



**Gatwick Northern Runway Project DCO (Project Reference: TR020005)**

**Deadline 8 Submission (7 August 2024)**

**Joint Surrey Councils – Surrey County Council (Ref. 20044665), Mole Valley Borough Council (Ref: 20044578), Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (Ref. 20044474) and Tandridge District Council (Ref: 20043605)**

**Overview**

1. This document provides a response at Deadline 8 from the above Joint Surrey Councils (JSCs) on a number of Deadline 7 submissions:
  - Comments on GAL Deadline 7 Submissions
  - Comments on any other submissions received by Deadline 7
2. The Joint Local Authorities have provided collective comment on a range of submissions. These have been submitted by Crawley Borough Council on behalf of the authorities.
3. The Legal Partnership Authorities’ have provided comments on the Applicant’s ExQ2 responses and ISH9 post-hearing submissions. These have been submitted by West Sussex County Council on behalf of the Legal Partnership.

**Response to GAL submissions at Deadline 7**

**GAL response to D6 submissions [REP7-095]**

4. The JSCs have a number of comments and queries.

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Summary (i.e. the comment or question)</b>	<b>JSC comment on GAL response</b>
Section 7 Table 2 – 5.6.2	The JSCs are not prepared to accept a construction compound access onto Balcombe Road other than for active travel.  Applicant Response: Details of how accesses to the construction compounds will be laid out and any required parking restrictions will be included in the CTMPs submitted for approval pursuant to DCO Requirement 12.	SCC notes that details will be included in the CTMPs submitted for approval pursuant to DCO Requirement 12. This will need to be developed in conjunction with SCC.  As per our concerns set out previously, SCC position remains the same.
Section 7 Table 2 – 5.7.2	Current access proposals are not satisfactory as they do not prohibit right turning into the site across the A217 immediately north west of the	SCC notes that details will be included in the CTMPs submitted for approval pursuant to DCO

	<p>Longbridge Roundabout. The access should be designed to facilitate left in and left out only, with U-turns being undertaken at the two roundabouts either side of the access.</p>	<p>Requirement 12. This will need to be developed in conjunction with SCC.</p> <p>As per our concerns set out previously, SCC position remains the same.</p>
--	--	--

**Surrey Written Scheme of Investigation for Post-Consent Archaeological Investigation (REP7-045)**

5. The latest version of the Written Scheme of Investigation for proposed archaeological works at Car Park B principally shows two sets of significant amendments. The first of these is to remove all references to the Sussex archaeological standards and replace with the *General Standards for Archaeological Projects in Surrey (2023)*. This was a previous recommendation, and we are pleased that it has been implemented. Paragraphs 6.2.17 and 6.2.18 have been altered to take account of the Surrey document and have been significantly augmented as a result. These changes were apparent in a previous version of this document and are welcomed.
6. The second major set of amendments relates to the insertion of section 9, dealing with Public Outreach, paragraphs 9.1.1 – 9.1.3. This section proposes a programme of public outreach, to be “developed and implemented following commencement” (presumably of the test pitting works in Car Park B, although this isn’t clear) “to share the findings of the ongoing archaeological investigations.” Whilst the focus of this WSI is on the test pitting proposal for Car Park B, we interpret the revised section 9, paragraph 9.1.1 to actually refer to the archaeological results of the Gatwick NRP overall, not just limited to this particular investigation. The public outreach programme is not outlined, but potential measures are suggested and paragraph 9.1.1 does indicate a timetable for discussions about this proposed programme to begin.
7. Both sets of signposted amendments in this WSI are acceptable, assuming the interpretation of the scope of paragraph 9.1.1 set out above, is correct.

**GAL Third Change Application Report (REP7-097)**

8. As the proposals involve the creation of a new temporary vehicular access to the A217, a heavily trafficked A road, SCC would like to understand if it has been explored whether the hotel could instead utilise its current exit onto Povey Cross Road in the event that the existing entrance from the A217 might have to temporarily be closed during the Longbridge roundabout works. The existing exit (which does not appear to be controlled through TRO’s) could be widened if necessary to allow for simultaneous entry and exit during those rare occasions that the main access might not be useable.
9. As the creation of a temporary access directly from the A217 would involve TRO’s and construction work on that road (including along the central markings to prevent right turning into the access from the west), this alternative option would be worth exploring.

10. If the temporary access onto the A217 is required, SCC as Highway Authority would require that:
- It is time bound and temporary.
  - The works are included in the Section 278 works for the Longbridge Roundabout.
  - Temporary signage, marking and central barriers on the A217 to prevent right turning into the site from the West are included in the Section 278 (the plans as submitted do not show how this will be achieved).
  - All fees for the extended Section 278, and Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders are paid in accordance with the intended Section 278.
  - All works associated with the temporary access are fully removed upon completion of the Longbridge Roundabout works with all verges reinstated and maintained for at least a year afterwards.

**Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan – version 3 tracked (REP7-027)**

11. We note that a number of comments made in our D6 submission (REP6-101), paras 12-15 have not been addressed. This includes access proposals for construction compounds and also how restricted use access of specific roads will be controlled. Detailed comments are:

Ref	Summary (i.e. the comment or question)	JSC comment
5.6.2	South Terminal Compound access from Balcombe Road	SCC notes that this access will be restricted to the public. However, SCC remains concerned that construction workers can still access from Balcombe Road with associated impact on SCC's Local Road Network. As per our concerns set out previously, SCC request that all access is from the South Terminal Roundabout, with Balcombe Road access restricted to active travel for local construction employees only, with associated parking restrictions added on Balcombe Road.
6.4.1	Construction sites or temporary compounds that can only be accessed by local roads	Please can it be confirmed if any routes are affected in Surrey?
Appendix A	Restrictions	We note the restricted use access of Povey Cross Road/Charlwood Road/Horley Road/The Street as well as Balcombe Road – please provide details of accesses to be used onto these roads and associated activities planned.

**Environmental Statement Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan - Part 3 Version 6 (REP7-053)**

12. Regarding Church Meadows Replacement Open Space (ROS) (Works No.40), the JSC's note the Applicant's response to ExA Q2 CA.2.9 (REP7-087) and welcome the clarity the response provides. The authorities were also grateful for the discussion around this at CAH2.

13. It is considered, however, that while it is intended for the detail regarding the ROS and maintenance would be set out in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP), in accordance with Requirement 8 of the DCO, the maintenance commitment should also be set out in the Outline LEMP as the overarching document for the subsequent LEMPs. The JSC's also consider that it should be made clear that the commitment to maintain the ROS would not be time restricted but secured indefinitely.

**Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice Annex 6 – Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation, VERSION: 4.0(REP7-031)**

14. It is noted that the revised document has omitted the previously shown paragraph 4.2.1, which described the grouping of non-homogenous individual trees under a single individual tree asset identifier. That said, the same trees still retain a single identifying tree number on the M23 & A23 Preliminary Tree Removal & Protection Plans.
15. We note that the overall impact of the scheme remains unchanged by these latest document changes. The shown removal of large numbers of individual and groups of trees, and understorey vegetation will have an undoubted deleterious impact to the landscape, biodiversity, and sylvan character of the area. Moreover, the loss of this green infrastructure and the ecosystems services provided, coupled with the increase in vehicles, airplane traffic, and associated airport activities, is considered detrimental to the wellbeing of those who live, work, and visit this part of the borough.
16. The affected authorities acknowledge the obligations in Requirement 8 of Schedule 2 of the Development Consent Order to publish and consult the affected authorities on the detailed LEMP. The expectation is that this will realise a thoughtful and diligently designed scheme of soft landscaping and tree/woodland planting. The scheme should also seek through appropriate metrics to compensate for some of the nature benefits lost, to restore some of the ecosystem's services values lost, and to enhance the new built environment. Furthermore, given the reduction in overall planting space created by the expansion, we would seek that off-site planting within the surrounding streetscape, and local amenity areas is considered.

**Response to other submissions at Deadline 7**

**National Highways responses to ExQ2 (REP7-115)**

17. In response to question TT2.12, SCC agrees with National Highways that a crossing provision where Footpath 346\_2sy intersects with North Terminal Roundabout at Longbridge Way and Northway would be beneficial as part of the overall Active Travel proposals.