Gatwick Northern Runway Project (Project Reference: TR020005)

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) – Version 4

East Sussex County Council (Registration Identification Number: 20044514

Deadline 21 August 2024

This PADSS report has been prepared by East Sussex County Council (ESCC), with input from the joint authorities and appointed consultants where required. This document identifies the remaining principal areas of disagreement that have been identified when reviewing Gatwick Airport's (GAL's) Development Consent Order (DCO) documentation and is an update of Version 3.

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: August 2024
Ref	**Principal Issue in Question**	**Concern held**	**What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern**
1	The capacity deliverable with the Northern Runway Project (NRP) Proposed Development	Following the provision of further information by the Applicant [REP1-054 and discussions, the hourly and daily aircraft movement capacity deliverable with the NRP Proposed Development is agreed as the likely maximum throughput attainable. However, the annual passenger and aircraft movement forecasts deliverable from this capacity are not agreed. Based on information provided by the Applicant it is considered that the maximum throughput attainable with the NRP to be of the order of 75-76 mppa so delivering a smaller scale of benefits.	Updated position Deadline 9: Assessments should be based on a lower throughput of passengers with the NRP.
2	The forecasts for the use of the NRP are not based on a proper assessment of the market for GAL,	The demand forecasts have been developed 'bottom up' based on an assessment of the	Updated position Deadline 9: The adoption of the top down forecasts, including an allowance for capacity growth at the other London airports as the base case for the assessment of the

	having regard to the latest Department for Transport forecasts and having regard to the potential for additional capacity to be delivered at other airports. The demand forecasts are considered too optimistic.	capacity that could be delivered by the NRP (see point above). It is not considered good practice to base long term 20 year forecasts solely on a bottom up analysis without consideration of the likely scale of the market and the share that might be attained by any particular airport. Alternative top-down forecasts have now been presented by GAL [REP1-052] that show slower growth in the early years following the opening of the NRP. These are considered more reasonable that the original bottom=up forecasts adopted by the Applicant but still fail to take adequate account of the extent to which some part of the demand could be met by expansion at other	impacts of the NRP and the setting of appropriate controls on growth relative to the impacts.

		airports serving London including a third runway or other expansion being delivered at Heathrow.	
3	Baseline Case has been overstated leading to understatement of the impacts.	There is concern that it is unreasonable to assume that the existing single runway operation will be able to support 67.2 mppa meaning that the assessment of impacts understates the effects, see REP4-049. The JLAs believe that the maximum throughput attainable in the Baseline Case is likely to be of the order of 57 mppa and that this alternative Baseline should be adopted as the basis for assessing the effects of the Proposed Development.	Updated position Deadline 9: The Alternative Baseline Case should be adopted as the basis for assessing the impacts of the NRP.
3	Overstatement of the wider, catalytic, and national level economic benefits of the NRP.	The methodology used to assess the catalytic employment and GVA benefits of the development is not robust as it is not based	The catalytic impact methodology needs to properly account for the specific catchment area and demand characteristics of each of the cross-section of airports to ensure that the catalytic impacts of airport growth are robustly identified.

| | | on the use of available data relating to air passenger demand in the UK. The JLAs are not confident that these assessments present a realistic position in terms of catalytic employment at the local level such that the results should not be relied on. The methodology used to assess the catalytic employment and GVA benefits of the development is not robust, leading to an overstatement of the likely benefits in the local area.
The national economic impact assessment is derived from demand forecasts which are considered likely to be optimistic and fails to properly account for potential displacement effects, as well as other methodological concerns. | The national economic impact assessment should robustly test the net impact of expansion at GAL having regard to the potential for growth elsewhere and properly account for Heathrow specific factors, such as hub traffic and air fares.
Work is ongoing between York Aviation and the Applicant regarding a joint local authority SoCG on operations / capacity and needs / forecasting.
.
Updated position Deadline 9:The catalytic impact methodology needs to properly account for the specific catchment area and demand characteristics of each of the cross-section of airports to ensure that the catalytic impacts of airport growth are robustly identified. Account needs to be taken of the specific relationship between growth at Gatwick and the characteristics of its catchment area, having regard to changes due to the NRP and displacement from other airports.

The national economic impact assessment should robustly test the net impact of expansion at Gatwick having regard to the potential for growth elsewhere and properly account for Heathrow specific factors, such as hub traffic and air fares. |

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council	Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: August 2024

Transport & surface access

Request for bus service improvements

The Council has pursued improvements to bus services in East Sussex to support access to the airport through commitments in the SAC's and alternatively as a requirement. These requests have been unsuccessful.

Whilst the Council notes the applicant's response in REP8-115, that the bus service improvements will be considered as part of 'Commitment 5 in the SAC, which requires reasonable financial support to be provided for the services stated in Table 1 of the SAC, or others which result in an equivalent level of public service transport accessibility'. This is alongside the applicant being 'required to consult the TFSG that additional services (including those requested by East Sussex County Council) would be assessed in order to identify the routes and services which maximise the potential of achieving the mode share commitments'.

The Council remain disappointed that bus service improvements have not been secured. However, as a member of the TFSG ESCC is committed to work with GAL through this forum to prioritise funding to enable bus service improvements to come forward to provide sustainable surface access to the airport to/from East Sussex. **For the avoidance of doubt, the Council maintains its position that the provision by the Applicant of bus service improvements is essential.**

Rail Enhancement Fund

The Council are pleased to note that the Applicant has proposed a Rail Enhancement Fund as specified in the Surface Access Commitments document [REP7-043]..

The Council recognise that discussions are continuing to take place with Network Rail, therefore, the Council confirm agreement to this matter. However, should assessment work, including modelling, be required as part of this fund the Council request that the East Coastway line (Brighton to Hastings, via Eastbourne) is included as it is a key corridor to join the Brighton Mainline to access Gatwick Airport.

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: August 2024
6	Page 36 (12-33) of the Transport Environmental Statement	Reference to East Sussex CC comment in PEIR to Extend scope of modelling to include Ashdown Forest. The Area of Detailed Modelling includes the Ashdown Forest area.	GAL have confirmed in the March 2024 SOCG (with ESCC) that the transport modelling covers a large area which includes all roads in neighbouring Districts and Ashdown Forest, as indicated in Diagram 5.3.3 of the Transport Assessment. Whilst GAL has sought to assess the impacts of the NRP on Ashdown Forest, and cites the impacts, ESCC requires measures that reduces traffic through sensitive locations near and through Ashdown Forest - which is a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) / Special Protection Area (SPA) – to be considered and introduced. The route through Ashdown Forest (via Sharpethorne) is a key route to the airport and avoids travel along the A22, which is our preferred strategic route to the airport. Whilst the applicant has stated that 'Agreement has been reached with Natural England on the method used for the HRA assessment and Natural England's Relevant Representations detail that no further information is required with regard to the HRA assessment' (ES Appendix 9.9.1 Habitats Regulation Assessment Parts 1 and 2 [APP-134 & APP-135].). Regardless of the agreement with Natural England, we wish for an accurate assessment of the current and anticipated impacts needs to be established in order to understand what the impacts would be, regardless of whether or not they are significant.

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council			Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: August 2024
			Updated position (Deadline 9): It remains unclear what the impacts of the NRP on Ashdown Forest would be in terms of additional vehicular impacts. Therefore, our previous position remains. Note: We have noted (since the deadline to GAL at 12pm 12 August 2024) that GAL has 'Agreed' this matter, which goes against the Council's updated position at Deadline 5 (ref. 2.20.2.1). An update to the SOCG by GAL on 19/08/2024 acknowledges that a response has not been provided.
Air quality			
11	Missing figures and the lack of clear study area information makes it difficult to understand traffic changes in the different scenarios. This in turn makes it difficult to understand if effects predicted at receptors are reasonable over the construction and operational phases.	*Document 5.1, Chapter 13* Paragraph 13.5.5 of the ES air quality chapter refers to a 'wider study area' (beyond the 11km by 10km domain), plus the modelled affected road network (ARN) outside this area. This is shown on Figure 13.4.1.4.1.1. The ES Air Quality Figures – Parts 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been reviewed, and this figure cannot be identified.	The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** It is still not possible to look at each individual ARN scenario to understand if the scenarios and the changes in traffic and pollutant concentrations for each scenario are logical.

| | | Currently, figures within Part 3 just show a wider study area domain, not the actual roads meeting the ARN criteria (e.g. Appendix 13.6.1 Figure 2.3.1). This figure should be provided to illustrate the affected road network. No further information on the road traffic air quality study was identified in ES Appendix 13.4.1: Air Quality Assessment Methodology. However, reference to the above missing figure is made within this ES Appendix document, suggesting it has been missed in the collation of this ES Appendix. | |
| 13 | Operational monitoring should be agreed during the examination. | *Document 5.1, Chapter 13*

Operational monitoring will be crucial to understand if measured air quality is following modelled prediction. | The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. The Joint Local Authorities have also submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality |

		There is no information in either the air quality chapter or the Surface Access Commitments document on how air quality data will be reviewed to check that changes are in-line with predictions, nor what measures would be taken if a significant adverse deterioration occurred.	Action Plan [REP2 -004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** Discussions are ongoing concerning operational air quality monitoring. However, any air quality monitoring would be best utilized within an Environmentally Managed Framework (EMG). This is because the Council has concerns that if modal shift targets are not achieved or if air quality standards were to change in future, the current controls within the DCO provide no mechanism to manage this uncertainty and would allow uncontrolled growth to continue even where breaches were occurring. The purpose of the EMG Framework proposed by the JLAs is to introduce action thresholds (which align with LAQM guidance TG22) to identify where a risk of exceedance is likely. The EMG approach would be clearly linked to air quality monitoring.
15	Using the application documents, is not possible to relate the figures to the results set out in the appendices tables	*Document 13.6.2* The receptor tables include most of the expected information, including a receptor ID reference. However, the tables (e.g. Table 2.1.1 and Table 2.4.1) do not	GAL should update receptor figures to present receptor IDs. Additionally, a column identifying the local authority location for each receptor would be extremely useful. Note: this links to our concerns over the impacts of air quality on Ashdown Forest (which is an area of European Ecological Importance, Special Area of Conservation, and a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Need to consider these impacts as part of the

| | | identify which figure the receptor listed is shown, as would be typically expected, to allow readers to move between the appendix, chapter and figures.

However, as receptors are not labelled by ID this is therefore not possible in this ES. The reader needs to plot the grid references provided to understand where a receptor is. | modelling work being undertaken (air quality - nitrogen deposition issues arising from additional traffic through Ashdown Forest).

The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. The Joint Local Authorities have also submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2 -004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.

Updated position (Deadline 9): The point concerning receptors on figures being made was that members of the public and people without access to shapefiles will not be able to follow the information within the ES without improved figures. The Applicant suggests that Table 2.1.1 can be used in conjunction with figures (e.g. 2.1.4) as the tables include the grid references of the receptors. However, this is incorrect as the figures do not include labelled grid lines. Without this the reader cannot use the grid references in the tables to locate receptors. The reader needs to enter the grid reference |

			information from the receptor table into a third-party tool or use a map with grid lines to enable them to link the two elements of the ES. The reader should not need to undertake additional work to understand the ES.
16	Lack of sensitivity analysis on the anticipated modal shift, and the associated air quality impacts.	*Document 5.1, Chapter 12* Paragraph 12.8.6 of the traffic and transport chapter sets out a variety of measures to produce the modal shift assumed with the proposed development. Within the assumptions, there are controls on on-site parking numbers, parking charges and forecourt access charges. There is insufficient sensitivity analysis on these figures, including the impact on air quality if they are not achieved.	The Applicant sets out in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality matters submitted by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 3 (Appendix A) [REP3-117] will be responded to by Deadline 5. This Appendix of air quality queries prepared by AECOM included a wide range of technical matters. The Joint Local Authorities have also submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2 -004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from the Applicant further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline. **Updated position (Deadline 9)**: The Council continues to consider that this information would assist in understanding the air quality risks associated with modal shift targets were not achieved. As this is unlikely to be provided at this stage this increases the importance of an EMG framework. In the event that an EMG approach was not possible further safeguards could be adopted in an AQAP or similar.

Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) from East Sussex County Council	Version Number: 1 Submitted at: October 2023 Updated: August 2024
Socio economics ESCC welcomes the updated ESBS and Draft ESBS Implementation Plan, which were shared at Deadline 7. The ESBS and Implementation Plans have been secured through the S106, but the Council require an ongoing dialogue with GAL through our role of the Steering Group to ensure that East Sussex's employment and skills needs are addressed and reflect our comments made during the examination.	

NOISE AND VIBRATION

Ref	Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern
Noise and vibration			
29	Lack of detail on noise impacts for East Sussex	Concerned that the impacts of noise on East Sussex communities has not been adequately addressed and assessed, and that appropriate mitigations will not be in place	Expect GAL to provide greater clarity on how many more flights would be passing over East Sussex, which locations would be the most affected and how this would be mitigated. This includes paying particular attention to sensitive and protected areas, such as Ashdown Forest. 2032 is not the worst-case year in terms of overflights. Overflight figures should be provided for all assessment scenarios. Northern runway departures should be included in overflights so impacts can be understood in areas close to the airport. The Deadline 1 position identifies that figures are still too coarse to draw any meaningful information from so this has not been addressed. Overflight figures should show aircraft below 4,000 feet as noise contours are most affected by aircraft movements below 4,000 feet.

			Updated position (Deadline 9): The Council disagree that overflights should only be assessed up to 7,000 feet. CAP1616a explicitly states: "*Change sponsors should portray LAeq, 16 hours noise exposure contours as a means of explaining noise impacts for airports where the proposed option is likely to result in a change in traffic patterns or traffic volumes or fleet mix below 4,000 feet*" It goes on to state: "*The height of 4,000 feet was selected as the criterion for LAeq contours because aircraft operating above this altitude are unlikely to affect the size or shape of LAeq contours*" As such, provision of overflights up to 7,000 feet does not provide necessary information to supplement the air noise assessment based on LAeq noise effects. The Council would like to be able to contextualise the impact of additional aircraft movements through provision of relevant overflight contours as follows: • for aircraft movements below 4,000 feet. • provided as contours calculated from 100mx100m grids. • include aircraft movement associated with the northern runway.)
30	Clarification on estimated overflight mapping	There is a need for assurances on the accuracy and reliability of the estimated overflight mapping, and we will require East Sussex to be included as part of this.	GAL to respond on this point. If East Sussex has not been included we would wish the overflight mapping to be revisited to include the county, and the results updated and shared as appropriate for consideration. 2032 is not the worst-case year in terms of overflights. Overflight figures should be provided for all assessment scenarios. Northern runway departures should be included in overflights so impacts can be understood in

			areas close to the airport. The Deadline 1 position identifies that figures are still too coarse to draw any meaningful information from so this has not been addressed. Overflight figures should show aircraft below 4,000 feet as noise contours are most affected by aircraft movements below 4,000 feet. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Council disagree that overflights should only be assessed up to 7,000 feet. CAP1616a explicitly states: "*Change sponsors should portray LAeq, 16 hours noise exposure contours as a means of explaining noise impacts for airports where the proposed option is likely to result in a change in traffic patterns or traffic volumes or fleet mix below 4,000 feet*" It goes on to state: "*The height of 4,000 feet was selected as the criterion for LAeq contours because aircraft operating above this altitude are unlikely to affect the size or shape of LAeq contours*" As such, provision of overflights up to 7,000 feet does not provide necessary information to supplement the air noise assessment based on LAeq noise effects. The Council would like to be able to contextualise the impact of additional aircraft movements through provision of relevant overflight contours as follows: • for aircraft movements below 4,000 feet. • provided as contours calculated from 100mx100m grids. • include aircraft movement associated with the northern runway.

Legislation, policy and guidance			
32	Interpretation of the Overarching Aviation Noise Policy	Paragraph 14.2.44 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration – sharing the benefits has been removed from the ES. This is a fundamental part of the Noise Envelope so it should be demonstrated how benefits of new aircraft technology are shared between the airport and local communities.	It should be demonstrated as part of the Noise Envelope how the noise benefits of future aircraft technology are shared between the airport and local communities. This is a policy requirement set out in the Aviation Policy Framework. The Applicant's method for sharing the benefits is flawed as it allows for a substantial increase in noise contour area in the 2032 daytime period over the 2019 baseline. It is hard to understand how it can be justified that any benefits have been shared with the local community in this case. ESCC's position maintains that there should be no allowance for any increase in noise contour limits to provide certainty to communities about noise they would experience in the future should the project be consented. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Council maintain their position that there should be no allowance for Noise Envelope contour limits to increase.
Assessment of significant effects – Air Noise			
34	The assessment switches between discussing properties and population depending on whether noise is between LOAEL and SOAEL (population) or	The assessment should cover both properties and population and be consistent when identifying significant effects to aid their understanding.	Provide an assessment of likely significant air noise effects covering both properties and population. Updated position (Deadline 9): The Applicant has not addressed this request for additional information.

	above SOAEL (properties)		
35	Identification of population exposed to noise above SOAEL and between LOAEL and SOAEL	It is not clear what population is exposed to changes in noise above SOAEL and between LOAEL and SOAEL in Table 14.9.10 and 14.9.11	It would be helpful to provide tables identifying the population exposed to changes in air noise at absolute noise levels between LOAEL and SOAEL and for population experiencing absolute air noise levels exceeding SOAEL **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Council would like to see an updated version of Chapter 14 where this matter could be addressed.
36	Properties that are newly exposed to noise levels exceeding the SOAEL are not identified	It is important to identify how many properties are newly exposed to noise levels exceeding the SOAEL to determine compliance with the first aim of the ANPS	Identify how many and the location of properties newly exposed to noise levels exceeding the SOAEL The Applicant should revisit Table 14.9.10 and Table 14.9.11 as they do not show population exposed to changes in noise between LOAEL and SOAEL and above SOAEL **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Council would like to see an updated version of Chapter 14 where this matter could be addressed
37	Paragraph 14.9.98 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration states that there would be reduced movements on the main runway	It is not clear is these Minor Beneficial effects would continue through the project lifespan when more capacity is taken up and the main runway may return to current intensity of operations	Identify significant effects during all assessment years to help understand how communities would be affected by noise throughout the project lifespan. The requested information should be clearly provided by providing a detailed assessment of all assessment years so noise effects can be understood throughout the lifespan of the project. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Council would like to see an updated version of Chapter 14 where this matter is addressed.

	resulting in Minor Beneficial effects		
39	No attempt has been made to expand on the assessment of likely significant effects through the use of secondary noise metrics.	Context is provided to the assessment of ground noise through consideration of the secondary LAmax, overflight, Lden and Lnight noise metric; however, no conclusions on how this metric relates to likely significant effects have been made so the use of secondary metrics in terms of the overall assessment of likely significant effects is unclear.	Provide some commentary about how secondary metrics relate to likely significant effects and whether the assessment of secondary metrics warrant identifying a likely significant effect. The Applicant does not demonstrate a consistent approach to assessing likely significant effects. ESCC's position remains that secondary metrics should be used to identify likely significant effects. ESCC would also request that the Applicant sets out their methodology for identifying likely significant effects due to Lmax events above 65dB in the day and 60dB at night. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Applicants response relates to ground noise; however, ESCC is concerned with how air noise will affect the county. ESCC's position remains that secondary metrics should be used to identify likely significant noise effects
Document name: Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling			
42	No details of the noise modelling or validation process are provided	It is difficult to have any confidence in the noise model without any provision of the assumptions and limitation that have been applied in the validation of the noise model and production of noise contours	Details of the validation process, noise modelling process along with any assumptions and limitations applied should be provided ECRD Report 2002 does not contain the information requested. The information is important to understand the aircraft noise contours has not been provided by the Applicant. The information was initially requested after the ESCC review of the PEIR and the Applicant has not fulfilled the request.

			Updated position (Deadline 9): The Applicant has provided information on the validation of the Boeing 737-800 aircraft only [REP5-079]. The issue regarding the lack of information on air noise model validation was raised at ISH9 and the Applicant responded that the data was confidential to the CAA and could not be releases. The JLAs have since contacted the CAA who stated they would release the data with the consent of the Applicant. ESCC await provision of the following information i) the results of statistical analysis of SEL and LAmax data for individual aircraft at each monitoring location that feed into the validation process at Gatwick along with a figure showing the monitoring locations on a map. And: ii) a comparison of the measured SEL and LAmax data against predicted levels for each aircraft. We would like to see this information for all aircraft that make up 75% of the noise energy at the airport.
43	No details of measured Single Event Level or LASmax noise data from the Noise-Track-Keeping are provided	Measured Single Event Level and LASmax noise data should be provided for individual aircraft variants as it is key information used when defining the aircraft noise baseline.	Provide Single Event Level and LASmax noise data for individual aircraft variants The requested information should formally be submitted and should include Lmax and SEL data for all aircraft that were validated. There is no dispute on the use of ANCON to model air noise, but it is important that sufficient information is provided such that it can be understood how aircraft fleets are transposed into noise contours. This information has been requested since the PEIR and the Applicant has not yet provided what is important and relevant information that underpins the air noise assessment. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Applicant has provided information on the validation of the Boeing 737-

			800 aircraft only [REP5-079]. The issue regarding the lack of information on air noise model validation was raised at ISH9 and the Applicant responded that the data was confidential to the CAA and could not be releases. The JLAs have since contacted the CAA who stated they would release the data with the consent of the Applicant. ESCC await provision of the following information i) the results of statistical analysis of SEL and LAmax data for individual aircraft at each monitoring location that feed into the validation process at Gatwick along with a figure showing the monitoring locations on a map. And: ii) a comparison of the measured SEL and LAmax data against predicted levels for each aircraft. We would like to see this information for all aircraft that make up 75% of the noise energy at the airport.
Document name: Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope			
44	Slow fleet transition noise contour area limits	There is no incentive to push the transition of the fleet to quieter aircraft technology. This means that the Noise Envelope allows for an increase in noise contour area on opening of the Northern Runway	Noise contour area limits should be based on the Central Case The Applicant's method for sharing the benefits is flawed as it allows for a substantial increase in noise contour area in the 2032 daytime period over the 2019 baseline. It is hard to understand how it can be justified that any benefits have been shared with the local community in this case. ESCC's position maintains that there should be no allowance for any increase in noise contour limits to provide certainty to communities about noise they would experience in the future should the project be consented.

			Updated position (Deadline 9): The Applicant has still not modelled 284,987 ATMs in 2029 i.e. the baseline scenario where no growth in the 2019 movements occurs, despite this approach being in line with the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Report (para 2.3.13 Appendix 6.2.2 [APP-095]) which states: *"The ES should also give consideration to the prospect of a 'no development' and 'no growth scenario' for comparative purposes and in support of the justification for the Proposed Development in the form that is to be presented in the DCO application".* It is noted that the applicant failed to provide this information: i) in its Scoping Response to PINS set out in 2.3.11 of Appendix 6.2.3 [APP-096]. ii) In response to the Surrey Local Impact Report - Appendix C: Noise and Vibration District and Borough Profiles [REP1-100]. In the Applicant's response – Updated position (July 2024) in column 4 - (connected to the updated central case) it appears to be using the forecast ATM movements in 2029 with 2019 technology, which is the reverse of the question being asked here.

45	Annual noise contour limits	Noise contour area limits relate only to the 92-day summer period. There should be additional noise contour area limits in place to control growth during periods of the year outside the 92-day summer period.	Annual noise contours should be included in the Noise Envelope Current DfT night-time controls apply to Gatwick for the summer and winter seasonal periods. The DCO should include a commitment that these controls are retained and maintained regardless of any future changes that may occur as a result of consultation relating DfT night flight restrictions. Night-time QC and movement limits for both summer and winter periods should be reported. It is noted that the Applicant exceeded their summer period night-time movement limit in 2023 so this information is relevant and important to the Noise Envelope. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** ESCCs position is that it is essential that there is a commitment in the DCO to retain and maintain DfT night noise controls should DfT night noise controls or Gatwick's designated airport status change in future.
46	Flexibility of noise contour area limits to account for airspace redesign and future aircraft technology	GAL wants flexibility to increase noise contour area limits depending on airspace redesign and noise emissions from new aircraft technology. If expansion is consented, any uncertainties from airspace redesign or new aircraft technology should be covered within the constraints of the Noise Envelope	There should be no allowance for the Noise Envelop limits to increase The Applicant's method for sharing the benefits is flawed as it allows for a substantial increase in noise contour area in the 2032 daytime period over the 2019 baseline. It is hard to understand how it can be justified that any benefits have been shared with the local community in this case. ESCC's position maintains that there should be no allowance for any increase in noise contour limits to provide certainty to communities about noise they would experience in the future should the project be consented.

			Updated position (Deadline 9): ESCCs response to sharing the benefits is set out in row 2.16.4.2 of the ESCC SOCG. ESCC maintain their position that there should be no allowance for Noise Envelope contour limits to increase.
47	CAA to regulate the Noise Envelope	To date, the CAA have not accepted a role regulating the Noise Envelope. There is no mechanism for local authorities to review Noise Envelope reporting, take action against breaches or review any aspects of the Noise Envelope	A mechanism should be included to allow the local authorities to scrutinise noise envelope reporting and take action in the case of any breaches ESCC maintain their position that the Host Authorities should be part of an independent group set up to regulate the Noise Envelope. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Council maintain their position that the Host Authorities should be part of an independent group set up to regulate the Noise Envelope.
48	Adoption of an action plan	A breach would be identified for the preceding year, with an action plan in place for the following year. Consequently, it would be two years after a breach before a plan to reduce the contour area would be in place	More forward-planning needs to be adopted to ensure that action plans are in place before a breach of the noise contour area limit occurs. The Applicant has not provided any information to support the use of forecasts to prevent contour limit breaches. ESCC maintain that forecasts are not reliable enough to prevent noise contour area limit breaches. An alternative forward-looking method should be adopted that can be applied during scheduling that can provide more confidence that breaches would not occur.

			Updated position (Deadline 9): The Council support the JLAs submission for an Environmentally Managed Growth Framework [REP4-040].
49	Capacity declaration restrictions as a means of managing aircraft noise	This would not prevent new slots being allocated within the existing capacity and is not an effective means of preventing future noise contour limit breaches if a breach occurred in the previous year	Slot restriction measures should be adopted in the event of a breach being identified for the previous year of operation ESCC maintain their position on this matter. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Council maintain their position on this matter.
Document name: Appendix 14.9.8 Noise Envelope Group Output Report			
50	Airbus NEOs (New Engine Option) are stated to be up to 5 dB quieter departure and 3 dB quieter on approach.	This statement is misleading as these levels of noise reductions are not achieved by Airbus A320Neo or A321Neo, which are the main Airbus variants that will be operational at GAL in the future.	Provide a more realistic reduction in noise that is provided the NEO aircraft. It is requested that the Applicant provide measure SEL and LAmax noise data for each aircraft variant modelled at each monitoring location. This information underpins the air noise assessment and is important for understanding to aircraft fleets are transposed int air noise contours. **Updated position (Deadline 9):** The Applicant has provided information on the validation of the Boeing 737-800 aircraft only [REP5-079]. The issue regarding the lack of information on air noise model validation was raised at ISH9 and the Applicant responded that the data was confidential to the CAA and could not be released. The JLAs have since contacted the CAA who stated they would release the data with the consent of the Applicant. ESCC await provision of the following information:

			i) the results of statistical analysis of SEL and LAmax data for individual aircraft at each monitoring location that feed into the validation process at Gatwick along with a figure showing the monitoring locations on a map. And: ii) a comparison of the measured SEL and LAmax data against predicted levels for each aircraft. We would like to see this information for all aircraft that make up 75% of the noise energy at the airport.