the evidence available about what those interrelationships between areas are.

00:32:04:24 - 00:32:43:19

The way in which, for example, labor would be sourced in terms of filling jobs at Gatwick, in terms of the nature of any population and housing effects and so on and so forth. So effectively, it represents what the functional on the ground reality is, insofar as data allows us to understand that. And it's very clear from our assessment that if you were to take the Crawley, uh, administrative area, that would not be a good fit with the reality of how socioeconomic effects materialize in this particular location because of the interconnectivity that I referred to earlier.

00:32:45:07 - 00:32:56:00

Thank you. But surely the definition of local. Sorry if I'm going back on myself, but surely the definition of local level would include local authorities.

00:32:57:28 - 00:33:30:15

Scotland applicant not necessarily mum. Local level is a term which hasn't been defined specifically to, say, local authority level. Therefore, there is flexibility in the approach that can be that can be taken. Um, it's a matter of assessment, bearing in mind the purpose of paragraph 4.5 is to allow for uh, consideration of impacts if those impacts are properly considered at a local level, which is not local authority level, the purposes of the policy are achieved.

00:33:30:17 - 00:34:03:04

Conversely, if looking at effects at a local authority level will not allow impacts to properly be considered and the purpose of the policy would not be achieved. And as as Mr. Jones mentioned,

when guidance is taken into account as to what should be done as far as assessment generally is concerned, it is focused on looking at effectively the functional relationships and how and how markets operate. And we say it's entirely within the scope of the term local levels for that to be done outside specific local authority areas.

00:34:04:12 - 00:34:15:19

Thank you. Before we move on to your next colleague, Mr. Bedford, do you have anything to add to that? Because, Mr. Lyness, by your very own admission, there hasn't been a definition of what local level is.

00:34:17:15 - 00:34:55:21

The Scott Linus for the applicant, the term local level isn't specifically defined within 4.5, which means that the term itself has to be applied by reference to the flexibilities inherent within that term. Uh, no specific definition has been provided to say, for example, it's local level. So it's a matter of judgment as to what local level means in the circumstances of any case. We say applying that to this case and bearing in mind the purpose of 4.5, which is to allow a proper consideration of impacts, uh, entirely consistent with 4.5, that ought to be done at a local, functional, uh, market level.

00:34:56:08 - 00:34:58:19

Thank you. Mr. Bedford. Do you wish to add anything?

00:34:59:14 - 00:35:32:15

Thank you, madam. Uh, Michael Bedford, joint local authorities. I think what we would say, uh, is that what the paragraph is intending to capture are all effects at all scales. And it uses, uh, the, uh, as it were, hierarchy of national, regional and local, um, as to how local is, uh, local in terms of how fine grained the analysis needs to be, I think we would accept that it is not prescriptive.

00:35:33:08 - 00:36:14:23

Um, but we would say that the starting point, certainly in terms of the expectation of a hierarchy expressed national, regional and local, the starting point is you would expect local to embrace local authority level. There may be circumstances where that isn't apposite, but you would need to demonstrate that, not assert it. And the problem for the applicant is that although the applicant has provided raw data at local authority level, the applicant has not carried out any analysis or assessment of that information in terms of its implication at local authority level.

00:36:14:25 - 00:36:47:13

So the applicant actually isn't in a position to say to you that there's nothing in that data that is meaningful or would change the outcome of the assessments we have carried out at a higher tier, because the applicant hasn't done that work. So it remains the case that there is a shortcoming or omission in the applicant's work, and the applicant obviously isn't proposing to change its position, which leads to the consequences that I referred to earlier in my earlier remarks.

00:36:48:16 - 00:36:49:05

Thank you.

00:36:50:17 - 00:37:22:17

Scott. The applicant thank you. Well, I'm grateful for the JLR accepting that that term and paragraph 4.5 Isn't prescriptive, but even on their At task, which is that someone must show why it's appropriate not to carry out an assessment at local level. We say we've done that because it's necessary to look at the functional relationships that occur in any market. As Mr. Jones has explained, and that's exactly what's been done in the EIA. So even taking up mr.

00:37:22:19 - 00:37:50:11

Bedford's test at we pass it. As for the allegation that we haven't assessed the implications of the raw data at local level. As I said, that date has been with the JLR for some time now. It hasn't been disputed, and they haven't come back to assess that. There's anything that they see in those figures, which is somehow alter the work that we have, that we have done. We say that needs to be taken into account as well.

00:37:52:26 - 00:37:54:28

Now, anything else I can ask Mr. Hunter?

00:37:55:10 - 00:37:56:05

No, that's fine, thank you.

00:37:56:07 - 00:37:56:28

Thank you very much, ma'am.

00:37:58:17 - 00:38:01:03

Sorry. Mr. Gunn Jones apparently has another point. Thank you.

00:38:02:09 - 00:38:48:09

Thank you, ma'am. Sorry. Mr. Jones, on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. I mean, I think just to reiterate two points on that. Firstly, guidance, including Pin's own guidance requires those assessments to be, um, the level or determined based on having regard to the likely extent of impact. So there is no prescription around that having to be at a particular local authority level. And as I mentioned earlier, the very unique nature of the way that authorities in this location work in terms of relationships on housing, employment and so on, means it is incredibly difficult and effectively pointless to try and isolate what the effects within an individual authority area would be.

00:38:48:11 - 00:39:19:09

But the information on what those effects is has been provided. And to take, I suppose, Mr. Bedford's example around the, um, uh, health and care sector as one example. It'd be very difficult to assess the effects on that particular sector, if that was the question that was being asked of us within Crawley, because so many of the workers in that sector in Crawley will commute in from other locations, which essentially illustrates the point and the difficulty of trying to do it based on purely arbitrary local authority boundaries.

00:39:19:11 - 00:39:38:19

So whether it's in relation to guidance or whether it's in relation to the practical reality of what we see in evidence of how this particular economy and area functions both lead to the conclusion that the

way that we've assessed, we've approached the assessment is the most robust approach to take. Thank you. Thank you.

00:39:41:18 - 00:40:20:15

Thank you. Andy Hunt for the applicant. Um, I think on on the point of the ESB s and its ability to deal with this issue, I think, you know, we're in agreement with the jazz on that. Um, there is a substantial amount of people who aren't currently working both within Crawley and across the wider labour market area. Um, and it is the intention that the SBS will effectively allow us to grow that labour pool by and um, providing training and giving access to jobs, um, such that people who are not currently working, um, would be able to to access work.

00:40:21:01 - 00:40:57:24

Um, we've, um, submitted this before, but the emerging the draft Crawley local plan has a formula for a training contribution contained within it. And if you put our scheme through that formula, the contribution would be of the order of £800,000. Now, what we're proposing is clearly significantly bigger than that. So, you know, we're confident that what we're proposing within the SBS and the fund, um, of course, the fund is intended to go significantly wider than just that point. Um, but that the fund is definitely kind of big enough to be able to deliver what would be a local policy compliance, um, situation.

00:40:58:09 - 00:41:32:20

Um, it's probably worth saying there would of course be benefits even without the ESB. So it's not that the SBS is required to see all of the economic benefits. That would still be the aviation benefits in terms of routes, connectivity, choice, fares, etc. there would be local jobs. There would be jobs that would go to local people without any intervention. Um, and there would be more tourism and inward investment. What the ASB's allows us to do is enhance that and target it so that the share of benefits that go locally are increased, and so that things like inward investment and tourism promotion are boosted, uh, through that fund.

00:41:32:22 - 00:42:05:23

So it's a means by which those benefits are enhanced. And it's important in dealing with those labour market, um, issues. And, you know, our shared objective to bring unemployed people back into work. So I think we're broad will obviously there's an agenda item on this, will, but I think we're in kind of broad agreement around that and that it is capable of dealing with any such issues that might arise, as Mr. Bedford has set out. Um, I'll deal briefly with Mr. Tanner's point and then return to, uh, the National Assessment and then hand over to Mr.

00:42:05:25 - 00:42:22:15

Meaney, who is online. Um, in terms of the community fund, it does scale with passengers, uh, as, as you're aware. And then just picking up the point on social value, I'm not quite sure about the where the 10% of social value comes from.

00:42:24:15 - 00:43:02:13

The intention is that when the public sector awards contracts in the awarding, in the scoring of those contracts, 10% of the score is to the social value that they're offering. It's not that 10% of the contract goes into social value. So um, that just to be clear on that, that, uh, the social value 10% is about how

things are scored in public sector contracting. Um, and then returning to the, uh, the national benefits. Um, obviously in the, in the needs case, we have both the oxy era um tag assessment and the Oxford economics work.

00:43:03:02 - 00:43:35:06

Um, uh, they obviously deal with national benefits and forecasts differently. Um, and the Oxford work is really focused on the runway capacity and the delta with and without the scheme. Um, so to the extent that any of the sensitivity tests and, uh, issues that have been raised around that are focused on the delta, Um, then, um, you know, those benefits, uh, arise from that. Um, and, um, as I say, I'll hand over to Mr.. Mainly to say more about the, uh, the tag assessment.

00:43:35:08 - 00:44:06:12

But, you know, as we've set out, there are challenges, um, to how that's applied in the aviation context. Um, and we've sought to be conservative in how we've done that and present a balanced position, um, such that there would be or the, you know, sensitivity changes test would go in either direction. Um, and that we believe that, uh, you can place weight on that assessment, but I will hand over to Mr.

00:44:06:14 - 00:44:08:28

Meaney who's online to say more about that.

00:44:14:25 - 00:44:18:00

Thank you. Can everyone hear me in the in the room. Okay.

00:44:18:17 - 00:44:19:21

Yes, Mr. Meaney.

00:44:20:02 - 00:45:04:03

Okay. Thank you. It's it's Andy Meaney for for the applicant. Um, yeah. So so talking about the, uh, tag, uh, based assessment. So this is, uh, the Department for transport appraisal guidance. Um, and in particular, it's its aviation guidance. Um, we've used this, uh, not because this is a context in which the public sector is, is spending money and you're testing the, the value for money of alternative schemes, uh, which is is what tag is therefore but really to, to provide, um, examine the authority with uh, an understanding of how the benefits weigh against the costs for the scheme.

00:45:04:18 - 00:45:35:27

Um, it's important to note that, um, uh, strictly speaking, the tag assessment is about the public sector spending money. Whereas, of course, in this case, the private sector will be spending money. Um, nevertheless, we have included in our, uh, net present value calculation that the cost of uh, delivering the the NRP um, that there's an argument as to whether that that should be included or not, given the, um, the costs are being born entirely by, by the private sector. Um, as as Mr.

00:45:35:29 - 00:46:16:16

Hunt alluded to, um, we've arrived at a net present value figure that's that says the the benefits exceed the costs of the scheme by £21.6 billion. Um, and I think it's it's important for the panel to, to understand that we've done that on, on a balanced way of if you see what I mean. So we we could have, um, put in an MPV that was larger than that, um, because of, um, benefits that we've not

included or because we've taken some quite conservative assumptions in assessing what the benefits of the NPA relative to the costs.

00:46:17:00 - 00:46:49:20

Um, there will also be scenarios in which the NPV will be lower than that. But we think that, um, by using that that figure, the analysis that we've done, uh, we are able to demonstrate that that benefits exceed the costs quite, quite considerably. Um, and that, you know, this is an uncertain, uh, procedure using the tag appraisal. But on balance, we think that that is a roundabout. The, the right number that we've included in, in the application.

00:46:50:10 - 00:47:24:10

If I can move on to, um, displacement. Um, I know there's been lots of discussions around traffic forecasts and I'm not the traffic forecast expert. So I think it's worth, um, saying that, but I think it's, it's worth making, um, a few points, which, you know, so to the extent that the traffic forecasts that we've used, uh, to generate the, the NPV of £21.6 billion, um, to the extent they already account for, um, displacement.

00:47:24:18 - 00:48:00:10

Uh, so passengers that would, uh, have generated these benefits anyway. Um, which is what we're trying to, uh, discuss in this context. Um, so we, we think that the traffic forecasts do reflect displacement, um, and, and displacement is, is limited to, to some extent anyway. Um, if you look at the, uh, some of the evidence that's been put forward by the applicant around overlapping catchments between different airports, uh, in the London system, um, and also the fact that a lot of those airports are congested at the moment.

00:48:00:17 - 00:48:30:24

Um, a lot of the benefits that we identify are associated with reducing congestion as a result of the NRP. Um, so to the extent that people can't fly at the moment due to congestion, then we think that we are capturing the benefits from releasing that capacity constraint in the London system within our analysis. Um, so, you know, short, short answer, I guess, is that we, we think that we have adequately captured displacement in the analysis.

00:48:31:14 - 00:48:32:00

Thank you.

00:48:32:28 - 00:48:49:16

Thank you, Mr. Meaney. Just before you go, you mentioned that not all benefits have been included in the tag assessment, if I heard you correctly. What? What are these benefits and why? Can you expand on why they haven't been included, please?

00:48:50:08 - 00:49:29:14

Yes. So so there's a, um, there's a range of benefits which haven't been included. Um, I believe they are listed in the report, but I don't have the reference to hand, I'm afraid. But we can provide that separately or in a minute. Um, so for for example, there are some benefits that are, um, limited in our assessment because we've taken a conservative approach. Um, for example, the, um, uh, as part of the

assessment, we have to make an assumption about the profits that airlines will make in, in general over the, over the assessment period.

00:49:29:29 - 00:50:12:24

Um, we've assumed that we're would be 2%, um, if you increase that to, to 5% and there's there's benchmark evidence of, uh, of what that would be, then they would be. So the NPV would be quite considerably increased by around about £3 billion. So that's benefits that we've included. But where we've taken a conservative assumption, there's other benefits where we have, um, uh, excluded them even though we've quantified them because we think there's a risk of double counting. So for example, we've got, um, benefits arising from increase in trade, uh, of around about £4 billion, um, which would again add to the 21.6 billion number.

00:50:13:07 - 00:50:48:18

Um, but we've excluded them because we're not sure whether or not including them would lead to double counting. Um, and then there's a category of other benefits which we have, um, not been able to calculate due to the, uh, due to the way in which the, the traffic, uh, forecasts that we're relying on have been put together. Um, so, for example, when we were working on, uh, an admittedly, it was a long time ago when we were working on the Airports Commission assessment of a second runway for Gatwick Airport.

00:50:48:20 - 00:51:21:15

As I said, ten years, ten years plus ago, um, we looked at benefits from increasing competition as a result of, uh, Gatwick growing and providing competition to other airports, and indeed to. To the airlines operating in the London system. Um, and those benefits were themselves substantial of the order of um, you know, 15 to 20 billion. Uh, now very different scheme, but but you can tell that there are benefits that we could have included and for various reasons haven't or partially included.

00:51:21:25 - 00:51:34:29

Um, and which would increase the MPV NPV quite substantially. Um, and so, you know, bearing all of that in mind, we think that this is this is quite a balanced assessment in terms of where we are at the moment.

00:51:36:06 - 00:51:44:26

Thank you. That's really helpful. In your written submissions. Can you just signpost to me? I think Mr. Meaney said it's already detailed. Can you just signpost that to me? Yes.

00:51:45:25 - 00:51:58:29

Thank you. I understand it's, uh, the report is app up to five one and the conservatism that have been mentioned. Table A, 2.1.5 and 2.1.6. But we'll confirm that in the written note. Man.

00:51:59:25 - 00:52:05:11

Thank you. That was very helpful. Miss Linus, do you have anything else to comment on that agenda item?

00:52:07:24 - 00:52:11:17

Thank you. We'll move on to agenda item, madam Clerk.

00:52:11:19 - 00:52:29:00

Sorry. Just ask Michael Bever, the joint local authorities, specifically on some of the material that Mr. Meaney was rehearsing? I think it would just be helpful to invite Miss Congdon if she had any particular comments on what was being said. Um. Thank you.

00:52:30:00 - 00:52:30:16

Thank you.

00:52:30:22 - 00:53:04:23

Louise Congdon, for the joint local authorities, I think, as misdemeanors identified the fundamental difference between us relates to the treatment of displacement from other airports. So ultimately, as has always been made clear in our submissions, it's really a forecasting question as much as an economic assessment question. But there are consequences for some of the economic assessment that go beyond simply the displacement point in that it relates to some of the benefits, competition, benefits, airfare benefits, and how they're calculated.

00:53:04:25 - 00:53:17:04

If you take a different view on displacement. It means you need to take a different view on some of the actual, more detailed calculations within the assessment. And that's something we've been pointing out since 2021.

00:53:18:26 - 00:53:21:28

Thank you. Mr. Linus, is there anything you'd like to comment on?

00:53:22:17 - 00:53:26:17

I'll ask Mr. Minaya if he wants to respond to that point.

00:53:30:10 - 00:53:48:14

Um, thank you, Mr. Mooney, for the applicants. Um, I don't think there's anything particularly further. I would, I would say I mean, certainly, um, the the point about displacement, I, I've attempted to, uh, respond to in, in my remarks already. Uh, I don't think there's anything further to add to that.

00:53:49:24 - 00:54:20:14

Thank you, Mr. Meaney. I'm now going to move on to agenda item 5.2. This looks at whether the jail is considered as a need for any additional controls in respect of socioeconomics, over and above. That's already been set up by the applicant. Mr. Bedford, we discussed requirements, obligations and control documents in yesterday's hearing. But following on from that discussion And I've noted the concerns expressed through our examination in respect of some aspects of the social economic assessments.

00:54:21:22 - 00:54:43:26

Are there any additional controls considered necessary by the jailers? Now, I know the applicant's response to this. I'm not guessing what you're going to say, but I am probably second guessing in respect that no significant adverse effects have been identified other than those that they are already mitigating. But I would like to hear your views on this particular aspect, please.

00:54:44:29 - 00:55:19:18

Thank you madam. Michael Bedford, joint Local Authorities I won't obviously rehearse the discussion we've had about the ISPs, um, and its content, but that is obviously an area where we think there is more work that needs to be done. Um, the housing, uh, fund is a separate item, uh, on your agenda. Um, and that's a matter which we will come back to again. We are currently not, uh, in agreement with the applicant on the approach in relation to that.

00:55:19:20 - 00:55:51:06

And then I think the only other element which I think has been the subject of, uh, discussions, partly through the discussions on ISPs, but partly through section 106, is the way in which the application addresses visitor economy and tourism. Uh, affects, um, that um, has been raised by us. I mean, I don't think it's one of our most, um, major areas of concern, but it is something which has been the subject of, uh, uh, engagement.

00:55:51:08 - 00:55:56:15

And I think we're not yet at the same position as the applicant on how that's being dealt with.

00:55:58:04 - 00:55:58:19

Thank you.

00:55:58:21 - 00:56:28:06

Mr. Lyness asked for the applicant. Um, I don't need to add to that. Beyond the recognising that, um, discussions are continuing. Uh, insofar as reference has been made to further obligations to deal with terrorism matters, including a terrorism fund. Um, our position is that we haven't seen any evidence to justify that beyond the provisions that are made more generally in the um, section 106. But as Mr. Bedford has noted, discussions are continuing.

00:56:29:17 - 00:57:00:05

Thank you. I move on to agenda item 5.3. This looks at the progress made between the parties regarding the ISPs. And I do appreciate that we've touched on this yesterday and today, but it is um, I think that was more about the securing mechanism. Um, it is evident from what Mr. Bedford said yesterday and, um, from various submissions into the examination, particularly in the Pads document, that there are outstanding issues between the parties.

00:57:00:07 - 00:57:35:07

So I'm going to turn to you, Mr. Bedford first. And a number of the local authorities have requested more tailored initiatives, um, which align and support local communities and needs. I just want today to understand I'm now aware that there is another meeting being planned on this. If you could just give me an update as to how discussions are progressing in respect of these issues. And also there were concerns about performance, financial management, monitoring and reporting mechanisms which were requested to be included into the implementation plan.

00:57:35:17 - 00:57:48:23

Um, if you're able to cover that, I'd be grateful. And if there is anything specifically that is missing from the implementation plan, I would be interested to hear.

00:57:49:14 - 00:58:41:09

Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford, joint local authorities. I'll bring in in a moment. Uh, Mr. John Howells from Aiken, who has been assisting the joint local authorities in relation to the discussions on this topic. Um, obviously I did rehearse, uh, yesterday a number of areas where we had outstanding concerns. Uh, there are, um, the ongoing discussions. Uh, one of the issues, which I think we did touch on briefly yesterday in the, um, ASB's implementation plan, is in its current form, there is a reference to thematic plans, but I think in terms of the information that the examination has at the moment, you have a specimen form which has no content.

00:58:41:21 - 00:59:15:02

Uh, late, I think yesterday afternoon or early evening, uh, we were provided informally with the applicant on a specimen content for a thematic plan, which was helpful to receive. I won't say too much about the helpfulness of the timing. It wasn't helpful to receive it this late in the process, because it has been something which has been the subject of discussion quite some time. We are looking at that, but it is, I think, fair to say that we can see it.

00:59:15:04 - 01:00:14:29

It's a step in the right direction. It's beginning to provide the sort of content that we think will need to come forward. Um, and, uh, say there are some further meetings. We would hope to make some, um, progress during the rest of the examination. But I think our, as it were, um, end position is we think it is then critical uh, that uh, whether it's by requirement or whether it's by section 106, uh, the documentation post consent is subject to approval by the local authorities so that that more detailed level of information and whether it's measures, whether it's initiatives, whether it's scales of funds, whether it's the direction or target areas, whether it's dealing with what's within the fund and what's dealt with by Gal outside of the fund.

01:00:15:01 - 01:00:32:00

All of those matters where there are still outstanding discussions, they do need to be tied down, but we can see that that's probably going to be in a post consent documentation. So that's our overall position. But I'll bring in Mr. Halstead if he can provide anything more. By way of of update.

01:00:33:23 - 01:00:51:03

Thanks. Uh, John Howells with the joint local authorities and not not a great deal to add to what Mr. Bedford has just outlined. Um, the we welcome the receipt of the, um, the example plans and they're broad and fairly comprehensive in detail. Um, having only received them, um, yesterday.

01:00:51:05 - 01:00:56:24

Sorry, Mr. Howes, could you just bring your microphone? It's. The air conditioning is directly above us. Thank you.

01:00:57:12 - 01:01:32:16

Um, yeah. We're just just to recap on what I just said there. We're we're reviewing the the the information submitted within the thematic plans. Um, that are pretty comprehensive. Um, there'll be some comments that we'd probably like to make regarding refining some of the, um, the, the, the, the general content. Um, particularly in relation to indicative outputs. Um, some questions around the

remain around the, the the funding. Um, the Mister Bedford has already already touched on. Um, but but yeah, we we we reiterate the we see these as a step in the right direction, and we look forward to discussing and discussing them in further detail with the applicant.

01:01:33:26 - 01:01:49:29

Thank you. I think Surrey County Council requested a route map showing process from ASB's to the implementation plan. Has this been delivered to yourselves? I don't think I've seen.

01:01:52:13 - 01:01:55:12

Uh, John Harris with the applicant. Uh, no, not not not not received as yet.

01:01:56:01 - 01:02:01:06

Okay. Before I hand over to the applicant, is there anybody else who wishes to comment on this agenda item?

01:02:03:14 - 01:02:04:27

No. Oh.

01:02:05:28 - 01:02:21:19

I'd only like to thank the applicant for confirming what I was trying to assert yesterday. That these proposals will lead to a massive increase in traffic, and they have confirmed what they seem to be unsure about yesterday. Thank you.

01:02:22:24 - 01:02:26:06

Returned to the applicant. Um.

01:02:28:28 - 01:02:43:28

Is there anything else you wish to add? From what you've heard in terms of progress that's been made? Because obviously it is important that the content of the mitigation is meeting the requirements of the local community in which it is obviously going to be delivered.

01:02:45:02 - 01:03:18:14

Scott Lyons for the applicant. Um, a couple of points. First of all, we welcome the recognition. This is a step in the the right direction. We've worked hard to try and address concerns raised by at the Glas. And secondly, we don't quite accept the characterisation that's being provided on health for late stage. This has been part of a process that's been lasting over the last six months or so, and we provided some additional information last night confirming our commitment to them, but I think doesn't quite capture the process that's been followed.

01:03:18:16 - 01:03:56:06

I said it's all been received at a late stage. Um, next, the approval process that Mr. Bedford mentioned, I think that's under discussion. It's a matter it will be raised at the next meeting between the parties. We've heard what has been said, and we think that can be developed through further discussions next week. Certainly the point raised by Surrey County Council, we understand they are invited to the meeting. Um, and that can be that can be addressed through further discussions. We anticipate finally there just to confirm, um, the um ESB s is not seen as mitigation from our point of view.

01:03:56:25 - 01:04:08:15

Um, to address, uh, impacts relating to employment benefits. I just want to clarify that without going over what was said yesterday, but we don't regard it as mitigation to address effects which which require mitigation.

01:04:09:00 - 01:04:20:23

Thank you. My wrong choice of words. But I'll take the point. Um. the thematic plans that were submitted, will we be able to have sight of those?

01:04:23:11 - 01:04:25:15

Let's go. Line up the applicant. Yes, ma'am. Deadline is.

01:04:25:21 - 01:04:47:01

Thank you. I'd like to move on to agenda 5.4, which looks at housing. Um, Mr. Bedford, before we move on to this issue. Has there been any change in respect of the, um, housing emergency declared by Crawley Borough Council earlier in the year?

01:04:48:24 - 01:05:05:17

Thank you. Michael Bedford, joint, uh, local authorities, uh, in terms of its status, uh, there has not been, uh, any change. But in terms of what we see as its, um,

01:05:07:16 - 01:05:53:22

significance, uh, we are continuing to experience, uh, pressures, uh, particularly on, uh, local authority, uh, accommodation, uh, demands. And we'll provide the more detailed figures in the post hearing submissions. But you'll remember from our previous discussion at an earlier issue when we dealt with the issue of temporary accommodation and we drew attention to the high numbers of out of borough temporary accommodation placements that Crawley was in particular experiencing, because obviously it has its statutory duties in relation to certain homeless persons.

01:05:54:00 - 01:06:31:06

But it was increasingly finding that the only way in which it could make provision for accommodation for those persons was not within the borough itself, but out of borough. That pressure is continuing, and our current indication is that so far this year, um, as at, I'm told, 23rd of July of 2024, we have already placed 185 households out of borough. So if that trend continues, it would set to exceed, uh, the level of out of borough placements in 2023.

01:06:31:08 - 01:06:40:28

So in other words, the pressure is being maintained and continued. Uh, and if anything, it's growing. But I said we'll provide information so on.

01:06:41:00 - 01:06:49:05

At the in your closing statements. Could you also provide me with an update of that situation.

01:06:49:07 - 01:07:08:15

So as well as near as possible to the data being available to 21st of August, we will do that. I have to say, I don't know, uh, on what frequency that data is collated. So it may be that there is by 21st of August, there might not be any more data than there is a deadline.

01:07:08:21 - 01:07:10:06

That's fine. Just the most up to date.

01:07:10:08 - 01:07:37:12

But we, we we will, as it were, register that point and and respond accordingly. So I say there hasn't been any change to the status of the housing emergency, but the will provide um, uh, as much further information as we can as to the current state of play. Either at deadline eight, uh, if that's when the data relates to or will update it at deadline nine.

01:07:38:29 - 01:07:57:14

Sorry. A request was made at the very outset of the examination. I think it's paragraph 18.3 of the joint West Sussex Local Impact Report. Regarding that the applicant explores a the possibility of providing temporary accommodation. Does that request requirements still stand?

01:08:00:11 - 01:08:30:21

It does. Sorry. Michael Bedford, joint local authorities, it does, uh, in the sense that what we, uh, we see is that is one mechanism that would be available to the applicant in order to address housing pressures. Um, there has been, as I think you know, some discussion in the section 106, uh, negotiations about the question of a housing fund.

01:08:31:09 - 01:09:08:03

Um, and I think the, the local authority's position is that we're not prescriptive as to which measures or mechanisms are taken up by the applicant to deal with matters so that, for example, if the applicant was to provide funding to enable the local authorities to deliver housing and particularly temporary housing, that would be a route if the applicant didn't want to do that but could make direct provision, then that would also be, uh, a route.

01:09:08:15 - 01:09:40:05

Um, I say we we're not seeking to prescribe which mechanism ought to be used, but what we are seeking to achieve is an outcome that requires the applicant to address what we do see as an issue. And I know, obviously, there's a debate between us and the applicant about whether there is an issue there. I don't now rehearse where we set out previous submissions about that, but we've made points in a number of our earlier representations.

01:09:40:07 - 01:10:06:07

But I think, uh, we're not we're not seeking, as it were, a requirement, uh, that uh, uh, would require the applicant only to deliver through direct means. I think we're amenable to it being dealt with through indirect means as well. Uh, and that could be via a fund through the section 106 or indeed, a fund secured by a requirement.

01:10:07:07 - 01:10:15:25

That was going to be my next question as to how you saw the housing fund, the content of the housing fund. But you you've you've answered. You've answered. Yeah.

01:10:16:01 - 01:10:51:06

I think what we are, uh, intending to provide, um, is, um, obviously we've got these discussions on the section 106, which we had a site rehearsal of that position yesterday. Um, it may be that matters on housing fund matters are successfully resolved through the section 106 negotiations. But if they're not, we would be putting forward a requirement that would then require the arrangements for such a fund in order to deliver the mechanism.

01:10:51:08 - 01:10:56:00

So that would come forward to you as a requirement. And I think we will provide that at deadline eight.

01:10:58:03 - 01:11:03:04

Thank you. Before I turn to the applicant, does anybody else wish to comment? Cagney.

01:11:05:28 - 01:11:40:27

Thank you very much, Sally Pavey for for Cagney. Um, we just wanted to touch on the housing fund, and, and I refer back to our document that was submitted at deadline one on the housing shortage and obviously the housing emergency. Um, we hope to be able to provide, um, complete data on the issue in Sussex alone to illustrate how, um, significant this is. And it's not just a Crawley issue. Um, the housing fund would be welcomed, but the biggest issue is that Crawley has no land to build on.

01:11:41:11 - 01:12:14:18

Um, and so the burden falls to other areas, and they also, um. Excuse me, um, are struggling to find land to build affordable in terms of low skilled workers requiring a housing. That's almost what we would refer to sometime goes council houses, because what is affordable now we are saying is, is too expensive for those low paid workers. And unfortunately, from the figures we see from Gatwick, that seems to be what is going to be attracted with the new jobs.

01:12:14:20 - 01:12:16:20

Um, for a new runway. Thank you.

01:12:16:22 - 01:12:20:05

Thank you. Will you submit that information at deadline eight?

01:12:20:07 - 01:12:21:07

We will. Thank you.

01:12:22:24 - 01:12:55:22

Um, I'd like to turn to the applicant. Now, I am aware of your position in terms of temporary accommodation and that, um, the construction workforce would not be expected to play a significant additional pressing pressure on demand for private rented accommodation. Um, but please correct me if I'm wrong, but in terms of non home based workers, I believe that you state that at peak this would equate to to 270 workers, non home based workers.

01:12:55:24 - 01:13:27:25

So that would be 270 people potentially looking for accommodation. And the GLA is accept that it's not the role of yourselves to manage the housing crisis that has been put in writing. And I do note the findings of the Socio-Economic assessment in respect of this issue. But by the very fact that you are introducing individuals into an area where there is a housing crisis, there will be additional pressure, pressure put on the local infrastructure.

01:13:28:17 - 01:13:58:12

Um, so my question is, do you think that the housing fund would assist in this issue and also has the possibility of temporary accommodation being considered by the applicant? As I'm sure you're aware, the provision of temporary accommodation is not unusual on large scale projects. The likes of Sizewell, Hinkley, different projects, I accept, but they are large projects. I'd just like to hear your views.

01:13:59:24 - 01:14:11:08

Scott, for the applicant, I'll ask Mr. Hunt to kick off and dealing with that response, please. And then hand on to Bethan Haynes. Thank you.

01:14:12:23 - 01:14:46:17

Thank you, Andy Hunt for the applicant. Um, if I deal with the points you've raised first and then kind of loop back to some of the broader points. We've assessed 270 very much as a worst case scenario. If you look at the city's data on the number of people who stay away from home, it's 5 or 6%, not 20%. We've then also tested all of those choosing private rented sector accommodation, and we know that won't be the case as well. So this is we are not saying there will be 270 people who will choose private rented sector accommodation.

01:14:46:19 - 01:15:04:01

What we're saying is if 270 people chose private rental sector, private rented sector accommodation, then this would be the level of demand and then we've assessed the capacity against that. If, uh, you look at um.

01:15:05:16 - 01:15:20:00

the. So I just got the reference. Um, it's rep 3082, and there's a figure in there which is the construction workforce profile. Um.

01:15:22:12 - 01:15:56:04

You can see from that that the, the 14 of the 1350 numbers reached only very, very briefly. We've got two periods where we're over 1000. One is about ten months, the other was about 12 months. That again mitigates against people using the private rented sector, because they won't be on the project long enough. So there will be significant use of bnbs and other forms of short term accommodation. It isn't that this will all go into the PRS. We've simply tested that, uh, as a worst case scenario, and we're satisfied that that wouldn't lead to significant impacts.

01:15:56:23 - 01:15:57:08

Um.

01:16:02:09 - 01:16:33:27

In terms of what's in front of us now. We don't think there is evidence that a relatively small number of workers seeking to use accommodation would directly lead to homelessness issues. Um, and the evidence from Hinckley, um, suggest that the market does respond through providing spare rooms, etc., etc.. So it isn't that there's a kind of fixed supply of housing with respect to, um, the provision of accommodation by the project.

01:16:33:29 - 01:17:06:14

And you may recall that I gave evidence on this at the side site examination. Um, they are of course very, very different projects. That's an 8000 construction workforce in a district that has in an area which has about 37,000 construction workers. So it's much more reliant on a non home based workforce, where you were talking about 6000 of the 8000 being non home based here, we're talking about a couple of hundred maximum in reality probably significantly less than that. Uh so it's a very, very different circumstance.

01:17:06:16 - 01:17:44:21

There is a much, much larger supply of existing construction workers and a much, much larger supply of housing. Um, so, uh, the Sizewell and Hinkley proposals, it's rural, it's coastal. There aren't the workers and there isn't the existing accommodation. And we don't think any of those things apply here. So, um, we're very concerned about proposals. And what's in the, uh, Glas proposal is a requirement to fund 280 additions to the dwelling stock, effectively permanent solutions for, uh, an overstated taking on most conservative, uh, assessment.

01:17:45:03 - 01:18:15:13

Um, so we don't think that's justified. There's reference to need in the operational, uh, phase as well. And again, I think they're taking our estimate that some people who will work on the project will also live in affordable housing. We're not saying that's new demand. That's people already in the district already in affordable housing. So we don't think there's a case for a fund that seeks to increase the supply of permanent housing in that way, because of the scale and because of the, the temporary nature.

01:18:16:02 - 01:18:16:17

Um.

01:18:19:27 - 01:18:23:27

I think that's probably as much as I will say. And hand over to the saints.

01:18:26:14 - 01:19:00:10

Uh, can you hear me? Okay. Yeah. Uh. Thank you. Um, so, Bethan Haynes for the applicant. Um, so Mr. Hunt has provided a bit of background about the amount of non home based construction workers that are expected for the project. Um, the evidence that was submitted by the applicant, um, undertook an assessment of the capacity in the private rented sector, um, which showed that there were over 4000 vacant bed spaces. So at its peak, and at a worst case scenario, the number of construction workers represents less than 6%. And as Mr. Hunter's alluded to, that assumes they all live in the private rented sector, which is unlikely to be the case.

01:19:00:26 - 01:19:31:27

Um, in issue specific hearing three, the JLA specifically requested that the applicant update this assessment because at the time it used 2011 census data, and in the period the 2021 census data came out, um, the applicant, uh, undertook its assessment. Um, the JLS didn't raise any issues with the methodology, so the applicant simply replicated its approach with this new data. And what that found was that essentially the PRS capacity had basically doubled within the last decade across the authorities that we looked at for non home based workers.

01:19:31:29 - 01:20:02:19

So, um, the, the number of, uh, bed spaces had gone up from 4000 to 11,000. So this means that the circa 200 non home based workers has gone down as a proportion of the vacant stock from 6% to just 2%. And even then, that still doesn't consider the other potential sources like, uh, B&Bs, hotels, other forms of short term accommodation that construction workers might choose. So notwithstanding that, the applicant's view originally was that there was not likely not likely to be an impact.

01:20:02:21 - 01:20:34:00

When we updated our assessment based specifically on the date of the JLo's requested, that showed that the impact, if anything had gone, had been even further lessened. Um, I might just, uh, turn to the point that the jazz, uh, raised specifically Crowley in the local impact report about its own quarterly review of right move data. Um, and CBC essentially says that its review of its own review of Rightmove data suggests that vacancy in the rented sector is much lower than the applicant, uh, than the applicant's evidence.

01:20:34:21 - 01:21:05:00

Um, we fundamentally dispute that the council's review of Rightmove data is more accurate or reliable than the census. It's not a published data set. We don't have any information about the quality assurance of the data that was collected by the council. Um, it also only provides a snapshot of the market on the day it was taken, and it doesn't cover all properties. Evidently, properties might come available that do not make it onto right move. Um, and the council's review also suggests that it has only looked at properties in Crawley.

01:21:05:08 - 01:21:41:24

Um, now the non home based workers are likely to be split across a number of authorities, so it doesn't actually even cover the entirety of the relevant geography that's needed. Um, and we kind of set those reasons out in full in our uh deadline three response, which is rep 3082. Um, finally on construction, I'll just address the housing emergency. And again, we've addressed this in full in writing in the deadline three response that I just referred to. Um, in particular, we would note that the housing emergency in Crawley has been declared for a number of reasons, many of those not relating to construction impacts, uh, that that might be linked to the project.

01:21:41:26 - 01:22:09:06

So, for example, um, the affordability of home ownership and the short term impacts of water neutrality on housing, on housing supply. So for the reasons set out in our, uh, in our written response, the housing emergency does not change the original conclusions that there remains no impacts on

housing during construction. Um, so I'll pause there on construction and we can come back to maybe operation, uh, operational affordable housing at a later point. Thank you.

01:22:10:23 - 01:22:12:24

Thank you. Do you have anything else to.

01:22:15:01 - 01:22:16:03

The stage? No. Thank you, ma'am.

01:22:16:05 - 01:22:19:18

Mr. Bedford, is there anything you wish to add at this point?

01:22:20:29 - 01:23:00:13

Thank you. Madam. Michael Bever, joint local authorities. I'm afraid we don't agree with the applicant's assessment. We did provide comments at deadline for in rep for zero for two on what the applicant had said at deadline three. We do find a mismatch between the applicant's approach to the assessment of the scale of non home based workers and those proportions being, uh, assumed for both the Luton project and the Lower Thames Crossing project, both of which obviously are in, as it were, populous parts of the country.

01:23:00:16 - 01:23:30:29

I know they're different projects, different scales, but we think that the applicant has underestimated the likelihood of non home-based workers. We also consider that the pressures that are placed on the local authorities, which we are given the instance of Crawley having to um, source um, temporary accommodation out of Borough, they're not doing that, as it were, as a matter of choice.

01:23:31:01 - 01:24:15:05

They're doing that because of the scarcity of affordable accommodation that's accessible to them within the local market. And there are other instances where we think that there is a real indication of local pressures on the housing market. Um, I say we'll make, uh, clear in our post hearing submissions. Uh, the information that we are, uh, relying on, um, but, um, I say we consider that there is a real problem and we consider the applicant needs to do something, uh, to address it, as opposed to, uh, avoiding the problem.

01:24:15:07 - 01:24:35:17

We don't see that this this application, uh, is, uh, dissimilar to other large scale infrastructure projects happening in the southeast of England, and that we consider that it is necessary for, um, some provision to be made to deal with temporary accommodation pressures.

01:24:36:13 - 01:24:39:21

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. I'll hear from you before I turn to the applicant.

01:24:40:06 - 01:25:17:03

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. Resident. Just to say, I think what we're hearing from the applicant is group. Think it's kind of lost reality. The facts are that Hinkley was referenced. Hinkley. They're hiring entire Pontins holiday camps to provide accommodation. You know this, the applicant seems to think

accommodation is going to appear out of mid-air. It's not. I feel a golf course where there is housing application being sought.

01:25:17:05 - 01:25:53:17

It can't go ahead because the water table can't cope with it. And it's the same across the whole place. You know, there is a shortage of accommodation. There's no point in talking about bed and breakfasts and guesthouse. It's complete fantasy. There is a shortage of accommodation in Crawley. It's a fact the applicant has admitted it. It's admitted that they're going to have to have lots of traffic, people driving in, and there aren't the resources to cope with that because the road system is already crowded and the train system is already struggling.

01:25:54:07 - 01:25:59:21

The whole thing is actually absurd. I'm listening to utter absurdity.

01:26:00:17 - 01:26:04:09

Thank you, Mr. Linus. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

01:26:05:05 - 01:26:08:28

Scotland of the applicant. Mr. hunt, going to address some comments, please.

01:26:10:03 - 01:26:42:09

Thank you. Andy Hunt for the applicant. Um, Mr. Bedford referenced other schemes in the south east. Referenced the lower Thames crossing. Obviously that's still it. Application hasn't yet been determined. They simply assumed the same numbers that as Hinckley did, so they did no actual assessment of what their workforce requirements were or what their home based, non home based split would be. They simply took the Hinckley ones. I don't think that was appropriate given the very different context of uh, schemes in the, in the urban southeast, uh, versus a very rural area.

01:26:42:23 - 01:27:21:18

Um, I would also add that in those cases, in the Hinckley case and the size of the case, please pick up on, uh, Mr. Tanner's point. There was a workforce management requirement for an onsite campus that drove what the applicant was doing, as well as the fact that there was a kind of shortage of, um, accommodation. And that doesn't apply in the same way. Uh, here, um, we still don't have evidence from the jails on how the construction we go from construction workers to an increase in demand to an increase in rents, to an increase in homelessness.

01:27:21:20 - 01:27:55:01

It's asserted that an increase in construction workers will lead to an increase in homelessness, uh, on a 1 to 1 basis. And therefore, the full 270 need to be, uh, housed. And there is no evidence before us to show how that chain of events happens that, as McCain said, there are a number of causes of homelessness. And it can't simply be asserted that an increase in demand from the construction workforce therefore leads to a 1 to 1 increase in homelessness, and therefore the full effects require.

01:27:55:07 - 01:28:13:17

The full effects of adverse and therefore require mitigation. So I think there's a sort of gap here between, um, what the authorities are saying the consequences are and the kind of logic chain, uh, that goes into that. So, um, as I say, there are important differences.

01:28:13:21 - 01:28:14:06

Uh.

01:28:14:08 - 01:28:32:11

With Hinkley, um, and the assumptions that other projects have made, we're confident our own for the reasons that we've set out. We think they're conservative in terms of the non home based share, given the CIP data of what happens in the southeast. Um, other projects make their own assumptions for their own reasons.

01:28:33:17 - 01:28:55:12

Uh, Scott Lang, applicant I'm just wondering if Miss Haynes could deal with this issue of the information about the available capacity on our part versus the information which we understand the jazz appear to be relying upon, which is going to be signposted in the note for, for this, um, uh, from this, uh, hearing your view on the the difference in information, please.

01:28:56:06 - 01:29:36:03

Yeah. Thank you. Uh, Bethan Haynes for the applicant. So, um, when we're undertaking these kind of assessments, where possible, we would use census data. Um, it's widely kind of accepted to be the most complete coverage and most statistically robust data sets collected by the owner. It's, uh, tested for quality assurance. It goes through kind of rigorous, um, you know, checking processes. So in, in this instance where we've undertaken a census relatively recently, in this case the 2021 census, um, when we're looking at the housing market, we would always refer to the census as a representation of how many homes are in which different tenure, and how many homes are vacant within an area.

01:29:36:05 - 01:30:06:22

There is simply no need in this current time frame to be reverting to information that a council officer has collected off Rightmove. We don't have any information about how that was collected when it was collected, what kind of quality it is. Notwithstanding that, as I've said before, Rightmove is just not a it's not a complete coverage data set. There are lots of reasons why properties that are available for them won't make it onto Rightmove. They might go directly through estate agents. They might be let by word of mouth.

01:30:07:00 - 01:30:41:21

Um, it's there's just simply no need to revert to a lower quality, uh, data set when we have census, when we have the census available, and indeed in issue specific hearing. Three the JLA specifically requested that the applicant redo its assessment using the latest census data, which the applicant did. So the the continued inclusion of data from elsewhere, which is frankly less robust, significantly less robust, and not necessary. Um, the inclusion of that is completely unclear and doesn't form any evidence justifying that there's a construction impact.

01:30:41:23 - 01:30:42:08

Thank you.

01:30:44:12 - 01:30:49:21

Thank you, Mr. Tanner. If it's brief, I will have you. And then Miss Scott. I'll hear from you in a minute as well.

01:30:49:25 - 01:31:21:29

It's very brief. We've moved from the absurd to actually, bluntly, the offensive from the applicant, the consideration that putting more people requiring accommodation into the area and that homelessness is not connected with it is utterly offensive. It demonstrates the applicant's complete disinterest in the well-being of the community. The applicant is not seeking to serve the community in any way.

01:31:22:01 - 01:31:33:25

It's seeking to pursue its own ends, regardless of the consequences for other people. And other people do have a right to survive in the community. Thank you.

01:31:35:27 - 01:31:37:09

Lisa. Scott, please.

01:31:37:26 - 01:32:10:28

Thank you. Yes. Lisa Scott, Charles Parish Council and I haven't heard any word mention within the numbers with regard to asylum seekers. This is a particular local issue, um, within the Crawley and surrounding areas. And we have thousands of asylum seekers that are in temporary accommodation. Um, the government blocks, bloc books, hotels, um, that clearly will take up um, large numbers of available B&B and hotel rooms.

01:32:11:12 - 01:32:41:17

Uh, we don't have a picture of the estimated number of arrivals over the coming years. Um, this is a very fluid and very rapidly changing situation that is only going to become, um, more stressed. Um, I wonder how the applicant has considered the numbers of asylum seekers that will continue to come and will continue to come in larger numbers, and how that impacts the available accommodation, um, short term and temporary accommodation within the area.

01:32:41:19 - 01:32:45:02

Um, there is significant strain. Thank you.

01:32:46:19 - 01:32:50:11

Thank you, Mr. Lyness. Are you able to comment on what Mr. Scott said?

01:33:04:16 - 01:33:10:24

Scotland's for the applicant. Um on that last point, but I think we do take that away. Um, ma'am.

01:33:13:15 - 01:33:15:25

That's fine. Mr. Bedford's final point.

01:33:16:07 - 01:33:47:05

You might have just only in relation to that particular issue. Michael Bedford, the joint local authorities, um, Crawley is able to say that it had been approached by Clear Springs, who are the Home Office's um, appointee for the provision of accommodation for asylum seekers, and Clear Springs approach Crawley Borough Council asking for help in meeting the asylum dispersal quota within the private rented sector, which they're contracted to deliver.

01:33:47:07 - 01:34:11:11

And apparently of the 85 placements that they were looking for, they only succeeded in finding accommodation for five, and their quota has now been increased to over 300. Um, so the in a sense, the anecdotal position from Crawley's experience is that that is an additional ingredient into the housing pressures that the local area faces.

01:34:12:16 - 01:34:15:12

Thank you, Mr. Landers. Are you just going to reply in writing.

01:34:16:04 - 01:34:32:16

Letters for the applicant? Uh, yes. Clearly, insofar as the Glas or appear to be relying upon information that they don't think we have seen before. Grateful to receive that so that you can have a proper response, rather than not submitting something at deadline and having to respond later.

01:34:32:24 - 01:34:36:08

Mr. Padfield, are you able to do that for deadline eight, please? Uh.

01:34:36:22 - 01:34:52:23

We will certainly provide the information at deadline eight. But I think that given that this is information that, uh, Crawley already has, I think informally in the dialogue with the applicant, I think we can provide it. I would hope this week, uh, in a form that it's available to the applicant.

01:34:52:25 - 01:35:02:14

Thank you for deadline eight for our information purposes. Thank you. It is now 1135, so we'll adjourn to 1155.