



Hearing Transcript

Project:	Gatwick Airport Northern Runway
Hearing:	Recording of Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) - Day 3 - Part 8
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_PT8

Created on: 2024-08-01 11:04:52

Project Length: 01:12:54

File Name: Gatwick_1st Aug_ISH9_PT8

File Length: 01:12:54

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:02 - 00:00:36:09

Now 1155 and time to resume this issue specific hearing socioeconomics. I'm going to move to agenda item 5.5. Um, regarding worst case scenarios in terms of employment benefit. Uh, turning to you, Mister Bedford. I'm familiar with the views of the jails in respect of this issue, and note that it's, uh, linked to wider concerns of the appropriateness of the level of which the socio economic assessments have been undertaken, and the labour market constraints faced in the region.

00:00:36:26 - 00:00:53:28

At this point, um, again, I don't feel that you need to rehearse those arguments in full. What I'd like to understand is if there's been any progress that's been made since the submission of the statements of Common Ground at deadline five in respect of this issue.

00:00:55:27 - 00:01:05:22

Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford, joint Local Authorities, but I do not think there has been any productive progress as yet in relation to this outstanding area of disagreement.

00:01:10:28 - 00:01:15:11

Thank you. Before I turn to the applicant. Anybody wish to add anything?

00:01:17:20 - 00:01:22:06

Mr. Linus? Is there anything in terms of progression regarding this issue that you wish to add?

00:01:23:09 - 00:01:25:28

Scotland asked Mr. Hunt to pick that up, please.

00:01:27:13 - 00:01:59:15

Thank you. Andy Hunt for the applicant. Um, as I think was mentioned earlier, we have a topic working group next week when we're seeking to, um, close out a number of these issues. Um, the definition of worst case scenario is slightly different in different parts of the statement of common grounds. So there's one point where, uh, there's a claim that we've over claimed employment benefits, and another which seems to suggest that we've understated them as well. So we'll seek to, uh, bottom that out, um, next week.

00:01:59:29 - 00:02:21:09

Um, on the over claiming one around construction. We've also assessed lower numbers as well. So, you know, we're confident that we've assessed both the peak and a lower number and set out what the

significance of that impact would be. Um, and I think the outstanding issue probably is around the labour market points, but we will seek to address that jointly with the authorities at the working group next week.

00:02:23:03 - 00:03:02:13

Thank you very much. We'll move on to agenda item 5.6. And this looks at the issues surrounding the surrounding methodology used to assess catalytic employment benefits. Um, several of the JLS have stated that the methodology used to assess these benefits is not robust, and as such, there's been an overstatement of the socio economic benefits. Deadline seven the applicant submitted an explanatory note into the examination, which is rep 777 which concluded that the estimates used to inform the assessment of socio economic impacts from the proposed development are robust and conservative, and the benefits have not been overstated.

00:03:02:27 - 00:03:21:14

Mr. Bedford, I know that there are ongoing discussions with the applicant. Um, and I know that there'll be a formal update in the next round of the statements of Common Ground, but I'd like to understand whether you've had the opportunity to review this note and whether its alleviated any of the concerns that have been raised.

00:03:22:13 - 00:03:39:15

Thank you, madam Mike Bedford, joint local authorities. Yes, we have reviewed the note. No, it doesn't alleviate all of the concerns. I'll bring in Miss Condon just to provide a little bit of, um, flesh on that. But obviously we're providing the detail in our, um, deadline eight submission.

00:03:41:18 - 00:04:14:12

Louise Congdon for the joint local authorities. There have been discussions with the applicant regarding this methodology and indeed over a draft of the note, so we have had time to consider it. Um, it's fair to say that when we first looked at the methodology, our big concern was that the methodology for assessing total employment, which against which they net off direct, indirect and induced to get the catalytic element was potentially overstating total employment, but on further examination, assisted by the explanatory note and discussions.

00:04:14:21 - 00:04:55:06

I think our concern is shifting somewhat to being probably best characterized as we simply don't know, but it may actually understate employment, which, of course, would worsen the housing issues in the local area and the labour market issues. The reason I say we simply don't know, and why we consider the methodology not to be robust as applied, is because they've adopted a very theoretical academic approach based on some work in Italy, which, in the absence of real data, made some general assumptions about how the number of air passengers that would exist in any given area.

00:04:55:16 - 00:05:33:26

Independent of whether there was an airport there. And they assess the relationship between that number of air passengers that might arise in a particular area and how that related to local employment. And at its heart, that's a reasonable thing to do. The problem is twofold. A we have real data in the UK which the applicant despite us pointing this out in 2022, has declined to use. So in the

UK we can actually look at the number of passengers that arise in any given area using CAA survey data and the methodology that the applicant has used to estimate.

00:05:33:28 - 00:06:11:17

That is not fundamentally something that appears robust because it doesn't take any account of the relationship between overlapping catchment areas, different airports in the UK. So, you know, the example we've used many times with them is when they've looked at the relationship between air passenger demand arising, say, in South Yorkshire and the relationship to Doncaster Airport before it closed. The majority of passengers from South Yorkshire don't actually or didn't actually use Doncaster Airport, by far the larger number used Manchester.

00:06:12:11 - 00:06:54:21

And it's not clear how in this methodology any of that's been accounted for. So by way of example, and I did a bit more checking last night, when you actually look at the real data, the relationship between the demand arising in any given area and its local airport varies from about 18%. In the case of Doncaster at its height and 96% to the case of Edinburgh. So this great variability in that relationship between the volume of air passengers in the area and its local airport. So the volume of air passenger to employment relationship may well be robust, but it's when you come to apply it to an individual airport that we start to have doubts about the robustness of the methodology overall.

00:06:54:28 - 00:07:29:29

So, for example, as we understand it for West Sussex, which is the basis of the analysis they've done for Gatwick and then extrapolated it to the the six counties, only about 72% of their passenger demand that you from West Sussex actually uses Gatwick. A substantial part of that demand actually uses Heathrow, and Heathrow is not projected under the applicant's forecast to grow. So you can't simply apply the uplift in traffic at Gatwick to the West Sussex total total passenger volume.

00:07:30:01 - 00:07:59:09

However, they've estimated it and say with confidence that that's the number of uplifted air passengers and therefore the number of uplifted jobs there would be. So we're now starting to suspect that if anything, the methodology of properly applied um, or as they've applied it compared to properly applying it with real UK data may actually understate rather than overstate local employment. But fundamentally, we just don't think the methodology as applied is robust.

00:08:02:05 - 00:08:06:03

Thank you. Could I ask that you submit that in writing?

00:08:06:15 - 00:08:08:04

Yes, we will do for sure.

00:08:08:19 - 00:08:13:10

Before I move to the applicant, is there anybody else who wishes to comment on this agenda item?

00:08:15:00 - 00:08:15:28

Miss Linus

00:08:17:24 - 00:08:22:19

Scott for the applicant. Thank you. I'll ask Mr. Hunt to deal with that initially, please.

00:08:24:06 - 00:09:07:18

Thank you. Andy Hunt for the applicant. Um. Mr. many is available online to cover some of the technical detail, but I'll sort of give a brief overview first. I mean, I think, um, the applicant chose this methodology as we've set out in the know because it seeks to overcome two problems. One is displacements and the other is the slightly circular nature of employment growth and air traffic growth, effectively one reinforcing the other. Um and um as Miss Collins said, um, this is a total employment number from which we subtract the, uh, direct, indirect and induced to get the catalytic number, um, the direct, indirect and induced jobs numbers I don't think are at issue.

00:09:07:20 - 00:09:42:16

I think they are agreed. It's the methodology by which we've sought to assess that, uh, catalytic number. Um, Mr. Will say more about the kind of the overlapping catchment. But because we're looking at the total employment in the first instance, the origin of passengers doesn't strongly affect that. It's the activity at the airport rather than where the passengers are, uh, is driven by the number of passengers rather than the, the origin, um, and um, the use of UK data in that context wouldn't overcome those two points around displacement and, uh, and circularity.

00:09:43:08 - 00:09:43:23

Um.

00:09:44:23 - 00:09:45:12

Uh.

00:09:45:23 - 00:10:17:20

To the wider point about the potential, uh, employment increases, um, being higher. Um, these are, of course, several steps removed from the direct application and would be contingent on other things happening in the economy. It's the same with the, um, Oxford Economics economic submission. Um, around the kind of productivity gains that there are other things that need to happen. It's not a direct consequence. It is what would be expected to happen. Um, but there may well be other planning permissions, etc.,

00:10:17:22 - 00:10:49:22

that that are required. Um, and in any case, if our local impacts were, uh, higher, um, than uh, we've currently assessed, there is still a very, very much higher spare capacity in the labour market. So we don't think this would lead to anything other than more significant benefits, um, rather than increasingly adverse impacts. Um, that's all I'll say for now. Mr. Meaney may have additional points that he wishes to add about some of that.

00:10:54:19 - 00:11:32:10

Thank you, Mr. Hunt. Andy Meaney for for the applicant. Um, I think with taking a step back and saying why we've used this approach, um, we know that the multiplier based approaches to assessing employment impacts from a change in any activity, and in this case, um, airport related activity can,

can suffer from some really quite substantial, uh, overestimates. Um, particularly, uh, if you look at, um, some of the ex-post evaluation evidence, um, you can see that, um, displacement.

00:11:32:12 - 00:12:15:05

So this, this point that, um, you're, you could be saying that jobs are created when in fact, they're, they're already going to, to be there in the, in the local area and can account. And we said this in the, in the document that you referred to, um, for about 20 to 30% of the employment effects that you would see from doing this more traditional approach. So we wanted to to use an approach that's that's robust. It's been applied in Italy, in the US, uh, in peer reviewed academic journals, and we've applied that approach to the UK, um, in order to, to make sure that the, the estimates that we're putting forward are, are robust.

00:12:15:22 - 00:12:48:29

Um, and, um, I won't go into detail on the particular approach that we've used. It's all set out in, in the note, but I would want to draw attention to the fact that we think that the JLS and and their advisers have misunderstood the approach that's being taken here. Um, we're not trying in the first stage of this approach to estimate demand in an area, but instead we're estimating total traffic from within and outside that area that would occur at an airport if it were located in that area.

00:12:49:09 - 00:13:24:19

Um, so it's not a measure of demand, but a measure of total activity. And I think that goes to the points that Miss Congdon were, were raising was raising. Um, I think the, the alternatives that the jazz have suggested actually don't manage to overcome the points around displacement and reverse causality. Um, and that's really important because of the sort of size of biases upwards, biases that, that you would see in the employment estimates that you would get, um, from using that type of analysis that they're, that they're suggesting.

00:13:25:03 - 00:13:58:10

Um, so I think in summary, um, it's a robust approach. It's drawn from peer reviewed academic articles. Um, the results we've got are similar to what's been seen in those, um, other countries, those other applications of this approach. Um, we think it deals with some really substantive biases that can arise from using a more traditional, uh, multiplier based approach. Um, and we think it's also comparable with, with some of the other estimates that, um, uh, the applicant has, has put forward as part of this process.

00:13:58:12 - 00:13:58:27

Thank you.

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

Thank you, Miss Lan. Is there anything else? Um, do the JLo's wish to comment on anything that's just been said?

00:14:10:15 - 00:14:12:24

Sorry, Louise. Calendar for the jails. Um,

00:14:14:12 - 00:15:10:06

this committee is slightly changed. Um, his description of what they were trying to predict. Because previously in discussions, it had always been our understanding and indeed our understanding from now reading properly and fully the Italian paper upon which he replies that the purpose of the exercise was to estimate the demand level arising in an area and correlate that to employment, not the theoretical level of traffic that an individual airport within an area might handle. That seems to be a change in the message that we're getting today in terms of what the methodology states and indeed what is stated in the note where it talks about, Given the characteristics of a given area, what would be the predicted level of traffic if there was an airport in the area? Now we actually know what the level of traffic would be if there is an airport in the area, because we have the data in the UK and the difficulty we've had all along is the applicant's not disclosed those estimates.

00:15:10:08 - 00:15:43:04

If the applicant actually disclosed those estimates that they've made of the traffic arising in each individual area, and we could check it against the actual data that we hold, which we actually suggest that the applicant that they should do. But if they've declined to do, then it might give us some comfort that the methodology is robust. But as things stand at the moment, the methodology is a black box and we don't understand what's going on inside it. So from our all our analysis of the methodology, how it's been applied elsewhere, how it works, all of the issues around endogeneity and displacement.

00:15:43:18 - 00:16:17:05

We don't have confidence that it's robust methodology. And whilst it does address factor displacement, i.e. the net effect of employment locally, taking into account people moving from jobs in other parts of the economy to jobs associated with the airport or its catalytic impact. So it does take that element of displacement into account. It is totally unclear to us how it takes any account of displacement of traffic between airports, which to to our opinion is the key issue as with the national economic assessment.

00:16:18:25 - 00:16:39:21

Thank you, Mr. Linus. Is this something because there seems to be some disagreement? Is this something that can be discussed at your next working group, whether or not that is a topic that was going to be included or not. I'm not aware, but I would like this matter before the end of examination if we could maybe reach some common ground.

00:16:41:20 - 00:17:05:11

Thank you. And for the applicant, I'm. I don't think this is an issue with disclosure. I think it's an issue of comparability within the methodology. Um, we can certainly have a further discussion with Miss Congdon, but it's a fundamental methodological element that that number can't be compared to actual data. So I don't think it'll take us very further forward. And therefore I think we probably will remain in disagreement. But certainly we can.

00:17:05:15 - 00:17:23:20

Um, I think Miss Condon said that she felt that there had been a shift in terms of what was being mentioned. So it's I don't want to discuss that in more detail here, because I think it's a very technical comment. So maybe if those, um, that communication could happen outside of this forum, I'd be I'd be grateful.

00:17:23:22 - 00:17:27:14

Certainly. I don't think there has been a shift, but we can seek to resolve that.

00:17:27:16 - 00:17:53:14

That's fine. Thank you, Mr. Linus. Is there anything else? I'll move on to agenda item 5.7. So this looks at the monitoring of engagement with vulnerable groups. Um, this is in response to the JLo's answer to EC2 HW 2.8. I'd just like the applicant to expand on this issue and how the monitoring of vulnerable groups would take place, please.

00:17:56:07 - 00:17:57:29

Ring and Piper for the applicant.

00:17:58:01 - 00:18:04:13

So I'd just ask you to either move closer to or bring your microphone again. Air conditioning.

00:18:05:18 - 00:18:07:03

Ring and piper for the applicant.

00:18:09:03 - 00:18:39:05

So set out in the health assessment which is app 043. Um is the assessment that includes vulnerable groups. And that includes all pathway receptors. And the proposal is not to monitor vulnerable groups per se, not to look at their individual clinical health outcomes in the population, but to measure the precursors, the air quality, the noise. So that's set out elsewhere in the application.

00:18:39:27 - 00:18:47:24

The noise app one, seven, eight, for example, and air quality schedule one of the 106.

00:18:53:13 - 00:18:57:01

Jails have anything they wish to add?

00:18:57:22 - 00:19:33:00

Thank you. Adam. Michael Bedford, joint local authorities I think what we are anxious to see is that the communications plan does make it clear, by provision of contact points and similar, how, uh, members of the public who are affected can, uh, raise their concerns about any of their impacts, and that there should be a variety of publication routes provided, including those that deal with non-English speakers and also persons with uh, any form of, uh, communications disabilities.

00:19:33:10 - 00:19:37:20

Um, so I think we just see there's a need to do a bit more than the applicant has so far done.

00:19:40:05 - 00:19:40:27

In Salinas.

00:19:41:12 - 00:19:51:21

Scott Linos for the applicant. We think the the plan is sufficiently clear, but we're content to take away examples such as those we've just heard and build those into the plan.

00:19:52:15 - 00:19:58:01

Thank you. With that, if you do make amendments, would that be deadline eight or deadline nine?

00:20:00:10 - 00:20:03:14

As Scott applicants, we can do that by deadline. Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

00:20:04:29 - 00:20:38:14

I'd like to move on to agenda item 5.8. And this looks at the hardship fund, which currently sits within schedule seven of the draft section on A6. This is the item that I said yesterday we are going to discuss today. Hence we are discussing it today. So these questions are going to be aimed initially at the applicants. Some of them are a bit technical. So if you want me to repeat them please just ask. So the first question I have is in response to EC2 HW 2.9, which is rep 784.

00:20:38:16 - 00:20:56:19

It's stated of the 4659 people from the nine wards around the airport, only 1% are likely to require the additional support and therefore be potentially eligible for funding. How was the figure of 1% arrived at please?

00:20:57:14 - 00:21:00:11

Scott, can I ask Mr. Piper to answer that, please?

00:21:01:14 - 00:21:33:24

Ryan Piper for the applicant. So the 1% is a professional judgment. It was derived in a couple of ways, one of which was looking at how many dwellings would be significantly, significantly affected. And I think noise is a particularly good indication of this. So in relation to construction impacts, um, there's about 206 dwellings which are referenced in app 171. That's table 3.1.3.

00:21:34:07 - 00:22:05:14

And in relation to operational and noise effects, uh, that are potentially significant for mitigation is about 80 dwellings. And that's in app 039 uh paragraph 14 9106. So together applying about a 2.6 persons per dwelling average that gets you around sort of, uh, seven, 750 people.

00:22:05:25 - 00:22:32:16

The the 6% of people is then applied to that. And that that comes from looking at the total population, which is around the 80,000, 5000 of which were in that, um, higher rate of vulnerability relating to disability, so that that 6% then apply to those properties brings you down to around 50 people, about 1%.

00:22:34:04 - 00:23:16:08

Thank you. Given that other mitigation is available, for example, a noise insulation scheme, can you give me an example of a type of hardship which may be faced by somebody with an existing vulnerability which would make them eligible to apply, which is as a direct result of the proposed development? Now, I do realize that every case is going to be an individual, but I'm just trying to

understand what circumstances you had in mind that would that are directly caused by the proposed developments, which could not be mitigated using other schemes which would make somebody eligible for the for the funding?

00:23:18:01 - 00:24:13:19

Ring and by both the applicant. So this is looking at exceptional vulnerability. I think that's that's very important to establish not not just general vulnerability. We've covered that at a population level. So particular examples might be an individual who is in palliative care for example, or a child who has very severe autism and is particularly hypersensitive to noise effects, for example. And should that overlap with being at one of the dwellings where particularly large changes are expected, and if the existing mitigation, for example, the noise insulation scheme isn't isn't applicable there or isn't really designed to deal with that level of sensitivity, then this is an extra safety net that sort of sits under that, and it just provides that assurance that you could mitigate and avoid a significant, inequitable.

00:24:13:24 - 00:24:45:28

Thank you that that's very happy, helpful, even or happy. Um, I do have some concerns in respect of part of the response to EC2. HW 2.9. It's part C of that response, which I'd like to discuss. You said that you will act compassionately, which I was hopeful that you would do. So the maximum amount in this fund is £10,000, and I think that's £5,000 per person.

00:24:46:00 - 00:25:20:04

It's capped at. And I went, I asked you the question of what would happen if somebody needs exceeded that £5,000 they were eligible for, and the response I got back was you would obviously assess each individual individually on their own merits, but fundamentally they would have to wait till the next financial year. And I do note that you have the discretion to provide further funding outside of that £10,000, but that isn't secured anywhere.

00:25:20:06 - 00:25:46:25

And if there's somebody who has an extreme level of vulnerability and they are facing hardship because of potentially the project, how how do you how do you balance that? You're telling somebody, yes, you accept there is an issue, but unfortunately you're going to have to wait till January the 1st 1st of April in order to receive additional funding.

00:25:52:21 - 00:26:03:07

So I think there's some points around the level of funding that perhaps I'll pass over to others. But, uh, yes, I think the point is absolutely the applicant would act with compassion.

00:26:06:08 - 00:26:13:25

But there is no guarantee that additional funding would be made available in that financial year to deal with the issues. Is that correct?

00:26:16:06 - 00:26:42:23

Scotland is for the applicant at two short points. Um, as far as the level of funding itself is concerned, we're reviewing that. I think we're going to be making an increased level, putting an increased level into the into the commitment. You'll see that at deadline nine. Um, as for the timing point, I think we'll

need to take that, um, away. Consider the timing implications that you've mentioned and we'll we'll consider that.

00:26:44:15 - 00:26:49:21

Thank you. Currently sits in the section 106. Should it be secured as a requirement.

00:26:53:19 - 00:27:05:11

Scott liners for the applicant. Um, I think you may suspect the answer's going to be, but, um. Uh, no, we don't think so. Um, we think that this is better done on the range to the flexibility of 106 obligation.

00:27:06:04 - 00:27:09:11

Mr. Bedford, due to the JLS. Have anything to add?

00:27:12:06 - 00:27:32:09

Thank you. Madam. Uh, Michael Bedford, joint, uh, local authorities. Um, I think, um, there are some discussions in relation to, uh, this matter which are ongoing. Um, I think that, uh, we do see a benefit in tightening, uh, the, um,

00:27:33:25 - 00:27:54:18

uh, terms by which some of the eligibility criteria are, uh, defined. And we also consider that, there should be an increase in the quantum of the overall fund. I say there are discussions ongoing, but we again are looking to see a better package than is currently being proposed.

00:27:55:11 - 00:28:04:06

And again, the same question. Um, are you content if those negotiations are completed, that it sits within the section on a six?

00:28:06:16 - 00:28:18:25

I think it again comes back to the same point that we rehearsed yesterday. If there's a satisfactory outcome to the section one and six, then yes, that's an acceptable way of dealing with it. But if there isn't, it ought to be a requirement.

00:28:19:19 - 00:28:25:16

Mr. Tanner, I will hear from you on the assumption that it is related specifically to the hardship fund.

00:28:27:08 - 00:28:29:02

Thank you. Nigel Tanner, resident.

00:28:33:07 - 00:29:03:08

I suggested that the needed to be an environmental authority. I think the example we're looking at absolutely demonstrates the point that the applicant cannot be trusted to be compassionate, that this funding all needs to be moved to an independent authority that would manage and provide the funding. I've suggested a mechanism for it.

00:29:03:10 - 00:29:39:05

The applicant was incorrect to state that um procurement, government procurement does not require actual performance. It just assesses on a point school's social value. Government procurement would require actual performance, and I think the applicant has made an overwhelming case that this must be independently run removed from the applicant, because the figures given demonstrate an entire lack of compassion.

00:29:39:07 - 00:29:49:29

And again, it's the same point we're going over and over. The JLA isn't getting the information it needs, when it needs, and there needs to be a buffer in the middle. Thank you.

00:29:51:16 - 00:29:54:19

Thank you. Does anybody else wish to comment on this agenda item?

00:29:56:05 - 00:29:56:20

Um,

00:29:58:01 - 00:30:12:10

moving on to item 5.9. I don't have any additional questions. So does any other party have any further comments they wish to make in respect of socio economic and health and well-being matters today, which have not been discussed?

00:30:14:05 - 00:30:40:05

Mr.. Thank you ma'am. A few short matters. If I if I may add an agenda item. 5.4 we discussed the JLo's position in relation to construction effects. We did hear something from may be operationally related and it would be grateful if you could ask, um, Miss Haynes to explain the position, not in relation to construction effects which we've gone through, but very briefly with operational effects as well. If that's okay, that's fine.

00:30:40:07 - 00:30:40:22

Please do.

00:30:43:24 - 00:31:15:13

Uh, thank you. So, uh, Bethan Haynes for the applicant. So, um, I just wanted to touch on the operational point, because this is obviously listed in the reasons and notes within the housing fund. Um, so it's really important to establish first that the, um, there is agreement between the parties that the project will not increase the overall amount of of the overall amount of housing that's needed in the area. And, um, Crawley set this out quite explicitly within, uh, document rep 3117. And in fact, they've also confirmed this position in their emerging local plan.

00:31:15:15 - 00:31:52:04

So they've made submissions to the local planning inspector that the project is not expected to increase the overall amount of housing that's needed within Crawley. So in terms of understanding the impact on affordable housing, um, the evidence that the applicant submitted in Document App 201, which is the Population in Housing report, undertook a very detailed review of the amount of affordable housing that is likely to come forward, not just within Crawley, but within the 6 or 7

authorities that surround Crawley. And one of those exercises was looking at the affordable housing policy requirements in current local plans.

00:31:52:06 - 00:32:31:02

So within the North West Sussex housing market area, so that's Crawley, Horsham and Mid Sussex. Existing local plans within those areas require that between 30 and 40% of all housing is delivered as affordable, and in Crawley, that's 40%. And in fact, if you look at the Crawley Local Plan review, that hasn't changed within the submission version of their plan, that is still 40%. So we are in agreement that the overall level of housing need is not affected by the project, and I would hope that we are in agreement that the Crawley Local Plan requires 40% of all homes delivered in Crawley to be affordable, and similarly that in the surrounding areas it's also around 30 to 40%.

00:32:31:26 - 00:33:13:11

So in terms of the project, we've assessed the number of workers that may be in need of affordable housing. And I would state at the outset that this is very much a worst case scenario, because it assumes all of those workers are additional to the area. And you've heard from not only myself, but also Mr. Hunt as to why that's unlikely to be the case. And this assessment basically shows that between 14 and 17% of workers associated with the project may be in need of affordable housing. Um, the Glas have not provided any specific criticisms of either the data or the methodology that underpinned the affordable housing assessment during the operational phase.

00:33:13:13 - 00:33:49:00

And in fact, if we look at the Jazz Deadline three response, which is rep 3135. That doesn't appear to dispute the conclusion itself, that the need is between 14 and 17%, because the jazz quote that figure without any criticism or without any question. So given that we agree that the project does not affect the overall amount of housing that's needed in this area, and we know that the councils within Crawley and the surrounding districts are already planning for between 30 and 40% of all housing to be affordable.

00:33:49:25 - 00:34:22:04

If the project's tenure demands are likely to be within the range of 14 to 17% affordable, then it cannot be concluded that the project in its operational phase is likely to affect the amount of affordable housing that is needed. Um. So in summary, the position remains that the housing fund, uh, during both kind of construction and operation is not justified by the evidence. And if I may, I'll just hand over to my colleague, Mr. Gun Jones, to quickly touch upon the specific wording, uh, of the of the requested additions.

00:34:22:06 - 00:34:22:23

Thank you.

00:34:27:07 - 00:34:27:28

Uh, yeah. Uh.

00:34:28:17 - 00:34:32:21

On behalf of the applicant, I mean, I think just to to add to what.

00:34:32:23 - 00:35:08:14

Miss Haynes has just described. Um, we had a number of comments on the sort of wording as proposed in terms of the requirement for the housing fund, which I think we wanted to register now, notwithstanding the general starting point that we don't believe it's it's justified. Um, but I think those those wording comments are important because they probably go to the heart of some of the issues we've been discussing this morning. And it probably boils down to two substantive issues. Uh, the first of those is essentially the intended purpose and scope of the housing fund.

00:35:08:27 - 00:36:02:02

Um, at the moment, the wording that's been set out refers to both construction and operational phases. Um, and if we read across to the reasons and notes related to that, um, those reasons refer to variably affordable housing, temporary accommodation, then affordable temporary and emergency housing, and then finally affordable and temporary. Um, I think our concern is that there seems to be a real conflation of different housing impact matters across different parts of the project, or stages, um, of the project, to the extent that we wouldn't really be left very clear as to what types of housing impact the fund is potentially being directed towards.

00:36:02:10 - 00:36:51:23

Um, and the discussion this morning, I think is perhaps added to that and therefore in turn, how that fund might operate. And I think that concern of ours becomes even more relevant, given that Mr. Bedford this morning has confirmed that the Jays are not seeking to be prescriptive necessarily on what that funding might relate to in terms of addressing housing, temporary accommodation or other similar effects. So I think our comment would be that we would want to see considerably greater clarity and precision in any form of wording, as to the purpose and scope of the fund and when within the project it would apply, and that really that would be, in our mind, critical if such a requirement were to be effective.

00:36:52:15 - 00:37:27:29

I think the second, um, substantive point, um, goes to the, uh, consultees that have been suggested, uh, in terms of how that that fund would be approved and who would be involved and consulted with as part of that. Um, so as it's currently drafted, um, it refers to a number of authorities, which, to our knowledge, have not made any submissions or raised any concerns regarding housing matters.

00:37:28:14 - 00:38:03:29

And and by that, I think particularly we would highlight East Sussex County Council, Kent County Council, Moor Valley District Council and Tandridge District Council. So the basis of their potential involvement in this is less clear. Um, and in the case of Kent County Council, we will be consulting with an organisation or an authority that actually falls outside of Gatwick labour market area and therefore does not feature in the population and housing assessment.

00:38:04:16 - 00:38:46:21

Um, So the basis for those to be included, um, is less clear to us. And I think then further to that, the generality would be that by including a number of upper tier authorities and by that I mean the county council. So those listed are East and West Sussex, Kent and Surrey. It would involve consultation with authorities as upper tier authorities that have no statutory housing function. So it's not clear to us what

their role or input as consultees to the fund would be, and indeed why they necessarily would have the right to be consulted upon it.

00:38:47:01 - 00:39:24:28

So to sum up, I think we are position or the applicant's position is that we say the current wording isn't sufficiently clear either in respect to the purpose or scope of the fund, and nor is there a clear basis from the evidence we've seen for the geographical extent of those to be consulted, to be defined in the way that is currently proposed. And I think if you take both of those elements together in our mind, there's a real risk that what is currently set out is potentially completely unworkable and therefore, in our view, the wording would require considerable modification.

00:39:25:00 - 00:39:35:12

Otherwise, it will present considerable practical difficulties in the event that a housing fund was accepted as accepted as being required. And in terms of how it might be implemented.

00:39:36:01 - 00:39:44:10

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Linus. I'm going to turn to the joint local authorities. Unless there's something else you wanted to add at that point.

00:39:44:12 - 00:39:51:22

Not on this point, ma'am. There's one other, unrelated point I'd like to raise on the AOB, but I can. I can leave that.

00:39:52:04 - 00:39:52:19

Thank you.

00:39:52:24 - 00:39:54:14

Mr. Bedford. Is there anything else?

00:39:54:28 - 00:40:32:10

Thank you, thank you, madam. Well. Um, Michael Bedford, the joint local authorities. Uh, it is slightly surprising to hear those, uh, various remarks which seem actually directed more to yesterday's agenda and part of item 3.1, um, which dealt with the housing fund and the terminology of a proposed requirement. But having said that, I think I'll make two points. The first is a general point that certainly the primary focus of our concerns in relation to housing, uh, relates to the pressures during the construction period.

00:40:32:12 - 00:41:16:08

That's the primary focus. But so far as there are also concerns raised about the operational period, we've heard what has been said on the applicant's part in relation to, um, where they consider that there are shortcomings in any evidential support for considering any need for a housing fund to address operational housing pressures. We obviously can, um, playback, as it were, the response before we submit our deadline, eight submissions and we will make sure that deadline eight, if there are things that we want to say that as were contest what's been put before, you will set that out.

00:41:16:10 - 00:41:17:23

And our deadline. Eight submission.

00:41:19:12 - 00:41:24:05

Thank you, Mr. Linus. Did you have so, Cagney?

00:41:26:12 - 00:42:09:25

Thank you ma'am. Uh, Sally Pavey for for Cagney. Um, in light of of what the applicant has, has remarked, um, I just wanted and I appreciate we're going to submit this, but to to give you a clue, um, on the the um, the the lack of affordable housing between 2020 and 2021, only 87, um, affordable houses were actually available in the Horsham area. Just to give you a perspective, and being a local councillor, I can tell you that 35% may be put forward as affordable, but when the housing is built out, the builders tend to significantly reduce that 35% affordable housing.

00:42:10:03 - 00:42:15:07

So just to to really just touch on what some of the points were made by the applicant. Thank you.

00:42:16:05 - 00:42:17:21

Thank you very much, Miss Linus.

00:42:18:14 - 00:42:49:05

Uh, Scott, I don't need to respond to any of the submissions we've just heard. The other point I was going to raise briefly murmurs that, uh, we've heard some, uh, points being raised over the last couple of days about what the airport does to support the communities. In particular, the impact of the project is going to have in the way the airport has effectively taken into account the wishes of local communities when developing its proposals, and in order just to let the airport put its position, be grateful if Mr.

00:42:49:07 - 00:42:57:05

Norwood could be given the opportunity just to explain what the airport does at the moment, the press, the other other comments you've heard in a broader context.

00:42:57:08 - 00:42:58:24

That's absolutely fine, Mr. Norwood.

00:43:00:22 - 00:43:33:14

Thank you very much. Tim Norwood for the applicant. Um, yes. This is just really to, uh, try and put a bit more context around some of the, um, comments that you'll have heard from local residents and parish councillors. Uh, and, and really just to explain what the airport does, uh, in order to address some of those concerns that people raise with us. And I just wanted to, uh, briefly, uh, cover, uh, three, three areas. Um, and just to give you some maybe practical examples of the work that the airport does.

00:43:34:20 - 00:44:04:21

Um, firstly, we obviously have, um, an education program. Uh, the education program is significant. Um, we do, uh, a huge amount of work with local schools and colleges. We have, uh, recently as from October 2023, we've opened up what we call our Stem center. This is a classroom like facility, uh, with, uh, breakout rooms.

00:44:04:28 - 00:44:29:22

uh, it equipment, um, a kitchen and, uh, just, um, equipment for school children to use. And, uh, we've now had over 2000 student encounters go through the Stem center. Um, actually, I think you might recall, I think we visited the Stem center at, uh, on our first site visit back in, in February.

00:44:29:24 - 00:44:34:15

Actually, I was just thinking, I think we we were taken care of. Yeah.

00:44:35:02 - 00:45:35:28

Um, we also have, um, a learn live uh, or Koreas live broadcast, which is broadcast on a monthly basis, uh, which is a program for 11 to 17 year olds. Uh, and that gives them the opportunity to understand the potential career opportunities at the airport. That averages about 12,000 live views per broadcast. And that explains the different types of jobs and careers that, uh, 11 to 17 year olds could have at the airport, as well as the, uh, we we have sort of our wider education program, including the apprenticeship program, uh, the mentoring, uh, and last week or just before, I think that or the week before we had our summer work experience week, uh, where children from every single, uh, secondary school in Crawley, uh, came and undertook a week's visit to the airport.

00:45:36:27 - 00:46:09:21

We also, uh, I'm really pleased to say that we have a graduate program as well, which we've reinstated. Um, I'm lucky enough to have a geography graduate, uh, in my department, uh, who has been following us around for the last five and a half months of this inquiry. Um, I'm hoping she might actually, um, become a planner eventually, but maybe I'll have to ask that question. Um, at the end of the at the end of the process. Um, but that would be to try and encourage people into definitely into the planning profession.

00:46:12:02 - 00:46:53:06

In terms of the work we do on economic partnerships. Uh, we hold an annual economic summit where we bring businesses, stakeholders and, uh, organizations like the Chambers of Commerce or the Gatwick business diamond, uh, as well as all of the local authorities to attend an annual event where we discuss the economic challenges of the region. And that really is an event that's focused on trying to create momentum about how we work together, uh, in partnership, uh, to deliver the benefits for the region.

00:46:53:16 - 00:47:24:15

Working together. We also within the Gatwick in the procurement team, we have a focus on local suppliers. Uh, so we tend to spend over £100 million in the local supply chain. Uh, and we subscribe to a database which searches locally, uh, for new suppliers, which are within the the Gatwick area, to make sure that the benefits of our supply chain are realised locally and actually within the airport.

00:47:24:17 - 00:47:55:24

If people are travelling through the airport, you'll see that we have a number of tourism and economic initiatives, such as the supporting the Sussex Six campaign, which brings local produce that is produced locally, uh, and that is sold within the airport, um, retail units. That's things like the West

Sussex is very well known for its wines and cheeses. So it's particularly important to make sure the local businesses benefit from having Gatwick.

00:47:57:10 - 00:48:27:24

And then in terms of the, um, the work that we do in the community, which I think is particularly important in terms of what we've heard. We have our community fund, which thank you, ma'am, for, for, for referencing that is in the the current section 106 agreement. Uh, and that is a fund that provides about, um, a quarter of £1 million a year to fund local projects.

00:48:28:11 - 00:48:37:01

I just want to mention three projects recently, which I think are very relevant to the discussions that we've heard over the last couple of days.

00:48:38:28 - 00:49:03:16

Firstly, the Crawley Open House. That was a contribution of £20,000 that we made to transform a disused building in Crawley into what the open house described as a life skills and employability workshop, specifically for disadvantaged people who live locally within the within the area.

00:49:05:25 - 00:49:17:21

We also made a contribution to of £30,000 to Chorleywood. That was for their sports and community centre. I'm sure the, um,

00:49:19:14 - 00:49:53:29

counselor from childhood will explain what a great initiative that is, and that funding is over three years to help with the cost of the new center. And then within Hallie, we've also, uh, funded a, uh, the replacement roof of the pavilion, again, a £30,000, uh, contribution. And last year, the community fund, uh, in terms of the allocations, uh, spent over £168,000 and funded 105 projects locally.

00:49:56:20 - 00:50:17:08

Not only do we work with the Community Fund, but there's also our sponsorship programme. Uh, back in May, we sponsored the run Gatwick event. Uh, we sponsored recently the Crawley High Street Live event for the local community. And a couple of years ago, picking up, uh, we sponsored the year of Culture in Horsham District Council.

00:50:19:22 - 00:50:55:00

In terms of the work that we do, uh, with our charity partners, we have, uh, had long standing relationships with a number of charity partners, including the Royal British Legion, where we support their Poppy appeal, which raised a record breaking £40,000 last year for the Royal British Legion. We also provide support with the and support and donations to the Kent, Surrey and Sussex Air Ambulance.

00:50:55:19 - 00:51:11:03

This is a very important life saving facility that if you are in the most need and you need an air ambulance, are the ones that come and come and get you and look after you and will potentially save your life.

00:51:13:10 - 00:51:38:01

We also have, um, the sash, which is the Surrey and Sussex Hospital Trust. Um, just a couple of months ago, a team from Gatwick, uh, cycled all the way to Paris again, raising over £40,000 for the for the hospital trust. And a lot of that money goes into the neonatal unit, uh, for, um, child care.

00:51:39:26 - 00:52:04:17

And then in Tunbridge Wells, We've also supported a Forest Schools enhancement programme as well. I think what this demonstrates is that Gatwick works across the region of both Kent, Surrey and Sussex. It works with our local authorities in Crawley, Mid Sussex, Horsham, Tandridge, Mole Valley.

00:52:07:27 - 00:52:48:10

And with the county councils of Surrey, Sussex and Kent. And I think I just wanted to try and make sure that there is no misconception or misrepresentation. The Gatwick team is absolutely dedicated to supporting this area. The team work really, really hard to try and make sure that we absolutely minimize the impacts of our operation. We want people to travel safely. Our teams work tirelessly 24 hours a day, seven days a week, to make sure that people can get away safely, especially at this time of year when a lot of people do take a well-earned holiday.

00:52:48:20 - 00:52:56:10

Nothing wrong with that. They deserve a break every now and again, and that's a really good thing to be able to go and visit different cultures.

00:52:59:15 - 00:53:29:18

We also want to make sure that people have good jobs at Gatwick, and we also want to make sure that we support the local businesses and we really benefit the local area. We've been doing this for a long, long time. We've been doing this for years. We adapt our approach to suit the circumstances. We're flexible in our arrangements, but we will continue to do with continue to carry this out and we'll continue to work in the best way we can for the for the local area. Thank you very much.

00:53:30:15 - 00:53:33:29

Thank you, Mr. Norwood. Mr. Linus, is there anything else?

00:53:35:09 - 00:53:35:27

Mr. Tanner?

00:53:37:05 - 00:54:11:07

Nigel Tennant, local resident. We seem to have got off the subject of affordable housing somehow, and the statement from the applicant that they're not going to do anything, which is basically the outcome of their many words. Given that there is clearly a demand for housing generated by both the build and the ongoing running of the project. It is clearly illogical to make any suggestion that no further affordable housing is necessary.

00:54:11:09 - 00:54:38:19

And again, I stress the point. The applicant repeatedly proves they're not competent, or have they have insufficient sense of social responsibility to be allowed to control or govern any of this, and it must

move to an independent body, because otherwise the local community will be victim to its arbitrary and irrational judgments. Thank you.

00:54:39:21 - 00:54:42:12

Councillor Essex. I can see that you've got your hand up.

00:54:45:21 - 00:55:25:01

Thank you. I just wanted to raise an additional point with regards to affordable housing. Um, if the construction work in Gatwick continues for quite a long time, presumably it will, um, draw workers in from outside that need housing, or it will, um, use existing employment locally that's already living. If it is the latter, then and then that will mean that the existing construction, uh, market could become inflated and there could be a competition for labor due to the constraint increased construction work that's going on around Gatwick.

00:55:25:13 - 00:55:51:21

If that increases construction costs for housing, then I would imagine it's likely that housing projects could, under the viability test, provide less affordable housing going forward than they have done without that additional pressure on the construction market by Gatwick Airport. Therefore, that's another reason why Gatwick should step in and accept its responsibility and provide affordable homes. Thank you.

00:55:54:17 - 00:55:59:15

Thank you. Councillor Essex. Miscellaneous. Is there anything you wish to add to Council Essex this comment?

00:56:01:00 - 00:56:36:02

I'm Andy Hunt for the applicant. Um, just on that last point. obviously, the nature of the construction projects are very different from housing. So the workforce will be an infrastructure development workforce rather than a, um, housing workforce. Um, so we're not anticipating that there would be that sort of drawing away and increasing in construction costs. And we do want local people to work on the project rather than people coming in from outside the area. And that's why we've got the measures in the PSBs to enhance the opportunities for local contractors and local residents to work on the project.

00:56:38:06 - 00:56:41:16

Thank you, Councillor Essex. Do you have another point?

00:56:42:03 - 00:57:12:22

Yeah, so so briefly, if if I hear it correctly, I think what Gatwick is saying is that the infrastructure development workshop workforce and the housing workforce are two completely different workforces, and there's no overlap between them and therefore there's no impact. Whereas I think the project includes construction of buildings, including hotels and maybe there there are, um, job types and skill sets which sit in both of those workforces and will move between them.

00:57:13:05 - 00:57:40:17

Um, presumably, um, for example, if the infrastructure development that Gatwick proposes involves electricity, they'll have electricians and those electricians could choose to work at Gatwick, or they could choose to work in the fitout of a housing development. But I think you've just said that you don't see that there's any overlap and there's any impact. And I wonder if you could clarify that, because that sounds somewhat unusual statement to make. Thank you.

00:57:41:08 - 00:57:43:00

Mr. Hunt. Do you wish? Yes.

00:57:43:07 - 00:58:18:14

Mr. hunt, the applicant. And there will be some overlap. But substantially an infrastructure workforce will be different from a housing workforce. Um, Councilor Essex is correct. There is some overlap. My second. The second part of my point was that there is a very large workforce, and we have the SPS to seek to increase the supply of workers and ensure that they're appropriately skilled. So I'm for clarity. I'm not saying they're to completely independent, um, uh, workforces, but, um, there are distinct infrastructure skills and house building skills, and the overlap is not 100%.

00:58:18:19 - 00:58:19:04

Um.

00:58:20:25 - 00:58:22:16

Thank you, Councilor Sacks.

00:58:23:02 - 00:58:57:19

So just to clarify, you're now saying that there is some overlap rather than there isn't, but and that it's not 100% overlap, but you're not prepared to quantify it. So its impact on the housing market locally or the construction market locally remains unqualified. And therefore you now have no evidence base to dismiss the impact that will have on the level of affordable housing provided under a viability test of a local housing element. So my understanding is that you are providing no evidence, so you aren't refuting the evidence.

00:58:57:21 - 00:59:11:07

You just don't aren't providing any. Is that correct? Well, I'm sorry I'm not allowed to ask you a question. I mean, asking the question to see if, um, whether the points I'm making is valid and reasonable. Thank you.

00:59:11:17 - 00:59:15:11

Thank you. Councillor six. Mr. hunt, do you do you have a final?

00:59:16:22 - 00:59:41:11

Um, uh, Andy Hunt for the applicant? We've made submissions on this, and we can add to it. On the scale of the construction workforce, it's 700,000 people within 90 minutes of the site. Uh, we do not believe that the scale of our construction workforce demand will have an impact on the viability of affordable housing and therefore lessen the delivery of affordable housing. And we can set out where we've set that out in previous submissions.

00:59:43:29 - 00:59:50:04

Thank you. Um, I'm going to move on. Councillor Essex. Um, do you have another question?

00:59:51:22 - 00:59:58:00

Um. Thank you. I'm going to hand over to Mr. Gleason to address agenda items 6 to 8 now.

00:59:59:24 - 01:00:00:09

Thank you very.

01:00:00:11 - 01:00:35:19

Much. So item six is action points. There are a number of action points from item five of this hearing, which will be checked and published on the project website as soon as possible, alongside those from yesterday and Tuesday. But the draft action points have gone through now. I'll start with number 31, because I think those up to number 30 have already been published. So 31 for the applicant is to submit the example thematic thematic plans that have been shared with the Glas.

01:00:36:01 - 01:00:37:09

Thus by deadline eight.

01:00:42:08 - 01:00:58:17

32 for the applicant, provide a route map showing the process from the SBS to the Employment Implementation Plan as requested by Surrey County Council in their pads, which is rep 5111.

01:01:02:06 - 01:01:10:02

Number 33. The joint local authorities to provide an update on the current situation of the housing emergency.

01:01:15:02 - 01:01:27:18

Number 34, again for the joint local authorities to provide wording for a requirement that would secure the housing fund if it were not agreed in the section 106 agreement.

01:01:31:27 - 01:01:38:08

35 For Cagney to provide data on the housing shortage issue in Sussex.

01:01:42:09 - 01:01:50:29

36 for the applicant to confirm whether an estimate of the number of asylum seekers has been considered within the assessment.

01:01:54:21 - 01:02:07:09

So all of these are. Deadline. Eight. Apart from number 33, which is the housing emergency which is deadline nine. Apologies.

01:02:12:03 - 01:02:26:21

Number 37, JLS. Submit detail of the JLR concerns regarding the methodology used to calculate the catalytic employment benefits for deadline eight.

01:02:33:11 - 01:02:56:24

Number 38 for the applicant and jazz. Further discussion to take place between the applicant and jazz regarding the assessment of catalytic employment benefits, and to provide the examining authority with an update on whether common grounds can be reached. Got that as deadline. 8 or 9.

01:02:59:22 - 01:03:04:16

Eight. You can do that for eight. It may need to.

01:03:06:20 - 01:03:14:16

Is that not going to be possible in terms of when is your your meeting is next week. Is it just before the next deadline?

01:03:17:00 - 01:03:18:01

Um, meeting in

01:03:19:20 - 01:03:33:22

Scotland? Yes. The meeting is next week. We're. We need to make sure that anything that happens in the meeting can be relayed to wider members of the team. And I think we we wouldn't want to commit to a deadline to something we could achieve.

01:03:34:16 - 01:03:39:02

Yeah. I mean, ideally deadline if possible, if not obviously deny nine.

01:03:39:11 - 01:03:48:11

Scotland if we're able to give any sort of update, at least of what's happened, we will do that by deadline. But we may need to give further details after that. Thank you, thank you. Yes.

01:03:50:15 - 01:04:29:15

Um, number 39 for the applicant to review whether amendments need to be made to the communications plan in relation to how vulnerable groups can raise concerns about their impacts. That's what that line eight. Yes. And the final one for the applicant. And 40 confirm the increased level of funding that will be included for the hardship funds in the section 106 agreements, and respond to whether an individual could be made to wait until the start of the following year to receive assistance if it exceeds the funding cap, and that by deadline nine.

01:04:31:23 - 01:05:01:25

Scotland of the applicant. Um. Yes. Thank you sir. The only one I was going to raise was number 36, I think in relation to the asylum seekers. Yes. Um, as you'll have heard in the examination, there appears to be some information that the glas have. And I'm concerned that we may not have enough time to receive that information and absorb it before deadline. Before deadline. So perhaps the way to deal with it is to take the same approach as we have on the other item we discussed.

01:05:01:27 - 01:05:07:11

We'll try and update you if possible at deadline, but it may be after that before we can deal with it properly.

01:05:07:13 - 01:05:08:05

That's acceptable.

01:05:08:07 - 01:05:09:07

Thank you very much, sir.

01:05:11:00 - 01:05:32:04

Uh, as I say, we will check those draft action points and hopefully publish them on the websites either later today or tomorrow. Thank you. So I'll now move on to item seven, which is any other business. Is there any other business relevant to this hearing that anyone wishes to raise?

01:05:33:29 - 01:05:37:09

No. Okay. Sorry, Mr. Edwards.

01:05:37:17 - 01:05:48:05

So can I just raise Michael Bell for the joint local authorities? Just a point that arises slightly out of that last, uh, discussion on deadlines.

01:05:48:26 - 01:05:49:11

Uh.

01:05:49:24 - 01:06:31:12

Obviously, I entirely appreciate why there are certain things that can't be done, uh, by deadline eight. And I therefore understand that in terms of the current, uh, timetable, why the next available deadline would be deadline nine. Uh, the difficulty that I see in terms of if there is information coming from the applicant at deadline nine is the difficulty of that presents for other parties. Um, because clearly it's not the normal expectation that unless you specifically request something, that the parties will be submitting things to you at deadline ten, I say, other than things that you've specifically requested.

01:06:31:14 - 01:07:19:23

Uh, whilst I'm not thinking that this sounds like there's going to be a lot of documentation coming from the applicant that might get held over from deadline eight to deadline nine for those logistical reasons. I'm just wondering whether you might consider, uh, that it would be useful to the examination to interpose a deadline et a at the probably the 14th of August, for, as it were, those catch up documents to be submitted by the applicant, so that at least there is a little bit of an opportunity for interested parties to see those and take those on board to the extent that they need to by deadline nine.

01:07:20:00 - 01:07:27:06

So that's that's the point. I'm sort of posing. I can see that it's possibly getting a reasonable reaction from the other side.

01:07:27:13 - 01:07:33:18

So so let's see what the formal reaction is. Mr. Linus Scott laughs and that's fine.

01:07:33:20 - 01:07:50:00

So I think we would accept that in relation to those, uh, documents we wouldn't want to see there was that deadline being used for other parties to necessarily put in huge swathes of other information, if it's done for that specific purpose. We're content with that.

01:07:50:11 - 01:07:52:15

Okay. Thank you. Okay.

01:07:55:21 - 01:08:25:27

Yeah. Acceptable here. Thank you very much. So in terms of any of the business, there's one matter that we wish to raise. And that was, um, we are aware that Heathrow Airport have recently published their results, um, and statistics for the year to date, for the first six months of the year up to the end of June. And some of this deals with passenger numbers and how they've changed since the first part of last year. Can I ask, Mr.

01:08:25:29 - 01:08:31:05

Linus, is this something that Gatwick do, and if so, could that information be made available?

01:08:35:23 - 01:08:36:08

In.

01:08:47:09 - 01:08:57:20

Scotland. For the applicant, I think to help you, sir. We're not in the position to deal with that properly today. We can take that away as another another action and.

01:09:00:18 - 01:09:01:25

We will. We'll do that.

01:09:03:16 - 01:09:11:25

Yes, we'll do that by a deadline here and explain any limitations or restrictions that we may need to refer to.

01:09:12:06 - 01:09:13:26

But that's fine. Um.

01:09:16:17 - 01:09:33:25

The the basis of asking that is, as we said, the results were recently published there in the public domain. Uh, as far as Heathrow Airport is concerned. And we were wondering if there was something comparable either expected or already published for Gatwick.

01:09:37:21 - 01:09:46:02

On the timing, yes. Scotland is the applicant. we will be publishing. Gatwick will be publishing results. We just need to check on the timing. That's fine. Thank you.

01:09:46:04 - 01:09:47:15

Very much. Okay,

01:09:49:10 - 01:10:16:10

so if there are no other matters, I'll move to item eight to close this hearing. So if I can remind you that the timetable for this examination requires that parties provide any posting documents on or before deadline eight, which is Wednesday the 7th of August. May also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the Inspectorate's website as soon as possible after this hearing.

01:10:18:11 - 01:10:38:17

As already indicated, the examining authority will be publishing proposed changes to the draft DCO on Wednesday, the 14th of August, and the final deadline in the examination is on Wednesday 21st of August, with the examination closing no later than Tuesday the 27th of August.

01:10:41:19 - 01:11:15:05

So I'm now going to move to close this issue specific hearing nine. The hearings this week have been the last formal hearings in this examination, so I'd like to thank not only all of those who've spoken at this hearing, but also all contributions to the entirety of the examination in writing and at all hearings. We're conscious of the enormous efforts made by local authorities, by a broad range of interested parties, community groups and individuals.

01:11:15:07 - 01:11:27:26

And the applicant team has been the vast amount of evidence put before us. We're very grateful for all the material and all of the efforts that has gone into collecting that evidence.

01:11:30:05 - 01:11:50:19

On behalf of the examining authority. I'd also like to express our thanks to you for the good natured, natured way in which the hearings had taken place. We recognized that there were strong feelings about the proposed developments. We are grateful for the way in which participants have conducted themselves within this room and online.

01:11:53:03 - 01:12:12:14

I'd also like to publicly thank members of the case team who are here today. Other case team members who've been involved and the wider pin's team, including the team who are responsible for ensuring that submitted documents are speedily and accurately added to the project website.

01:12:14:04 - 01:12:44:10

Finally, thanks to the audiovisual staff who have worked tirelessly to make sure we are recorded and broadcast, and to the security team who thankfully have been able to keep a low profile. So I'm now going to draw this event to close. This has been the final issue specific hearing in the examination of the Gatwick Airports Northern Illinois application. And with the time it's 1307, this hearing is now closed.

01:12:44:12 - 01:12:45:12

Thank you very much.