



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and Horsham District Council – Clean Version

Book 10

VERSION: 3.0

DATE: AUGUST 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.1.3

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Current Position	5
2.1.	Agricultural Land Use and Recreation	5
2.2.	Air Quality	6
2.3.	Capacity and Operations	25
2.4.	Climate Change	26
2.5.	Construction	29
2.6.	Cumulative Effects and Interrelationships	31
2.7.	Draft DCO and Explanatory Memorandum	38
2.8.	Ecology and Nature Conservation	63
2.9.	Forecasting and Need	66
2.10.	Geology and Ground Conditions	67
2.11.	Greenhouse Gases	68
2.12.	Health and Wellbeing	77
2.13.	Historic Environment	81
2.14.	Landscape, Townscape and Visual	82
2.15.	Major Accidents and Disasters	84
2.16.	Noise and Vibration	85
2.17.	Planning and Policy	140
2.18.	Project Elements and Approach to Mitigation	150
2.19.	Socio-Economics and Economics	153
2.20.	Traffic and Transport	172
2.21.	Waste and Materials	189
2.22.	Water Environment	190
3	Signatures	192
	Appendix 1: Record of Engagement Undertaken	193

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in support of the examination phase for the proposed Gatwick Northern Runway Project (NRP). The Application was made by Gatwick Airport Limited (the Applicant) to the Secretary of State for the Department for Transport (the Secretary of State) pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008).
- 1.1.2 The Application comprises alterations to the existing northern runway which, together with the lifting of the current restrictions on its use, would enable dual runway operations. It also includes the development of a range of infrastructure and facilities which, with the alterations to the northern runway, would enable an increase in the airport's passenger throughput capacity. This includes substantial upgrade works to certain surface access routes which lead to the airport. A full description of the Proposed Development is included in **ES Chapter 5: Project Description** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
- 1.1.3 SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and focus on specific issues that may need to be considered during the Examination. The purpose and possible content of SoCG is detailed in the Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance entitled 'Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent' (2015), stating:
- "A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence."*
- 1.1.4 The SoCGs between the Applicant and the local authorities comprises several documents, to which this document is one. The Statement of Commonality provides details of the structure and status of the SoCG between all the relevant Interested Parties, including the local authorities. Naturally, the level of detail across the suite of SoCG varies to reflect the nature and complexity of the matter, as well as the position between the parties.
- 1.1.5 This document solely relates to matters between the Applicant and Horsham District Council. A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between the parties is detailed in **Appendix 1** of this document.
- 1.1.6 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. Therefore, the SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. Future iterations will be submitted at each deadline; and both parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as discussions progress, to ensure it is comprehensive and up to date.
- 1.1.7 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached, and is presented in a tabular form. This SoCG does not seek to replicate information that is available elsewhere, either within the Application and/or Examination documents, referring out where

appropriate. The terminology used within the SoCG to reflect the status between the parties is either:

- “Agreed” to indicate where a matter has been resolved to the satisfaction of the parties.
- “Not Agreed” to indicate a final position where parties cannot agree.
- “Under discussion” to indicate where matters are subject of on-going discussion with the aim to either resolve or refine the extent of disagreement between the parties.
- “No longer pursuing” where the stakeholder no longer pursues an interest in the matter.

1.1.8 The versions of the SoCGs submitted at Deadline 9 reflect the discussions between parties since the previous versions submitted into the Examination at Deadline 5. This has allowed for substantive updates from both parties until 12 August 2024 (when the JLAs returned comments on their updated position). Following receipt of those comments and in view of the timescales of the examination, the Applicant has only provided updates to such matters where considered necessary/helpful in view of its previous stated response, including by reference to its closing submissions and/or where engagement has enabled matters to be further progressed (including through the Section 106 Agreement). Therefore updated commentary has not been provided for all matters.

1.1.9 Furthermore, updates to the SoCGs at Deadline 9 have been prepared in parallel with negotiations on the Section 106 Agreement. Whilst the parties have endeavoured to ensure the positions reflected in this SoCG reflect the agreement now reached, the parties prepared a joint statement to confirm the effect of the agreed s106 Agreement on resolving a number of issues which have been raised in the examination. The matters set out below by both parties should be read within the context of the joint position statement prepared by the Applicant and the JLAs submitted as part of their respective Deadline 9 submissions and their respective closing submissions submitted at Deadline 9 where applicable to the topic in question.

2 Current Position

2.1. Agricultural Land Use and Recreation

2.1.1 **Table 2.1** sets out the position of both parties in relation to agricultural land use and recreation matters.

Table 2.1 Statement of Common Ground – Agricultural Land Use and Recreation Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Agricultural Land Use and Recreation within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.2. Air Quality

2.2.1 Table 2.1 sets out the position of both parties in relation to air quality matters.

Table 2.2 Statement of Common Ground – Air Quality Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
There are no issues relating to the baseline for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.					
Assessment Methodology					
2.2.2.1	Air Quality and Emissions Mitigation Guidance for Sussex (2021)	<p>Clarification from the Applicant is requested to explain the extent to which the Sussex Guidance was given consideration in preparing the air quality mitigation plan. The overarching principle of the guidance is to, as far as it is possible, design emissions out of a scheme, and mitigate or offset any residual emissions. Thus, the guidance aligns with the aims of Defra’s Clean Air Strategy on reducing emissions to protect health and protect the environment, and the HDC environmental policy, which is why it is essential applicants adhere to its principles.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is noted that an appraisal of air quality damages has been presented in Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment (APP-251). It is also noted that measures to mitigate air quality have been identified. It is understood from the December TWG air quality meeting that an AQAP will be produced by GAL. Within this AQAP it is requested that GAL demonstrate how the overall monetary disbenefits identified will be redressed by the measures proposed.</p> <p>Sussex Air Quality Guidance should be referred to. The AQAP should include performance costings, estimated impacts in terms of emission / concentration reductions, performance indicators, delivery partners, sources of funding, and implementation timeframes.</p> <p>As a matter of clarification it is noted that road traffic NOX and PM2.5 Other on-site operations are predicted to improved, can GAL outline the source of this improvement?</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sets of 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 GAL further progress cannot be</p>	<p>This approach taken for the ES is consistent with the principles of the Clean Air Strategy and guidance set out in the Sussex Guidance; it follows requirements for EIA and NPSs; and provides detailed commitments for suitable measures to be secured through the DCO.</p> <p>Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment includes the TAG assessment identifying the air quality damage costs of the Project.</p> <p>Table 13.4.1 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality considers the Sussex Guidance.</p> <p>The air quality assessment undertaken in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project and the Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p> <p>This notwithstanding, the assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality sets out the proposed measures with the aim of reducing the airport contribution to local air quality regardless of significance.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL has provided a draft Outline AQAP to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the Outline document into the Examination in due course taking account of the LAs feedback.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft air quality action plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. Section 1.2 of the draft AQAP summarises air quality improvements. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC’s feedback on the draft AQAP.</p>	<p>Table 7.2.1 of ES Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251]</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024):The Councils continue to consider that the provision of information inline with Sussex Guidance would be beneficial. The Council will review any updated AQAP following Deadline 8. In relation to national planning policy mitigation is not only needed in relation to significant effects but to mitigate negative effects (See ANPS paragraph 5.29).</p>	<p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): The required scope of the AQAP under the Draft DCO Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063] has been updated and the draft AQAP has also been updated in response to comments made by the JLAs. The JLAs have provided further comments on the AQAP Deadline 7 [REP7-103], the Applicant will respond on these matters at Deadline 8. The Applicant does not agree that additional mitigation beyond what is already proposed is necessary. This is consistent with national policy and EIA requirements.</p>		
2.2.2.2	Health Damage Cost Calculation	<p>The emissions calculation and total calculated value of emissions’ health damage cost were not included in the DCO documents.</p> <p>Understanding costs is essential to effective and necessary mitigation and Chapter 13.12.6 states the costs associated with air pollution are considered under the Socio-Economic Effects of Chapter 17. However, there is no mention of such costs in Chapter 17.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is noted that an appraisal of air quality damages has been presented in Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment (APP-251). It is also noted that measures to mitigate air quality have been identified. It is understood from the December TWG air quality meeting that an AQAP will be produced by GAL. Within this AQAP it is requested that GAL demonstrate how the overall monetary disbenefits identified will be redressed by the measures proposed.</p> <p>Sussex Air Quality Guidance should be referred to. The AQAP should include performance costings, estimated impacts in terms of emission / concentration reductions, performance indicators, delivery partners, sources of funding, and implementation timeframes.</p> <p>As a matter of clarification it is noted that road traffic NOX and PM2.5 Other on-site operations are predicted to improved, can GAL outline the source of this improvement?</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response</p>	<p>This approach taken for the ES is consistent with the principles of the Clean Air Strategy and guidance set out in the Sussex Guidance; it follows requirements for EIA and NPSS; and provides detailed commitments for suitable measures to be secured through the DCO.</p> <p>Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment includes the TAG assessment identifying the air quality damage costs of the Project.</p> <p>Table 13.4.1 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality considers the Sussex Guidance.</p> <p>ES Chapter 13: Air Quality has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project and the Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p> <p>This notwithstanding, the assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality sets out the proposed measures with the aim of reducing the airport contribution to local air quality regardless of significance.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL has provided a draft Outline AQAP to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the Outline document into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback from the LAs.</p>	<p>Table 7.2.1 of ES Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251]</p> <p>Table 13.4.1 and Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4</p>	Covered by Row 2.2.2.1

		<p>Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sets of 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	<p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft air quality action plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. Section 1.2 of the draft AQAP summarises air quality improvements. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC’s feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p>	<p>Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	
<p>2.2.2.3</p>	<p>Model Set Up and Methodology</p>	<p>Regarding model verification, Appendix 13.6.1: Air Quality Data and Model verification is missing details on how model verification factors for the selected zones were established. Details are required of the initial verification including Monitored Road NOx Contribution versus Unverified Modelled Road NOx, which monitoring sites were used, and which were removed from the verification process. To facilitate the scrutiny of the model set up and any assumptions used, it is requested that a complete set of input files be shared for 2018 (Base Year) and 2029 (nearest future year). In addition, Operational and Construction impacts for 2029 should be modelled jointly as one scenario, in order to enable the evaluation of all impacts associated with the development.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We welcome the provision of model files. There are a few residual queries from this review and the review of the verification appendix. These include: further details on why so many sites were excluded from the verification and how we identify which receptors received which verification factor. Confirmation on why a later 2022 baseline year was not used too.</p> <p>It is welcomed that GAL propose to provide further information on modelling scenarios at the next air quality TWG. This matter will remain under discussion until this TWG has been held.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sets of 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</p>	<p>Full details of the model verification process are included in Section 3 within the ES Appendix 13.6.1. Table 3.2.2 provides a list of all sites excluded along with justification and Table 3.3.2 provides a comparison between modelled and monitored NO_x and NO₂ concentrations.</p> <p>The verification methodology was agreed with local councils at the modelling methodology workshop in November 2022. Model files and results were provided to the TWG via email 18th August 2023.</p> <p>Traffic modelling has been undertaken for two construction scenarios, airfield construction and surface access (highways) construction. Further detail is contained in Report 7.4 of the Transport Assessment. The construction scenarios assume the peak construction traffic flows applied to the first year of airfield (2024) and surface access (2029) construction which is a conservative assumption since emissions and background concentrations are anticipated to improve in future years.</p> <p>As set out in paragraph 13.5.53 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality, the 2029 surface access construction scenario represents years 2029-2032, during which there will be an overlap with the operation of the Project. The 2029 surface access construction scenario is a combined scenario considering the contribution from both construction and operational traffic over this period to represent a realistic worst case assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A verification figure has been provided at Deadline 1 which shows the factor applied to each</p>	<p>ES Appendix 13.6.1 Air quality Data and Model Verification [APP-159]</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>ES Report 7.4 Transport Assessment [AS-079]</p> <p>Appendix A of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050]</p> <p>Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

		<p>matters. Without a response from GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	<p>receptor, contained in Appendix A of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs (Doc Ref. 10.4).</p> <p>GAL has also set out the model scenarios and provide that summary at Deadline 1, within Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs (Doc Ref. 10.4).</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant notes that the JLAs have provided a submission on air quality at Deadline 3. The Applicant will review this submission and respond accordingly.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): This matter can be marked as ‘agreed’ following consultation with AECOM on behalf of the local authorities on the technical queries set out at Deadline 5 [REP5-073].</p>	<p>Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	
<p>2.2.2.4</p>	<p>Model results – 2047 scenario</p>	<p>Despite previous commitments to including a 2047 scenario, this scenario has not been modelled.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is noted that air quality should improve beyond 2038. However, it is our understanding that the ANPS requires a full assessment of the airport at full capacity.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Applicant has provided information on road traffic emissions in 2047, but not Airport emissions which will be of increased relative importance in 2047.</p>	<p>An assessment of 2047 has been included in the ES Chapter 13: Air Quality with an emissions inventory (Table 13.10.8), including aircraft and road vehicle emissions. The air quality assessment concludes that no significant effects for air quality are anticipated for 2047. Between 2038 and 2047 a number of predicted improvements to air quality would be expected to occur as a result of national policies to reduce emissions and also as a result of the project.</p> <p>Background concentrations are expected to reduce between 2038 and 2047 and vehicle emissions would continue to reduce. Road traffic is the main source of emissions likely to result in an impact from the project due to the proximity of road sources to sensitive receptors, compared with aircraft emissions. Therefore, despite the uncertainty of predicting emissions for a future year of 2047, it has been concluded that the 2047 future year is not at risk of resulting in a significant impact to air quality.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided further information regarding the 2047 assessment at Section 3 of Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050].</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038].</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>

			<p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): The Applicant has submitted its position regarding the 2047 assessment at Section 3 of Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050]. This was discussed at the July TWG and the applicants position is unchanged.</p>		
2.2.2.5	Worst-case scenario	<p>The scenarios in the ES do not provide a realistic worst-case assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A key part of this concern is around the modelled scenarios assessed. It is welcomed that GAL propose to provide further information at the next air quality TWG. This matter will remain under discussion until this TWG has been held.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13: Air Quality has provided an assessment of air quality impacts from all related sources (road vehicles, aircraft and airport sources) following the methodology agreed with the local councils. The assessment has been based on the best estimate of emissions and conservative assumptions where applicable, presenting reasonable worst case effects in line with best practice guidance and available data. The assessment concludes that the impact of the Proposed Development would not be significant.</p> <p>Conservative assumptions have also been built into the air quality assessment to reduce uncertainty in any future scenario such as background values being frozen to 2030 and no improvements in aircraft emissions being accounted for in the air quality modelling.</p> <p>Paragraph 13.7.16 in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality outlines the approach for future road traffic emissions including how the approach is conservative, since road traffic emissions are anticipated to improve in line with the Transport Decarbonisation Plan.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL has set out the model scenarios and provide a summary at Deadline 1, contained in Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs (Doc Ref. 10.4).</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):The Applicant notes that the JLAs have provided a submission on air quality at Deadline 3. The Applicant will review this submission and respond accordingly.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>ES Report 7 Transport Assessment [AS-079]</p> <p>Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38)</p>	Agreed

			<p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): This matter can be marked as ‘agreed’ following consultation with AECOM on behalf of the local authorities on the technical queries at the July TWG.</p>		
2.2.2.6	Road traffic study	<p>Road traffic study information is required to understand the air quality assessment of road traffic air quality effects.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The information requested is the full ARN shown on a figure for each of scenarios modelled. With the ARNS showing locations with increased traffic flows within the ARN as red and locations with decreases in traffic flows as green.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): It is still not possible to look at each individual scenario ARN to understand if the scenarios and the changes in traffic and pollutant concentrations for each scenario are logical.</p>	<p>The traffic and transport assessment (AS-079) provides full details of the assessment methodology and potential traffic and transport effects of the Project during construction and operation.</p> <p>Model files and results were provided to the TWG via email on 18th August 2023.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL has provided an updated ARN figure at Deadline 1, contained in the updated ES Air Quality Figures (Doc Ref. 5.2).</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):The Applicant notes that the JLAs have provided a submission on air quality at Deadline 3. The Applicant will review this submission and respond accordingly.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): This matter has been discussed in consultation with AECOM on behalf of the local authorities on the technical queries at the July TWG. This item is not agreed. The applicant has provided sufficient information through the ES to all parties for a full and thorough review of technical air quality and transport data. The single ARN was used which incorporated all links screened into the assessment for each scenario. This approach allows the same receptors to be reported for every assessment year and scenario. The approach to screening traffic and creating the ARN was agreed with the local authorities during modelling specific TWG meeting prior to the assessment being carried out.</p>	<p>ES Report 7.4 Traffic and Transport [AS-079]</p> <p>ES Air Quality Figures Part 1 [APP-066]</p> <p>ES Air Quality Figures Part 2 [REP1-018]</p> <p>ES Air Quality Figures Part 3 [APP-068]</p> <p>ES Air Quality Figures Part 4 [APP-069]</p> <p>ES Air Quality Figures Part 5 [APP-070]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38)</p>	Not agreed

<p>2.2.2.7</p>	<p>Model verification</p>	<p>Information is required to establish if the air quality model verification is robust.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We welcome the provision of model files. There are a few residual queries from this review and the review of verification appendix. These include: further details on why so many sites were excluded from the verification and how we identify which receptors received which verification factor. Confirmation on why a later 2022 baseline year was not used too.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	<p>Full details of the model verification process are included in Section 3 within the ES Appendix 13.6.1. The verification methodology was agreed with local councils at the modelling methodology workshop in November 2022. A robust assessment presenting reasonable worst case effects has been provided in line with best practice guidance and data.</p> <p>GAL engaged with key stakeholders through the topic working groups and during such engagement, efforts were made to gain agreement with local authorities on model verification. Methodology transparency has been demonstrated and model files and results were provided to the TWG via email on 18th August 2023.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A verification figure has been provided at Deadline 1 which shows the factor applied to each receptor, contained in Appendix A of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs (Doc Ref. 10.4).</p> <p>GAL will also set out the model scenarios and provide a summary at Deadline 1, contained in Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs (Doc Ref. 10.4)</p> <p>GAL is happy to liaise with the Councils on any further information that may be requested in relation to model verification.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):The Applicant notes that the JLAs have provided a submission on air quality at Deadline 3. The Applicant will review this submission and respond accordingly.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): This matter can be marked as 'agreed' following consultation with AECOM on behalf of the local authorities on the technical queries set out at Deadline 5 [REP5-073].</p>	<p>ES Appendix 13.6.1 Air quality Data and Model Verification [APP-159]</p> <p>Appendix A of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050].</p> <p>Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050]</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>2.2.2.8</p>	<p>Air quality action plan</p>	<p>The proposed air quality action plan could be informed by local monetisation of air quality impacts. Whilst this may not be a requirement of the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) and National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS), this is a matter of local concern, as shown in the local guidance prepared by the Sussex Air Quality Partnership and participating members in 2021.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is noted that an appraisal of air quality damages has been presented in Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment (APP-251). It is also noted that</p>	<p>This approach taken for the ES is consistent with the principles of the Clean Air Strategy and guidance set out in the Sussex Guidance; it follows requirements for EIA and NPSs; and provides detailed commitments for suitable measures to be secured through the DCO.</p> <p>Table 13.4.1 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality considers the Sussex Guidance.</p>	<p>Table 7.2.1 of ES Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251]</p> <p>Table 13.4.1 and Section 13.9 of ES</p>	<p>Covered in Row 2.2.2.1</p>

		<p>measures to mitigate air quality have been identified. It is understood from the December TWG air quality meeting that an AQAP will be produced by GAL. Within this AQAP it is requested that GAL demonstrate how the overall monetary disbenefits identified will be redressed by the measures proposed.</p> <p>As a matter of clarification it is noted that road traffic NOX and PM2.5 Other on-site operations are predicted to improved, can GAL outline the source of this improvement?</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sets of 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13: Air Quality has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project and the Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p> <p>This notwithstanding, the assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality sets out the proposed measures with the aim of reducing the airport contribution to local air quality regardless of significance.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL will provide a draft Outline AQAP to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the Outline AQAP into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback received.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft air quality action plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC's feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs' review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p>	<p>Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038] Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38)</p>	
2.2.2.9	Additional information	<p>Additional information is also required to fully understand the air quality assessment methodology and assessment outcomes, including, (i) technical details to help understand if a realistic worst-case has been assessed, (ii) further information on the Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP) and Construction Workforce Transport Management Plan (CWTMP) to understand how any deviation from the Air Quality Action Plan will be addressed to protect air quality and (iii) information on the Emission Ceiling Calculations.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A key part of this concern is around the modelled scenarios assessed. It is welcomed that GAL propose to provide further information at the next air quality TWG. This matter will remain under discussion until this TWG has been held. Concerning the CTMP and CWTMP it is not clear what air quality monitoring and air quality triggers will be used to identify where air quality is worse than predicted in the ES and what actions would then be taken.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13: Air Quality has provided an assessment of air quality impacts from all related sources (road vehicles, aircraft and airport sources) following the methodology agreed with the local councils. A robust assessment presenting reasonable worst case effects has been provided in line with best practice guidance and available data. The assessment concludes that the impact of the Proposed Development would not be significant.</p> <p>Conservative assumptions being applied in the assessment include background values being frozen to 2030 and no improvements in aircraft emissions being accounted for in the air quality modelling.</p> <p>Paragraph 13.7.16 in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality outlines the approach for future road traffic emissions including how the approach is conservative, since road traffic emissions are</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038] Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050]</p> <p>Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Concerning Emission ceilings some of the results appear counter intuitive. Further details can be provided to GAL for discussion.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Further information is still requested on the CWTMP and CTMP as set out above so this can be considered by the Council during the examination.</p>	<p>anticipated to improve in line with the Transport Decarbonisation Plan.</p> <p>GAL engaged with key stakeholders through the topic working groups and during such engagement, efforts were made to gain agreement with local authorities on key modelling points. Methodology transparency has been demonstrated and model files and results were provided to the TWG via email on 18th August 2023.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL has set out the model scenarios and provide a summary at Deadline 1, contained in Appendix D of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs (Doc Ref. 10.4).</p> <p>A draft Outline AQAP will be provided to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the Outline AQAP into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback received from the LAs.</p> <p>GAL would welcome clarification on the emissions ceilings questions, to then be able to provide a response or further detail (as necessary).</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft air quality action plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. Section 2 of the AQAP sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to the construction phase, controlled by the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP1-021] secured by Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO. The current monitoring arrangements will allow the collection of air quality concentrations in the vicinity of the airport to support the understanding of air pollution effects in the construction period. The data will be used to compare against national standards.</p> <p>The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC's feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice [REP1-021]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38)</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): The Applicant is liaising directly with AECOM on behalf of the local authorities on the technical queries set out at Deadline 5 [REP5-073], to resolve any queries not yet agreed. Progress was made at the July TWG with final clarifications which we anticipate will close out this point being provided to the JLAs before Deadline 8.</p> <p>Monitoring requirements are set out in section 6.6 of the oCTMP [REP7-026] and section 10 of the oCWTP [REP7-024]. Further detail will be provided in the CTMP and CWTP submitted to local authorities for approval under DCO Requirements 12 and 13 respectively.</p>		
Assessment					
2.2.3.1	Sensitivity of predictions to modal shift objectives	<p>The future air quality predictions, in part, are reliant on modal shift assumptions. Future information is required on how sensitive predictions are to modal shift objectives not being achieved, to understand how much air quality may deteriorate if measures are not successful.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The applicant response has not provided sensitivity testing in relation to air quality. Therefore, uncertainty remains for air quality as to how sensitive predictions presented are to the success of mode shift. Additionally, whilst there are provisions to monitor mode shift it is unclear what actions would be taken if mode shift was not identified and what air quality triggers would be used.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council continues to consider that an EMG framework would be beneficial to avoid any unexpected adverse air quality outcomes. In the</p>	<p>The mode share commitments within the Surface Access Commitments (SACs) document represent the position GAL is confident it can achieve, based on the modelling of mode choice and transport network operation. Further details are provided in Report 7 of the Transport Assessment. The range of interventions to improve sustainable travel has been tested to inform the mode share commitments reported in the Application. The SAC also includes a section on GAL’s further aspirations, which includes more ambitious mode share targets which it will be working towards, but it has set the committed mode shares explicitly to ensure that the core surface access outcomes set out in Environmental Statement are delivered. The SAC contains measures to monitor and ensure that the mode commitments are met.</p> <p>Conservative assumptions have also been built into the air quality assessment to reduce uncertainty in any future scenario such as background values being frozen to 2030 and no improvements in aircraft emissions being accounted for in the air quality modelling.</p> <p>The assessment of air quality is measured against the relevant air quality standards. The draft Section 106 agreement includes commitment to monitoring of air quality at current and proposed monitoring sites against relevant air quality standards. Results will be reported to local authorities.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A sensitivity test with the conservative assumption that there are no improvements in</p>	<p>ES Report 7.4 Transport Assessment [AS-079]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [APP-090]</p> <p>ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>Appendix F of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs [REP1-050]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4</p>	Not agreed

		<p>event that an EMG approach was not possible further safeguards could be adopted in an AQAP or similar.</p>	<p>emissions beyond 2030 has been provided a Deadline 1, within Appendix F of the Supporting Air Quality Technical Notes to the SoCGs. The draft AQAP will separately be provided to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the outline version into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback received.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC’s feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the JLAs have provided a submission on air quality at Deadline 3. The Applicant will review this submission and respond accordingly.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): The Applicant has responded to the JLAs’ Introduction for a proposal for Environmentally Managed Growth at Appendix B of The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref 10.38) submitted at Deadline 5 and The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 5 Submissions - Response to JLA’s EMG Framework Paper [REP6-093] submitted at Deadline 6. Together, these submissions detail why the Applicant considers an EMG framework is neither necessary nor appropriate for the Project.</p>	<p>Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38)</p>	
<p>2.2.3.2</p>	<p>Damage Cost Calculation</p>	<p>There should be a Damage Cost Calculation for the air quality impacts, and the Transport Analysis Guidance forms the basis for the calculation.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is noted that an appraisal of air quality damages has been presented in Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment (APP-251). It is also noted that measures to mitigate air quality have been identified. It is understood from the December TWG air quality meeting that an AQAP will be produced by GAL. Within this AQAP it is requested that GAL demonstrate how the</p>	<p>Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment includes the TAG assessment identifying the air quality damage costs of the Project.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL will provide a draft Outline AQAP to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the Outline AQAP into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback received.</p>	<p>Table 7.2.1 of ES Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251]</p> <p>Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106</p>	<p>Covered in Row 2.2.2.8</p>

		<p>overall monetary disbenefits identified will be redressed by the measures proposed. Sussex Air Quality Guidance should be referred to.</p> <p>The AQAP should include performance costings, estimated impacts in terms of emission / concentration reductions, performance indicators, delivery partners, sources of funding, and implementation timeframes.</p> <p>As a matter of clarification it is noted that road traffic NOX and PM2.5 Other on-site operations are predicted to improved, can GAL outline the source of this improvement?</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sets of 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	<p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC’s feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p>	<p>Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	
Mitigation and Compensation					
2.2.4.1	Air Quality Mitigation Plan (Operational)	<p>Lack of a stand-alone operating Air Quality Plan. The guidance requires that each application is supported by an air quality mitigation plan detailing measures to mitigate and/or offset the impacts and setting out itemised costing for each proposed measure. It is recognised that air quality mitigation measures have been set out in the Carbon Action Plan (Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan) and Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments. Although they may contain the same measures, the aim of a Carbon Plan is reducing emissions on a larger scale, such as a region, whereas the aim of an air quality plan would be to reduce/offset emissions locally. Furthermore, an effective air quality plan would contain the following elements for each proposed measure: Costings; Performance Indicators; and Delivery Timescales. These are the essential mechanisms that can enable the Authorities and the Airport to respond accordingly for the benefit of communities and public health. It is essential that there is confidence that proper monitoring mechanisms and indicators are established at the outset and reviewed as necessary. The Carbon and Surface Access plans do not address any of these criteria.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13: Air Quality has provided an assessment of air quality impacts from all related sources (road vehicles, aircraft and airport sources) following the methodology agreed with the local councils. A robust assessment presenting reasonable worst case effects has been provided in line with best practice guidance and available data. The assessment concludes that the impact of the Proposed Development would not be significant. As such, taking into account embedded mitigation, no other mitigation is required as a result of the project.</p> <p>Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment includes the TAG assessment identifying the air quality damage costs of the Project.</p> <p>Table 13.4.1 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality considers the Sussex Guidance.</p> <p>This notwithstanding, the assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality sets out the proposed measures with the</p>	<p>Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 [APP-251]</p> <p>Table 13.4.1 and Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>ES Appendix 13.8.1 Air Quality Construction Period Mitigation [APP-161]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Plan (REP1-021)</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access</p>	Covered in Row 2.2.2.8

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): This response does not align with the commitment provided by GAL in the December 2023 Air Quality TWG to provide an AQAP. Please can GAL confirm this response is out of date</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response The Joint Local Authorities have submitted a detailed review of the Air Quality Action Plan [REP2 -004]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review. Without a response from GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	<p>aim of reducing the airport contribution to local air quality regardless of significance.</p> <p>Measures that will be in place through the construction of the Project including mitigation and monitoring of dust are detailed in Section 5.8 of the ES Appendix Construction Period Mitigation and are included in the Code of Construction Practice, to be secured under a Requirement of the DCO.</p> <p>The ES Appendix Carbon Action Plan sets out outcomes that GAL is committing to deliver for key airport operational and construction emissions sources. Commitments on surface access emissions are set out in ES Appendix Surface Access Commitments.</p> <p>Measures and monitoring commitments will be secured via the DCO and updated draft section 106 agreement. The commitments will provide suitable monitoring to allow for the local authorities to carry out their LAQM requirements.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL will provide a draft Outline AQAP to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the Outline AQAP into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback received.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC's feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs' review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p>	<p>Commitments [APP-090]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.12 Carbon Action Plan [APP-091]</p> <p>Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	
2.2.4.2	Air Quality Mitigation Plan (Construction) Appendix 13.8.1: Air Quality Construction Period	Construction traffic will use the strategic route network in the District. Although commitment to adopting London Low Emission Zone standards was made at the PEIR stage, Appendix 13.8.1 advises the standards will be used "where applicable" while Paragraph 7.2.15 of Appendix 5.3.2	Measures that will be in place through the construction of the Project including mitigation and monitoring of dust are detailed in Section 5.8 of the ES Appendix Construction Period Mitigation and contained within the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP).	ES Appendix 13.8.1: Air Quality Construction Period Mitigation [APP-161]	Agreed

	<p>Mitigation Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice Annex 3 - Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</p>	<p>states that “Low emission plant would be encouraged and used where practicable [...]” but provides no further details and makes no commitment to using London Low Emission Zone standards and adopting a Fleet Recognition Scheme. Lack of Emissions Monitoring Strategy for the Construction Phase. No specific details for the construction phase monitoring strategy were provided. Although it is expected that a dust monitoring plan and a monitoring plan will be provided at a later date, key points and decisions should have already been made available.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is still requested that all plant and construction traffic achieve the standards requested.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sets of 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.</p>	<p>This explains that all on-road vehicles will comply with the requirements of the London Low Emission Zone and the London Non-Road Mobile Machinery standards, where applicable, which is appropriate when considering availability of equipment, specialist kit and non-discrimination of local suppliers. This commitment is secured through the updated CoCP (REP1-021), submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Code of Construction Practice (Section 5.8) has been updated and submitted at Deadline 1 to include the requirements of the London Low Emission Zone and the London Non-Road Mobile Machinery standards.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item, or confirmation if this item can be marked as ‘agreed’ or ‘no longer pursuing’.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): This matter can be marked as ‘agreed’ following consultation with AECOM on behalf of the local authorities on the technical queries set out at Deadline 5 [REP5-073].</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Plan (REP1-021)</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	
<p>2.2.4.3</p>	<p>Operational air quality monitoring</p>	<p>Further information is required to understand operational air quality monitoring and reporting and further steps, should air quality deteriorate further than predicted.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Whilst there are provisions to monitor air quality from GAL it is unclear what actions would be taken if greater changes in air quality occur than predicted in the ES and what air quality triggers would be used to identify this. This could be addressed as part of the AQAP that GAL committed to provide in the Air Quality TWG in December 2023.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sets of in paragraph 3.7.7 of their Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] that the air quality</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13: Air Quality has provided an assessment of air quality impacts from all related sources (road vehicles, aircraft and airport sources) following the methodology agreed with the local councils. A robust assessment presenting reasonable worst case effects has been provided in line with best practice guidance and available data. The assessment concludes that the impact of the Proposed Development would not be significant. As such, taking into account embedded mitigation, no other mitigation is required as a result of the project.</p> <p>This notwithstanding, the assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality sets out the proposed measures with the aim of reducing the airport contribution to local air quality regardless of significance.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The</p>	<p>Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>

		<p>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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Discussions are ongoing concerning operational air quality monitoring.</p>	<p>The draft Section 106 agreement sets out the mechanism for monitoring air quality (NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and the impacts from the Proposed Development, to identify and manage any new exceedances of the National Air Quality Standards occur as a result of airport activity.</p> <p>GAL has worked with Local Authorities over many years to fund air quality monitoring to understand air quality locally. As part of the Project, a commitment will be made in the draft Section 106 agreement to the continuation of current monitoring, and additional monitoring at several proposed sites (Chapter 13 Figure 13.1.12) using a mixture of monitoring types, including another DEFRA equivalent reference monitor (reference MCERTS monitor) and indicative MCERTS monitoring equipment to be able to monitor key pollutants of concern. Compared to current monitoring, this approach increases the spatial and temporal collection of monitoring data to allow detailed assessment of ambient air quality. The approach is considered proportionate given the cost of monitoring equipment and the results of the ES which show there are no significant effects being predicted.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL will provide a draft Outline AQAP to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the outline version into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback received.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC's feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs' review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p>	<p>Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

			<p>Updated Position (July 2024): The Applicant is continuing to engage with the Local Authorities on the drafting of the Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a revised Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063] at Deadline 6, including a revised draft air quality action plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5.</p>		
2.2.4.4	Dust Management Plan	<p>There is no Dust Management Plan (DMP) provided with the application and the Applicant is therefore requested to provide a DMP (or Outline DMP) for Examination.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is understood that a final DMP cannot yet be provided, but an outline or draft DMP can be prepared. This is still requested.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response</p> <p>The Joint Local Authorities have submitted detailed reviews of the GAL Dust Management Plan [No Examination Ref]. Please see REP4-053 for this detailed review.</p> <p>Without a response from GAL to the DMP review (and any updated DMP committed to by GAL for Deadline 5) [REP4-033] further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council is hopeful that all final matters will be addressed in an updated DMP due at Deadline 8 and will confirm following receipt of the updated DMP.</p> <p>Updated Position Deadline 9: The majority of remaining changes discussed have been made in the updated CDMS (Annex 9 - REP8-047). However, there remains a few matters that have not been addressed which is preventing us from reaching an agreed status for the DMP.</p> <p>These are points previously raised by the Councils in previous submissions e.g. [REP3-117] and the most recent technical working Group (5th July 2024):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The absence of a proactive approach to informing the Councils when there are dust complaints ▪ The absence of an approach to share data in real time (or near real-time) for automatic particulate monitoring (e.g. Osiris monitoring). 	<p>Measures that will be in place through the construction of the Project including mitigation and monitoring of dust are detailed in Section 5.8 of the ES Appendix Construction Period Mitigation and are included in the Code of Construction Practice, to be secured under a Requirement of the Draft DCO.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.2.7 of the CoCP sets out that Construction Dust Management Plans (CDMP) will be prepared in accordance with the CoCP.</p> <p>Management plans will be prepared for specific areas of the Project to reflect any site-specific conditions or measures to mitigate dust impacts (set out in para 5.8.2 of the CoCP).</p> <p>The CDMPs will be prepared for approval by the relevant local planning authority prior to construction works commencing, as confirmed in paragraph 5.8.2 of the CoCP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): An outline CDMP will be shared with the Local Authorities for comment by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the outline version into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback received.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Draft Construction Dust Management Plan (CDMP) has been shared with local authorities for comment on 26th March, considering the items set out by local authorities in the SoCG and Local Impact Reports. The Applicant looks forward to receiving the LAs comments in due course.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p>	<p>ES Appendix 13.8.1: Air Quality Construction Period Mitigation [APP-161]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Plan [REP1-021]</p> <p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	<p>ssionAgreed – subject to further discussion before D10</p>

		<p>The three additional points are also noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That visual observations are listed to be undertaken on a weekly frequency (paragraph 5.7.1). IAQM (2018) guidance states that visual inspections “..should be conducted at least once on each working day”. ▪ With reference to the 3 monthly review of the CDMP, the council would like the text to be clear that any new updated strategy will be issued to the local authorities for approval. ▪ Lastly, paragraph 5.8.3 identifies the possibility that unacceptable dust emissions may occur despite additional mitigation measures but requires only that “consideration should be given” to taking action. This paragraph should be strengthened to read ‘In the event that unacceptable dust emissions continue, despite the additional mitigation measures, site operations will be modified in liaison with the local authority, and site operations temporarily suspended until the issue can be resolved.’ 	<p>Updated Position (July 2024): The final comments on the DMP were discussed at the July TWG, all matters are considered to be resolved and an updated final DMP will be provided at Deadline 8 and is secured by DCO requirement 27.</p>		
<p>2.2.4.5</p>	<p>Air Quality Management Plan</p>	<p>There should be a stand-alone Air Quality Management Plan. It is recognised that air quality mitigation measures have been set out in the Carbon Action Plan (Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan) and Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments. However, carbon measures are focused on reducing emissions on a larger scale, such as a region, whereas the aim of an air quality plan would be to reduce/offset emissions locally. Furthermore, the Sussex Guidance recommends that applicants produce an action plan where measures are costed and assessed for air quality impact/effectiveness individually. The carbon and surface access plans do not address any of these criteria.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): This response does not align with the commitment provided by GAL in the December 2023 Air Quality TWG to provide an AQAP. Please can GAL confirm this response is out of date.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sets of 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 GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 13: Air Quality has indicated that there are no significant effects as a result of the Project and the Project is not predicted to impact compliance with the air quality standards.</p> <p>This notwithstanding, the assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality sets out the proposed measures with the aim of reducing the airport contribution to local air quality regardless of significance.</p> <p>Measures that will be in place through the construction of the Project including mitigation and monitoring of dust are detailed in Section 5.8 of the ES Appendix Construction Period Mitigation and are included in the Code of Construction Practice, to be secured under the requirements of the DCO.</p> <p>The ES Appendix Carbon Action Plan sets out outcomes that GAL is committing to deliver for key airport operational and construction emissions sources. Commitments on surface access emissions are set out in ES Appendix Surface Access Commitments.</p> <p>Measures and monitoring commitments will be secured via the DCO and updated draft Section 106 agreement. The commitments will provide suitable monitoring to allow for the local authorities to carry out their LAQM requirements.</p>	<p>Section 13.9 and Table 13.4.1 of ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.2: Carbon Action Plan [APP-091]</p> <p>ES Appendix 13.8.1: Air Quality Construction Period Mitigation [APP-161]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Plan (REP1-021)</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [APP-090]</p> <p>Table 7.2.1 of ES Needs Case Appendix 1 –</p>	<p>Covered in Row 2.2.2.8</p>

			<p>This approach taken for the ES is consistent with the principles of the Clean Air Strategy and guidance set out in the Sussex Guidance; it follows requirements for EIA and NPSs; and provides detailed commitments for suitable measures to be secured through the DCO. Table 13.4.1 of ES Chapter 13: Air Quality considers the Sussex Guidance.</p> <p>Table 7.2.1 of Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment includes the TAG assessment identifying the air quality damage costs of the Project.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL will provide a draft Outline AQAP to the LAs by 26th March (to align with Deadline 2), with the intention of submitting the Outline AQAP into the Examination in due course taking account of any feedback received.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC’s feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs’ review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p>	<p>National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251]</p> <p>Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	
2.2.4.6	Monitoring Commitment	<p>Monitoring commitment – it is not clear what is being funded and over what timeframe.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Further discussions on operational monitoring and the S106 are proposed to resolve this matter.</p> <p>Version 3 Deadline 5 Response Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) 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</p>	<p>The assessment in Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13 Air Quality summarises the proposed operational phase air quality monitoring.</p> <p>Monitoring commitments will be secured under the draft Section 106 agreement to be entered in relation to the Project.</p> <p>The draft Section 106 agreement commits to funding of monitoring at three existing local authority stations and the continuation of monitoring at Gatwick airport monitoring site. In addition, Gatwick will add an additional Defra reference equivalent monitor and additional indicative MCERT continuous monitors. Therefore, there is no change in the monitoring as currently carried out and additional monitoring will be added. This approach is considered</p>	<p>Section 13.9 of ES Chapter 13 Air Quality [APP-038]</p> <p>Schedule 1 and Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air</p>	Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.

		<p>detailed review. Without a response from GAL further progress cannot be made. It is anticipated that further progress can be made before the next Examination Deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Discussions are ongoing concerning operational air quality monitoring.</p>	<p>proportionate given the cost of monitoring equipment and the results of the ES which show there are no significant effects being predicted.</p> <p>Chapter 13 Figure 13.1.12 outlines draft locations of the proposed monitoring stations.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. The document sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to air quality and odour management to be undertaken by GAL which are secured under the DCO or s106 Agreement. The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC's feedback on the draft AQAP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has provided a response to the air quality matter submitted by the JLAs at Appendix A: Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities – Air Quality to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.38). The Applicant will respond at Deadline 6 to the JLAs' review submitted at Deadline 4 [REP4-053].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024): This point relates to draft s106 Agreement discussions, the s106 text has since been updated, the Applicant has submitted a revised Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063] at Deadline 6.</p>	<p>Quality to The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-073]</p>	
<p>Other</p>					
<p><i>There are no other issues relevant to this topic in this Statement of Common Ground.</i></p>					

2.3. Capacity and Operations

2.3.1 Table 2.3 sets out the position of both parties in relation to capacity and operations matters.

Table 2.3 Statement of Common Ground – Capacity and Operations Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>Please see the joint Statement of Common Ground prepared in relation to Capacity and Operations (Doc Ref. 10.1.18).</i>					

2.4. Climate Change

2.4.1 Table 2.4 sets out the position of both parties in relation to climate change matters.

Table 2.4 Statement of Common Ground – Climate Change Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
<i>There are no issues relating to the baseline for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					
Assessment Methodology					
2.4.2.1	The risks associated with storm events, wildfire and fog are not considered sufficiently in the risk assessment	<p>There is a lack of consideration of a number of climate variables including storm events, wildfire and fog, which is a key omission in the Climate Change Resilience Assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is acknowledged that the Applicant will update the SoCG with the newly available wildfire data, and add in additional information on fog.</p> <p>It is noted and accepted regarding storm events.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): This principal area of disagreement has been removed.</p>	<p>Storm events are considered through the inclusion of extreme rainfall (increased probability of extreme weather events (Risks 2, 13-15 in Appendix 15.8.1 Climate Change Resilience Assessment) and high winds (risks 18-21 in Appendix 15.8.1 Climate Change Resilience Assessment) within the assessment. The risks associated with these hazards have been assessed as medium. Additional information on changes in wind speeds can be found in Chapter 15 (Paragraph 15.5.28). Reductions in wind speeds are anticipated in winter and summer. Quantitative data on changes in lightning across the UK are not provided by UKCP18 at the 12km scale. A summary of the Met Office findings for changes in lightning flash rate across the UK is provided in Chapter 15 (Paragraph 15.5.27) which suggests that Gatwick can expect lightning frequency to increase during summer and spring and decrease during autumn. Risks 22 and 23 in Appendix 15.8.1 Climate Change Resilience Assessment provide information on the potential impacts, existing mitigation measures and risks associated with increased lightning strikes.</p> <p>Additional data is now available for wildfire that was not available at the time of submission of the DCO application, GAL will put more detail about wildfire in the SoCG.</p> <p>GAL will put more detail about fog in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) of which there will be one combined one for climate change.</p>	<p>Risks 2, 13-15, 18-23 in Appendix 15.8.1 Climate Change Resilience Assessment [APP-187]</p> <p>Paragraph 15.5.27 and 15.5.28 of ES Chapter 15 Climate Change [APP-040]</p>	Agreed
Assessment					
2.4.3.1	Climate impact statements lacking consistency	The climate impact statements documented in both Chapter 15 Climate Change and Appendix 15.8.1 Climate Change Resilience Assessment are lacking in consistency in the way they are articulated in that some are missing an 'impact'. This end result is what should determine the consequence rating and could arguably have led to an under-estimation of risk.	The anticipated impacts of climate change are provided for all risks identified within the CCRA. In Chapter 15 of the ES (Climate Change) this is included within Tables 15.8.5 and 15.8.6 within the 'Climate Change Impact' column and in Appendix 15.8.1 (Climate Change Resilience Assessment) within Table 2.1.1 in the 'Climate Change Impact' column. Risk ratings would not change following a	<p>Tables 15.8.5 and 15.8.6 of ES Chapter 15 Climate Change [APP-040]</p> <p>ES Appendix 15.8.1 Climate Change</p>	Agreed

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Whilst there are different approaches to undertaking climate change risk assessments, and further detail and clarity around impact statements would be helpful, the Applicant's assessment of operational impacts does constitute a robust assessment that meets the planning requirements.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): This principal area of disagreement has been removed.</p>	clarification of specific impacts and therefore no material impact on the assessment will arise.	Resilience Assessment [APP-187]	
2.4.3.2	Disagree with the assessment that 'cumulative effects are not relevant'.	<p>The Council understands that a conclusion may be drawn that cumulative impacts from nearby projects maybe be 'insignificant', but we disagree with the statement that 'An assessment of cumulative effects is not relevant'. For example, nearby projects could exacerbate the urban heat island impact of the Project or increase the impact of flooding to the site or access to the site.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is acknowledged that the Applicant did not assess for cumulative effects outside of the project site boundary, as the CCR only assessed those within this area.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): This principal area of disagreement has been removed.</p>	The Zone of Influence considered within the cumulative effects assessment was the project site boundary for the CCR assessment. This does not include nearby projects therefore it was not relevant to assess the potential impact of additional projects on the UHI. The UHI effect was found to be low and therefore it would be unlikely that any nearby development would exacerbate this.	ES Appendix 15.8.1 Climate Change Resilience Assessment [APP-187]	Agreed
Mitigation and Compensation					
2.4.4.1	Lack of identification of additional mitigation / adaptation measures	<p>The lack of identification of additional mitigation / adaptation measures is a key omission from the Climate Change Resilience Assessment and the Urban Heat Island Assessment. Whilst the Applicant may not have assessed any of the risks as 'significant', the identification of further adaptation measures that can increase asset resilience should be noted, especially considering the potential underestimation of risk detailed above.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is acknowledged that the Applicant has outlined mitigation and adaptation measures for the project in the report and appendixes, in addition to referencing existing policies and plans in place at GAL.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): This principal area of disagreement has been removed.</p>	<p>Further adaptation measures are not formally identified (under the heading of 'further mitigation') as no significant risks were identified within the assessment which would require mitigation that is not already embedded within the Project. However, mitigation measures are included within relevant chapters/documents. The Code of Construction Practice (ES Appendix 5.3.2) includes an overview of relevant mitigation measures. This document is referenced within Chapter 15 of the ES (Climate Change). The Gatwick Airside Operations Adverse Weather Plan (GAL, 2021) sets out additional measures that should be followed during other extreme weather events. The Outline Climate Resilience Design Principles captured within the Design and Access statement detail how elements of the design have been developed to account for climate change adaptation and would be implemented at the time of construction.</p> <p>An additional summary of mitigation measures/commitments made in relation to mitigation can be found in ES Appendix 5.2.3 Mitigation Route Map.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Plan (REP1-021)</p> <p>Table 15.8.4 and 15.9.1 of ES Chapter 15 Climate Change [APP-040]</p> <p>Design and Access Statement Volume 5 [APP-257]</p> <p>Appendix 5.2.3 Mitigation Route Map [APP-078]</p>	Agreed

			Additionally, several mitigation measures are already embedded within the project. These are detailed within Table 15.8.4 and 15.9.1 in Chapter 15 of the ES (Climate Change).		
Other					
<i>There are no other matters relevant to this topic in this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.5. Construction

2.5.1 Table 2.5 sets out the position of both parties in relation to construction matters.

Table 2.5 Statement of Common Ground – Construction Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
2.5.1.1	Air Quality Mitigation Plan (Construction) Appendix 13.8.1: Air Quality Construction Period Mitigation Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice Annex 3 - Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan	<p>Construction traffic will use the strategic route network in the District. Although commitment to adopting London Low Emission Zone standards was made at the PEIR stage, Appendix 13.8.1 advises the standards will be used “where applicable” while Paragraph 7.2.15 of Appendix 5.3.2 states that “Low emission plant would be encouraged and used where practicable [...]” but provides no further details and makes no commitment to using London Low Emission Zone standards and adopting a Fleet Recognition Scheme. Lack of Emissions Monitoring Strategy for the Construction Phase. No specific details for the construction phase monitoring strategy were provided. Although it is expected that a dust monitoring plan and a monitoring plan will be provided at a later date, key points and decisions should have already been made available.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council expects to see London Low Emission zone standards in construction traffic unless otherwise stated, justified and agreed. Further work is required to ensure this is a commitment in the CoCP.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Please refer to the JLAs submission at Deadline 4 REP4-042</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Update welcomed.</p>	<p>The commitments are detailed in the Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 5.4.2, Carbon Action Plan. ES Appendix 5.3.2, 'Code of Construction Practice Annex 3 - Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan', should be considered in conjunction with this document and further detail will be developed in consultation with the local authorities though the final Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Code of Construction Practice (Section 5.8) has been updated and submitted at Deadline 1 to include the requirements of the London Low Emission Zone and the London Non-Road Mobile Machinery standards.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item, or confirmation if this item can be marked as ‘agreed’.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Section 7.6.2 of the OCTMP – includes a requirement for compliance with London LEZ requirements for on road and non-road vehicles. This was confirmed by the Applicant at ISH7.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.4.2 Carbon Action Plan [APP-091]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice Annex 2 – Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan [APP-084]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice [REP1-021]</p>	Agreed
2.5.1.2	Additional information requirements	<p>Additional information is also required to fully understand the air quality assessment methodology and assessment outcomes, including, (i) technical details to help understand if a realistic worst-case has been assessed, (ii) further information on the Construction Transport Management Plan (CTMP) and Construction Workforce Transport Management Plan (CWTMP) to understand how any deviation from the Air Quality Action Plan will be addressed to protect air quality and (iii) information on the Emission Ceiling Calculations.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Ongoing – issues to be addressed as per points (i), (ii) and (iii)</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Please refer to the JLAs submission at Deadline 4 REP4-042 and REP4-053</p>	<p>The impact from construction traffic due to movement of construction materials will be managed in accordance with a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). The impact of construction workforce travelling to and from the Airport will be managed in accordance with a Construction Workforce Travel Plan (CWTP), both of which will be developed by GAL and its contractors during detailed design / pre-construction stage in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>The detailed (o)CTMP and Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan (oCWTP) will be finalised in consultation with the relevant highway authorities and the National Highways</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a draft Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) at Appendix 5 of Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004]. Section 2 of the AQAP sets out measures</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice Annex 2 – Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan [APP-084]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice Annex 3 – Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-085]</p> <p>Appendix 5 of the Draft Section 106</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Councils consider that the provision of information inline with Sussex Guidance would be beneficial. The Council will review any updated AQAP following Deadline 8.</p>	<p>and monitoring commitments related to the construction phase, controlled by the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP1-021] secured by Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO. The current monitoring arrangements will allow the collection of air quality concentrations in the vicinity of the airport to support the understanding of air pollution effects in the construction period. The data will be used to compare against national standards.</p> <p>The Applicant looks forward to receiving HDC's comments on the draft AQAP.</p>	<p>Agreement [REP2-004]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice [REP1-021]</p>	
--	--	---	--	--	--

2.6. Cumulative Effects and Interrelationships

2.6.1 Table 2.6 sets out the position of both parties in relation to cumulative effects and interrelationships matters.

Table 2.6 Statement of Common Ground – Cumulative Effects and Interrelationships Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
2.6.1.1	Baseline data for Heathrow	<p>There are other concerns in relation to the consideration of a third runway at Heathrow Airport in the CEA including the assumptions around air traffic levels at Gatwick if a third runway is operational by mid-2030s, the appropriateness of using future baseline data published as part of the 2019 Heathrow DCO consultation and whether it is realistic to assume that development at both Heathrow and Gatwick Airports is unlikely to have a significant effect on the UK’s ability to meet Net Zero targets.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): R3 has been assessed, and the Council questions the robustness of the data underlying this assessment (i.e. 2019 data).</p> <p>PINS Scoping Opinion makes clear that the likelihood of another runway coming forward at Heathrow should not be ignored and the implications should be assessed both individually and cumulatively.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council’s position remains unchanged, and has been outlined in response to the Applicants ExQ1 (CE1.1) [REP4-061]</p>	<p>The approach to the assessment of cumulative effects with Heathrow R3 has taken into account the ongoing uncertainty around the status of the Heathrow R3 project and is described in section 20.7.2 to 20.7.6 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): the Applicant has provided a detailed response on this matter to Examining Authority question CE1.1 at Deadline 3.</p>	ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]	Not Agreed
2.6.1.2	Land West of Ifield	<p>This site should be included in the short-list as a Tier 2 development for the CEA given the scale and proximity of the proposal. It is not considered that the potential for impact on key ecological receptors and core habitats has been adequately assessed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Pleased that Wol has been included as Tier 2 development, however there are inconsistencies in the approach to the cumulative effects of the site alongside the Project.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Whilst it is understood that from the survey efforts for this project, radio tracking results found core foraging habitats for bats to be located to the west and north of the Site, Bechstein’s bat roosts have been identified within Ifield Wood, which is approximately 1.2km south-west from the airport. Radio tracking information on bats from the Ifield Wood roost are currently limited, however as reported by Wol, movement data to date suggests core foraging areas are outside of the Wol development area, concentrating on</p>	<p>As per Item 15.6 of the October 2023 Issues Trackers, Land West of Ifield was included as a Tier 2 site (see ref. 353 on Page 27 of ES Appendix 20.4.1: Cumulative Effects Assessment Long and Short List for GAL’s reasoning).</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Wol was not included in the Tier 2 list in ES Chapter 9 as there was no potential overlap with impacts from the Project. Although it is understood that Wol will interact with the same bat populations that use the Project site, the core foraging habitats of bats identified in survey work to support the ES (ES Appendix 9.6.3 Bat Trapping and Radio Tracking Surveys [APP-131, APP-132] were to the west and north of the airport, not to the south. As such, cumulative effects were not assessed further.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024):</p>	n/a	Not Agreed

		<p>areas adjacent to Ifield Wood. A single juvenile male was also radio-tracked from Wol to a roost in the hedgerow network to the west of Ifield Road (west of Gatwick Airport). It was therefore recommended that cumulative effects with Wol were assessed, to ensure there will be no adverse impacts on this roost and the core foraging and commuting habitats, and thus connectivity with the wider meta-population. Cumulative effects should also be considered when assessing impacts on bat roosts and associated habitat identified within the vicinity of Wol.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Applicant's update at deadline 5 (section 3 of Supporting Ecology Technical Notes [REP5-069] referencing engagement with Natural England in respect of the noise impacts on bat populations is noted as is the ongoing work to establish whether there are additional roosts. The submissions at Deadline 8 will be reviewed.</p> <p><u>Updated Position Deadline 9: The report does not deal with noise impacts on bat populations to the west of the airport, but on tree removal. Natural England position on noise impacts is awaited.</u></p>	<p>Surveys with respect to bat roosts in trees are on-going. As of 1st July 2024, all trees with Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) that may be lost have had at least one aerial survey with approximately half having had a second. To date, no bat roosts have been identified. A report with results to date will be submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The Applicant is awaiting the submission to be provided at Deadline 9. For the Applicant's final position with respect to this matter please see the ecology section of the Applicant's Closing Submission (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>		
Assessment Methodology					
2.6.2.1	Concerns about CEA methodology and rationale and consistency of assessment across topics	<p>The Applicant appears to have assumed a high level of certainty around other development sites in the District in order to support favourable socioeconomic outcomes, while simultaneously citing lack of certainty or information as justification for excluding these same developments from various topics assessments. The methodology and rationale used for the CEA has not been made clear, leading to concerns that the assessment of individual sites may have been applied inconsistently or incorrectly. There is an inconsistent approach applied across the various topic assessments that have the potential to skew the assessment results. For example, Land West of Ifield has been excluded from some assessments, i.e., Transport during its construction phase, despite the Project relying on future Local Plan development coming forward to mitigate housing need arising from the Project. It is also difficult to understand the extent to which key developments have been considered without more transparency in how the CEA has been carried out in more detail.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Minimal detail on, and justification of, the approach to the CEA has been provided. Advice Note 17, and other guidance, indicates some professional judgment can be applied but that this should be transparent and justified.</p>	<p>The cumulative effects assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the approach set out in PINS Advice Note 17 and the approach is described in Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships of the ES. This includes the development of a long list and short list of other developments that have been used for the cumulative effects assessment provided in the ES. Whilst this chapter also provides a summary of the cumulative effects per topic, the detailed cumulative effects assessments are within the topic chapters of the ES.</p> <p>Land West of Ifield is included on the short list as a tier 2 development.</p> <p>In terms of traffic modelling, as set out in Section 12.11 of ES Chapter 12, cumulative developments have been considered in accordance with Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) and developments with uncertainty levels of 'near certain' or 'more than likely' are included in the future baseline. West of Ifield was identified with an uncertainty level of 'reasonably foreseeable' and therefore not included in the future baseline but in a separate scenario together with Horley Employment Park and Gatwick Green following comments from local stakeholders. This assessment scenario is based on the best</p>	<p>ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]</p>	Resolved

		<p>As per para 12.11.9 of ES Chapter 12 West of Ifield, Horley Employment Park and Gatwick Green have been excluded from the cumulative effects assessment during the project's construction period however the Council does not consider enough information has been sought, or provided by, the applicant to demonstrate there will be no significant transport impacts during the period.</p> <p>The Council is also concerned at the lack of support for a new multi-modal transport link from the A264 to the A23 in order to address the cumulative impacts of other development alongside the Project.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council discussed the consideration of West of Ifield and North of Horsham developments in the CEA in a TWG with the Applicant. Clarity was provided, and welcomed.</p>	<p>available information about the uses and floorspace proposed for the three sites. Given the level of uncertainty, the assessment is undertaken for the core scenarios of 2029, 2032 and 2047.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): Although the transport modelling is inherently cumulative, these three developments were included explicitly in the cumulative scenarios. Where possible information was sourced from promoters or public information but there was insufficient detailed information on the construction phases of any of those developments to allow them to be included in the Project's construction phase modelling. Given the three developments are not sufficiently certain to be included in the future baseline modelling (in line with TAG guidance) it is expected that the promoters of each development would need to assess effects related to construction of those developments and mitigate them if necessary.</p> <p>The transport modelling identifies the likely environmental effects related to traffic and transport, and the operational impacts on the transport networks. The modelling is comprehensive and has not indicated a need to include mitigation in the form of a multi-modal transport link between the A264 and A23.</p>		
2.6.2.2	Rationale and information underlying the Zones of Influence is unclear	<p>There are a number of concerns with the thresholds used and the ES does not adequately explain the rationale behind them. While it is accepted that professional judgement is necessary, further detail should be provided. Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport states: "The Zone of Influence for considering cumulative effects related to traffic and transport is the same as that used for the core assessment described in previous sections." It is not made clear which previous sections the reader should refer to. Chapter 11: Water Environment states "The Zone of Influence (Zol) for the water environment has been identified based on the spatial extent of likely effects." Other topic chapters are similarly vague. It is unclear exactly how these Zols have been set, and it is disappointing local authorities have been unable to scrutinise the rationale. There are concerns more specifically with the Zol boundaries. The current Zol used for the assessment of cumulative socio-economic impacts does not reflect the likely impacts on conurbations in the north of the District meaning potentially significant impacts are not properly understood.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the Zones of Influence (Zols). For example, local authorities were not given sight of the criteria used to set Zones of Influence for the various topics before submission and there are a number of concerns with the thresholds. However, given the ES does</p>	<p>The Zols for the cumulative effects assessment are summarised in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships with the detail being provided in the individual topic chapters 7 to 19 of the ES.</p> <p>GAL will review this request to provide further detail on the Zone of Influence for the various assessments.</p> <p>The Zone of Influence (Zol) for the Water Environment assessment has been defined by the Upper Mole Hydraulic Model extent as it captures all upstream watercourse catchments (specially the River Mole and its tributaries: Burstow Stream, Crawter's Brook, the Gatwick Stream, Man's Brook and Westfield Stream) interacting within the Project site boundary, and further continues 2km downstream. This Zol was defined in order to cover the extent if all anticipated impacts due to Project and to identify any significant flood risk effects to third parties. As demonstrated by the depth difference mapping in ES Figure 11.9.1 and 11.9.2 in Chapter 11: Water Environment, which show no adverse impacts outside the site boundary.</p>	ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]	Resolved

		<p>not adequately explain the rationale it is difficult for local authorities to scrutinise the appropriateness or otherwise of the thresholds. The Council accepts that professional judgement is required but this should be a transparent and replicable process.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting further detail from the applicant.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position reflects that of the JLAs outlined in REP4-061 in response to ExQ1 CE1.2</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council discussed the consideration of West of Ifield and North of Horsham developments in the CEA in a TWG with the Applicant. Clarity was provided, and welcomed.</p>	<p>Updated position (April 2024): Detail on this matter is provided in the Applicant's response to the Joint West Sussex Councils LIR, section 4.17, issued for Deadline 3. The long and short list of other developments together with a detailed technical note describing the way in which the search areas and topic Zols were identified and refined and a figure showing the extent of the Zols was issued to consultees in September 2022. Also further consultation was undertaken on the updated long list in May 2023.</p>		
2.6.2.3	Rationale and assumptions underlying the shortlist of other developments is unclear	<p>A number of assumptions and reflections made in relation to other developments are not considered accurate or consistent throughout the assessment.</p> <p>There is concern around the assumptions made in relation to development and there is a lack of clarity around the methodology and rationale used for the CEA. Comments previously made by the Council, relating to errors and information, have not been fully reflected and there is some inconsistency and factual errors in the assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The long and short lists were shared and comment provided by the Council, however there are inconsistencies and errors within the CEA itself which should be reviewed and corrected.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. The Council's position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council discussed the consideration of West of Ifield and North of Horsham developments in the CEA in a TWG with the Applicant. Clarity was provided, and welcomed.</p>	<p>The long list and short list was shared with the local authorities prior to use in the Environmental Statement. The cumulative effects assessment methodology is set out in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships and accords with the approach set out in the PINS advice note.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): feedback from consultees on the two rounds of consultation on the long list (September 2022 and May 2023) was taken into account by the Applicant in refining the list used in the ES (Appendix 20.4.1 Cumulative Effects Assessment Long and Short List in accordance with the approach to the cumulative effects assessment set out in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships and the PINS advice note.</p>	ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]	Resolved
2.6.2.4	Treatment of temporal boundaries is unclear	<p>The assessment appears to assume that only development occurring at the same time will interact or combine. No mention of how impacts not occurring at the same time as the Project have been assessed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issue in relation to the temporal boundaries has not been addressed by the applicant.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. The Council's position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>The cumulative effects assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the approach set out in PINS Advice Note 17 and the approach is described in Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships of the ES. The criteria used to identify the short list from the long list are set out in section 20.4.21.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Temporal information for the other developments, where available, was taken into account as part of the stage 3 desk study and used for the cumulative effects</p>	ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]	Not Agreed

			assessments provided within the ES topic chapters (see paragraph 20.4.23 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships that refers to construction and operation dates).		
2.6.2.5	Temporal interaction	<p>It is unclear how temporal interaction has been considered. The Applicant states that the assessment considers impacts “from two or more developments which could occur at the same time”. Guidance2 suggests cumulative impacts should consider “incremental changes caused by other past, present or reasonably foreseeable actions together with the project” but the Application has not made clear what temporal boundaries have been applied.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The applicant has considered the temporal information of other development included in the CEA shortlist, but the issue refers to the exclusion of impacts based on the limited temporal scope applied.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. The Council's position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>Where publicly available and applicable, temporal information about the phasing of other developments has been considered.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Temporal information for the other developments, where available, was taken into account as part of the stage 3 desk study and used for the cumulative effects assessments provided within the ES topic chapters (see paragraph 20.4.23 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships that refers to construction and operation dates).</p>	n/a	Not Agreed
2.6.2.6	Treatment of Heathrow expansion (R3)	<p>The Council has several concerns around the way the Heathrow expansion proposals have been considered across the CEA. While the assessment of Heathrow's expansion (R3) alongside the Project is supported, it is disappointing that this has been undertaken in isolation and has not been explored in combination with other developments. As currently presented the assessment is unlikely to capture the realistic worst-case scenario should expansion at both airports occur. In addition, the Council questions the use of future baseline data published as part of the 2019 DCO consultation for a third runway and whether this data is still relevant. It is also unclear on what basis the assumption that air traffic levels at Gatwick would decline if Heathrow R3 is operational by the mid-2030s.</p> <p>It is disappointing the Applicant has chosen not to include the Heathrow expansion in the main CEA, especially given the Planning Inspectorate's advice in its Scoping Opinion3. The consideration of impacts in combination with the Project, excluding other developments, is, in the Council's view, not in the spirit of CEA, and is unlikely to provide for a realistic assessment should both Heathrow and Gatwick receive development consent for further development.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): R3 has been assessed, and the Council questions the robustness of the data underlying this assessment (i.e. 2019 data).</p>	<p>The approach to the assessment of cumulative effects with Heathrow R3 has taken into account the ongoing uncertainty around the status of the Heathrow R3 project and is described in section 20.7.2 to 20.7.6 of ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): the Applicant has provided a detailed response on this matter to Examining Authority question CE1.1 at Deadline 3.</p>	ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]	Not Agreed

		<p>PINS Scoping Opinion makes clear that the likelihood of another runway coming forward at Heathrow should not be ignored and the implications should be assessed both individually and cumulatively.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged, and has been outlined in response to the Applicants ExQ1 response CE1.1 [REP4-061]</p>			
2.6.2.7	Further information	<p>Further information provided by local authorities should be taken into account as the examination progresses where this is likely to have a material impact. Owing to this additional or alternative mitigation may be required.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Acknowledge sharing of list of sites in advance of examination, however the Council continues to request this is reviewed as the examination progresses.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. The Council's position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Horsham District Local Plan was submitted for examination on 26 July 2024. The Council considers there is justification for the ExA to consider whether interaction between the Project and the site allocation Land West of Ifield has been adequately considered by the Applicant.</p>	<p>As set out in Chapter 20: Cumulative effects and inter-relationships the long list of other developments was reviewed and updated up until three months prior to the submission of the application for development consent to allow the assessment to be finalised. Any applications for other developments submitted after this cut off date will be considered, where required, during the examination period.</p> <p>The long list and short list was shared with the local authorities prior to use in the Environmental Statement. The cumulative effects assessment methodology is set out in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships and accords with the approach set out in the PINS advice note.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): the long list of other developments was reviewed by consultees in September 2022 and May 2023 in accordance with PINS advice note seventeen.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]</p>	Not Agreed
Assessment					
2.6.3.1	Further assessment of cumulative impacts on health and wellbeing are necessary	<p>The Applicant has not addressed the potential for several impacts considered, when reviewed in isolation, not to have significant effects, to interact and have significant effects on health and wellbeing when considered in combination. For instance, noise impacts coupled with air quality impacts and traffic impacts may combine to have significant detrimental impacts.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The section has been noted. This should be provided on a more local / community specific scale in order to address these concerns, both quantitatively and qualitatively.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. The Council's position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Update noted</p>	<p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing sets out the assessment of interactions and combined effects in Section 18.11, paragraph 18.11.1 to 18.11.22. That section considers how each of the potential health effects that are assessed in isolation within Section 8.8 may interact or result in greater effects in combination. The assessment follows guidance (IEMA 2022) and presents the analysis both by geographic population and by vulnerable group sub-population. The assessment concludes that there would not be no new or materially different significant population health effects due to inter-related effects. Notwithstanding this conclusion, paragraph 18.11.22 sets out further mitigation to ensure there is a process to mitigate against exceptional circumstances relating to vulnerable individuals and combined effects. This is a best practice assessment and approach to combined effect mitigation.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043]</p> <p>ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]</p>	No longer pursuing

			<p>Additional information is set out in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships.</p> <p>Project Lifetime Effects are set out in Table 20.8.3 of ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships. This specifically considers the combined effects of different assessment years. ES Chapter 20 also reports on receptor-led Inter-related effects. i.e. the potential for multiple effects to interact, spatially and temporally, to create inter-related effects on a receptor or receptor group.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043] section 18.11 analysis of in-combination effects includes the site-specific level, which as described in section 27.3.2 [APP-043] relates to the nine-ward area (comprised of the small community areas around the airport). This small area, community level, analysis is therefore provided and is considered appropriate and proportionate to identify if there is the potential for materially different effects to population health due to in-combination effects. The section 18.11 analysis is qualitative and, as with the main assessment in section 18.8 [APP-043], it is informed by the quantification reported in ES Appendix 18.8.1 Quantitative Health Assessment Results [APP-208]. ES Appendix 18.4.1 Methods Statement for Health and Wellbeing [APP-205] confirms that the EIA significance methodology described by guidance is a qualitative analysis and the role of the quantitative analysis is to provide an estimation of the scale of change in selected health outcomes to inform that qualitative EIA significance methodology. Small area quantitative analysis is not appropriate as described in paragraph 3.1.8 [APP-205].</p>		
<p>Mitigation and Compensation</p>					
<p><i>There are no issues relating to the mitigation and compensation for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.</i></p>					
<p>Other</p>					
<p><i>There are no other issues relating to this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.</i></p>					

2.7. Draft DCO and Explanatory Memorandum

2.7.1 **Table 2.7** sets out the position of both parties in relation to Draft DCO and Explanatory Memorandum matters.

2.7.2 As regards the draft DCO, the table below (and particularly where matters are marked 'Not Agreed') should be read in conjunction with the Applicant's **Response to the ExA's Proposed Schedule of Changes to the draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 10.72) and the Applicant's **Closing Submissions** (Doc Ref. 10.73) on the draft DCO. In those documents the Applicant has set out the further changes it has made to the draft DCO after the publication of the ExA's **Proposed Schedule of Changes to the draft DCO** [PD-028], some of which will resolve matters that were not agreed at the time the below table was most recently exchanged with the JLAs. Where the Applicant has identified points raised by the JLAs which remain outstanding as at Deadline 9, it has included and addressed these in its **Closing Submissions** (Doc Ref. 10.73) on the draft DCO. On that basis, specific additional responses have only been added to the below table by exception where new material is raised in these SoCGs that is not otherwise addressed elsewhere.

2.7.3 Similarly, the Legal Partnership Authorities will be submitting a consolidated response to the draft DCO including comments on the ExA further changes at Deadline 9, therefore the table below should also be read in conjunction with this document and the JLA's closing statement.

Table 2.7 Statement of Common Ground – Draft DCO and Explanatory Memorandum Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
2.7.1.1	Definition of 'commencement'	<p>The definition of "commencement" and, in particular, the implications arising from certain operations which fall outside that definition, and which do not appear to be controlled (article 2(1), interpretation).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): All references in this column to the draft Development Consent Order ("dDCO") are to Version 3.0 of the dDO [PDLA-004] dated February 2024. This column provides a summary of the Council's position in respect of the points detailed in Table 2.7. Further detail, particularly in respect of points not addressed in Table 2.7, will be submitted at Deadline 1.</p> <p>It is noted that each of the 15 exceptions to the definition of "commencement" is either included in at least one of the following made DCOs: Sizewell C, Manston Airport, and M25 Junction 28, or "aligns with emerging drafting submitted in the Luton Airport Expansion" dDCO.</p> <p>The SoCG and Explanatory Memorandum ("EM") [AS-006] identify precedents; however, this is not enough. For instance, it does not follow that a provision relevant to the authorisation of a nuclear-powered generating station in Suffolk or the alteration of a motorway junction in Essex is relevant to the instant project. The relevance must be explained and the inclusion of the provision justified. The same point applies to provisions based on those which are included in airport DCOs, made or otherwise.</p> <p>Advice Note Fifteen: Drafting Development Consent Orders (republished July 2018 (version 2)) is clear on this point. It states –</p> <p>"If a draft DCO includes wording derived from other made DCOs, this should be explained in the Explanatory Memorandum. The Explanatory Memorandum should explain why that particular wording is relevant to the proposed draft DCO, for example detailing what is factually similar for both</p>	<p>The drafting of the definition of "commence" has advanced since the version commented upon. There are now 15 exceptions at sub-paragraphs (a) to (o) of article 2(1).</p> <p>These exceptions are all preceded by at least one of the Sizewell C (article 2), Manston Airport (article 2) or M25 J28 (article 2) DCOs or align with emerging drafting submitted in the Luton Airport Expansion application (Schedule 2, Part 1). The only additional provision is sub-paragraph (n) (establishment of temporary haul roads), which has been included as a separate limb for clarity, though the stated activity falls within the scope of other more generally worded exceptions from "commencement" in precedent DCOs (e.g. 'construction of temporary structures').</p> <p>As per paragraph 3.4.1 of the Explanatory Memorandum to the Draft Development Consent Order [AS-006] ("ExM"), it is reasonable and proportionate to include the specified exceptions to enable the efficient use of time in the construction timetable prior to the triggering of "commencement" under the DCO. All pre-commencement activities will be subject to the Code of Construction Practice and its associated management plans (see requirement 7) and must be carried out in accordance with the Carbon Action Plan (see requirement 21).</p> <p>The activities specified in this definition were selected to accord with precedent and as activities which can be (and, in many cases, must be) carried out early in the construction timetable. As per the ExM, the activities do not give rise to materially new or materially different environmental effects to those assessed in the ES.</p> <p>The ES assesses the environmental impacts from preparatory and construction activities for the project, and the activities captured by</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP7-005]</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4.1 of the Explanatory Memorandum to the Draft Development Consent Order [REP7-007]</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.8 onwards of ES Chapter 5 Project Description [REP1-016]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to ExQ2 - Development Consent Order and Control Documents [REP7-081]</p>	Agreed

	<p>the relevant consented NSIP and the Proposed Development. It is not sufficient for an Explanatory Memorandum to simply state that a particular provision has found favour with the Secretary of State previously; the ExA and Secretary of State will need to understand why it is appropriate for the scheme applied for. Any divergence in wording from the consented DCO drafting should also be explained. Note, though, that policy can change and develop”.</p> <p>(Paragraph 1.5, emphasis added).</p> <p>In the light of the above, it is clear the applicant should give reasons specific to each exception being suggested, rather than seeking to rely on the generic reference to precedent made in the EM and SoCG.</p> <p>The Council notes pre-commencement activities are subject to the COCP; however, this is not clear from Requirement 7 (code of construction practice) and it should be made explicit on the face of the dDCO. The limitations of the COCP, and the Council’s concerns about that document, are described elsewhere in this document.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.4.1 of the EM [AS-006] states the excluded operations “do not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects to those assessed in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 5.1), being either de minimis or having minimal potential for adverse effects, in line with the Planning Inspectorate’s Advice Note 15”. Paragraph 3.4.1 then goes on to refer to them as “low impact preparatory works”.</p> <p>Certain of the excluded operations would seem capable of giving rise to significant effects and it is not clear how the dDCO restricts these works to “low impact preparatory works”. To give one example, sub-paragraph (k) (“erection of temporary buildings and structures”) does not place any limit on the size of the “buildings and structures” or indicate what “temporary” might mean. An explanation is needed.</p> <p>Regarding temporary exempted works generally (for instance, as well as the temporary buildings and structures already referred to, sub-paragraph (n) provides for the “establishment of temporary haul roads” and sub-paragraph (o) for the “temporary display of site notices, advertisements or information”) it is not clear how these will be dealt with when they are no longer needed. Again, this needs to be made clear on the face of the dDCO.</p> <p>The Council is surprised by the applicant’s conclusion that no passage from the ES can be cited in respect of any exception (noting that, to give one example, the exception could provide for a temporary building of</p>	<p>the exceptions to the definition of "commence" have been assessed as part of this exercise. However, given that the exceptions are categories of activities which form part of the wider preparatory and construction works timetable, there are not specific passages of the ES which can be cited in respect of each individual exception. Certain of the pre-commencement activities which can be identified with particular certainty at this stage are described from Paragraph 5.3.8 of ES Chapter 5: Project Description.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):</p> <p>The Applicant reiterates that the approach of excepting certain construction activities from triggering "commencement" of the DCO is well precedented in made DCOs. The Council's comments on the relevance of precedent are noted, but the Applicant considers that it is useful to bring this to the ExA's attention to demonstrate where drafting approaches are commonly deployed by promoters and accepted by the Secretary of State. The justification for excepting activities from "commencement" accompanies the references to precedent in paragraph 3.4.1 of the Explanatory Memorandum to the Draft Development Consent Order [REP1-007].</p> <p>In respect of the Council's comment on the CoCP, this is already apparent on the face of the DCO. Requirement 7 specifies that <i>"Construction of the authorised development must be <u>carried out</u> in accordance with the code of construction practice unless otherwise agreed with CBC"</i> (emphasis added). There is no reference to commencement. Therefore, any part of the authorised development being carried out is subject to the CoCP. Duplicative wording in a separate location of the draft DCO is unnecessary.</p> <p>All pre-commencement activities will be subject to the CoCP and its associated management plans (see requirement 7); the written schemes of investigation for Surrey and West Sussex (see requirement 14); the Carbon Action Plan (see requirement 21) and the flood resilience statement (see requirement 24). These control measures provide sufficient assurance that impacts of pre-commencement works will be adequately managed.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024):</p> <p>Further detail on the specific reasons for the inclusion of items (a) to (o) as exceptions to the definition for "commencement" are detailed within The Applicant's Response to ExQ2 - Development</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

		<p>limitless size). The Council considers this approach to pre-commencement activities to be too casual and owing to this, and the lack of certainty as to what the exceptions to “commencement” would entail, considers these works should be subject to the approval of either the local planning authority or local highway authority, depending on the type of works involved.</p>	<p>Consent Order and Control Documents [REP7-081] response to DCO.2.1.</p>		
<p>2.7.1.2</p>	<p>Article 3</p>	<p>The drafting of article 3 (development consent etc. granted by Order);</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A drafting point regarding article 3(2): the EM says this paragraph is preceded in art.3(2) of the Manston Airport DCO 2022; however, while Gatwick refers to “Any enactment applying to land within or adjacent to the Order limits ...” Manston refers to “Any enactment applying to land within, adjoining or sharing a common boundary with the Order limits”.</p> <p>The Council would be grateful if the applicant could confirm why it departed from the cited precedent.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Applicant states “Certain of the pre-commencement activities which can be identified with particular certainty at this stage are described from paragraph 5.3.8 of ES Chapter 5: Project Description. [REP1-017]”. In that document, Table 5.3.1: Indicative Sequencing of Construction Works identifies the following pre-commencement activities –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pre-construction activities (including surveys for any Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and any necessary pre-construction surveys). This would seem to fall within sub-paragraph (b) of the definition of “commence” in article 2(1) (interpretation); • establishment of compounds. This would seem to fall within sub-paragraph (m) of the definition of “commence”; • fencing. This would seem to fall within sub-paragraph (e) of the definition of “commence”; and • diversion works and re-provision of essential replacement services. These would seem to fall within sub-paragraph (h) of the definition of “commence”. <p>No mention of the remaining elements of the definition of “commence” is included in Table 5.3.1.</p> <p>The Council therefore maintains its position as set out in Update 1: the applicant should give reasons specific to each exception being suggested. For instance, no justification is given for the inclusion of the “erection of temporary buildings and structures” (sub-paragraph (k) and no idea is provided regarding the size of these or what “temporary” might mean. Regarding the “establishment of temporary haul roads” (sub-paragraph</p>	<p>Several precedent DCOs contain a separate article authorising the operation and use of the authorised development – see, for example, article 7 of the Sizewell C DCO: “<i>The undertaker is authorised to operate and use the authorised development for which development consent is granted by this Order.</i>”</p> <p>In drafting article 3 of the draft DCO, it was considered that it was clearer and more succinct to subsume the separate authorisation of operation and use into a single provision in article 3.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):</p> <p>The Applicant considers that “adjacent” is more appropriate than the wording cited in the Manston Airport Development Consent Order 2022. It is not clear to the Applicant the distinction between land “adjoining” the Order limits and land “sharing a common boundary with the Order limits” from the Manston Order. Use of “adjacent” captures enactments which affect land adjoining the Order limits and land otherwise very near to the Order limits, both of which may still (if not taking effect subject to the provisions of the Order) hinder the carrying out of the authorised development (e.g. by preventing access to the site).</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the drafting in article 3(2) of the draft DCO (including “or adjacent”) is well preceded in made DCOs, including article 3(9) of the National Grid (Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project) Development Consent Order 2024, article 4(2) of the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Development Consent Order 2024 and article 3(2) of the Boston Alternative Energy Facility Order 2023.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Applicant maintains the position set out in its earlier updates, but refers to the additional explanation provided in response to DCO.2.1 in its Response to ExQ2 – Development Consent Order and Control Documents (Doc Ref. 10.56) which signposts how each activity specified in the definition is subject to controls</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

		<p>(n)), and the “temporary display of site notices” it is not clear how these will be dealt with when they are no longer needed.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the Applicant’s further detail on these points, particularly in the updated (ie D7) COCP.</p> <p>As mentioned previously, the Authorities main concerns are with the potential impacts of the works that fall within paragraphs (k), (m), (n) and (o).</p> <p>Regarding (m), the establishment of construction compounds, the Authorities welcome paragraph 5.4.14 of the COCP which states -</p> <p>“Temporary construction compounds will be reinstated to their previous use and habitats will be restored to their existing ecological value (as a minimum)”.</p> <p>The Authorities consider the COCP should include similar commitments in respect of the following paragraphs and would be grateful if the Applicant could confirm the COCP will be updated accordingly –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (k) erection of temporary buildings and structures; (m) establishment of construction compounds; (n) establishment of temporary haul roads; and (o) the temporary display of site notices, advertisements or information. 	<p>elsewhere in the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1) and in the Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 5.3) (CoCP).</p> <p>The Applicant continues to consider that the JLAs' concern is targeted more at how the activities it references are controlled more broadly, rather than their inclusion in the definition of "commence", and hopes that this additional explanation (along with new drafting that has been added to the CoCP) satisfies any remaining concerns.</p>		
<p>2.7.1.3</p>	<p>Article 9</p>	<p>The drafting of article 9 (planning permission) and confirmation regarding which planning permission and conditions the applicant is concerned about.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): To allow the Council to understand the full implications of article 9(3) and (4), the Council requests the applicant provides a full list of the existing planning permissions (including deemed planning permission) which are at issue. Once that information is provided, the Council will be better able to say whether those provisions are acceptable.</p> <p>Regarding article 9(4), who will decide what “incompatible” means and how that will be conveyed to other parties (e.g. the local planning authority)?</p> <p>Regarding article 9(5), the Council disagrees with the applicant’s analysis that retaining permitted development rights would “allow for minor works to be separately consented without needing to rely on an amendment to the Order, which would be disproportionate and impractical”.</p> <p>First, the Council considers the potential scope of development permitted by the provisions cited in article 9(5) cannot be dismissed as “minor</p>	<p>Please refer to paragraphs 4.24 – 4.28 of the ExM, which explains the rationale for article 9 in light of the recent Supreme Court decision in <i>Hillside Parks Ltd v Snowdonia National Park Authority</i> [2022] UKSC 30. Other recently submitted DCO applications make similar provision, including the draft Luton Airport Expansion DCO (article 45) and Lower Thames Crossing DCO (article 56).</p> <p>As regards the cited wording which disapplies incompatible conditions of previously granted planning permissions, similar wording features in article 45(2)(c) of the draft Luton Airport Expansion DCO.</p> <p>In response to the further queries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The drafting at article 9(1) of the draft DCO is a model provision (article 36) which is well-established in numerous precedent DCOs. The drafting is by reference to section 264 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (“TCPA 1990”) and the effect is to ensure that permitted development rights attaching to the undertaker in relation to operational land have effect as they would do if planning 	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006] Explanatory Memorandum to the Draft Development Consent Order [AS-006]</p> <p>Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 2: Control Documents / DCO [REP1-057]</p> <p>The Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 2: Control Documents / DCO [REP1-063]</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>

	<p>works” and is unconvinced these should be retained. Second, if further development, which is not authorised by the DCO, is to take place at the airport, it should be subject to control by the local planning authority. Third, if the applicant wants the DCO to authorise yet further works, these should be included in Schedule 1 in the usual way (and their effects assessed). This approach is consistent with Advice note thirteen: Preparation of a draft order granting development consent and explanatory memorandum (Republished February 2019 (version 3)) which states (at paragraph 2.9) the dDCO should include the following –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A full, precise and complete description of each element of the NSIP, preferably itemised in a Schedule to the DCO; and • A full, precise and complete description of each element of any necessary “associated development””. <p>The retention of permitted development rights could, contrary to Advice note thirteen, result in a partial and incomplete description of the proposed development being included in the dDCO.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council is mainly concerned with paragraphs (4) and (5), neither of which is included in the corresponding provisions of the Lower Thames Crossing or Luton draft DCOs. (See article 56 of the former [REP10-005] and article 45 of the latter [REP11-092]).</p> <p>Article 9(4): regarding paragraph (4), the Applicant has confirmed in its answer to ExQ1 GEN1.2 [REP3-091]- "The operation of the repositioned northern runway, once implemented, would be incompatible with the restrictions on its use under the 1979 planning permission. As such, Article 9(4) would be engaged and that use restriction under the 1979 planning permission would cease to have effect". In its Deadline 4 response to this answer, the Council states the power under paragraph (4) should be limited to the identified mischief i.e. the relevant conditions of the 1979 planning permission. The Council considers there is no justification for this power, which is extraordinary for a private company, to be cast any wider.</p> <p>Article 9(5): the Council maintains the position, which has been articulated in previous submissions, that the exceptions concerning permitted development rights within article 9(5) (and requirements 4 and 10) should be removed and drafting included which provides the permitted development rights do not apply. (Please see, for example, column 6 of Appendix M to the West Sussex LIR [REP1-069], action point 10 of Legal Partnership Authorities Responses to Applicants Written Summary of Oral Submissions and Responses to Actions (from Issue Specific Hearings 1-5) [REP2-081], and paragraph 4.2 of Issue Specific Hearing 2: Control Documents and the DCO Post Hearing Submission [REP2-212].</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p>	<p>permission had been granted for the authorised development. "Operational land" is defined in section 263 TCPA 1990.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Sub-paragraphs (2) and (3) address legal risk arising from the <i>Hillside</i> decision and ensure that (i) the authorised development can continue to be carried out notwithstanding an incompatible planning permission and (ii) planning permissions granted and initiated prior to commencement of the authorised development under the DCO can continue to be lawfully implemented thereafter. Whether activities authorised by the DCO are taking place pre- or post-commencement do not affect these principles. 3) As above. 4) 'Incompatibility' is as discussed in the Hillside decision. A planning permission would be 'incompatible' with the development authorised by the DCO if it were physically impossible to build out both developments (e.g. due to overlapping consented structures). <p>There is no sub-paragraph (9) in article 9 of the current draft DCO and it is presumed that this point is in reference to sub-paragraphs (5) and (6) of the present drafting. These make clear that the DCO does not restrict the future exercise by the undertaker of permitted development rights. This is necessary to ensure that GAL as airport operator can continue to rely on its extant permitted development rights to facilitate the ongoing operation of the airport and allow for minor works to be separately consented without needing to rely on an amendment to the Order, which would be disproportionate and impractical.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant refers to the explanation provided at paragraph 4.1.24 of its Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 2: Control Documents / DCO [REP1-057]. The Applicant does not consider that a prescribed mechanism is required as regards potential incompatibility dealt with by article 9(4). The question of incompatibility under article 9(4) is only likely to arise in the event that enforcement action is pursued in respect of an extant planning permission. In such circumstances, it would be for the defendant party to rely on article 9(4) and particularise how it affects the enforcement action in question.</p> <p>As regards article 9(5), all works forming part of the Project have been included in the Applicant's application. As per the Applicant's response to Action Point 10 in The Applicant's Response to</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>Article 9(4) In both the Authorities D7 “Consolidated Submissions on the draft DCO” [REP7-108] and the updated version of that document which was submitted at D8 [see Part B], the Authorities suggested two Alternatives – Alternative A and Alternative B – for article 9(4). The text below is taken from the D8 document –</p> <p>Alternative A The Authorities note that, in the latest version of Appendix A to the Planning Statement [REP7-057], the Applicant has identified (in paragraph 1.2.2) two conditions from “the 1979 Permission” [i.e. planning permission CR/125/1979] as “inconsistent with the Project” namely –</p> <p>“Condition 3 restricts the use of the emergency runway to times when the main runway was temporarily not in operation; and Condition 4 requires the western noise mitigation bund to remain in place”.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.2.3 states: “These restrictions are the only inconsistent conditions that the Applicant is aware of”. [Emphasis added].</p> <p>The Authorities do not disagree with this analysis. Owing to the fact the Applicant and Authorities consider only two conditions are inconsistent with the DCO application, the Authorities would suggest that the Applicant’s proposed paragraph (4) (which the Authorities considered should be deleted at D7) should be amended as follows –</p> <p>“(4) Conditions 3 and 4 of planning permission CR/125/1979, which are incompatible with the requirements of this Order or the authorised development, shall cease to have effect from the date the authorised development is commenced.”</p> <p>If this amendment were made, the new paragraph (5), which was introduced by the Applicant at D7 [REP7-006], should be deleted as it would no longer be necessary (because paragraph (5) concerns a notification point which would fall away in the light of the Authorities’ proposed amendments to paragraph (4)).</p> <p>Alternative B The Authorities have considered the planning permissions which affect the airport. If this drafting is retained, the Authorities consider the following conditions should be excepted from article 9(4) because they are not incompatible under paragraph (4) and so, for the avoidance of doubt, should be preserved –</p> <p>New Schedule SCHEDULE [X] CONDITIONS EXCEPTED FROM ARTICLE 9(4)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="697 1858 1513 1900"> <thead> <tr> <th>Condition</th> <th>Planning permission</th> <th>Site address</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Condition	Planning permission	Site address				<p>Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 2: Control Documents / DCO [REP1-063], many of the works forming part of the DCO application could otherwise have been carried out by the Applicant under its permitted development rights. The Applicant has chosen to seek a DCO for the Project as a whole, holistically, and accepts that the Project should be controlled as a whole through the DCO and related control documents.</p> <p>However, this approach does not mean that the Applicant should be deprived of its permitted development rights over the operational airport in future if the DCO is granted, as now appears to be the Council’s suggestion. The Applicant does not consider it appropriate for a DCO, which is granted in respect of a defined project which will be built out and in due course completed, to disapply permitted development rights relating to that site for the purpose of future, distinct development. The rationale for the provision by Government (under the authority of Parliament) of permitted development rights to airport operators such as the Applicant is to allow them to carry out development in support of the effective and efficient running of an airport. This rationale remains – and is indeed amplified – if this DCO is granted and the northern runway is brought into routine use.</p> <p>In any event, article 9(5) merely restates and clarifies what the Applicant considers to be the existing position at law, and the Applicant does not consider that a DCO without this wording would restrict the subsequent use of permitted development rights. However, it is considered preferable to clarify this expressly.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024):</p> <p>Useful discussions continue between the parties to try and find an agreed approach to article 9(4) and the notification of any incompatible planning conditions. The Applicant has included a notification provision in article 9(5) in version 8 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 6 [REP6-005] and is hopeful that this wording will be agreeable to the JLAs.</p> <p>In respect of what was article 9(5) (now numbered article 9(6) in version 9 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 2.1)), the Applicant understands that agreement will not be reached with the JLAs.</p> <p>The JLAs set out their position in [REP6-110] that they wish article 9(5) to prohibit (i) the exercise of any permitted development rights on Museum Field, Pentagon Field and the reed beds (i.e. Work No.</p>		
Condition	Planning permission	Site address								

		<table border="1"> <tr><td>3</td><td>CR/2020/0707/NCC</td><td>Hampton by Hilton, Longbridge House</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>CR/2019/0802/FUL</td><td>Bloc Hotel, South Terminal</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>CR/2019/0802/FUL</td><td>Bloc Hotel, South Terminal</td></tr> <tr><td>11</td><td>CR/2017/0116/FUL</td><td>Boeing Hangar</td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td>CR/2017/0116/FUL</td><td>Boeing Hangar</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>CR/2011/0620/FUL</td><td>Pollution Control Lagoon</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>CR/2011/0014/FUL</td><td>Sofitel London Gatwick</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>CR/2011/0014/FUL</td><td>Sofitel London Gatwick</td></tr> <tr><td>1</td><td>CR/2010/0396/NCC</td><td>Runway Shoulders</td></tr> <tr><td>5</td><td>CR/2009/0326/FUL</td><td>North Terminal</td></tr> <tr><td>4</td><td>CR/2002/0865/FUL</td><td>Travel Inn, Longbridge Road</td></tr> <tr><td>8</td><td>CR/1999/0243/FUL</td><td>Jetset House and Compound Adjacent to Perimeter Road South</td></tr> <tr><td>4 and 5</td><td>CR/1997/0138/FUL</td><td>Car Park Z, Southern Perimeter Area</td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td>CR/1997/311/FUL</td><td>Computer Centre, Buckingham Gate</td></tr> <tr><td>11 and 12</td><td>CR/127/1979</td><td>Outline application for Airport Passenger Terminal and associate access</td></tr> </table>	3	CR/2020/0707/NCC	Hampton by Hilton, Longbridge House	8	CR/2019/0802/FUL	Bloc Hotel, South Terminal	9	CR/2019/0802/FUL	Bloc Hotel, South Terminal	11	CR/2017/0116/FUL	Boeing Hangar	25	CR/2017/0116/FUL	Boeing Hangar	9	CR/2011/0620/FUL	Pollution Control Lagoon	9	CR/2011/0014/FUL	Sofitel London Gatwick	10	CR/2011/0014/FUL	Sofitel London Gatwick	1	CR/2010/0396/NCC	Runway Shoulders	5	CR/2009/0326/FUL	North Terminal	4	CR/2002/0865/FUL	Travel Inn, Longbridge Road	8	CR/1999/0243/FUL	Jetset House and Compound Adjacent to Perimeter Road South	4 and 5	CR/1997/0138/FUL	Car Park Z, Southern Perimeter Area	9	CR/1997/311/FUL	Computer Centre, Buckingham Gate	11 and 12	CR/127/1979	Outline application for Airport Passenger Terminal and associate access	<p>Article 9(5)</p> <p>The Authorities welcome the removal of permitted development rights, as suggested by the ExA, for the reasons set out in various earlier representations.</p> <p>The Authorities will of course consider any proposals by the Applicant as an alternative means of achieving the same objective but the Authorities would want to be reassured that any proposed cap put forward by the Applicant on parking numbers would be capable of enduring for the lifetime of the operation, and would indirectly exclude the provision of additional parking within the perimeter of the Airport, whether that be through the exercise of permitted development rights or through any express planning permissions. This suggestion would not address the Authorities concerns were it to simply be a cap which only regulates development as long as it's being undertaken under the DCO. The Authorities await further information as to the Applicant's proposal for a parking cap.</p>	<p>43) and (ii) the exercise of any permitted development rights to deliver car parking anywhere on the airport.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above, the Applicant continues to consider it disproportionate, unjustified and unnecessary to disapply broad swathes of the Applicant's permitted development rights over the whole airport. In relation to airport-wide development of car parking, the Applicant has explained its position on several previous occasions, and most recently in response to DCO.2.6 in its Response to ExQ2 – Development Consent Order and Control Documents (Doc Ref. 10.56). This notwithstanding, in cognisance of the JLAs' particular concerns, the Applicant has sought to offer a reasonable compromise position that represents a significant concession on behalf of the Applicant.</p> <p>In version 9 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 2.1), the Applicant has specified in article 9(7) that it must not exercise any permitted development rights for any development on Museum Field or for any car parking development on Pentagon Field or the water treatment works (i.e. the reed beds, Work No. 43). The disapplication of permitted development rights more broadly than for car parking for the latter two sites is considered disproportionate because these sites are identified by the Applicant as potentially suitable for future development such as for solar panels. In any event, the Applicant would be bound to comply with any landscape and ecology management plan approved for those sites under requirement 8 of the draft DCO and would breach the DCO were it to use its permitted development rights contrary to the landscaping secured in such plans.</p>		
3	CR/2020/0707/NCC	Hampton by Hilton, Longbridge House																																																	
8	CR/2019/0802/FUL	Bloc Hotel, South Terminal																																																	
9	CR/2019/0802/FUL	Bloc Hotel, South Terminal																																																	
11	CR/2017/0116/FUL	Boeing Hangar																																																	
25	CR/2017/0116/FUL	Boeing Hangar																																																	
9	CR/2011/0620/FUL	Pollution Control Lagoon																																																	
9	CR/2011/0014/FUL	Sofitel London Gatwick																																																	
10	CR/2011/0014/FUL	Sofitel London Gatwick																																																	
1	CR/2010/0396/NCC	Runway Shoulders																																																	
5	CR/2009/0326/FUL	North Terminal																																																	
4	CR/2002/0865/FUL	Travel Inn, Longbridge Road																																																	
8	CR/1999/0243/FUL	Jetset House and Compound Adjacent to Perimeter Road South																																																	
4 and 5	CR/1997/0138/FUL	Car Park Z, Southern Perimeter Area																																																	
9	CR/1997/311/FUL	Computer Centre, Buckingham Gate																																																	
11 and 12	CR/127/1979	Outline application for Airport Passenger Terminal and associate access																																																	

<p>2.7.1.4</p>	<p>Article 10</p>	<p>The disapplication of several provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 without the application of the relevant highway authority's permit scheme (article 10; application of the 1991 Act).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council maintains its opposition to the disapplication of sections 73B, 73C, 77 and 78A of the 1991 Act. The Council notes the cited precedents. It is now for the applicant to explain why the disapplication of the cited provisions is relevant to this project. That is the approach required by paragraph 1.5 of Advice Note Fifteen (see comments on article 2(1) re "Commencement" above). While the Council has not undertaken an analysis of the cited precedents, the Council assumes the inclusion of these provisions was not controversial in those projects. The position is different here because their inclusion is of concern to the Council. Moreover, it does not follow that what is appropriate for a highways or a nuclear power DCO is relevant to an airport DCO. Similarly, provisions relevant to one airport DCO might not be relevant to another.</p> <p>The Council considers the disapplication of the provisions would be acceptable if the relevant highway authority's permit scheme was applied to the construction and maintenance of the authorised development.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council notes the applicant is considering the implications of the application of the highway authority's permit scheme to the authorised development and will discuss further with the highway authority. The Council would welcome these discussions and emphasises that the Traffic Management (Surrey County Council) Permit Scheme Order 2015 (as varied) was incorporated into the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange Development Consent Order 2022 (SI 2022/549). Other local authority permit schemes have been incorporated into other DCOs.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024) The Council welcomes the incorporation of the permit schemes into the draft DCO.</p>	<p>The drafting of article 10 has advanced since the version commented on by the Councils and the cross-references are now complete. The latest draft no longer refers to "permit schemes".</p> <p>Section 74A of the 1991 Act is no longer disappplied in the latest draft of the DCO. Sections 73B, 73C and 78A of the 1991 Act are disappplied in several precedent DCOs, including the Sizewell C (article 15), Manston Airport (article 10), A303 (Amesbury to Berwick Down) (article 8) and A417 Missing Link (article 12) DCOs. Section 77 of the 1991 Act is disappplied in the Sizewell C DCO (article 15).</p> <p>GAL invites the Councils to please specify the precise nature of their concern with the disapplication of these provisions and why the approach here should depart from the precedent outlined.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Sections 73A, 73B, 73C and 78A of the 1991 Act are prospective provisions that will be applied through sections 55 and 57 of the Traffic Management Act 2004. These provisions are not yet in force, but should they become legislation then they are disappplied for the purpose of the Project. The disapplication of these provisions (which are designed primarily to regulate the carrying out of street works by utility companies in respect of their apparatus) is appropriate given the scale of highway works proposed under the DCO, the specific authorisation given for those works by the DCO and the specific provisions in the DCO which would regulate the carrying out of the works included in the DCO and ensure sufficient measures to mitigate any impacts of these works.</p> <p>The disapplication of these provisions is well precedented, including in article 8 of the A66 Northern Trans-Pennine Development Consent Order 2024 and article 11 of the Boston Alternative Energy Facility Order 2023.</p> <p>Section 77 of the 1991 Act provides that, where a highway is used as an alternative route to a highway that is restricted or prohibited due to street works, the undertaker must indemnify the highway authority of the highway used as a diversion in respect of costs of strengthening that highway or making good any damage caused by the diverted traffic.</p> <p>It is appropriate to disapply this provision in a DCO context because the impacts of the Project, including as regards traffic, have been subject to a full EIA and, where impacts have been identified,</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
----------------	-------------------	--	--	-----------------------------	---------------

			<p>appropriate mitigation has been incorporated into the Project's design or otherwise secured. Section 77 of the 1991 Act would cut across this mitigation package.</p> <p>The disapplication of section 77 of the 1991 Act is precedented in article 15 of the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022.</p> <p>As regards the highway authority's permit scheme, the Applicant is considering the implications of this proposal and will discuss this further with the relevant highway authorities.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Applicant is content to incorporate the Surrey and West Sussex permit schemes into the draft DCO and has done so in version 9 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 2.1)</p>		
2.7.1.5	Article 11	<p>The way in which street works are controlled under article 11 (street works).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Owing to the small number of streets affected within the Order limits, it would seem straightforward to cross-refer in the article to a specified list. The applicant will be aware that such an approach is not unusual. Absent such cross-reference, the Council maintains its position that the power should be subject to street authority control.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council maintain their concern that article 11 departs from most precedents by authorising interference with any streets within the Order limits, rather than those specified in a schedule.</p> <p>This is a significant departure from the Model Provisions (see Model Provision 8(1)) and established precedent; for example, article 14 (street works) of the Sizewell C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2022 (SI 2022/853), article 12 (street works) of the M42 Junction 6 Development Consent Order 2020 (SI 2020/528), and article 10 (street works) of the Thames Water Utilities Limited (Thames Tideway Tunnel) Order 2014 (SI 2014/2384).</p> <p>The Council's position is set out in the West Sussex LIR (Appendix M, column 8) [REP1-069], the SCC PADSS (column 87), and the Legal Partnership Authorities' response to ExQ1 DCO1.22 [REP3-135].</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p> <p>Article 11</p>	<p>Article 11 is by reference to streets "within the Order limits" rather than a specified list of streets because (i) there are only a small number of streets within the Order limits and there is little benefit therefore in listing them in a schedule and (ii) GAL foresees a need for flexibility as regards the streets under which it may need to carry out works, particularly in relation to necessary utility diversions which may become apparent during construction.</p> <p>Further, such an approach is precedented in several DCOs, including the A38 Derby Junctions (article 11), A47 Wansford to Sutton (article 15), A57 Link Roads (article 10) and Thurrock Flexible Generation Plant (article 11) DCOs.</p> <p>The additional wording proposed in bold is not included in any of these precedent DCOs. Its inclusion would be a departure from well-established precedent and therefore unjustified.</p> <p>The approach in the draft DCO, that article 11 does not require the consent of the street authority while article 12 does, is precedented in the Sizewell C DCO (see articles 13 and 14). The works envisaged by article 12, which extend inter alia to permanently altering the nature and characteristics of streets, are of greater consequence to the ongoing use of the streets in question than the more limited works envisaged by article 11, which are largely in or under the streets. There is therefore good reason why the street authority's consent should be required for works under article 12 and not article 11.</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p> <p>Land Plans [AS-015]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>The Authorities note the Applicant has not provided a schedule of streets and would therefore suggest that the street works powers proposed under article 11 should be subject to the street authority's consent. Absent any consent provision, there is a risk of streets being interfered with at inappropriate times which would be detrimental to the undertaker and street authority. The Authorities would therefore propose that article 11 should be amended as follows –</p> <p>11.—(1) The undertaker may, for the purposes of the authorised development and subject to the consent of the street authority, enter on so much of any of the streets as are within the Order limits and may— ...</p>	<p>Updated position (April 2024):</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary for article 11 to reference a schedule setting out a list of streets. There are a small number of streets within the Order limits and, due to the nature of this Project's site, the vast majority are either airport roads or are the subject of the surface access works comprised in the authorised development. Through the examination and by reference to plans including the Land Plans [AS-015], stakeholders are able to examine the extent of the Order limits and therefore the extent of streets over which the article 11 power may be exercised. The Applicant is not aware that the Council has raised specific concerns regarding the exercise of article 11 over particular streets. In that context, preparing and referencing a schedule of all streets within the Order limits would mean that article 11 has the same effect as presently.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024):</p> <p>The Applicant maintains its previous position and refers to its response to DCO.2.8 in its Response to ExQ2 – Development Consent Order and Control Documents (Doc Ref. 10.56).</p> <p>The Applicant understands that the JLAs are considering whether they have any concerns with particular streets and would welcome confirmation of such concerns as soon as possible so that any bespoke provision can be made in article 11 (street works) if warranted.</p>		
2.7.1.6	Article 14	<p>The inclusion of deeming provisions in articles 12(4) (power to alter layout, etc. of streets), article 14(8) (temporary closure of streets), 18(10) (traffic regulations), 22(5) (discharge of water), and 24(6) (authority to survey and investigate the land).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1):</p> <p>New sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (5)</p> <p>The Council cannot envisage a situation when it would not want an alternative temporary route to be provided and considers it would be more straightforward if this was made clear in the DCO.</p> <p>"Must not be of a lower standard"</p>	<p>The drafting of article 14 has advanced since the version commented on by the Councils.</p> <p><u>New sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (5)</u></p> <p>The additional wording proposed to be included after existing sub-paragraph (5) is not considered necessary. Sub-paragraph (4) already provides that: "The undertaker must not temporarily alter, divert, prohibit the use of or restrict the use of any street without the consent of the street authority, which may attach reasonable conditions to any consent but such consent must not be unreasonably withheld or delayed". Should the street authority wish to request an alternative route to the temporarily altered/diverted/restricted etc. street be provided, it can do so as a</p>	Draft DCO [REP3-006]	Agreed

		<p>The Council notes the applicant's response and is considering its position.</p> <p>Deeming provision</p> <p>The extension of deadline from 28 to 56 days is welcomed; however, the Council maintains its in-principle objection to the deeming provision.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): New sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (5)</p> <p>The Council maintains its position on this point.</p> <p>"Must not be of a lower standard"</p> <p>The Council is no longer pursuing this point.</p> <p>Deeming provision</p> <p>Regarding deemed consent, the Council agrees with the position set out in row 9 of Appendix M to the Joint West Sussex LIR [REP1-069]: the deeming provision should be deleted. The Council's notes the Applicant's position that a "failure to respond to requests for consent/approval in a timely manner can lead to significant delays in a construction timetable".</p> <p>The Council does not disagree with this; however, owing to the fact that (per paragraph (3)), the consenting authority must not unreasonably withhold or delay consent, the scenario envisaged by the applicant is unlikely to arise. In any event, it is unreasonable to include the deeming provision and the "unreasonably withhold or delay consent" wording.</p> <p>Turning to the precedents mentioned by the applicant, the inclusion of a "deeming provision" does not appear to have been controversial in any of those projects and so the issue was not considered in detail by the Examining Authority or Secretary of State. The position is clearly different here.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024) The Council welcomes the omission of "or delayed" from each deeming provision.</p>	<p>condition to its consent (provided that such a condition is reasonable in the circumstances).</p> <p>Materially similar formulations of article 14 (without the additional proposed wording) were included in precedent DCOs including the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange (article 14) and A38 Derby Junctions (article 15) DCOs. It is also noted that a similar approach has been taken in the emerging draft Luton Airport Expansion DCO (article 13).</p> <p><u>"Must not be of a lower standard"</u></p> <p>The further proposed amendment in bold to what is now sub-paragraph (5) ("and must not be of a lower standard") is not justified. Where a street is being temporarily altered, diverted or restricted (etc.), it is not reasonable to require that the temporary diversion be of the same standard as the main permanent route. Indeed, this is unlikely to be the case.</p> <p><u>Deeming provision</u></p> <p>Several provisions of the DCO (including this article 14) contain deeming provisions where the consent of a third-party body is required. A failure to respond to requests for consent in a timely manner can lead to significant delays in a construction timetable. Use of deeming provisions in respect of some key consents is therefore considered reasonable and in alignment with the objectives of the Planning Act 2008 to ensure efficient delivery of nationally significant infrastructure projects. To reflect the Councils' concern regarding deemed approval, the time period after which consent is deemed given has been extended to 56 days rather than the 28 days included in the version of the DCO upon which the Councils have commented.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):</p> <p><u>New sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (5)</u> The Council's position on this is noted, but the Applicant does not consider it useful to any party to limit the relevant Council's discretion to address a variety of situations that may arise under article 14 when the existing drafting would already facilitate the solution the Councils are seeking (i.e. temporary diversions on a case-by-case basis should the relevant street authority consider this necessary). In any event, it is noted that Horsham District Council is</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>not a street authority and therefore does not appear to have a relevant interest in this provision.</p> <p><u>"Must not be of a lower standard"</u> Noted.</p> <p><u>Deeming provision</u> The Applicant reiterates its position that deeming provisions are justified and appropriate. A failure to respond to requests for consent/approval in a timely manner can lead to significant delays in a construction timetable. Use of deeming provisions in respect of some key consents/approvals is therefore considered reasonable and in alignment with the objectives of the Planning Act 2008 to ensure efficient delivery of nationally significant infrastructure projects.</p> <p>The time period after which consent is deemed given has been extended to 56 days in response to the Councils' previous comments and the Applicant considers that this period is sufficient for matters subject to deemed consent to be thoroughly considered and a decision reached, even if further information is requested of the undertaker.</p> <p>It is noted that deeming provisions are well precedented in recently made DCOs, including the National Grid (Yorkshire Green Energy Enablement Project) Development Consent Order 2024, the A12 Chelmsford to A120 Widening Development Consent Order 2024 and the Boston Alternative Energy Facility Order 2023 (all of which, it is noted, use a shorter period than the draft DCO of 28 days after which consent is deemed to have been granted).</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024):</p> <p>The Applicant has amended the relevant articles in version 9 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 2.1) to remove reference to consent being "<i>unreasonably... delayed</i>" where there is also a deeming provision. The Applicant understands that this resolves the JLAs' concerns with the deeming provisions.</p>		
2.7.1.7	Article 14(5)	<p>The standard to which alternative routes must be provided under article 14(5) (temporary closure of streets).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1):</p> <p>New sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (5)</p>	<p>The drafting of article 14 has advanced since the version commented on by the Councils.</p> <p><u>New sub-paragraph after sub-paragraph (5)</u></p>	Draft DCO [REP3-006]	Duplicate

		<p>The Council cannot envisage a situation when it would not want an alternative temporary route to be provided and considers it would be more straightforward if this was made clear in the DCO.</p> <p>"Must not be of a lower standard"</p> <p>The Council notes the applicant's response and is considering its position.</p> <p>Deeming provision</p> <p>The extension of deadline from 28 to 56 days is welcomed; however, the Council maintains its in-principle objection to the deeming provision.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Row 2.7.1.7 repeats the contents of Row 2.7.1.6. (The Council would suggest that one of the rows is deleted).</p>	<p>The additional wording proposed to be included after existing sub-paragraph (5) is not considered necessary. Sub-paragraph (4) already provides that: "The undertaker must not temporarily alter, divert, prohibit the use of or restrict the use of any street without the consent of the street authority, which may attach reasonable conditions to any consent but such consent must not be unreasonably withheld or delayed". Should the street authority wish to request an alternative route to the temporarily altered/diverted/restricted etc. street be provided, it can do so as a condition to its consent (provided that such a condition is reasonable in the circumstances).</p> <p>Materially similar formulations of article 14 (without the additional proposed wording) were included in precedent DCOs including the M25 Junction 10/A3 Wisley Interchange (article 14) and A38 Derby Junctions (article 15) DCOs. It is also noted that a similar approach has been taken in the emerging draft Luton Airport Expansion DCO (article 13).</p> <p><u>"Must not be of a lower standard"</u></p> <p>The further proposed amendment in bold to what is now sub-paragraph (5) ("and must not be of a lower standard") is not justified. Where a street is being temporarily altered, diverted or restricted (etc.), it is not reasonable to require that the temporary diversion be of the same standard as the main permanent route. Indeed, this is unlikely to be the case.</p> <p><u>Deeming provision</u></p> <p>Several provisions of the DCO (including this article 14) contain deeming provisions where the consent of a third-party body is required. A failure to respond to requests for consent in a timely manner can lead to significant delays in a construction timetable. Use of deeming provisions in respect of some key consents is therefore considered reasonable and in alignment with the objectives of the Planning Act 2008 to ensure efficient delivery of nationally significant infrastructure projects. To reflect the Councils' concern regarding deemed approval, the time period after which consent is deemed given has been extended to 56 days rather than the 28 days included in the version of the DCO upon which the Councils have commented.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): See Row 2.7.1.6 directly above.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Updated position (July 2024):</p> <p>Given that this row duplicates discussion in the row above, it has been marked 'Duplicate'.</p>		
2.7.1.8	Article 16	<p>The proposal to allow the Applicant to create new means of access without the street authority’s consent under article 16 (access to works).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council maintains its position that consent is required for the creation of new means of access.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council welcomes the inclusion of the consent provision in article 16(2) (access to works).</p> <p>The Council considers that, in paragraph (2), the words “(such consent not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed)” should be deleted because paragraph (4) contains a deeming provision. It is unreasonable to include the deeming provision and the “unreasonably withhold or delay consent” wording.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p> <p>The Council welcomes the omission of “or delayed” from this provision.</p>	<p>Article 16 provides an appropriate degree of flexibility in case the need for an access only becomes apparent at a later stage of the implementation of the authorised development.</p> <p>As airport operator, GAL exercises a significant degree of autonomy over streets within the airport. A requirement for street authority consent is not, therefore, necessary or justified.</p> <p>In any event, the wording of article 16(1) is identical to that in the M25 Junction 28 (article 12) and M54 to M6 Link Road (article 14) DCOs.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Street authority consent is now required for exercise of the power in article 16(1), as per article 16(2) – see version 6.0 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-006].</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024):</p> <p>See 2.7.1.6 above.</p>	Draft DCO [REP3-006]	Agreed
2.7.1.9	Article 18	<p>How the “instrument” referred to in article 18(6)(a)(traffic regulations) will be accessed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council looks forward to hearing from GAL regarding the way in which the “instrument” will be accessed.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Authorities have no comments in respect of the amendments made to article 18 in the latest version of the dDCO [REP3-006] ; however, they agree with the concerns in respect of this article, as set out in the following rows of Appendix M to the West Sussex LIR [REP1-069]: row 22 (regarding paragraph (1)), row 23 (regarding paragraph (5)), row 24 (regarding paragraph (6)), and row 25 (regarding paragraph 10)).</p> <p>Regarding how the instrument will be “held” etc., the Applicant states –</p> <p>“As is currently the case for traffic regulation orders made by the Applicant in its role as an airport operator, any instruments would be available for inspection at the Applicant’s registered office address”.</p>	<p>GAL will consider this further and revert in due course.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): As is currently the case for traffic regulation orders made by the Applicant in its role as an airport operator, any instruments would be available for inspection at the Applicant’s registered office address.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024):</p> <p>The Applicant understands that the JLAs are submitting proposed drafting on this point at Deadline 7 and will review this upon receipt.</p>	Draft DCO [REP3-006]	Not Agreed

		<p>The Council considers it would be helpful if this was made explicit on the face of the Order and that the undertaker must replicate the steps the highway authority must take when publicising TROs. Again, this should be made explicit on the face of the Order. The Council would welcome the opportunity to discuss these points with the Applicant.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p> <p>The following text was included in the Authorities' D7 Consolidated Submissions on the draft DCO [REP7-108] and its purpose is to ensure that the traffic authorities are provided with copies of the "instrument" which gives effect to any traffic regulation measures made by the Applicant under art. 18 (1), (2) or (3), and that the public can see them too. The text is as follows -</p> <p>"7A) The instrument referred to in paragraph (7)(a) must be displayed by the applicant on its website and a copy must be sent to—</p> <p>(a) [email address] in the case of Surrey County Council;</p> <p>(b) [email address] in the case of West Sussex County Council."</p>			
<p>2.7.1.10</p>	<p>Article 40</p>	<p>The timing of the vesting of special category land in the applicant under article 40 (special category land).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council looks forward to hearing from GAL regarding the way in which the "instrument" will be accessed.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Regarding the delivery plan, the Council considers the undertaker should be responsible for maintaining the replacement land as open space and that article 40(2) should be amended accordingly. (The Joint Legal Authorities' suggested drafting is included in their Deadline 4 document "Legal Partnership Authorities Response to the Applicant's Schedule of Changes – Version 2", which is included at Appendix A to REP4-042.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p> <p>The Authorities have a remaining concern about one point regarding article 40, namely the provision, by the Applicant, of a commitment to maintain replacement open space in perpetuity, The Authorities consider this is essential and more detail is set out in their Deadline 8 submission "Consolidated submissions to the draft DCO – Update at Deadline 8" (see Part C).</p>	<p>The precise nature of the Council's concern is not clear from this comment – please clarify.</p> <p>Pursuant to article 40, special category land cannot be vested in the undertaker until (i) the undertaker has acquired the necessary replacement land (to the extent not already in its ownership) and (ii) an open space management plan has been approved by the relevant planning authority. The undertaker must comply with the open space management plan.</p> <p>Any concern of the relevant planning authority as to the provision of replacement open space land can therefore be dealt with in the open space management plan to be agreed, which the undertaker is then obliged to comply with.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):</p> <p>Section 131 of the Planning Act 2008 indicates that replacement land need not be provided before special category land can be acquired pursuant to a development consent order. Section 131 allows for an order to authorise the compulsory acquisition of such land without the need for special parliamentary procedure provided that the Secretary of State is satisfied that, inter alia, "<i>replacement land has been or will be given in exchange for the order land</i>" (emphasis added).</p> <p>The approach adopted in article 40 of the draft DCO is predated in several recently made DCOs. Article 45 of the Chelmsford to A120 Widening Development Consent Order 2024, article 38 of the</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

			<p>A38 Derby Junctions Development Consent Order 2023 and article 34 of the A303 (Amesbury to Berwick Down) Development Consent Order 2023 all allow the acquisition of special category land once the Secretary of State (in consultation with the relevant planning authority) has certified that a scheme for the provision of the replacement land as open space and a timetable for the implementation of the scheme has been received from the undertaker. In each case the scheme need not have been laid out prior to acquisition of the special category land.</p> <p>Article 40 of the draft DCO similarly provides that special category land is not to vest in the undertaker until an open space delivery plan has been submitted to and approved by Crawley Borough Council (in consultation with Reigate & Banstead Borough Council and Mole Valley District Council). This delivery plan must include a timetable for (i) the submission of a landscape and ecology management plan pursuant to requirement 8 for each part of the replacement land and (ii) the laying out of each part of the replacement land as open space.</p> <p>Through the Applicant's submission of and adherence to the delivery plan, the relevant local authorities will have oversight of, and be involved in, the delivery of the replacement open space.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Applicant understands that none of the JLAs wish to own or maintain the replacement open space and the Applicant has therefore agreed to own the plots and arrange for their maintenance itself. Article 40 (special category land) and the recitals to the draft DCO have been amended to reflect this in version 9 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 2.1). The Applicant understands that this position is agreed.</p>		
2.7.1.11	Schedule 1	<p>The inclusion of Work Nos. 26, 27, 28 and 29 (which all concern hotels) in Schedule 1 (authorised development).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is not clear to the Council how these hotel-related Works are “associated development”, per section 115 of the Planning Act 2008. There does not appear to be an explanation in the EM. A satisfactory explanation is needed. Moreover, the Council is concerned about the prospect of these works evading proper environmental controls. Owing to these facts, the Council considers these Works should be deleted from the dDCO.</p>	<p>It is presumed that this concern relates to hotel provision constituting “associated development” under the 2008 Act, though please clarify if this is not the case.</p> <p>Section 115 of the 2008 Act provides that development consent may be granted for “associated development” alongside “development for which development consent is required”. “Associated development” is defined as development associated with the principal development.</p>	n/a	Not Agreed

	<p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council’s latest position on this issue is summarised at row 3 of the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Deadline 1 document “Issue Specific Hearing 1: Case for Proposed Development Post Hearing Submission” [REP1-211], which states –</p> <p>“The Authorities recognise that it is proposed that the 4 hotels should be “Associated Development” and so authorised by the development consent order. Whilst the Applicant argues that this development supports operation of airport, reduces impacts and is subordinate, the Authorities (and in particular Crawley Borough Council) have concerns regarding the need to ensure that Control Documents include adequate controls, especially on the provision of additional on-airport parking at hotels. The Authorities’ view is that any such parking should be operational parking only so as to support the Applicant’s Surface Access Commitments. This is particularly important as the hotels will, in due course, exist as commercial operations operated by other parties and so there is no reason that they should be exempt from the Local Planning Authorities wider policies in relation to car parking merely by virtue of their conception under the DCO for authorising consent. The Authorities also need to be assured that all other aspects that would be addressed were the hotels to come forward as TCPA development (such as design/materials and sustainable construction/energy use) will be adequately controlled if they are to be authorised by the DCO.”</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p> <p>Generally, the Authorities consider that more detail is required in relation to the car park, hotel and office accommodation elements of the development, and including limitations on parking space numbers, guest bedroom spaces and office floor areas is a reasonable minimum expectation.</p> <p>In relation to hotels, the Authorities suggested a new requirement in [REP7-108] which would impose controls on the type of parking that could be provided.</p> <p>The Authorities have therefore suggested (see [REP7-108], for example) that the following Work Nos. should be amended as follows –</p> <p>Work No.22</p> <p>Works associated with the North Terminal building including works to—</p> <p>(a) extend the International Departure Lounge on levels 20, 30 and 40 to the north;</p> <p>(b) extend the International Departure Lounge on levels 10, 20 and 30 to the south;</p> <p>(c) extend the baggage hall and baggage reclaim;</p> <p>(d) construct the North Terminal autonomous vehicle station;</p> <p>(e) construct the autonomous vehicle maintenance building;</p>	<p>As per the 'Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects' (Department for Communities and Local Government – April 2013), it is for the Secretary of State to decide on a case-by-case basis whether development constitutes “associated development”. By reference to the 'core principles' that the guidance notes the Secretary of State will take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associated development should support the construction or operation of the principal development or help address its impacts. Hotel accommodation on-site supports the operation of the airport in providing necessary accommodation for passengers. It further helps to address the airport's impacts, as alluded to in the Councils' comment, by reducing the need for transport between accommodation and the airport. • Associated development should be subordinate to the principal development. The hotels are subordinate to the use of the airport and facilitate this use. They are not an aim in themselves. • Development should not be treated as associated development if its purpose is solely to cross-subsidise the principal development. That is not the case here. • Associated development should be proportionate to the nature and scale of the principal development. The hotels are a proportionately small part of the overall proposed development. <p>In light of the above application of the 'core principles', GAL considers that it is open to the Secretary of State to conclude that the hotels are “associated development”, and that such a conclusion is clearly justified.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):</p> <p>The Applicant's original response (directly above) explained how the hotels met the meaning of "associated development" by reference to the relevant guidance. If the Council disagrees with this analysis, please provide detailed justification by reference to this guidance and the reasoning above.</p> <p>It is not clear on what basis that Council asserts that hotel works may "evad[e] proper environmental controls". These works would form part of the authorised development under the DCO and therefore be subject to the requirements, including the CoCP by virtue of requirement 7. Further detail is requested from the Council as to the precise nature of their concern.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>(f) reconfigure internal facilities; (g) construct a multi-storey car park with provision for no more than 890 parking spaces for cars; (h) demolish the CIP building and circulation building; (i) remediate the coaching gates.</p> <p>Work No. 28</p> <p>Works associated with the Car Park H Site including works to— (a) construct a hotel; (b) construct an office with provision for up to 5,000 square metres of office floor space; (c) construct a multi-storey car park with provision for no more than 3,700 parking spaces for cars; (d) demolish Car Park H; (e) external vehicle and pedestrian accesses.</p> <p>Work No. 29</p> <p>Works to convert Destinations Place office into a hotel with provision for up to 250 bedrooms and refurbishment of the building exterior.</p> <p>Work No. 30</p> <p>Works to construct Car Park Y including— (a) earthworks and works to construct an attenuation storage facility with a capacity of approximately 32,000m³; (b) construction of a multi-storey car park with provision for no more than 3,035 parking spaces for cars.</p> <p>Work No. 31</p> <p>Works associated with Car Park X including— (a) earthworks and landscaping; (b) construction of a flood compensation area with a capacity of approximately 55,000m³; (c) construction of an outfall structure; (d) access improvements; (e) deck parking provision with provision for no more than 3,280 parking spaces for cars, including a re-provision of Purple Parking and surface parking amendments. (f) [delete sub-para (f)]</p> <p>Work No. 32</p> <p>Works to remove existing car parking at North Terminal Long Stay car park and construct a decked car parking structure with provision for no more than 1,680 parking spaces for cars if Work No. 44 (wastewater</p>	<p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>The JLAs' position regarding car parking is noted from the lefthand column, however that does not bear on the inclusion of hotels in Schedule 1 (authorised development). On the basis that the said inclusion is understood to now be agreed, the Applicant has marked this row as 'Agreed'.</p> <p>The Applicant has added new requirement 34 (office occupier) in version 9 of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 7 (Doc Ref. 2.1), which secures that the occupier of the new office to be constructed on the Car Park H site must be an entity related to, or whose business and/or operations are related to, the airport, air travel and/or aviation, unless otherwise agreed in writing by CBC.</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

		<p>treatment works) is not implemented or 2,842 parking spaces for cars if Work No. 44 is implemented.</p> <p>Work No. 33</p> <p>Works associated with the existing Purple Parking car park including—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) removal of existing decked car parking structure; (b) partial removal of existing surface car parking; (c) erection of a fenceline; (d) re-configuration of remaining surface level car parking with provision for no more than 700 parking spaces for cars. <p>Work No. 38</p> <p>Works to construct the habitat enhancement area and flood compensation area at Museum Field including works to—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) construct a flood compensation area with a capacity of approximately 57,600m³; (b) extend Gatwick greenspace footpath; (c) construct a maintenance access road; (d) undertake earthworks, landscaping and a bund (up to 6 metres in height above datum) around the southern and eastern perimeter; (e) construct footbridge; (f) construct two farm access bridges 			
2.7.1.12	Schedule 2	<p>The drafting of several requirements (Schedule 2) including: the drafting of “start date” (R.3(2) (time limits and notifications); the 14-day notification period in R3(2); why some documents must be produced “in accordance with” the certified documents and others must be produced either “in general accordance” or “in substantial accordance” with them; paras 12 (construction traffic management plan) & 13 (Construction workforce travel plan) – “following consultation with the relevant local planning authority on matters related to its function.”; the drafting of R.14 (archaeological remains); and of those which concern noise (e.g. R.15 (air noise envelope), R.18 (noise insulation scheme)); the ambiguous drafting in R.19 (airport operations); para 21 (carbon action plan) ambiguous “general accordance” is vague.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1):</p> <p>Requirements: general</p> <p>The Council notes the response in Row 20.29 in Table 20 of the Issues Tracker; however, it does not consider it answers its question. Put another way, the Council would like to understand why “in general accordance” has been used in Requirements 8(3), 10(2), 11(2), 21 and</p>	<p>The precise nature of the Council's concerns in respect of the cited drafting is not clear from this comment – please clarify.</p> <p>Where appropriate and reasonable, some requirements allow (i) activities to be carried out either “in general accordance” or “substantially in accordance” with specified control documents or (ii) subsequent details/plans to be submitted which are “in general accordance” or “substantially in accordance” with prior documents/strategies.</p> <p>Use of these terms in the former context allows for departures which are minor or inconsequential and not of substance, without giving rise to a criminal offence. It is beneficial to draft control documents in clear and straightforward language. Strict compliance with such wording may not always be possible. Without the wording above, in such circumstances the relevant requirement would be too easily breached and a criminal offence too easily committed. The wording above therefore ensures a proportionate approach.</p> <p>Use of these terms in the latter context allows for minor improvements (e.g. due to advances in technology or best practice)</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p> <p>Paragraphs 9.4 – 9.36 of the Explanatory Memorandum to the Draft Development Consent Order [AS-006]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>22(2); and why “substantially in accordance” has been used in Requirements 7, 8(4), 12(2), 13(2) and 22(3).</p> <p>Requirement 3: start date</p> <p>By Requirement 3(1), development must commence within 5 years of the “start date” i.e. the later of the day after (a) the day on which the period for legal challenge of the Order under the 2008 Act has expired; and (b) the final determination of any legal challenge under the 2008 Act. The Council objects to the extended duration of “start date”, which should be when the order comes into force.</p> <p>Requirement 3: notice period etc.</p> <p>By Requirement 3(2), the relevant planning authority must be given 14 days' notice of commencement of each part of the authorised development. The Council considers a more generous notice period should be included. The Council also considers the local highway authority, which is also a discharging authority for certain requirements, should be notified of commencement.</p> <p>The Council's has several concerns about each of the noise-based requirements. In summary, these include the following points –</p> <p>Requirements 15 (air noise envelope)</p> <p>There is no role for any local authority control in this Requirement and the Council considers there should be. (The same point applies to R.16 (air noise envelope) and R17 (verification of air noise monitoring equipment)).</p> <p>While the EM summarises the Requirement, it does not provide the necessary justification as required by paragraph 1.5 of Advice Note Fifteen. For instance, it does not provide the source of this provision (if any), the section of the Planning Act 2008 under which it is made, or why it is appropriate for the development of the project. Similarly, It does not explain why the CAA is the appropriate body for discharging Requirements 15 to 17. The Council considers the EM should be amended to reflect these points. The Councils can then better consider their position in respect of them these requirements.</p> <p>The Council notes R.15(4) requires the applicant to publish certain information on a website within 45 days of it being approved by the independent air noise reviewer. The Council seeks confirmation as to why such a long deadline is included. Once approved, a document can be published on a website within seconds. (The same point applies to Rs. 16(6) and 17.</p>	<p>to the principles underlying the original document/strategy upon submission of the subsequent details. In any event, the submitted details will be subject to the approval of the relevant body under the terms of the requirement.</p> <p>Paragraphs 9.4 – 9.36 of the ExM contain further details in respect of each requirement.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):</p> <p><u>Requirements: general</u></p> <p>The drafting of the requirements in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO has advanced significantly since these comments. References to "general accordance" have been replaced and, where appropriate to provide for a degree of flexibility, "substantially in accordance" has been used. This is subject to the new definition of this phrase in article 2 (interpretation).</p> <p><u>Requirement 3: start date</u></p> <p>It is appropriate and necessary for the time period to commence on the "start date" (as defined in the draft DCO) due to the increasing prevalence of judicial review challenges by objector groups to high-profile DCOs. The government's policy paper '<i>Getting Great Britain building again: Speeding up infrastructure delivery</i>' (2023) notes that "over half of all legal challenges to NSIP decisions have been brought since 2020" and that even unsuccessful legal challenges can "set a project back years in delays"¹. It is inappropriate for the period within which the undertaker can begin development to be reduced (potentially substantially) while legal challenges are finally determined.</p> <p><u>Requirement 3: notice period etc.</u></p> <p>The notice provisions have developed significantly since the Council's comment and the Council is invited to review the latest version of the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 3 [REP3-006].</p> <p><u>Requirement 15 (air noise envelope):</u></p> <p>In relation to the role of the Local Authority's in relation to compliance with Requirement 15, during consultation with the TWGs and the Noise Envelope Group (NEG) in summer 2022 the</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/getting-great-britain-building-again-speeding-up-infrastructure-delivery/getting-great-britain-building-again-speeding-up-infrastructure-delivery>

		<p>Requirement 18 (noise insulation scheme)</p> <p>Again, little justification is provided for this requirement, which appears to be unprecedented.</p> <p>In the first instance, it would be helpful to know why each of the time limits set out in the requirement has been chosen. For instance, in R.18(1), why does the applicant have up to 3 months from commencement of Work Nos. 1 to 7 to submit noise insulation scheme details to the relevant planning authority? Why can't that be done (say) before commencement? The same point applies to the 6-month limit in R.18(2). The Council would expect these points to be explained or sign-posted in the EM.</p> <p>Again in R.18(2), the Council considers the requirement to use "appropriate steps" to notify residential properties to be imprecise and considers these "steps" should be described in the requirement. As well as being imprecise, absent the explanation, the requirement would be difficult to enforce. In its current form, the requirement does not appear to satisfy at least two of the six tests of conditions (i.e. enforceable and precise) as required by the Circular 11/95: Use of conditions in planning permission.</p> <p>Requirements 19 (airport operations)</p> <p>R.19(1) requires the applicant to serve notice on the relevant planning authority no later than 7 days after the commencement of dual runway operations informing of the same. The EM explains the timeframe is relevant "to other control mechanisms", though it does not explain what these are and it is not clear from the DCO what these are. The Council would welcome an explanation.</p> <p>R.19(2) would restrict dual runway operations to 386,000 commercial air transport movements per annum. The Council considers a control on total air transport movements per annum would be appropriate and considers a total of no more than 389,000 would be reasonable.</p> <p>R.19(3) allows the use of the northern runway between the hours of 23:00 - 06:00 when the southern runway is not available for use "for any reason". The Council considers "for any reason" to be too broad and considers the use of the northern runway between these times should only be used when the southern runway is not available because of planned maintenance and engineering works.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Requirement 3: start date</p> <p>Regarding "start date", see the answer in row 2.7.1.13 above.</p> <p>Requirement 3: notice period</p>	<p>local authorities were consulted on the concept and make-up of a "Review Body" which would review and approve the outputs from the noise envelope when it becomes active. GAL's proposal for a sub-committee of GATCOM was opposed by the LPAs. The suggestion of having Local Authorities as the "Review Body" was also discussed during the NEG meetings and there was concern on the part of Community Representatives regarding there being a conflict of interest between economic benefit in that some councils receive money from the Airport as part of the S106 agreement but are impacted little by the noise from airlines using the airport. There was no clear resolution on the issue within the NEG and GAL subsequently decided that the CAA would be best placed to perform the function of Independent Reviewer as explained in ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope. The Local Authorities can monitor the outputs of the review process and in the case of a breach take enforcement action as appropriate. The same position applies for Requirements 16 and 17.</p> <p>The Air Noise Envelope provisions are bespoke to the Air Noise Envelope, and the information which explains that is contained in Appendix 14.9.7 – the Noise Envelope [APP-177]</p> <p>The period of 45 days is provided for in R.15(4) because it allows time for the Applicant to consider appealing a decision before publication of the information, and this approach is taken to avoid confusion with material being appealed via the DCO being presented to the public.</p> <p><u>Requirement 18 (noise insulation scheme):</u></p> <p>It is again confirmed that this is a bespoke provision, which gives effect to the Noise Insulation Scheme [APP-180]. The Applicant has a period of 3 months from commencement of Work Nos. 1 – 7 (inclusive) to submit details of how the noise insulation scheme is to be promoted and administered to persons considered to be vulnerable to noise related effects to ensure equitable access to the noise insulation scheme because this is a reasonable period time after works have commenced, by which point a decision to deliver the project has been taken. There is no reason why this must be before commencement, as this does not adversely impact the ability of the Applicant to deliver the noise insulation measures to properties within the Inner Zone before operations from the northern runway commence. Further details of the steps to be taken to advertise the scheme are detailed in ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme Update Note, and information contained in that note will be included in an updated version of the Noise Insulation</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>The Council considers –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more generous notice period for the commencement of each part of the authorised development should be provided, • the other local authorities should also be notified of commencement (the administrative burden of doing so will be negligible), • before Requirement 3, there should be a requirement which provided that no part of the authorised development can commence until a masterplan for each part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority. (Example drafting is set out in the Authorities’ answer to DCO.1.40 (R3). <p>Further detail on these points is set out in the Legal Partnership Authorities’ response to ExQ1 DCO.1.40 (R3) [REP3- 135] in respect of the amendments that should be made to this requirement.</p> <p>Requirement 15 (air noise envelope)</p> <p>The Council notes the Applicant’s response; however, it considers the requirement should make provision for local authority control.</p> <p>At Deadline 4, the Joint Local Authorities submitted their Introduction to a proposal for an Environmentally Managed Growth Framework [REP4-050] (“the Introduction”), which explains that the DCO requirements which include controls related to environmental effects provide the Applicant with too much flexibility. The Introduction states the Joint Local Authorities consider a bespoke Environmentally Managed Growth Framework should apply to the proposed development and that a worked-up Framework will be submitted to the Examination as soon as possible. The Framework will apply to the air noise envelope (requirements 15 and 16), and to requirements 19 (airport operations), 20 (surface access), and 21 (carbon action plan).</p> <p>Requirement 19 (airport operations)</p> <p>The Council maintains its position regarding paragraph (2) being too broad. The Council disagrees that its proposed wording “lacks precision” since it is similar to the wording used in condition 3 of the 1979 planning permission.</p> <p>The Council agrees with the position set out in the Legal Partnership Authorities Response to the Applicant’s Schedule of Changes, which is included at Appendix A of [REP4-042].</p> <p>Regarding paragraph 4(a), the proposed drafting is again too broad. For instance, condition 3 (runway use) of the 1979 planning permission allows use of the emergency runway when the “main runway is temporarily non operational by reason of an accident or a structural defect or when maintenance to the main runway is being undertaken”.</p>	<p>Scheme document which is to be submitted at Deadline 4. The comments regarding preciseness and enforceability are not agreed with, as the Requirement and the control document that sits behind this are both clearly drafted and will be able to be known whether what those require has been complied with.</p> <p><u>Requirement 19 (airport operations):</u></p> <p>The requirements drafted by reference to the commencement of dual runway operations (requirements 6(2), 15(1), 16(4), 17, 18(4), 18(6), 19(1) and 20) all have effect "from" or "following" (or equivalent) that date or require actions to have been taken by a certain anniversary of the commencement of dual runway operations. It is therefore appropriate for the purposes of monitoring compliance with these requirements for the undertaker to notify CBC of the actual date on which commencement of dual runway operations occurs.</p> <p>In respect of the comment on what is now requirement 19(1) (previously numbered 19(2)), the Applicant refers to its response to Action Point 1 in The Applicant’s Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 2: Control Documents / DCO [REP1-063], which explains the definition of "commercial air transport movements" and why it would be inappropriate to impose a hard limit on flights that do not fall within this definition, which are urgent and largely unplanned in nature. The Applicant further refers to its response to comments on Action Point 1 in section 5.5 of its Response to Deadline 2 Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.20).</p> <p>On requirement 19(2) (previously numbered 19(3)), it is important that the Applicant is able to continue to use the northern runway when the main runway is unavailable for reasons other than planned maintenance or engineering works and for this purpose "for any reason" must be retained. For example, if there was an incident on the main runway or damage to that runway, the Applicant would use the northern runway as it does currently using the same flight paths. This would not result in any increase of movements and associated noise within those hours by comparison to use of the main runway.</p> <p>The central purpose of Requirement 19(2) is to ensure that only one runway will ever operate between 23:00 – 06:00, and the southern runway will continue to be the primary runway which is used during those hours, preserving the status quo. The current wording achieves this.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

		<p>The Council considers it would be reasonable if similar wording were incorporated into paragraph 4(a). Condition 3 also requires GAL to notify the local planning authority in advance of when maintenance is to be carried out. A similar provision should be included in Requirement 19. The Council does not agree to the inclusion of paragraph (4)(b) because it could have the effect of overriding the prohibition under paragraph (3). The Council does not consider this approach to be reasonable. It is noted that while the Explanatory Memorandum [REP3-008] summarises paragraph (3), it does not justify the inclusion of paragraph (4).</p> <p>In the light of the above comments, the Authorities' proposed amendments to existing Requirement 19 are set out in row 92 of Appendix A to [REP4-042]. The Council obviously agrees with these proposed amendments.</p> <p>The points made above under "Requirement 15 (air noise envelope)" regarding the Environmentally Managed Growth Framework also apply to this requirement.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p> <p>Requirement 3 These amendments are intended to correct the position following submission of amendments at D6 in which references to "business" days were removed.</p> <p>(a) within the period of 7 days beginning with the date on which the authorised development begins;</p> <p>(b) at least 42 days prior to the anticipated date of commencement of the authorised development, provided that commencement may still lawfully occur if notice is not served in accordance with this sub-paragraph;</p> <p>(c) within the period of 7 days beginning with the actual date of commencement of the authorised development;</p> <p>(d) at least 42 days prior to the anticipated date of commencement of dual runway operations; and</p> <p>(e) within the period of 7 days beginning with the actual commencement of dual runway operations.</p> <p>Requirement 15</p> <p>The Authorities' latest comments on requirement 15 are set out in Part C of their D8 submission "Consolidated submissions on the draft DCO – Update at Deadline 8". (The Examination Library reference was not available when this document was updated).</p> <p>Requirement 19</p> <p>The Authorities will consider the updated requirement 19 at Deadline 8.</p>	<p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p><u>Requirement 3 – 'start date' and notice periods</u></p> <p>The Applicant and the JLAs' solicitors continue to have positive engagement on the drafting of requirement 3 (including the use of 'start date') and the Applicant is hopeful that this wording can be agreed. Pending resolution, the Applicant maintains its position set out above.</p> <p><u>Requirement 15 – noise envelope</u></p> <p>The Applicant maintains its position set out above and refers to its previous submissions on the appropriate independent air noise reviewer, which it maintains should be the CAA. Please see further the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions - ISH8 – Noise [REP6-081].</p> <p><u>Requirement 19 – airport operations</u></p> <p>The Applicant and the JLAs' solicitors continue to have positive engagement on the drafting of requirement 19 and the Applicant is hopeful that this wording can be agreed. The Applicant understands that there is only a definitional point outstanding between the parties.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

<p>2.7.1.13</p>	<p>Schedule 11</p>	<p>The 8-week deadline in Schedule 11 (procedure for approvals, consents and appeals) for determining significant applications (e.g., the waste recycling facility).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): For certain major works which are listed in Schedule 1 (including, but not limited to Work Nos. 26 to 29) the standard 6-week/ 8-week deadline is unreasonably short. The Council notes paragraph 1(2)(a) and (b) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 is subject to the applicant agreeing to an extension. There is no guarantee that an extension would be agreed and no obligation for the applicant to act reasonably in considering any request for extension.</p> <p>The Council considers it would be more straightforward if the major works had their own deadlines. More detail on this point will follow at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The Council disagrees that such an approach would cause unnecessary delay. Major applications under the TCPA 1990 regime can take 13 weeks (or longer) to determine. Providing a 6 or 8 week deadline runs the risk of the application having to be refused and the parties spending time and resources on an appeal which might have been avoided if the Schedule included a reasonable timeframe for determination.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Regarding the Applicant’s reluctance to include a longer deadline for determining major works, while the Council notes the Applicant states the undertaker is “going to take a pragmatic approach to agreeing any request from the discharging authority for an extension of time”. This gives cold comfort when the period for determining major works is either 6 weeks or 8 weeks, which is substantially shorter than if a local planning authority were to discharge a major works application under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Council reiterates its position that major works should have their own deadline.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024)</p> <p>The Authorities consider the period for determining “major works” under Schedule 11 is too short and this should be increased to 13-weeks, which is consistent with the timeframe within which a major application must be determined under the Town and Country Planning Act regime.</p> <p>The Authorities consider (see REP7-108, row 44) that the following works should be treated as “major works”</p>	<p>The 8-week period (or 6-week where the discharging authority need not consult with any other body) is the default period within which the discharging authority must respond. If further information is requested from the undertaker by the discharging authority, the 8/6 weeks run from the day immediately following that on which said further information is supplied. If a longer period is required, the undertaker and discharging authority can agree such longer period in writing (paragraphs 1(2)(a) and (b), Part 1, Schedule 11). Given the above, the specified periods provide sufficient time for the discharging authority to scrutinise applications pursuant to the requirements of the draft DCO. Any longer period would unduly and unnecessarily delay progress in implementing the authorised development.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):</p> <p>The Council’s comment is noted. However, it is likely that the undertaker would agree an extension with the discharging authority were this required following an application being made for “major works”. The alternative would be that the application would be refused by the discharging authority or not decided in time, either of which could only be escalated through the appeal process in paragraph 4 of Schedule 11 to the draft DCO. This process would likely require significant time and expenditure and the undertaker would be mindful of that before triggering those provisions. The undertaker is therefore realistically going to take a pragmatic approach to agreeing any request from the discharging authority for an extension of time. In any event, the Applicant considers that the standard 6 or 8 week deadline is perfectly adequate for detailed consideration of details that may be subject to approval.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024):</p> <p>The Applicant maintains the position set out above. It is understood that the JLAs will be proposing a 16-week decision period for detailed design approval for certain works. The Applicant considers that to be excessive given that this period, in the context of the TCPA 1990, applies only to applications requiring their own Environmental Impact Assessment. Here, an EIA has already been undertaken and will be considered through the Secretary of State’s decision on the DCO. A decision period of a length to encompass undertaking that process from scratch is not appropriate for the discharge of requirements pursuant to a made DCO for which an EIA will already have been carried out.</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>
-----------------	--------------------	---	--	-----------------------------	-------------------

2.8. Ecology and Nature Conservation

2.8.1 Table 2.8 sets out the position of both parties in relation to ecology and nature conservation matters.

Table 2.8 Statement of Common Ground – Ecology and Nature Conservation Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
2.8.1.1	Evidence base for the presence of Barbastelle and Bechstein's Bat roosts	<p>The Applicant's evidence base records the presence of Barbastelle and Bechstein's Bat roosts to the west of the Airport. There is concern that the bat trapping and radio tracking surveys do not show the full extent of Bechstein bat roosts. This area is predicted to be subject to increased noise pollution and there are properties near to the Bechstein's maternity roosts that have been identified as being above the acceptable threshold for noise and will receive noise insulation.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting result of review with Natural England.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. Awaiting results of review with Natural England.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Applicant's update at deadline 5 (section 3 of Supporting Ecology Technical Notes [REP5-069] referencing engagement with Natural England in respect of the noise impacts on bat populations is noted as is the ongoing work to establish whether there are additional roosts. The submissions at Deadline 8 will be reviewed.</p>	<p>The issue will be reviewed in consultation with Natural England.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Review of potential impacts of noise on bats ongoing with Natural England.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Surveys with respect to bat roosts in trees are on-going. As of 1st July 2024, all trees with Potential Roosting Features (PRFs) that may be lost have had at least one aerial survey with approximately half having had a second. To date, no bat roosts have been identified. A report with results to date will be submitted at Deadline 8.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The Applicant is awaiting the submission to be provided at Deadline 9. For the Applicant's final position with respect to this matter, please see the ecology section of the Applicant's Closing Submission (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>	n/a	Not Agreed
Assessment Methodology					
2.8.2.1	Ancient woodland around Land North of Horsham	<p>The noise impacts on areas of Ancient Woodland habitat parcels around Land North of Horsham (with records of Barbastelle) and around the A264 should also be assessed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issue not addressed.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. The Council's position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>The impact of changes in construction noise (disturbance) on ecology receptors is assessed in Section 9 of Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The woodlands referenced are >5km from the Project site so were not included in the potential zone of influence for impacts considered within the ES.</p>	ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-034]	Not Agreed
Assessment					
2.8.3.1	Concerns in relation to potential impacts on sensitive species and habitats, the High Weald AONB and heritage assets in the District	<p>The full extent of the Bechstein bat roosts to the west of the Airport have not been shown and there is concern around the noise impacts on Bechstein and Barbastelle bat populations. The Applicant's Ecology and Nature Conservation Figures do not show the Ancient Woodland, St Leonard's Forest SSSI or Local Wildlife</p>	<p>All Bechstein's bat roosts identified during surveys are shown in the figures accompanying Appendix 9.6.3 Bat Trapping and Radio Tracking Surveys.</p>	ES Appendix 9.6.3 Bat Trapping and Radio Tracking Surveys Part 1 [APP-131]	Not Agreed

		<p>Sites within the 15km buffer from the Project Site Boundary nor are the noise impacts / flight paths overlain, including WIZAD (Route 9) which affects the AONB. The impacts of increased overflight on WIZAD (Route 9) on heritage assets in the District also do not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issue not addressed. Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. The Council's position remains unchanged that noise impacts o bat populations should be fully assessed,</p>	<p>As set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation national designated sites have been considered within 5km of the Project unless they occurred within 200m of a major road that might experience an increase in traffic flows as a result of the Project. This scope was agreed with Natural England during pre-submission consultation. St Leonard's Forest SSSI is located east of Horsham with no major roads near to it. As such, it has not been scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant maintains the position that the St Leonard's Forest SSSI is outside the scope of assessment as there are no major roads within 200m of it that might experience significant increases in traffic flow as a result of the Project. The scope of the assessment was agreed with Natural England during pre-submission consultation.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 9.6.3 Bat Trapping and Radio Tracking Surveys Part 2 [APP-132]</p>	
2.8.3.2	Impact of WIZAD route	<p>Additionally, the shift of air traffic on to WIZAD (Route 9) flies over areas of Ancient Woodland within St Leonard's Forest and beyond (where Barbastelles have been recorded) as well as the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. These areas contain many core sites as part of the Wilder Horsham Nature Recovery Network and Sussex Biodiversity Opportunity Areas. The Applicant's Ecology and Nature Conservation Figures do not show the Ancient Woodland, St Leonard's Forest SSSI or Local Wildlife Sites within the 15km buffer from the Project Site Boundary nor are the noise impacts / flight paths overlain, including the WIZAD (Route 9) route. There is also a lack of clear data on the noise impacts associated with the WIZAD (Route 9) route. The Council requests that the Applicant addresses the potential impacts additional noise will have on the local Bechstein and Barbastelle bat population. Within this context the Council wishes to highlight paragraph 4.2.2 of the Airports National Policy Statement to the Applicant and the Examining Authority along with paragraphs 5.90, 5.91, 5.96 and 5.102.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issue not addressed. Updated Position (Deadline 5): No further comment at this stage. The Council's position remains unchanged that noise impacts on bat populations should be fully assessed,</p>	<p>As set out in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation national designated sites have been considered within 5km of the Project unless they occurred within 200m of a major road that might experience an increase in traffic flows as a result of the Project. This scope was agreed with Natural England during pre-submission consultation. St Leonard's Forest SSSI is located east of Horsham with no major roads near to it. As such, this site and associated receptors (including any bats resident there have not been scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant maintains the position that the St Leonard's Forest SSSI is outside the scope of assessment as there are no major roads within 200m of it that might experience significant increases in traffic flow as a result of the Project. The scope of the assessment was agreed with Natural England during pre-submission consultation.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-034]</p>	Not Agreed
Mitigation and Compensation					
2.8.4.1	Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Whilst the Council has specific concerns about the impacts on bats and the loss of woodland habitat the delivery of Biodiversity Net Gain is welcomed. However, further consideration of appropriate</p>	<p>The Bechstein's maternity colonies identified during survey work (Appendix 9.6.3 Bat Trapping and Radio Tracking) are located to the west of the airport within Glovers Wood and other areas of</p>	<p>ES Appendix 9.6.3 Bat Trapping and Radio</p>	Not agreed

		<p>mitigation to minimise any harm to bats, including Bechstein maternity roosts which may require off-site mitigation, is required. There are also errors in relation to the BNG metric assessment which need to be addressed to ensure the correct baseline is applied in the BNG metric for all habitat types (e.g., area, linear watercourse and linear hedgerow). Subject to these issues being addressed, the Council requests that the proposed level of net gain is committed to by the Applicant and secured in the DCO, should the application be consented.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Further discussion on BNG assessment welcomed, particularly in relation to Bechstein roosts and how off site mitigation can be delivered.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position is reflected in the response to the Applicant's response to EN 1.5 and EN 1.6 in REP4-063</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Updated in respect of Natural England's position is noted. Concerns around the impact on Bechstein populations remain.</p>	<p>ancient woodland. The potential for any impacts on these colonies is considered in Section 9 of Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation of the ES.</p> <p>The approach to the BNG baseline was discussed extensively with both Natural England and the Biodiversity Working Group. There are extensive areas of habitats that are not impacted by the construction of the Project but have been included within the Order Limits to reflect the existing airport boundary and make clear that such land, forming part of the operational airport, remains subject to (as well as benefitting from) the powers and controls secured by the DCO. As set out in Natural England's RR, the area impacted should be used as the baseline for the BNG assessment. This is in line with other DCO applications such as Luton Airport Expansion.</p> <p>GAL are committed to delivering biodiversity net gain through the Project and have worked extensively with stakeholders to ensure this is incorporated.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant's position remains as previously set out. The approach of the Project to BNG is set out in ES Appendix 9.9.2 Biodiversity Net Gain Statement, updated at Deadline 3 [REP3-047]. This demonstrates that the Project will deliver over 20% net gain with respect to habitats.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position with respect to the baseline when determining the BNG calculation for the Project was set out during Issue Specific Hearing 8 – Ecology, as described in the summary of that hearing [REP6-082]. Given the particulars of the Project, the use of the area impacted to determine gain was considered proportionate. This position is supported by Natural England at section 2.8.4.2 in the Statement of Common Ground between Natural England and the Applicant [REP6-061].</p> <p>It is assumed that the issues with respect to EN.1.6 are now agreed.</p>	<p>Tracking Surveys Part 1 [APP-131]</p> <p>ES Appendix 9.6.3 Bat Trapping and Radio Tracking Surveys Part 2 [APP-132]</p> <p>ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-034]</p>	
<p>Other</p>					
<p><i>There are no other issues relevant to this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.</i></p>					

2.9. Forecasting and Need

2.9.1 Table 2.9 sets out the position of both parties in relation to forecasting and need matters.

Table 2.9 Statement of Common Ground – Forecasting and Need Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>Please see the joint Statement of Common Ground prepared in relation to Forecasting and Need (Doc Ref. 10.1.18).</i>					

2.10. Geology and Ground Conditions

2.10.1 **Table 2.10** sets out the position of both parties in relation to geology and ground conditions matters.

Table 2.10 Statement of Common Ground – Geology and Ground Conditions Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Geology and Ground Conditions within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.11. Greenhouse Gases

2.11.1 Table 2.11 sets out the position of both parties in relation to greenhouse gases matters.

Table 2.11 Statement of Common Ground – Greenhouse Gases Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
<i>There are no issues relating to the baseline for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					
Assessment Methodology					
2.12.2.1	No consideration is provided in the ES around the risk of the Jet Zero Strategy and the impact this would have on the significance of the assessment. There is also no assessment of cumulative UK airport expansions and how this will impact the UK's net zero trajectory	<p>The GHG Assessment fails to consider the risks of the Jet Zero Aviation Policy and how this could compromise the UK's net zero trajectory in alignment with the concerns raised to the UK Government by the CCC and in the judicial review. Additionally, the GHG Assessment does not assess the cumulative impact of the Project in the context of the eight of the biggest UK airports planning to increase to approximately 150 million more passengers a year by 2050 relative to 2019 levels.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We acknowledge the Applicant's assessment has been undertaken with consideration to the Jet Zero high ambition trajectory and that this trajectory is representative of government's current 'budget' for aviation to contribute to net zero. On this basis it could be considered to align with the approach set out by IEMA.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed.</p>	<p>It is not for the applicant or for the examination to assess risks on the basis that government policy will fail.</p> <p>It is apparent that government is committed to its net zero target and to closely monitoring aviation and other trajectories to ensure compliance.</p>	n/a	Agreed
2.12.2.2	In Aviation methodology well-to-tank (WTT) emission sources are not confirmed to be accounted for which is against the GHG Protocol Standard mentioned in the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005].	<p>Not accounting for WTT is non-compliant with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting standard, referenced in the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005] in Section 16.4.18 where scope 3 emissions were included. Furthermore, this also contradicts the GHG ES Methodology [TR020005] referenced under Section 16.4.24. This would result in an underestimation of the GHG emissions associated with aviation since a 20.77% (BEIS, 20231) uplift would be required on all aviation emissions. Therefore, this would result in 1,106,530tCO₂e not being accounted for in 2028 (the most carbon-intensive year), where 5.327 MtCO₂e was estimated to be released (Table 5.2.1).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is acknowledged that excluding specific emission sources from the assessment is valid for the purpose of conducting a like-for-like comparison against a carbon budget/trajectory. However, given that transparency is a fundamental principle of GHG accounting, GAL should openly report these potential emission sources at least qualitatively.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5):</p>	<p>The assessment does not seek either to develop a Corporate Reporting Account (which is informed by the GHG Corporate Protocol Standard) nor a Whole Life Carbon Appraisal for the Project - the methodology has been developed to allow for the assessment of impact, and doing this within the context of the contextualisation exercise that forms part of the assessment. It is not debated that Well-to-tank emissions arise in the supply chain for fuels and methodologies for estimating these (as an uplift to direct emissions) are well established.</p> <p>However, the approach adopted is based on the assessment process which is contextualising emissions against a) the UK carbon budget and b) the Jet Zero Strategy. The context for Jet Fuel usage is specifically challenging due to the proportion of this fuel that is imported from outside the UK (approximately 70% in recent years [Ref 1]) and as a result WTT emissions would predominantly fall outside the scope of the UK carbon budgets and the Net Zero commitment. Additionally the aviation strategy set out in Jet Zero does not include WTT within the main emissions calculation methodology. For these reasons WTT has</p>	n/a	Not Agreed

		<p>In Deadline 4, the Applicant has provided WTT estimates for construction, ABAGO, surface access, and aviation. These updates increase the total emissions from the project between 2018 and 2050 by 3,978,000 tCO₂e, representing a 19.83% increase.</p> <p>To contextualise these emissions against the carbon budget, the Applicant references DUKES 2023 Chapter 3: Oil and Oil Products, estimating that around 36% of WTT aviation emissions occur within the UK boundary. Using this justification, the Applicant compares only this portion of aviation WTT emissions to the carbon budget, along with the WTT emissions from construction, ABAGO, and surface access.</p> <p>The Applicant then presents only the net impact, stating it accounts for 0.649% of the UK's 6th carbon budget, without displaying the total future impact of the airport as done in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant should further forecast the percentage impact on future estimated carbon budgets using the CCC projections to estimate the project's impact on future carbon budgets to understand if it is decarbonising in line with the estimated net zero trajectory.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The CCC's balanced net zero pathway serves as a guide for governments and institutions aiming to assess and determine strategies for achieving net zero emissions. While these guidelines are not legally binding, they illustrate the necessary carbon reductions to meet the legally binding net zero mandate set by the amended Climate Change Act.</p> <p>Furthermore, the IEMA GHG Assessment guidance, which the Applicant uses for its evaluation, recommends contextualising a project's emissions by referencing the UK carbon budgets and net zero trajectory. This approach is considered good practice.</p> <p>In addition, for aviation emissions, the Applicant uses the entirety of the Jet Zero High Ambition Scenario budget to demonstrate alignment with the net zero trajectory. However, the Applicant does not allocate the budget proportionally based on GAL's size. Therefore, it would be more appropriate for the Applicant to estimate how much of the Jet Zero High Ambition Scenario budget should be allocated to GAL and then use this allocation as a benchmark to determine if future emissions are within the allocated budget.</p>	<p>been excluded from the aviation impact assessment. For consistency across the assessment methodology it has also been removed from other aspects of the GHG assessment.</p> <p>Ref 1: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/petroleum-chapter-3-digest-of-united-kingdom-energy-statistics-dukes</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024) It is acknowledged that the inclusion of WTT for Construction, ABAGO, and Surface Access would be useful for contextualisation against the UK Carbon Budgets. The WTT emissions for these will be calculated and provided at Deadline 4.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The quantification for net impact of the Project, including WTT, at a level of 0.649% has been presented as this informs the assessment of significance.</p> <p>Including WTT within the evaluation of emissions across the whole airport would include the contribution to carbon budgets as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fourth carbon budget: 0.171% (vs 0.144% presented in ES) • Fifth carbon budget: 0.161% (vs 0.139% presented in ES) • Sixth carbon budget: 3.383% (vs 3.136% presented in ES) <p>This incorporates the assumption relating to the proportion of aviation fuel imported to the UK.</p> <p>The CCC projections do not reflect the level that future budgets will actually be set at. On this basis there is no appropriate detail which would support an assessment against carbon budgets beyond 2038.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): Please see the Applicant's final position with respect to this issue please within the greenhouse gases section of the Applicant's Closing Submission (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>		
2.12.2.3	It is not clear how or if the Applicant converted CO ₂ emissions from aircraft to CO ₂ e.	It is not clear if the Applicant undertook a conversion from CO ₂ to CO ₂ e as this would impact the aviation emissions by around a 0.91% increase BEIS (2023)2 . Therefore, if not accounted for, this would increase aviation GHG emissions by approximately 48,441 tCO ₂ e in 2028 in the	The modelling process estimated fuel consumption from aviation, and that this was then converted to estimated tCO ₂ e using the appropriate conversion factor. All aviation emissions within the ES	n/a	Agreed

		<p>most carbon intensive year where 5.327 MtCO₂e was estimated to be released (Table 5.2.1).</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	<p>are reported to reflect tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e).</p>		
2.12.2.4	Conversions from CO ₂ to CO ₂ e	<p>Fundamental errors were identified in the GHG Assessment, with significant emission sources such as well-to-tank emissions and conversions from CO₂ to CO₂e not undertaken, which could potentially increase the total emissions by around 20%. Therefore, millions of tonnes of CO₂e are not accounted for, which is non-compliant with the GHG Protocol Corporate Accounting Standard and GHG accounting best practice.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is acknowledged that excluding specific emission sources from the assessment is valid for the purpose of conducting a like-for-like comparison against a carbon budget/trajectory. However, given that transparency is a fundamental principle of GHG accounting, GAL should openly report these potential emission sources at least qualitatively.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	<p>The assessment does not seek either to develop a Corporate Reporting Account (which is informed by the GHG Corporate Protocol Standard) nor a Whole Life Carbon Appraisal for the Project - the methodology has been developed to allow for the assessment of impact, and doing this within the context of the contextualisation exercise that forms part of the assessment. It is not debated that Well-to-tank emissions arise in the supply chain for fuels and methodologies for estimating these (as an uplift to direct emissions) are well established.</p> <p>However, the approach adopted is based on the assessment process which is contextualising emissions against a) the UK carbon budget and b) the Jet Zero Strategy. The context for Jet Fuel usage is specifically challenging due to the proportion of this fuel that is imported from outside the UK (approximately 70% in recent years [Ref 1]) and as a result WTT emissions would predominantly fall outside the scope of the UK carbon budgets and the Net Zero commitment. Additionally the aviation strategy set out in Jet Zero does not include WTT within the main emissions calculation methodology. For these reasons WTT has been excluded from the aviation impact assessment. For consistency across the assessment methodology it has also been removed from other aspects of the GHG assessment.</p> <p>The modelling process estimated fuel consumption from aviation, and that this was then converted to estimated tCO₂e using the appropriate conversion factor. All aviation emissions within the ES are reported to reflect tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (tCO₂e).</p> <p>Ref 1: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/petroleum-chapter-3-digest-of-united-kingdom-energy-statistics-dukes</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024) Please refer to the response at Row 2.12.2.2.</p>	n/a	Agreed
2.12.2.5	Concern regarding unaccounted carbon	<p>Given the fundamental errors and the potential for a large amount of unaccounted carbon, the Council is concerned that this will have a knock-on effect on the climate change resilience assessment.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	<p>It is not credible to consider the scope of any potential under-reporting of GHG emissions within the assessment resulting from Well-to-Tank to be of a scale that would materially affect the assessment of climate resilience.</p>	n/a	Agreed
Assessment					

There are no issues relating to the assessment for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.					
Mitigation and Compensation					
There are no issues relating to mitigation and compensation for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.					
Other					
2.12.5.1	Expansion of the Airport at a time when the environmental impacts associated with air travel are of local, national and global concern	<p>The Council asks for careful consideration of airport expansion and whether the expansion proposed as part of this DCO application can be justified and supported at this time. The Council is also disappointed at the lack of acknowledgement of local authority positions on Climate Change and what an expanding airport adjacent to Horsham District’s boundary means for locally set climate strategy objectives.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	<p>It is clear that the Government has committed to monitoring and managing aviation and other emissions trajectories – i.e. there is a process in place for that purpose.</p> <p>By definition this is a global, rather than a local issue.</p>	n/a	Agreed
2.12.5.2	Adequacy of assessment	<p>It is considered that the GHG Assessment documented in the ES ‘Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases’ is not considered a comprehensive GHG Assessment since it does not adequately assess the impact of the Project in relation to carbon. A number of fundamental issues that need to be addressed to ensure carbon has been effectively assessed have been identified.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It is acknowledged that excluding specific emission sources from the assessment is valid for the purpose of conducting a like-for-like comparison against a carbon budget/trajectory. However, given that transparency is a fundamental principle of GHG accounting, GAL should openly report these potential emission sources at least qualitatively.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): In Deadline 4, the Applicant has submitted updated calculations estimating emissions from maintenance, repair, replacement, and refurbishment activities. These emissions account for approximately 2.12% of the total emissions. The Applicant demonstrates that these emissions fall below the IEMA threshold, and therefore, they are not required to be included in the total whole-life carbon assessment.</p> <p>In Deadline 4, the Applicant has provided WTT estimates for construction, ABAGO, surface access, and aviation. These updates increase the total emissions from the project between 2018 and 2050 by 3,978,000 tCO₂e, representing a 19.83% increase.</p> <p>To contextualise these emissions against the carbon budget, the Applicant references DUKES 2023 Chapter 3: Oil and Oil Products, estimating that around 36% of WTT aviation emissions occur within the UK boundary. Using this justification, the Applicant compares only this portion of aviation</p>	<p>The comment is noted but it does not specifically identify what issues need to be responded to. Please may HDC provide clarification.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024) Noted. However this comment still does not articulate what areas of the assessment are considered to be unclear and we would therefore request this further clarity from HDC in order to be able to respond.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Please refer to the response at 2.12.2.2.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): Please see the Applicant’s final position with respect to this issue please within the greenhouse gases section of the Applicant’s Closing Submission (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>	n/a	Not Agreed

		<p>WTT emissions to the carbon budget, along with the WTT emissions from construction, ABAGO, and surface access.</p> <p>The Applicant then presents only the net impact, stating it accounts for 0.649% of the UK's 6th carbon budget, without displaying the total future impact of the airport as done in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant should further forecast the percentage impact on future estimated carbon budgets using the CCC projections to estimate the project's impact on future carbon budgets to understand if it is decarbonising in line with the estimated net zero trajectory.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The CCC's balanced net zero pathway serves as a guide for governments and institutions aiming to assess and determine strategies for achieving net zero emissions. While these guidelines are not legally binding, they illustrate the necessary carbon reductions to meet the legally binding net zero mandate set by the amended Climate Change Act.</p> <p>Furthermore, the IEMA GHG Assessment guidance, which the Applicant uses for its evaluation, recommends contextualising a project's emissions by referencing the UK carbon budgets and net zero trajectory. This approach is considered good practice.</p> <p>In addition, for aviation emissions, the Applicant uses the entirety of the Jet Zero High Ambition Scenario budget to demonstrate alignment with the net zero trajectory. However, the Applicant does not allocate the budget proportionally based on GAL's size. Therefore, it would be more appropriate for the Applicant to estimate how much of the Jet Zero High Ambition Scenario budget should be allocated to GAL and then use this allocation as a benchmark to determine if future emissions are within the allocated budget.</p>			
2.12.5.3	General concerns	<p>There are key concerns in relation to the latest legislation and guidance, baseline information, assessment of significant effects, and mitigation, enhancement and monitoring.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	The comment is noted but it does not specifically identify what issues need to be responded to. Please can HDC provide clarification.	n/a	Agreed
2.12.5.4	Local planning policy	<p>ES Appendix 16.2.1 summarises relevant current and emerging local planning policy, however, no consideration has been given to any relevant local authority positions on Climate Change or to any council climate strategies. Horsham District Council has declared a Climate Emergency and there is concern about how such significant expansion of the Airport fits with the Council's climate commitments and ability to meet our locally set objectives.</p>	It is noted that various stakeholders have their own commitments and reductions trajectories however the test applied to assess significance of the impacts arising are carried out in line with IEMA guidance by comparison to national carbon budgets, and contextualised against appropriate sectoral trajectories to achieve Net Zero at a national scale.	Para 16.1.4 of ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases [APP-041]	Agreed

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We acknowledge the Applicant's assessment has been undertaken with consideration to the Jet Zero high ambition trajectory and that this trajectory is representative of government's current 'budget' for aviation to contribute to net zero. On this basis it could be considered to align with the approach set out by IEMA.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	<p>This is noted in ES Paragraph 16.10.4 that references the IEMA Guidance noting that "The inappropriateness of undertaking a cumulative appraisal (other than by contextualising against Carbon Budgets) is reflected in the IEMA guidance. This guidance notes that 'effects from specific cumulative projects...should not be individually assessed, as there is no basis for selecting any particular (or more than one) cumulative project that has GHG emissions for assessment over any other'."</p>		
2.12.5.5	In-combination effects	<p>It is unclear how the in-combination effects of the Project, other development and further possible expansion at Heathrow will impact on the UK's ability to hit GHG emission and climate change targets.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We acknowledge the Applicant's assessment has been undertaken with consideration to the Jet Zero high ambition trajectory and that this trajectory is representative of government's current 'budget' for aviation to contribute to net zero. On this basis it could be considered to align with the approach set out by IEMA.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	<p>It is noted that various stakeholders have their own commitments and reductions trajectories however the test applied to assess significance of the impacts arising are carried out in line with IEMA guidance by comparison to national carbon budgets, and contextualised against appropriate sectoral trajectories to achieve Net Zero at a national scale.</p> <p>This is noted in ES Paragraph 16.10.4 that references the IEMA Guidance noting that "The inappropriateness of undertaking a cumulative appraisal (other than by contextualising against Carbon Budgets) is reflected in the IEMA guidance. This guidance notes that 'effects from specific cumulative projects...should not be individually assessed, as there is no basis for selecting any particular (or more than one) cumulative project that has GHG emissions for assessment over any other'."</p>	Para 16.1.4 of ES Chapter 16 Greenhouse Gases [APP-041]	Agreed
2.12.5.6	Justification for expansion	<p>The expansion of the Airport is presented at a time when the environmental impacts associated with air travel are of local, national and global concern and the Council asks for careful consideration of this issue and whether the expansion proposed as part of this DCO application can be justified and supported at this time.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	<p>This is a comment which relates to the application of government policy. The Government's Jet Zero Strategy is clear that its modelled outputs for emissions from airport expansion (including from the NRP) are consistent with its commitment to a net zero trajectory.</p>	n/a	Agreed
2.12.5.7	The unsustainable growth of airport operations may result in significant adverse impacts to the climate.	<p>The increased demand in GAL's services may lead to unsustainable surface access transportation and airport operation growth, which may significantly impact the climate.</p> <p>It is suggested a control mechanism similar to the Green Controlled Growth Framework submitted as part of the London Luton Airport Expansion Application, is provided. Emission limits and thresholds for pertinent project stages should be established.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Applicant should consider how it can foster sustainability into the projects governance processes to demonstrate that it will monitor and</p>	<p>The Climate Change Act places a duty on the Secretary of State to prepare "such proposals and policies as the Secretary of State considers will enable the carbon budgets that have been set under this Act to be met." (Section 13).</p> <p>That duty lies with the Secretary of State and it is apparent that the Government has put in place a clear framework of policy to ensure that the Government's duty and commitment is met. The Jet Zero Strategy forms part of that policy framework and, within it, the Government makes clear that its modelling demonstrates that the commitment can be met without demand management – i.e. without constraining the growth of airports. That conclusion is</p>		Not Agreed

	<p>control GHG emissions during operation using control mechanism to similar to the Green Controlled Growth Framework.</p> <p>The position from the JLA's on the Green Controlled Growth Framework is set out in the documents that we submitted under Deadline 4.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The unsustainable growth of airport The JLAs have detailed their full position in the D7 EMG Framework response concerning the control of greenhouse gases from surface access and ABAGO to support sustainable growth.</p> <p>In summary the JLAs are concerned, on the level of ongoing enforcement on greenhouse emissions, including consequences if targets are not being met, and considers an Environmentally Managed Growth (EMG) framework would act as a safety net and provide this reassurance.</p> <p>The Applicant appears to be taking a reactive approach to managing greenhouse gas emissions, failing to set thresholds or limits to support sustainable growth. This contrasts with best practices, such as the Luton Airport Green Controlled Growth Framework which supports a similar framework.</p> <p>Alternative Changes if EMGF is Not Accepted ABAGO Unlike Surface Access Journeys, there is no dedicated group to hold the Applicant accountable for ABAGO commitments. It is recommended to establish a similar group with relevant local authorities and stakeholders for regular reviews.</p> <p>If the EMGF is not accepted, the ABAGO Annual Monitoring Report should outline the carbon reduction trajectory and thresholds towards the 2030 and 2040 targets, providing early warnings if commitments are not met.</p> <p>This will enable the Applicant to take corrective action if targets are missed, reporting to the forum on measures to limit growth until targets are achieved.</p> <p>This approach ensures proactive rather than reactive measures, keeping the Applicant on track with ABAGO commitments in the CAP [APP-091].</p> <p>The Applicant should extend its emission scope to include Scope 3 emissions within its targets. The CAP [APP-091] strategy balances remaining emissions from sources under GAL's jurisdiction with removals,</p>	<p>reached in the light of the acknowledged importance of aviation to the UK and the critical importance of the Government supporting growth in the aviation sector, whilst meeting its binding carbon reduction targets.</p> <p>The JZS is also clear that the Government is monitoring the position closely and will take further measures if necessary, if it becomes apparent that the trajectory of aviation emissions is not being achieved. In these circumstances, a control of the type proposed by the local authority in this case would cut across the balance being struck by government and would not meet the relevant tests of necessity or appropriateness.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Please refer to Deadline 5 Submission - 10.38 Appendix B - Response to the JLAs' Environmentally Managed Growth Framework Proposition Version 1 [REP5-074] and Deadline 6 Submission - 10.52.3 The Applicant's Response to Deadline 5 Submissions - Response to JLA's EMG Framework Paper [REP6-093].</p> <p>With regards to offsetting, GAL has been carbon neutral since 2017. Carbon neutrality is recognised through the ACI Airport Carbon Accreditation scheme (ACA) with offsets bought covering Scope 1 and Scope 2 GHG emissions (as well as business travel). GAL is currently accredited at Level 4+ of ACA and is committed to maintaining this.</p> <p>To maintain ACA accreditation, GAL can only purchase offsets that are aligned to schemes recognized by the ACA. The ACA Offsetting Guidance is publicly available: https://www.airportcarbonaccreditation.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/ACA-Offset-Guidance-Documents-FINAL-09112023-2.pdf</p> <p>As GAL transitions from carbon neutral to net zero status, absolute carbon reductions are being achieved. Consequently, residual emissions, and the amount of offsets required, are reducing. For net zero only removal offsets are allowed. GAL is in the process of transitioning from reduction to removal offsets. For 2023, GAL bought 25% removal offsets and 75% reduction offsets.</p> <p>GAL provided an offsetting statement in the 2023 Decade of Change Performance Summary which is publicly available:</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>aiming for zero emissions for Scope 1 and 2 by 2040, but currently does not offset Scope 3 emissions.</p> <p>Scope 3 emissions should be included in the CAP [APP-091] as a net limit, including any offsetting measures, ensuring emissions stay within the CAP limit.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to net zero Scope 1 and 2 emissions by 2030 and zero emissions by 2040, aligning with Jet Zero. A reduction trajectory should be presented to minimise reliance on removals by 2040, with a suggested linear reduction for net zero by 2030 and zero emissions by 2040.</p> <p>Surface Access Journeys If EMG is not accepted, the Transport Annual Monitoring Report should include GHG emissions against reduction targets. If targets are not met, the Applicant should report actions to limit growth until targets are achieved.</p> <p>Similar to the Luton Airport Green Controlled Growth Framework, JLAs suggest GAL should offset net surface access journey emissions when thresholds are exceeded.</p>	<p>https://www.gatwickairport.com/company/reports/sustainability-reports.html.</p> <p>Currently GAL buys offsets annually in arrears from the voluntary carbon market (VCM). GAL is investigating developing a local removal offsetting project which would, ideally, provide all offsets from 2030. It should be noted that any local offsetting scheme will have to be accredited by an ACA recognised scheme.</p> <p>Further information was given in GAL's response to Action Point 13 following ISH6 in The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH6: Climate Change (including Greenhouse Gases) [REP4-036].</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): Please see the Applicant's final position with respect to this issue please within the greenhouse gases section of the Applicant's Closing Submission (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>		
<p>2.12.5.8</p>	<p>If the Applicant does not provide infrastructure or services to help decarbonise surface transport emissions it may have the potential to result in the underreporting of the Proposed Development's impact on the climate. The full impact of the Proposed Development on the government meeting its net zero targets cannot be identified</p>	<p>The Applicant must actively promote the transition to a decarbonised economy, incentivising airport users to adopt low-carbon technologies like electric cars and public transportation systems.</p> <p>The Applicant should provide infrastructure within the Airport to support the anticipated uptake of electric vehicles and provide electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Additionally, to support this movement, the Applicant should support a Green Bus Programme such as the expansion of the network of hydrogen buses</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has demonstrated in Deadline 3 that it is committed to providing charging infrastructure for electric vehicles used to access the Airport (both passenger and staff) to facilitate the use of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles for those journeys that are made by car. The Applicant is also committed to investing £1m to Metrobus in hydrogen buses for the local network.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment [AS-079] and the Surface Access Commitments (SAC) [APP-090] set out how the Applicant's commitments to sustainable travel are binding under the DCO. Achieving the modes shares set out will significantly reduce surface transport emissions. We are continuing to invest in charging infrastructure for passengers and staff within a wider strategy for EVs on the campus as part of our Decade of Change programme independent of the DCO. This includes a partnership with Gridserve to provide an electric vehicle charging forecourt on airport, completed in early 2024. Our passenger valet parking service also offers an EV charging service. For operational vehicles there is a programme underway to deliver the Applicant's and third party airfield EV charging requirements.</p> <p>The Applicant has invested or pledged over £1m to Metrobus in hydrogen buses for the local network serving the airport and continues to support the transition to ultra low or zero emission vehicles in local bus services and in the Applicant's own surface transport fleet.</p> <p>Decarbonisation of all surface transport is a matter for Government policy and the Applicant cannot mandate that all</p>	<p>Transport Assessment [AS-079]</p> <p>Surface Access Commitments [APP-090]</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

			<p>surface access journeys are by zero emission vehicles ahead of meeting those policy targets</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): It is considered this matter can be marked as 'agreed'.</p>		
2.12.5.9	<p>GAL does not identify the risks associated with using carbon offset schemes.</p>	<p>The scientific community has identified various risks around using offsetting schemes to claim net zero or carbon neutrality. GAL should specifically state which offset scheme they intend to use so research can be conducted into the trustworthiness of the scheme.</p> <p>GAL should state if they comply with the Airport Carbon Accreditation Offset Guidance Document which specifies the type of offsetting Schemes that need to be used. GAL should seek to utilise local offsetting schemes that can deliver environmental benefits to the area and local community around the airport.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Addressed</p>	<p>At Gatwick today, through its Airport Carbon Accreditation Level 4+, the Applicant buys offsets covering residual Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions (as well as business travel).</p> <p>In order for the Applicant to maintain its ACA certification, any offsets – removal and/or reduction – must be bought from schemes accredited by the ACA.</p> <p>ACA is the only global, airport-specific carbon standard which relies on internationally recognised methodologies. It provides airports with a common framework for active carbon management with measurable goalposts. The programme is site-specific allowing flexibility to take account of national or local legal requirements, whilst ensuring that the methodology used is always robust</p> <p>Details of Level 4+ available on the ACA website: https://www.airportcarbonaccreditation.org/about/7-levels-of-accreditation/</p> <p>With a view to achieving Net Zero for Scope 1 and 2 GHG emissions by 2030 (under both its existing Decade of Change commitments, and the equivalent under the Carbon Action Plan as part of the Project), the Applicant is in the process of transitioning from use of carbon reduction offsets to carbon removal offsets instead (as the use of carbon removal offsets would not meet the definition of Net Zero). For 2023, GAL purchased 25% removal offsets and 75% reduction offsets.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Applicant is investigating the development of a local removal project, independent of the Project. Any such project will need to be accredited by the ACA.</p>		Agreed

2.12. Health and Wellbeing

2.12.1 Table 2.12 sets out the position of both parties in relation to health and wellbeing matters.

Table 2.12 Statement of Common Ground Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
There are no issues relating to the baseline for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.					
Assessment Methodology					
2.13.2.1	Assumptions	<p>The Applicant is reliant on other developments to “employ standard good practice measures” to reduce the potential for significant adverse impacts, however they have not been explicit about what assumptions have been made and on what basis (i.e., local policy).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issue not addressed.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): No change in the Council’s position</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The clarification by the Applicant is welcomed</p>	<p>All developments covered by the cumulative assessment are required to align with relevant policy and regulatory requirements. It is considered that that is a reasonable basis for assessing cumulative effects. It would not be proportionate to set out the specific policies and regulatory standards applicable to other developments.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043] section 18.2 and ES Appendix 18.2.1 Summary of Planning Policy - Health and Wellbeing [APP-202] summarise relevant legislation and policy relevant to the Project. Whilst some are aviation specific, many of the requirements would relate to other projects and would be set out in their assessments and planning applications as appropriate.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The IEMA 2016 EIA guide to delivering quality development sets out the different types of mitigation that a project may include. The three types are primary, secondary and tertiary. Standard good practice measures are tertiary measures that are described in Annex A (pdf page 17 of that publication), the description provided is “Actions that would occur with or without input from the EIA feeding into the design process. These include actions that will be undertaken to meet other existing legislative requirements, or actions that are considered to be standard practices used to manage commonly occurring environmental effects”. It is entirely reasonable to assume other cumulative schemes would adopt tertiary mitigation measures without having to specify them specifically.</p>	ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]	Agreed
2.13.2.2	Consideration of residents living within proximity to the airport.	<p>The assumption that residents living in proximity to the airport can “reasonably be assumed to be in a position to take the noise impacts of the Airport into account” is flawed, particularly given the high level of housing need, especially affordable housing. Proximity to the Airport is unlikely to be a sufficiently high consideration for many residents.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Housing need, in particular for affordable housing, is such that in reality aircraft noise is unlikely to be a</p>	<p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing notes this point at paragraph 18.10.11. The point is a reflection that aviation noise will be one of several considerations for future residents. It is agreed that housing pressures and income levels will also play an important role and for many people will be an overriding consideration. The point is specifically in the context that any future residential development can reasonably be assumed to be built to standards that provided an appropriate noise environment.</p>	ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043]	Agreed

		<p>consideration at all for many needing access to affordable housing. This assumption should be removed from the basis of any assessments in relation to sensitivity or vulnerability and health and wellbeing, particularly considering a) the existing communities (including sensitive receptors such as schools) already in situ, and b) the fact that many areas in the assessment will be in proximity to the airport and with overflight at a relatively low altitude.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Applicant's update is welcomed.</p>	<p>Aviation Policy Framework, 2013, para 3.21 notes "The NPPF expects local planning policies and decisions to ensure that new development is appropriate for its location and the effects of pollution – including noise – on health, the natural environment or general amenity are taken into account. This does not rule out noise-sensitive development in locations that experience aircraft noise. In the same way that some people consider themselves annoyed by aircraft noise even though they live some distance from an airport in locations where aircraft are at relatively high altitudes, other people living closer to an airport seem to be tolerant of aircraft noise and may choose to live closer to the airport to be near to employment or to benefit from the travel opportunities."</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043] assigns the highest sensitivity level for vulnerable groups in relation to noise, irrespective of their decisions to move to the area. The statement at paragraph 18.10.11 [APP-043] on cumulative effects is clear that it relates to new residents of new accommodation that has been built to standards that provide an appropriate noise environment. There is not reliance on such residents, including of affordable housing, taking noise into account to avoid a significant adverse effect on population health. It is agreed the statement is not relied on as the basis of assessments in relation to sensitivity or vulnerability.</p>		
Assessment					
Mitigation and Compensation					
2.13.4.1	Request for further mitigation	<p>A number of impacts not identified as significant across topic areas could interact and combine to have an overall significant health and wellbeing impact but the Applicant has not addressed this.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The assessment provided in the chapter referred to should be provided on a more local / community specific scale in order to address these concerns, both quantitatively and qualitatively.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The clarification of approach is welcomed.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing sets out the assessment of interactions and combined effects in Section 18.11, paragraph 18.11.1 to 18.11.22. That section considers how each of the potential health effects that are assessed in isolation within Section 8.8 may interact or result in greater effects in combination. The assessment follows guidance (IEMA 2022) and presents the analysis both by geographic population and by vulnerable group sub-population. The assessment concludes that there would not be no new or materially different significant population health effects due to inter-related effects. Notwithstanding this conclusion, paragraph 18.11.22 sets out further mitigation to ensure there is a process to mitigate against exceptional circumstances relating to vulnerable individuals and combined effects. This is a best practice assessment and approach to combined effect mitigation.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043]</p> <p>ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045]</p>	<p>Applicant suggests (July 2024) that it can be agreed that this issue can be marked as resolved.</p> <p>Resolved</p>

			<p>Additional information is set out in ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043] paragraphs 18.4.8 to 18.4.14 set out the study areas and geographic scope of the health assessment. This includes a focus on wards (small administrative areas) close to the airport (site-specific effects), as well as effects to surrounding local and regional populations. The approach is considered proportionate. Section 8.11 [APP-043] assesses whether effects not considered significant in isolation may be significant in combination. The assessment includes the defined 'site-specific' and 'local' geographic areas.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Further to the points previously made with regard to ES Chapter 18 Health and Wellbeing [APP-043], ES Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships Figures [APP-051] Figure 20.4.1 illustrates the overlap in study areas of the individual topic area effects that may interact. ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045] discusses interactions in section 20.8, paragraphs 20.8.15 to 20.8.30. This includes the paragraph 20.8.19 discussion of combined community effects in Crawley, Charlwood and Horley. As discussed in paragraph 20.8.4 [APP-045] the assessment is qualitative. Given the inherent nature of such in-combination assessment to consider effects across a wide range of potential influences on health and different technical topic areas there is not a unified quantitative assessment methodology that could be applied. This is discussed in ES Appendix 18.4.1 Methods Statement for Health and Wellbeing [APP-205] paragraph 3.1.2, which confirms that there are no quantitative methods that are applicable to EIA that can determine the overall population health effects of a project across all determinants of health and health outcomes. For this reason, the primary analysis must be qualitative. ES Appendix 18.4.1 Methods Statement for Health and Wellbeing [APP-205] paragraph 3.1.11 notes that caution should be applied in combining the effects of the quantitative health outcome analyses for air quality and noise due to a risk of double counting effects related to co-exposures, and for that reason the interaction has not been expressed quantitatively. Notwithstanding this, the quantitative analyses have informed both the main assessment and the in-combination assessment as indications of the relative scale of change. It is considered that an appropriate assessment of the interactions between effects has been undertaken and that this has been</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			presented at a local / community specific scale. We suggest that this is marked as agreed.		
<p>Other</p>					
<p><i>There are no other issues relating to this topic in this Statement of Common Ground.</i></p>					

2.13. Historic Environment

2.13.1 Table 2.13 sets out the position of both parties in relation to historic environment matters.

Table 2.13 Statement of Common Ground – Historic Environment Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Historic Environment in this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.14. Landscape, Townscape and Visual

2.14.1 Table 2.14 sets out the position of both parties in relation to landscape, townscape and visual matters.

Table 2.14 Statement of Common Ground – Landscape, Townscape and Visual Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
There are no issues relating to the baseline for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.					
Assessment Methodology					
There are no issues relating to the assessment methodology for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.					
Assessment					
2.15.3.1	Impact of WIZAD route	<p>WIZAD (Route 9) flies over part of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Council has had regard to section 3.2(e) of the Department for Transport’s Air Navigation Guidance 2017 which also sets out that it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 ft should seek to avoid flying over AONBs. The Applicant states that it is not possible to assess the impact on the tranquillity of nationally designated landscapes because of the uncertainty around airspace modernisation. This is not a valid reason to have excluded any level of assessment. There are additional concerns around increased overflight on heritage assets within Horsham District and the Council therefore queries whether the potential environmental and heritage impacts from increased use of WIZAD (Route 9) have been fully assessed.</p> <p>Further discussion required re: flightpath use.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council’s position is reflected in the Authorities’ response to the Applicant’s answer to ExQ LV.1.6 [REP4-067]</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The use of WIZAD (Route 9) is covered elsewhere, in the Capacity and Operations SoCG and in the JLAs’ responses in ISH9 in response to agenda item 4.2. On the basis of these submissions, and earlier submissions, the Council’s concern that use of WIZAD route risks impact on National Landscapes, and that this impact has not been assessed by the Applicant.</p>	<p>The tranquillity study has been determined through an appropriate methodology (to accommodate specific criteria in CAP1616 Appendix B, para B30 and B56). Frequency of aircraft movements and general orientation of flights are illustrated in ES Figures 8.6.3 to 8.6.7 together with nationally designated landscapes. The increase in overflying aircraft at less than 7000 ft above local ground level as a result of the project, compared to the future baseline scenario in 2032, has informed the assessment of perception of tranquillity with nationally designated landscapes.</p> <p>The use of WIZAD is addressed at Row 17.3 of Table 17 Capacity and Operations.</p> <p>Updated Response (April 2024): Please refer to the Applicant’s Response to EXAQ1 LV.1.6 submitted at Deadline 3, in that it states:</p> <p><i>No new flight paths are proposed as part of the Project. The increase in the number of overflights in 2032 compared to 2019, including as a result of aircraft using WIZAD (Route 9), is illustrated in Figure 8.6.6 [APP-061]. The WIZAD route involves an initial climb on westerly departures with a turn at approximately 2.3 miles onto a heading which routes the aircraft between Crawley and the northern edge of Horsham. The route onwards is across the High Weald National Landscape. ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] assesses impacts on the High Weald National Landscape having regard to a number of matters, including CAA guidance (CAP1616 Appendix B, para B30 and B56). The frequency of aircraft movements and general orientation of flights are illustrated in Figures 8.6.3 to 8.6.7 of the ES Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources Figures [REP2-007] together with nationally designated landscapes and 10 popular and well known locations within them.</i></p>	<p>ES Chapter 8 Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033]</p> <p>ES Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources Figures [REP2-007]</p>	Not Agreed

			<p>The ES assesses effects on the perception of tranquillity within the High Weald National Landscape as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft up to 7,000 ft above local ground level compared to the future baseline situation in 2032 (see ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] Table 8.9.1 for summary of representative assessment locations and overflight numbers – this includes assessment at Wakehurst Place. At this location, the 2019 baseline number of Gatwick overflights is 21, in the future baseline this increases to 28.2 in 2032, and with the project in 2032 increases to 33.8).</p> <p>People generally experience a relatively high level of tranquillity in nationally designated landscapes of high scenic quality. These receptors are likely to be of high or very high sensitivity to change. Overflying aircraft at less than 7,000 feet above local ground level currently form a regular visible or audible feature that forms a slightly discordant aspect when experiencing the landscape. The special qualities that people living within and visiting the High Weald AONB experience, including distant scenic views and the landscape’s relative tranquillity and dark skies, whilst affected to some extent as a result of an increase in the number of overflying aircraft, would still be positive qualities that would continue to be experienced.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The Stakeholders position is noted, however the Applicant considers the April 2024 response above addresses the issue and that the assessment of effects on the perception of tranquillity within ES Chapter 8: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources [APP-033] remains robust.</p>		
Mitigation and Compensation					
<i>There are no issues relating to mitigation and compensation for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					
Other					
<i>There are no other issues relating to this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.15. Major Accidents and Disasters

2.15.1 Table 2.15 sets out the position of both parties in relation to major accidents and disasters matters.

Table 2.15 Statement of Common Ground – Major Accidents and Disasters Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Major Accidents and Disasters within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.16. Noise and Vibration

2.16.1 Table 2.16 sets out the position of both parties in relation to noise and vibration matters.

Table 2.16 Statement of Common Ground – Noise and Vibration Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
2.17.1.1	Modelling (Air Noise)	<p>The forecast modelling is only partially complete for the future years. There is no information for 2029. Local authorities have requested a sensitivity analysis showing the 2019 base year movements with the predicted 2029 fleet mix to determine actual improvements that might be experienced with technology. A number of datasets are incomplete including missing overflight information (14.9.30 simply shows a cropped image of proposed flight paths but is listed as departure overflights). No consideration is made of arrivals as well as departures.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): In addition to the sensitivity test the local authorities have requested the GIS files with the appropriate modelled years.</p> <p>While some data has been provided in different forms it has not all been provided in a form that allows the authorities to conduct their own independent review analysis.</p> <p>For example, in the ES overflight data is only supplied for 2019 and 2032 and it is not as stated in the response. 2032 will not be the worst year for overflights as flights are predicted to grow under baseline and with project.</p> <p>All data needs to be in the ES and also made available as GIS files to permit local authorities to conduct their own analysis as appropriate. This accords with the requirements of the Planning Noise Advice Document: Sussex.</p> <p>It is noted that Gatwick has provided some clarity on this as there are errors with the reference. These should be corrected in the ES.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): A full range of sensitivity analysis has not been provided in the modelling. A full range of modelling has not been supplied in a form that allows the local authorities to undertake analysis. There are errors in the forecasts upon which the noise modelling is based and the air noise modelling has not been updated to take this into</p>	<p>The ES provides forecast noise modelling for the 2019 baseline, 2029, 2032, 2038 and 2047. For each year, noise contour data is provided for primary and secondary noise metrics, for the baseline and Project case, and for two rates of fleet transition. This is sufficient to assess the likely significant effect of the project and has allowed the ES to specify the required noise mitigation in line with guidance and policy.</p> <p>The ES provides 48 noise contour maps for 2019, 2032, and 2038. Noise contours for 2029 and 2047 are not mapped in the ES figures because noise impacts are higher in other years and shown by the population and contour area data that is provided for these years. Contours for years mapped in the ES figures and the other years have been provided to LPAs on the TWG in the online Air Noise Viewer.</p> <p>Modelling of the 2019 base year movements with the predicted 2029 fleet mix has not been undertaken because this scenario will not arise because in all future years there will be some growth in traffic.</p> <p>Figure 14.9.30 illustrates how overflights from the northern runway, which will only be departures, compare with those from the main runway. The overflight information referred to in this comment as 'missing' is presented in Figure 14.9.31, which is incorrectly titled. It should be titled 2018 All Airport Overflights With Project Flights (20%) as listed in the Table of content and described in paragraph 14.9.146 of ES Chapter 14. The overflight data provided covers both the base and Project cases and is considered a full illustration of how the numbers of overflights is likely to increase as a result of the Project across the whole area up to 35 miles from the airport that is overflowed by Gatwick flights.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant feels the following statement is misleading 'While some data has been provided in different forms it has not all been provided in a form that allows the authorities to conduct their own independent review analysis'. Air noise contours have been uploaded to the online Air Noise Viewer specifically at the request of local authorities and in universal GIS formats so that any local authority can view and analyse the contours using their own GIS system. We were not made aware if this format does</p>	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039]	Not Agreed

	<p>consideration.</p> <p>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 in addition to the figures for up to 7,000'.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDC disagree that overflights should only be assessed up to 7,000 feet. CAP1616a explicitly states: <i>“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”</i> It goes on to state: <i>“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”</i> 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. HDC would like to be able to contextualise the impact of additional aircraft movements through provision of relevant overflight contours as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for aircraft movements below 4,000 feet. • provided as contours calculated from 100mx100m grids. • include aircraft movement associated with the northern runway. <p>Furthermore HDC believe that similar to assessing the total effects of noise the total numbers of all secondary metrics should be reported against the base year in all scenario years.</p>	<p>not work for HDC. The online Air Noise Viewer was created in March 2023 when all local authorities on the Noise Topic Working Group were given access. Since then the Applicant has responded to 13 requests for additional GIS files, all of which have been responded to.</p> <p>With regards the worst year for overflights, the worst year in terms of the impact of the Project will be the year in which the proportion of overflights increases by the greatest amount above the baseline in that year. The overflights assessment in 2032 takes a cautious approach by reporting a 20% increase in 24 hour overflights on an average summer day. ES Table 14.7.1 gives the precise values as 4% in 2029, and 18% in 2032 and 2038. The total number of overflights in 2038 is forecast to be 1120 which is only 7 more than in 2032 when the total number of flights is forecast to be 1113. Therefore, the ES has assessed and reported the worst case overflight impacts from the project.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) 2032 is the year with the greatest proportion of increased overflights at 19% rounded up to 20% for the assessment. See ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039] Table 14.7.1. Under CAP1616 guidance noise effects in the vicinity of an airport are assessed in terms of modelled noise levels, and overflights are considered as supplementary metrics to illustrate changes beyond the noise contours. Effects close to the airport should therefore be assessed in terms of the noise contours provided not overflights. CAP1616 requires overflights to be assessed up to 7,000 ft. Noise effects from aircraft at any height are assessed by noise contours.</p> <p>The Applicant does not agree there are errors in the forecasts upon which the noise modelling is based.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9) This partial quote from para 1.8 of CAP1616a is under the heading Leq Contours and relates to Leq contours. <i>1.18 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, and are therefore also unlikely to result in changes to significant adverse effects as determined by WebTAG. However, for the largest airports, the population noise exposure information required for input to WebTAG may extend to areas where aircraft are above 4,000 feet.</i> Paragraphs 1.40 to 1.44 are under the heading Overflights give guidance on overflight. Paragraph 1.10 begins: <i>The CAA publication CAP 1498 Definition of Overflight...</i> CAP1498 defines overflights up to 7,000 ft as portrayed in Figure 2 of CAP1616a. Indeed paragraph 1.44 of CAP1616a gives an example of an overflight at 5,000ft.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

			<p>The discussion on 4,000ft in CAP1616 is discussing that usually (except for the largest airports) Leq contours will illustrate significant effects that usually arise from aircraft below 4,000 ft. This is why overflights are a useful way to illustrate lesser effects from aircraft that are higher ie up to 7,000 ft that do not generally contribute to the Leq contour plotted.</p> <p>The Applicant has followed the CAA’s CAP1616 and CAP1489 guidance and mapped overflights to the correct height so as to best illustrate effects beyond Leq contours.</p> <p>Flights from the northern runway are included on the main runway as explained in ES Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling [APP-172], and given that the purpose of overflight mapping is not to portray effects close to the airport for which Leq contour are used (and ES Figure 14.9.30 is used), but rather to portray effects beyond the Leq contours, this was considered a reasonable approximation.</p> <p>CAP1616 has no requirement to map to a 100m grid.</p>		
Assessment methodology					
2.17.2.1	Local Planning Policy (Air Noise)	<p>Local planning policies in relation to noise are briefly referred to in sections 14.2.61 to 14.2.62 of Chapter 14 the Environmental Statement. There is no explanation of the policies, the weight given to them and how they have influenced the design, assessment of impact and mitigation of the proposal. This is contrary to the ‘Balanced Approach’ required by UK and international policy.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Local planning policies should be covered in detail with information provided regarding where they have been addressed in the ES.</p> <p>Can the applicant confirm how they have sought to integrate their plans with the local policies in relation to housing provision and noise control. The airport is as responsible for taking into consideration existing housing (both planned and developed) as the local authority is for taking into consideration separation of sensitive development with the airport.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The applicant has only sought to refer to housing policies and not answered the question at Deadline 1.</p> <p>Local planning policies and how they have been addressed in the noise assessment should be covered.</p> <p>While the noise preferential routes are not being moved there is an intensification over the use of Route 9 where the housing development was permitted having regard to the minimal and ad hoc use of the route. The airport seeks to change the way the route</p>	<p>The relevant local planning policies relating to noise and vibration have been used in the assessment and reference to them is made where relevant in the ES, e.g. para 14.11.15 specifically refers to local planning guidance for new housing in accordance with the ICAO Balanced Approach. Planning policies and how they are addressed in relation to the application is addressed in the Planning Statement.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has considered all existing housing in developing the noise mitigation measures for the project. In this case flight paths are not being moved, so mitigation measures are aimed at reducing noise from operations on the existing routes.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Project does not seek to change the way the Route 9 Standard Instrument Departure is used, but rather identifies a potential intensification in its use where it continues to serve the same necessary function. The noise assessment has shown (see 2.17.2.3 below) that the effects on the consented housing referred to north of Horsham is not significant either due to future baseline intensification of Route 9 or as a result of the Project.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9)</p> <p>The council will be aware that the Applicant is fully aware of Planning Noise Advice Document: Sussex, from its work consulting with the council on the subject of land use planning with the Noise Management Board. This local guidance provides guidance on all types of noise sources and on new noise sensitive development, not specifically airport development. ES Appendix 14.9.3 Ground Noise Modelling [APP-173] refers to Noise Advice Document: Sussex for the assessment of fixed noise sources.</p>	<p>Paras 14.11.15 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039]</p> <p>Planning Statement [APP-245]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>is used by this intensification and in disregard of the local policies which it had an opportunity to comment upon.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Applicant has not addressed the original points that were made. Local Planning Policies should be covered in detail with information provided regarding where they have been addressed in the ES. In particular there is an absence of detail about the Planning Noise Advice Document: Sussex and the standards that it applies across all aspects of noise.</p>			
2.17.2.2	Threshold and scope of LOAELS and SOAELS (Air Noise)	<p>The ES only considers the Leq metric for LOAELs and SOAELs. In doing so it makes reference to national policy. The consideration only of Leq as a metric is too narrow and other metrics should be applied to the decision processes within the Project to inform impact and mitigation. In determining the LOAELs and SOAELs more recent data, including planning decisions and revised health assessment criteria need to be applied. The consideration only of the Leq metric does not represent all the effects of air noise across the District.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Supplementary noise metrics should be used supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects.</p> <p>Whilst it is important to refer to the policy there is new evidence about the other characteristics of noise which are themselves material considerations and should be properly accounted for.</p> <p>The comment on awakenings is noted and consideration of these is welcome. However, we do not consider that they have been considered or expressed appropriately and therefore we continue to believe that the effects have been underestimated.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Position is unchanged from Deadline 1. HDC, as have other authorities, expressed concern over the 'engagement and the availability of information.</p> <p>The effect of all additional noise induced awakenings as a result of aviation noise from Gatwick operations is not shown and needs to be to demonstrate the cumulative effect of proposed additional operations.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024):</p>	<p>The assessment follows current policy and guidance so that all air noise effects are assessed. The awakenings study provided in ES Appendix 14.9.2 provides additional assessment of the effects across the district.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024):</p> <p>GAL engaged with the LPAs before and after the PEIR to discuss and explain the scenarios modelled and reported in the ES. These comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 metrics - Leq 16 hr, Leq 8 hr night, N65 day, N60 night, Lden, LNight, Lmax and overflights; • 5 assessment years – 2019, 2029, 2032, 2038 and 2047 • 2 Fleet transition scenarios, the Central Case and Slower Transition Case. <p>These are presented in 71 figures in the ES relating to air noise impacts with the data tabulated in Appendix 14.9.2. The Applicant considers the ES has made sufficient use of supplementary noise metrics to fully illustrate the noise changes that the Project will bring, both increases and reductions. Available guidance indicates how to judge significance using the primary metrics, not the supplementary metrics.</p> <p>The Applicant believes the Awakenings Study is reported clearly and accurately estimates likely effects. If HDC feels the awakenings study has not been considered or expressed appropriately please advise what is considered to be required to address this. Further details are provide in response 2.17.2.5 below.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The effect of all additional noise induced awakenings as a result of aviation noise from Gatwick operations is provided in the ES at paragraph 7.4.2 of ES Appendix 14.9.3 clearly as summarised in 2.17.2.5 below.</p>	ES Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling [APP-172]	Not Agreed

		<p>The HDC disagrees with the Applicant's interpretation and conclusion in respect of one additional noise induced awakening and the JLA responses have presented further information in support of its position. The Applicant has not provided sufficient detail on secondary noise metrics so as to be able to understand the noise effects at all identified communities and for all assessment scenarios.</p>	<p>Updated position (Deadline 9) The Applicant disagrees with the Council's interpretation of the significance of one additional awakening and has provided reasons why, including in The Applicant's Response to Deadline 7 Submissions [REP8-115]</p>		
<p>2.17.2.3</p>	<p>Assumptions on WIZAD (Route 9)</p>	<p>WIZAD (Route 9) is a tactical offload route with prohibition on use between 23:00 and 07:00. Under the proposals the local air traffic control at Gatwick Airport would have no choice but to schedule aircraft on this route thereby making it a planned permanent use. The impact on Horsham town has not been assessed and the periods of greatest impact have not been made clear. This impacts existing dwellings, those currently under development and proposed new development. Whilst this route is one of a number of options under FASI-S it cannot be relied upon and the application should not pre-determine the FASI-S process.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council does not agree that WIZAD can be used in this way. This undermines the baseline growth.</p> <p>A full and appropriate set of metrics to determine the impact on the town needs to be used to determine the effect on the population of the use of WIZAD in this way and appropriate mitigation and compensation.</p> <p>Supplementary noise metrics should be used to supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects as a result of the increased use of WIZAD (route 9).</p> <p>We will review this in light of the comments of the TWG of the 9th February 2024.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): If there are no plans for normal use of the WIZAD route at night, there should be a requirement in the DCO to that effect.</p> <p>Additionally, noise controls should be put in place to limit the use of the WIZAD route during the daytime to levels that may be considered normal under the present mode of operation ie that of tactical offload route. The reliance on the route in future to facilitate expansion suggests that the airport is intending to change the nature of the use of the route contrary to the intention of how the</p>	<p>Noted, the N65 contours are effective at showing the noise footprint of the additional daytime air traffic expected to use the WIZAD Route 9 in the Northern Runway cases which is the same proportion as in the future base case. PEIR Appendix 4.3.1 provides air traffic forecasts and fleet mix. The proportion of air traffic assigned to each route will be reported in the ES. The proportions vary slightly from year to year as traffic varies. There are no plans to use WIZ at night.</p> <p>As discussed in the TWGs the existing WIZAD SID is to be used more in the future baseline, but not so as to require an airspace change. It is not used at night.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.12 shows the 2032 baseline Leq 16 hr. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. For daytime, Figure 14.9.1 shows the 2032 with Project Leq 16 hr, the largest for any future year. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. Changes in air noise below LOAEL are not significant.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.3 shows the 2019 baseline N65. Horsham town is outside the N65 20 contour. For daytime, Figure 14.6.14 shows the 2032 baseline N65. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. For daytime, Figure 14.9.15 shows the 2032 N65 with the Project, the largest N65 contour for any future year with the Project. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. The contour is slightly larger than the baseline 2032 contour indicating slightly more events above Lmax 65dB. Using the online air noise viewer to look at the area in the North of Horsham Town in more detail, for example at postcode RH12 5JY just south of the A264, the number of events above Lmax 65dB is expected to increase from 23.2 to 24.8 as a result of the Project in the noisiest year, 2032 with the noisiest fleet. The addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): As stated above, appropriate sets of metrics has been used to assess impacts in the Horsham area and across the entire study area, including supplementary metrics, and this has shown</p>	<p>Figures 14.6.3 and 14.6.12 of ES Noise and Vibration Figures – Part 1 [APP-063]</p> <p>Figure 14.9.15 of ES Noise and Vibration Figures – Part 2 [APP-064]</p> <p>Diagram 2.1.1 of ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling [APP-172]</p> <p>Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix F - Aircraft Fleets for Noise Modelling [REP3-071]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

		<p>NPR was to be used.</p> <p>HDC maintain their position likely significant effects are not appropriately identified by the LAeq,T metric and supplementary metrics should be used to identify likely significant effects.</p> <p>Updated position 12 August 2024 (21/08 clarified): HDC position is unchanged.</p> <p>The increase in airport capacity is linked to an increase in demand on congested airspace and as a result the JLAs and the HDC consider that the expansion will necessitate the increase in the use of WIZAD, Route 9; or routes by a different name proposed under FASI-S that will adhere to a similar initial routing but depart south from the main runway rather than turning eastward.</p>	<p>the effect of the increased flights on Route 9 as a result of the Project will be insignificant in this area.</p> <p>Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix F - Aircraft Fleets for Noise Modelling [REP3-071] provides full details of the aircraft fleets modelled in each year.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) As noted at 2.17.2.1, the Project does not seek to change the way the Route 9 Standard Instrument Departure is used, and this will remain as a tactical offload route only.</p> <p>The use of supplementary metrics to assess the significance of air noise effects is contrary to CAP1616. The Applicant has made appropriate use of supplementary metrics (N65) to describe the noise change that can be expected, in accordance with that guidance.</p>		
<p>2.17.2.4</p>	<p>Air Noise</p>	<p>The reliance on the average noise level (the Leq) does not help to fully explain the effect on Horsham District whereas the metric that shows the number of aircraft noise events above a specified level (known as the “N above”) shows a marked effect. The lack of clarity over diurnal runway and departure route usage with an hourly breakdown have not allowed the effects of noise to be made clear. Key information has not been made available during the public consultation and prior to submission of the application.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We do not consider that there has been adequate modelling and sensitivity testing of different noise metrics.</p> <p>We are reviewing our position in relation to the comments on the policy of Sharing the Benefit.</p> <p>Please can full breakdowns of the fleet and hourly operation be provided. The air noise viewer does not facilitate the analysis we require for the Local Impact Report and therefore places the local authorities at a disadvantage.</p> <p>Supplementary noise metrics should be used to supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position likely significant effects are not appropriately identified by the LAeq,T metric and supplementary metrics should be used to identify likely</p>	<p>As discussed in the TWGs, the existing WIZAD SID is to be used more in the future baseline, but not so as to require an airspace change. It is not used at night.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.12 shows the 2032 baseline Leq 16 hr. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. For daytime, Figure 14.9.1 shows the 2032 with Project Leq 16 hr, the largest for any future year. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. Changes in air noise below LOAEL are not significant.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.3 shows the 2019 baseline N65. Horsham town is outside the N65 20 contour. For daytime, Figure 14.6.14 shows the 2032 baseline N65. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. For daytime, Figure 14.9.15 shows the 2032 N65 with the Project, the largest N65 contour for any future year with the Project. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. The contour is slightly larger than the baseline 2032 contour indicating slightly more events above Lmax 65dB. Using the online air noise viewer to look at the area in the North of Horsham Town in more detail, for example at postcode RH12 5JY just south of the A264 the number of events above Lmax 65dB is expected to increase from 23.2 to 24.8 as a result of the Project in the noisiest year, 2032 with the noisiest fleet. The addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect.</p>	<p>Tables 4.2.1 to 4.2.14 of ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling [APP-172]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.5: Air Noise Envelope Background [APP-175]</p> <p>Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix F - Aircraft Fleets for Noise Modelling [REP3-071].</p> <p>ES Addendum – Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

		<p>significant effects and effects that are not otherwise significant but for which an appropriate mitigation strategy should still exist.</p> <p>The Applicant should demonstrate sharing of benefits for the lifetime of the project from 2019 onwards.</p> <p>The Applicant has not made clear why and how the route will increase in use under baseline forecasts and how those forecasts will be achieved.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): 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:</p> <p><i>“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”.</i></p> <p>It is noted that the applicant failed to provide this information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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]. <p>In its response opposite (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.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August) HDC notes the Applicant’s proposed increases in baseline and the with project for the secondary metrics. However, the HDC position is that the pressure on airspace occurs as a result of the airport expansion thereby forcing the use of the route, in essence requiring that it be flight planned. For all other intents and purposes the capacity of the airport cannot be achieved without it else why would it be used. The Applicant has subsequently suggested that it may not be required and commented that the modelling is a worst case. That being so it is wholly appropriate that if it is worst case and it is not required that the use of this route is controlled through</p>	<p>Paragraph 14.2.44 of the ES described how the reference to Sharing the Benefits of aircraft noise emission reduction has been removed from the government’s Overarching Aviation policy Statement in March 2023. We consulted on sharing the benefits through our Noise Envelope Group in summer 2022.</p> <p>An illustration of sharing the benefits was discussed and is reported in pages 165 to 175 of ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope.</p> <p>The effect referred to as ‘marked’ in the N65 contours is due to the baseline for the Project.</p> <p>Departure route usage has been discussed with the TWG where Diagram 2.1.1 of Appendix 14.9.2 was provided.</p> <p>Full tables of operations for day and night periods by aircraft type will be provided.</p> <p>We consider all key information has been made available. The air noise viewer has provided easy access to all the noise contours and was viewed over 600 times during September 2023.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix F - Aircraft Fleets for Noise Modelling [REP3-071]. As noted above the council was consulted on which noise metrics to use and did not suggest additional metrics. As noted above using the N65 modelling results reported in the ES the addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over a baseline of 23 within an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The use of supplementary metrics to assess the significance of air noise effects is contrary to CAP1616. The Applicant has made appropriate use of supplementary metrics (N65) to describe the noise change that can be expected, in accordance with that guidance.</p> <p>The Applicant’s method for calculating sharing the benefits is taken from the Bristol Airport expansion Planning Inspectors Report as noted in ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [APP-179] and shared with the local authorities in June 2022.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an assessment of noise impacts for the Updated Central Case fleet in ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004] which is identified to be the most likely.</p>	<p>Noise Envelope [AS-023]</p>	
--	--	--	---	---------------------------------------	--

requirement and that the requirement extended to prevent the effects on the ground.

HDC have persistently expressed concern about the absence of secondary metrics in the noise envelope and have been consistent in this messaging throughout the examination period including citing that people will be newly overflowed and that the secondary metrics show this more clearly than the Leqs.

HDC are not of the opinion that the Applicant has sought to fulfil the policy requirement to share the benefit.

In oral evidence at ISH8 (summarised in **The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH 8: Agenda Item 6 – Noise [REP6-080]**) and in **ES Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope - Version 3 – Tracked [REP6-056]** submitted at Deadline 6 the Applicant confirmed its commitment to setting the noise envelope limits based on the Updated Central Case fleet.

An illustration of how the benefits of noise improvements is shared is provided in **ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [APP-179]** pages 165 to 175 in respect of the slower transition fleet. The methodology adopted is described fully in that appendix, and is that referred to in the Inspector's report on the Bristol Airport Planning Appeal Decision, Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/20/3259234, 2 February 2022. The Inspector in that decision considered sharing of the noise benefit in terms of the proportion of the full potential reduction in LOAEL and SOAEL contour areas possible due to fleet transition to quieter types, which is then taken up by ATM growth and the amount of reduction which is remaining. Page 168 of ES Appendix 14.9.9 provide a worked example of the method used for the Bristol airport case.

Applied to this case, 2019 can be taken as the baseline starting point. -The full potential reduction in LOAEL contour area in a given year, eg 2038, is the difference between the contour area with the 2019 fleet and the contour area with the fleet transitioned in the future baseline without the Project. The extent of the difference in the contour area which is then taken by ATM growth is the proportion of the benefit goes to the airport/industry, with the remaining share going to the community. Page 173 of Appendix 14.9.9 gives the calculation for the slower transition fleet. The results are reproduced in the table below along with the results of the same calculation using the Updated Central Case noise contour areas reported in **ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004].** and values for 2032 added.

	Daytime Benefit Share		Night Benefit Share	
	% to Community		% to Community	
	2032	2038	2032	2038
Slower Fleet Transition	-15%	50%	13%	66%
Updated Central Case Fleet	31%	58%	50%	69%

The following calculations show how these percentages are calculated for the Updated Central Case fleet (UCC) using the same methodology. The calculations for 2038 Slower Transition Fleet (SFT) are in Appendix 14.9.9 on p173 day and 175 night.

2038 UCC Day:
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 101.7

			<p>NE limit = 119.4 Full benefit available = 144.0-101.7 = 42.3 Community benefit = 144.0-119.4 = 24.6 % share to community = 24.6/42.3 = 58%</p> <p>2038 UCC Night: 2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 123.4 NE limit = 134.6 Full benefit available = 159.4-123.4 = 36.2 Community benefit = 159.4-134.6 = 24.8 % share to community 24.8/36.2 = 69%</p> <p>2032 UCC Day: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0 2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 116.5 NE Limit = 135.5 Full benefit = 144.0-116.5 = 27.5 Community benefit = 144.0-135.5 = 8.5 % share to community = 8.5/27.5 = 31%</p> <p>2032 UCC Night: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 134.5 NE Limit = 146.9 Full benefit available = 159.4-134.5 = 24.9 Community benefit = 159.4-146.9 = 12.5 % share to community = 12.5/24.9 = 50%</p> <p>2032 STF Day: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 125.6 NE Limit = 146.7 Full available benefit = 144.0-125.6 = 18.4 Community benefit = 144.0-146.7 = -2.7 % share to community = -2.7/18.4 = -15%</p> <p>2032 SFT Night: 2932 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 143.9 NE Limit = 157.4 Full available benefit = 159.4-143.9 = 15.5 Community benefit = 159.4-157.4 = 2.0 % share to community = 2.0/15.5 = 13%</p> <p>The change made to the noise envelope limits to reflect the Updated Central Case, increases the share of the benefits going to the community.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>In 2019 the area of the Leq16 hr day contour was 136.0 and the area of the Leq 8 hr night contour was 159.4. With the noise envelope limits now based on the Updated Central Case Leq, 16 hour day or Leq, 8 hour night contours, for any year of operation the noise envelope ensures that air noise contours do not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and that an amount of the benefit of technological improvements in noise is always required to be shared.</p> <p>As can be seen from the above, the extent to which the benefits of improvements in noise performance are shared with the community -is greater in 2038 than it is in 2032, and this is because in the early years there is anticipated to be a greater increase in the number of ATM's, which would be expected of any airport expansion project.</p> <p>The above summarises a calculation of how the benefits of improvements in aircraft noise performance are shared. There are also significant wider socio-economic benefits of the airport which arise from the point the runway opens and which are relevant to the consideration of the benefits of the Project as a whole.</p>		
2.17.2.5	Air Noise	<p>The quantification of the impacts does not take into consideration the cumulative impacts of the different types of airport related noise that have been modelled independently. This includes the combined effect of Gatwick's predicted baseline growth and the Northern Runway for awakenings, the difference in the absolute sound levels within Horsham District and the changes to those as a result of development. The Applicant has not provided any data that will help explain how people will experience the sound, for example the single mode contours.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We note the applicant's comments but do not consider it addresses our concerns,</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has not provided any response to the request for information relating to single mode contours. The Applicant provides information on single mode noise at representative community locations (Table 4.2.1 to Table 4.2.14 [REP-APP-172] so clearly has modelled single mode contours. Through presenting the single mode noise predictions, the Applicant acknowledges that they provide important information on understanding noise effects. As such, it is requested that the Applicant provides single mode contours for all assessment years.</p> <p>The Council shares similar concerns to those expressed by the UKHSA in their representation: UK Health Security Agency RR [RR-4687].</p>	<p>Cumulative noise impacts are assessed in Section 14.11 of ES Chapter. The reasons why this is done qualitatively instead of quantitatively are explained.</p> <p>The use of single mode contours is discussed at Row 13.53 of this table.</p> <p>Noise changes in Horsham District is discussed at Row 13.40 of this table.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): With regards awakenings, paragraph 7.4.2 of ES Appendix 14.9.3 clearly gives the total number of awakening in the future baseline (i.e. with predicted baseline growth) as well as with the Project as follows (and is noted as lower than the 2019 baseline):</p> <p><i>The numbers of awakenings estimated due to aircraft noise are as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2019 base 32,317 • 2032 Central Case base 26,508 • 2032 Central Case with Project 29,560 • 2032 STF Case base 29,061 • 2032 STF Case with Project 32,843 <p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>With regards single mode contours, this issue has been discussed in the Topic Working Group Meetings. The Applicant responded to a technical note issued on behalf of the local authorities on 6 January 2023 in relation to noise metrics. The response was circulated to the local authorities on 3</p>	<p>Section 14.11 of ES Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration [APP-039]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated Position (August 12) The position on awakenings remains unchanged. Whilst the Applicant may have followed the methodology to calculate the awakenings, the reporting, interpretation and conclusions diverge from the basis of the original work. The absence of data for all scenario years and lack of presentation about of total additional noise induced awakening as a result of aviation noise associated with Gatwick is considered to be a serious omission. The use of single mode contours is crucial to understanding where and when people are affected by noise and HDC and this has not been presented despite repeated requests to do so throughout the process.</p> <p>HDC does not agree with statements that have been made by the Applicant in response to the original concern.</p>	<p>February 2023 as part of the papers for Noise TWG 4 of 8 February 2023. The issue is addressed directly on page 374 of ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023]. Leq 16 hr and Leq 8 hour are defined as average modal split by the Department for Transport when defining LOAEL. This is because long term noise effects such as annoyance and sleep disturbance are not determined by either noise levels on westerly operating days or by noise levels on easterly operating days, but by the combination of both as experienced in the relevant proportions over the long term. CAP 1506: <i>Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014: Aircraft Noise and Annoyance, Second Edition</i> (July 2021) concludes that: <i>“Practically, this means that single-mode contours are unsuitable for decision making, but that they may be helpful for portraying exposure and changes to exposure. Of the average-day modes, the existing 92-day summer average mode was found to correlate better than shorter average modes. There was therefore no evidence found to support a change from the current practice of basing LAeq,16h on an average summer day.”</i></p> <p>The awakenings study was carried out specifically in response to comment from UK Health Security Agency on the PEIR and adopts the methodology they refer to.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9) The Applicant disagrees with the Council’s interpretation of the significance of one additional awakening and has provided reasons why, including in The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 7 Submissions [REP8-115]</p>		
2.17.2.6	Air Noise	<p>There is an overreliance on limited metrics by the Applicant to describe and place control on sound whereas the Council’s view is that a range of metrics, stated for different periods, are needed to understand effects upon (and mitigation required for) certain appropriate areas.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We note the applicant’s comments but do not consider it addresses our concerns,</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): No update has been provided by the Applicant on this matter.</p> <p>Updated Position (August 12)</p> <p>The Applicant has not provided further breakdown for different metrics about when the effects of the proposal are most likely to have an impact.</p>	<p>The ES provides forecast noise modelling for the 2019 baseline, 2029, 2032, 2038 and 2047. For each year, noise contour data is provided for primary and secondary noise metrics, for the baseline and Project case, and for two rates of fleet transition. This is sufficient to assess the likely significant effect of the project and has allowed the ES to specify the required noise mitigation in line with guidance and policy.</p> <p>The ES provides 48 noise contour maps for 2019, 2032, and 2038. Noise contours for 2029 and 2047 are not mapped in the ES figures because noise impacts are higher in other years and shown by the population and contour area data that is provided for these years. Contours for years mapped in the ES figures and the other years have been provided to LPAs on the TWG in the online Air Noise Viewer.</p> <p>Modelling of the 2019 base year movements with the predicted 2029 fleet mix has not been undertaken because this scenario will not arise because in all future years there will be some growth in traffic.</p> <p>Figure 14.9.30 illustrates how overflights from the northern runway, which will only be departures, compare with those from the main runway. The</p>	<p>ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039]</p>	Not Agreed

			<p>overflight information referred to in this comment as 'missing' is presented in Figure 14.9.31 which is incorrectly titled. It should be titled <i>2018 All Airport Overflights With Project Flights (20%)</i> as listed in the Table of content and described in paragraph 14.9.146 of ES Chapter 14. The overflight data provided covers both the base and Project cases and is considered a full illustration of how the numbers of overflights is likely to increase as a result of the Project across the whole area up to 35 miles from the airport that is overflown by Gatwick flights.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) As described immediately above the noise assessment uses the full range of noise metrics recommended in CAA guidance CAP1616.</p>		
Assessment					
2.17.3.1	Quantification of effects based on limited threshold information (Air Noise)	<p>Chapter 18 – Health and Wellbeing for the significant effects of noise is based on the disputed thresholds contained in ES Chapter 14 – Noise and Vibration. As the thresholds are disputed, this calls into question the calculation of the significance of effects.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We note the applicant's comments but do not consider it addresses our concerns.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): No update has been provided by the Applicant on this matter.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024). The Applicant's adviser has refused to accept that one additional noise induced awakening is a significant observable adverse effect level. As such if this is not taken into consideration or properly taken into consideration in Chapter 18 as we believe to be the case, the conclusions of Chapter 18 are incorrect.</p>	<p>The monetisation of the health effects of noise follows the current DfT methodology in WebTAG. Whilst other dose/response relationships and thresholds are discussed in various literature these are not in the current WebTAG methodology or other policy guidance. The monetisation of health effects is not used to judge the significance of noise effects.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The Applicant does not accept the thresholds and criteria are incorrect, and has provided further evidence of this in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101]</p>	The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) – Noise and Vibration [REP3-101]	Not Agreed
2.17.3.2	Assessment of significance of effects – the disregard of total effects of noise on health and annoyance by referring only to marginal impacts of the NRP over a rapidly increasing baseline (Air Noise)	<p>The Environmental Statement takes into consideration only the marginal increase in noise as a result of the additional capacity of the NRP. Given this, it disregards the existing health effects of the otherwise uncontrolled and unmitigated growth. For example, awakening data for the NRP part of capacity is below the Heathrow SOAEL of one additional awakening. However, this disregards the awakenings that occur now and the increase in awakenings that will occur with purported increase in baseline growth without the Northern Runway.</p>	<p>It is not the purpose of an Environmental Statement to either assess or identify mitigation for the impacts of the current operation. The ES, as prepared, assesses the likely significant effects of the Project, i.e. the increase in flights and use of the northern runway for some of these flights, over and above the baseline. It is widely accepted in EIA methodology to consider the future baseline when the Project occurs, as has been done in this case when looking at the changes and impacts that the Project will likely create. In fact, the future baseline noise impacts in this case are lower than currently, as illustrated in Diagrams 14.9.1 and 14.9.2 of Chapter 14 of the ES because in the future baseline the noise reduction due to fleet transition more than offsets traffic growth. This means the</p>	<p>ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme [APP-180]</p> <p>Applicant's Response to Actions ISH8,</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We cannot agree with the applicant's approach for reasons stated elsewhere.</p> <p>There are uncertainties around the forecasting and the baseline growth. The lack of sharing the benefit with the local community by the airport that would have been brought into focus with sensitivity testing of the 2019 movements with 2029 fleet technology. Furthermore, the existing operation appears to be causing harm without any mitigation and that appears set to become worse with the NRP.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has not addressed HDC's position on this matter. Any property that is predicted to experience, on average across the 92 day summer period, one additional aviation noise induced awakening per night due to aircraft noise should benefit from insulation.</p> <p>Updated Position: 12 August 2024 HDC 's position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>assessment of the Project against the future baseline shows larger impacts than when assessed against the current baseline, as explained in Section 9 of Chapter 14 of the ES.</p> <p>However, GAL propose a Noise Insulation Scheme to address not only the impacts of the Project but the total impacts of the airport in the future worst case year consistent with government policy.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant does not agree that the existing operation is 'without mitigation'. Gatwick Airport Ltd has a comprehensive noise management system, as laid out in the Noise Action Plan and summarised in the ES. Nonetheless, the Applicant is entirely content the ES appropriately assess the likely significant effects of the project for which consent is sought, including by reference to appropriate future baselines so as to ensure total impacts can be understood for the purpose of decision making.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The Applicant has explained why a single awakening is not significant and is not used to trigger noise insulation in 10.49.4 Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH 8: Agenda Item 6 – Noise.</p>	<p>Appendix A – Noise [REP6-087]</p>	
<p>2.17.3.3</p>	<p>Assessment of changes in sound levels (Air Noise)</p>	<p>There is insufficient consideration of the impacts of changes to noise levels for a range of metrics that lie between the LOAEL and SOAEL or above the SOAEL. An assessment of significance of the changes is required to determine if it is acceptable and if so, what mitigation is required in such circumstances.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Supplementary noise metrics should be used supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position on this matter</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024) HDC maintain their position on this matter.</p>	<p>Section 14.9 provides information of the changes in noise levels expected and the populations exposed to these changes (e.g. Tables 14.9.10 and 14.9.11. All metrics are discussed. There are 16 figures provided which show the noise changes expected for Leq 16 hr, Leq 8 hr, N65 and N60 metrics and Lmax change between the two runways is provided. Overflights and awakening changes and are mapped.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): This comment and others below again asks for the significance of effect to be judged using the supplementary noise metrics. Supplementary noise metrics, N65, N60, Lden, LNight, Lmax and overflights have been used to illustrate change in the ES as required by guidance and that guidance is clear that Leq 16 hr and Leq 8 hour are the primary metrics on which to judge significance for air noise.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The CAA guidance on assessing noise impacts in CAP1616 states <i>When considering noise impacts, the CAA will weigh the outcomes from 'primary' metrics over 'secondary' metrics. Primary metrics will be those that are used to quantify total adverse noise effects, such as the Department for Transport's TAG outputs. Secondary metrics will be those that are not being used to determine total adverse noise effects, but which are still able to convey noise effects, such as number above contours.</i> See 2.17.3.5 below for discussion on the N65 noise levels.</p>	<p>Section 14.9 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039]</p> <p>ES Noise and Vibration Figures Part 1 [APP-063]</p> <p>ES Noise and Vibration Figures Part 2 [APP-064]</p> <p>ES Noise and Vibration Figures Part 3 [APP-065]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

<p>2.17.3.4</p>	<p>WIZAD Route</p>	<p>Paragraph 14.6.39 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration describes a shift of 8% of traffic onto WIZAD (Route 9) westerly standard instrument departure route on which aircraft departing west turn south between Crawley and Horsham with usage predicted to be 13% by 2038. Whilst this is an existing Noise Preferential Route (NPR) it is a tactical offload route and is currently used very rarely (0% (rounded) in 2019). The Council considers that increased capacity at the Airport will drive traffic on to WIZAD (Route 9) resulting in a permanent significant noise effect, along with other impacts, which we do not consider have been properly assessed and which the Council seeks to resist.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Supplementary noise metrics should be used supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects as a result of the increased use of WIZAD (route 9).</p> <p>Reviewing in light of additional information provided at TWG of 9 February.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): This highlights how, in the case of intensification of an existing route, the LAeq,T metric is not sensitive enough to identify likely significant effects and supplementary metrics should be used. Restricting the normal use of WIZAD at night should be a DCO commitment and a control measure should be put in place to limit daytime use to the intention in the Noise Preferential Route.</p> <p>Updated Position 12 August 2024) HDC's position with the Applicant on the increased use of this route remains unchanged and supports the proposed requirement seeking additional controls over this route to provide certainty to the local community.</p>	<p>Noted, the N65 contours are effective at showing the noise footprint of the additional daytime air traffic expected to use the WIZAD Route 9 in the Northern Runway cases which is the same proportion as in the future base cases. PEIR Appendix 4.3.1 provides air traffic forecasts and fleet mix. The proportion of air traffic assigned to each route will be reported in the ES. The proportions vary slightly from year to year as traffic varies. There are no plans to use WIZ at night.</p> <p>The increased use of WIZAD as a result of the Project has been assessed and is not expected to be significant.</p> <p>As discussed in the TWGs the existing WIZAD SID is to be used more in the future baseline, but not so as to require an airspace change. It is not used at night.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.12 shows the 2032 baseline Leq 16 hr. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. For daytime, Figure 14.9.1 shows the 2032 with Project Leq 16 hr, the largest for any future year. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. Changes in air noise below LOAEL are not significant.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The CAA guidance on assessing noise impacts in CAP1616 states <i>When considering noise impacts, the CAA will weigh the outcomes from 'primary' metrics over 'secondary' metrics. Primary metrics will be those that are used to quantify total adverse noise effects, such as the Department for Transport's TAG outputs. Secondary metrics will be those that are not being used to determine total adverse noise effects, but which are still able to convey noise effects, such as number above contours.</i> See 2.17.3.5 below for discussion on the N65 noise levels.</p> <p>As a reminder of context, the assumed increase in the usage of WIZAD is a reasonable worst-case scenario to assess environmental impacts and is not required to achieve the airfield throughput capacity generated under the Proposed Development, i.e it is not the result of 'a decision by an airport and/or its Air Navigation Service Provider (ANSP) to redistribute air traffic from one SID to another...'. The WIZAD SID is not a flight plannable route and would continue to be operated in accordance with the current published protocols as set out in the UK Aeronautical Information Publication (UK AIP).</p> <p>The noise abatement procedures - including those that relate to the use of the WIZAD SID - set out in the UK AIP under Section 78(1) of the Civil Aviation Act 1982 are deemed by the Secretary of State to be appropriate for the purpose of limiting, or of mitigating the effect of, noise and vibration connected with the taking off of aircraft from London Gatwick.</p>	<p>14.6.12 of ES Noise and Vibration Figures – Part 1 [APP-063]</p> <p>Diagram 2.1.1 of ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling [APP-172]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>
-----------------	--------------------	--	---	---	-------------------

			<p>Under the Transport Act 2000 the CAA has a general duty to maintain a high standard of safety in the provision of air traffic services. Under the same act the Government has issued a licence to NATS (En Route) plc (NERL) to provide en-route air traffic services in the UK. This includes provisions that require NERL to manage the flow of air traffic for the purpose of expediting and maintaining an orderly flow of air traffic.</p> <p>The DCO is not an appropriate mechanism to put in place airspace restrictions that have the potential to impact the ability of the Air Navigation Service Provider to ensure the safe and efficient conduct of flight, in particular in relation to effective management of disruption or degradation of service due to events - such as adverse weather conditions - that impact the utilisation of the airspace.</p>		
2.17.3.5	Noise impact at Horsham District	<p>The Applicant has not adequately assessed the impact of noise within Horsham District meaning that the north of the District will be exposed to noisy aircraft events, particularly between 06:00 and 07:00 when sleep is at its most vulnerable.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Supplementary noise metrics should be used supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects as a result of the increased use of WIZAD (route 9). In particular, the use of overflights would help understand how communities are affected.</p> <p>The statement is noted that Route 9 is not proposed to be used at night but we continue to be of the view that the proposed use is a change to that intended and that the impacts have not been adequately considered.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position on this matter.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 12 August 2024): HDC maintain their position on this matter.</p>	<p>As discussed in the TWGs the existing WIZAD SID is to be used more in the future baseline, but not so as to require an airspace change. It is not used at night.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.12 shows the 2032 baseline Leq 16 hr. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. For daytime, Figure 14.9.1 shows the 2032 with Project Leq 16 hr, the largest for any future year. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. Changes in air noise below LOAEL are not significant.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.3 shows the 2019 baseline N65. Horsham town is outside the N65 20 contour. For daytime, Figure 14.6.14 shows the 2032 baseline N65. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. For daytime, Figure 14.9.15 shows the 2032 N65 with the Project, the largest N65 contour for any future year with the Project. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. The contour is slightly larger than the baseline 2032 contour indicating slightly more events above Lmax 65dB. Using the online air noise viewer to look at the area in the North of Horsham Town in more detail, for example at postcode RH12 5JY just south of the A264 the number of events above Lmax 65dB is expected to increase from 23.2 to 24.8 as a result of the Project in the noisiest year, 2032 with the noisiest fleet. The addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect.</p> <p>Under the current published operating protocols the WIZAD SID is only available for use 0700-2300. No flights on this route are expected between 0600 and 0700. The ES has assessed noise impacts across all districts. For the vast majority of the Horsham District Leq 16 hr and leq 8 hr night</p>	<p>Figures 14.6.3 and 14.6.12 of ES Noise and Vibration Figures – Part 1 [APP-063]</p> <p>Figure 14.9.15 of ES Noise and Vibration Figures – Part 2 [APP-064]</p>	Not Agreed

			noise levels are forecast to increase by less than 1dB, i.e. slightly, as a result of the Project. Figure 14.9.4 shows the small area within the district in the extreme north, north of Prestwood Lane, where Leq 16 hr noise levels are predicted to increase by between 1 and 2 dB (a low and not significant increase) in the worst case (2032 with the slower transition fleet).		
Mitigation and Compensation					
2.17.4.1	Noise Insulation Scheme	<p>The noise insulation scheme is not sufficient to protect those who will suffer adverse effects of noise and deal with the unintended consequences of the installation of noise insulation. There are multiple issues with the scheme, by way of example, the Council: (i) disagrees that the thresholds of qualification are set at the correct level and within the correct parameters; (ii) considers the Applicant has had no regard to overheating created as a result of the installation of noise insulation measures; (iii) disagrees that once installation is complete all ongoing maintenance and running costs are borne by the householder or person in charge of the premises; and (iv) considers that everyone should be eligible for the scheme whether or not they have qualified previously.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Points are still to be agreed with stakeholders. It should be stressed that overheating is not addressed by acoustic ventilators, which only introduce fresh air and do not have any cooling capability.</p> <p>Modulated MVHR alone is also unlikely to be capable of achieving sufficient cooling.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Ventilators are not sufficient for reducing overheating. The Applicant has not addressed the matter of overheating other than to offer blinds to windows exposed to direct sunlight (paragraph 4.2.4 [REP4-017]), which HDC deem as not sufficient.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Applicant did not address this matter to HDCs satisfaction in the noise insulation TWG and the HDCs position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>The noise insulation scheme proposed was presented as 4 slides and discussed in the TWG on 4th January 2023 and has been discussed with the TWG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The noise thresholds applied are in line with good practice and exceed government policy requirements. This issue has been responded to at Row 13.100 of Table 13 in Appendix 1. ii) Overheating has been addressed by the provision of acoustic ventilators to all rooms with acoustic insulation. Further details have been developed on the specification of these ventilators and this will be provided in the technical note on implementation of the scheme and shared with the TWG. This issue has been responded to at Row 13.102 of Table 13 in Appendix 1. iii) The running costs of acoustic ventilators have been discussed with the TWG and are very low particularly if only used in hot weather. iv) Everyone is eligible for the scheme whether or not they have qualified previously. This will be further clarified in a technical note on implementation of the scheme and shared with the TWG. <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided further details of the provision of noise insulation including the specification of acoustic ventilators to reduce overheating in 5.3 ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme Update Note [REP2-032].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) The Applicant has received specific comments on the NIS from the JLAs at Deadline 5, including relating to addressing overheating, and is arranging a TWG to discuss these and may then revise the NIS.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9) The TWG discussed overheating and the NIS has been updated to reflect what the Applicant can provide to address this concern, see ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme Tracked [REP8-086].</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme [APP-180]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme Update Note [REP2-032].</p>	Not Agreed

<p>2.17.4.2</p>	<p>Noise Envelope</p>	<p>The Council does not consider the noise envelope is fit for purpose on multiple grounds.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council's position has not changed. The applicant refers to the process of the noise envelope and we do not consider that it followed a balanced and reasonable approach.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position on this matter</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDC support the JLAs submission for an Environmentally Managed Growth Framework [REP4-050] and [REP5-093]. This is the preferred mechanism.</p>	<p>The approach to the noise envelope is considered to be entirely appropriate and there is no intention for any re-design of this to be undertaken.</p> <p>As described in ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope, each year an Annual Monitoring and Forecasting Report will be required to not only report monitoring of last year's performance against the Noise Envelope limits but to forecast compliance 5 years ahead, so that noise control measures can be planned and implemented in advance. The Noise Envelope, in Section 7.3, puts restrictions of further capacity declaration in the event that an exceedance of the noise envelope is forecast. The approach ensures action is taken in a timely manner to require compliance, with the sufficient threat of capacity restrictions if a breach is not remedied through the action plan measures within a reasonable time period. This strikes an appropriate fair balance, for the in the unlikely event of actual breach taking into account the purposefully forward-looking nature of the annual monitoring and forecasting approach.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.2.44 described how the reference to Sharing the Benefits of aircraft noise emission reduction has been removed from the government's Overarching Aviation Policy Statement in March 2023. We consulted on sharing the benefits through our Noise Envelope Group in summer 2022.</p> <p>An illustration of sharing the benefits was discussed and is reported in pages 165 to 175 of ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope.</p> <p>As communicated previously, GAL does not control airline fleet procurement and the airport sits within well-defined existing regulatory frameworks governing noise management, airport charges, slots and the requirement to consult on noise related actions which could be operating restrictions. Airline feedback to the Noise Envelope Group also explained that many factors can influence fleet procurement, some of which could be outside of the airlines' control. The York Aviation review of the PEIR for the Local Authorities noted '<i>We consider that the fleet mix assumed in the Central Case for assessment is somewhat optimistic, particularly in the early years given the deferral of aircraft orders that has occurred during the pandemic, but that the Slower Transition Case represents a robust worst case</i>'.</p> <p>The reasons for adopting the Slower Transition Fleet noise contours areas are given in ES Appendix 14.9.5 Air Noise Envelope Background at Section 3.2.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope [APP-177]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.5 Air Noise Envelope Background [APP-175]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>
-----------------	-----------------------	---	---	---	-------------------

			<p>It is not agreed that airspace change (which is a project in its own right and subject to its own assessment) can reasonably be assessed in the ES. Moreover, the noise impacts of more carbon emissions efficient aircraft and legislative drivers for their adoption are not able to be predicted. For further information on those matters please refer to sections ,6.5 and 6.6 of the Noise Envelope Document.</p> <p>The host local authorities will be provided with the annual monitoring and forecasting reports approved by the CAA. This will confirm the position in respect of compliance with the noise envelope. In the unlikely event of any breach of the terms of the DCO the Host LPA's may petition action and seek to rely on section 161 of the Planning Act 2008. Moreover, the host LPA's will also retain their role under Regulation 598/2014 in relation to the introduction of noise related operating restrictions pursuant to the DCO requirements. There is therefore a sufficient level of scrutiny and ability to take action provided for the host LPA's. The CAA, who have relevant knowledge and expertise, are the most appropriate persons to review the noise envelope submissions made pursuant to the DCO for the purpose of their verification.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an assessment of noise impacts for the Updated Central Case fleet in ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004] which is identified to be the most likely. In oral evidence at ISH8 (summarised in The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH 8: Agenda Item 6 – Noise [REP6-080]) and in ES Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope - Version 3 – Tracked [REP6-056] submitted at Deadline 6 the Applicant confirmed its commitment to setting the noise envelope limits based on the Updated Central Case fleet.</p> <p>An illustration of how the benefits of noise improvements is shared is provided in ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [APP-179] pages 165 to 175 in respect of the slower transition fleet. The methodology adopted is described fully in that appendix, and is that referred to in the Inspector's report on the Bristol Airport Planning Appeal Decision, Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/20/3259234, 2 February 2022. The Inspector in that decision considered sharing of the noise benefit in terms of the proportion of the full potential reduction in LOAEL and SOAEL contour areas possible due to fleet transition to quieter types, which is then taken up by ATM growth and the amount of reduction which is remaining. Page 168 of ES Appendix 14.9.9 provide a worked example of the method used for the Bristol airport case.</p> <p>Applied to this case, 2019 can be taken as the baseline starting point. -The full potential reduction in LOAEL contour area in a given year, eg 2038, is the difference between the contour area with the 2019 fleet and the</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

contour area with the fleet transitioned in the future baseline without the Project. The extent of the difference in the contour area which is then taken by ATM growth is the proportion of the benefit goes to the airport/industry, with the remaining share going to the community. Page 173 of Appendix 14.9.9 gives the calculation for the slower transition fleet. The results are reproduced in the table below along with the results of the same calculation using the Updated Central Case noise contour areas reported in **ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004].** and values for 2032 added.

	Daytime Benefit Share		Night Benefit Share	
	% to Community		% to Community	
	2032	2038	2032	2038
Slower Fleet Transition	-15%	50%	13%	66%
Updated Central Case Fleet	31%	58%	50%	69%

The following calculations show how these percentages are calculated for the Updated Central Case fleet (UCC) using the same methodology. The calculations for 2038 Slower Transition Fleet (SFT) are in Appendix 14.9.9 on p173 day and 175 night.

2038 UCC Day:

2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 101.7
 NE limit = 119.4
 Full benefit available = 144.0 - 101.7 = 42.3
 Community benefit = 144.0 - 119.4 = 24.6
 % share to community = 24.6 / 42.3 = 58%

2038 UCC Night:

2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 123.4
 NE limit = 134.6
 Full benefit available = 159.4 - 123.4 = 36.2
 Community benefit = 159.4 - 134.6 = 24.8
 % share to community 24.8 / 36.2 = 69%

2032 UCC Day:

2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 116.5
 NE Limit = 135.5
 Full benefit = 144.0 - 116.5 = 27.5
 Community benefit = 144.0 - 135.5 = 8.5
 % share to community = 8.5 / 27.5 = 31%

2032 UCC Night:

2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4

			<p>2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 134.5 NE Limit = 146.9 Full benefit available = 159.4-134.5 = 24.9 Community benefit = 159.4-146.9 = 12.5 % share to community = 12.5/24.9 = 50%</p> <p>2032 STF Day: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 125.6 NE Limit = 146.7 Full available benefit = 144.0-125.6 = 18.4 Community benefit = 144.0-146.7 = -2.7 % share to community = -2.7/18.4 = -15%</p> <p>2032 SFT Night: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 143.9 NE Limit = 157.4 Full available benefit = 159.4-143.9 = 15.5 Community benefit = 159.4-157.4 = 2.0 % share to community = 2.0/15.5 = 13%</p> <p>The change made to the noise envelope limits to reflect the Updated Central Case, increases the share of the benefits going to the community.</p> <p>In 2019 the area of the Leq16 hr day contour was 136.0 and the area of the Leq 8 hr night contour was 159.4. With the noise envelope limits now based on the Updated Central Case Leq, 16 hour day or Leq, 8 hour night contours, for any year of operation the noise envelope ensures that air noise contours do not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and that an amount of the benefit of technological improvements in noise is always required to be shared.</p> <p>As can be seen from the above, the extent to which the benefits of improvements in noise performance are shared with the community -is greater in 2038 than it is in 2032, and this is because in the early years there is anticipated to be a greater increase in the number of ATM's, which would be expected of any airport expansion project.</p> <p>The above summarises a calculation of how the benefits of improvements in aircraft noise performance are shared. There are also significant wider socio-economic benefits of the airport which arise from the point the runway opens and which are relevant to the consideration of the benefits of the Project as a whole.</p>		
2.17.4.3	Draft DCO	The control of air noise, by metric and operational limitation, is underrepresented in the DCO including (but not exclusively) the noise envelope requirements, use of routes, night flying restrictions,	This is a general comment and in general our responses to other comments refer. However, it should be noted that there are a wide range of noise control measures in place, as summarised in the Noise Action	Section 8 of ES Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration [APP-039]	Not Agreed

		<p>limitation on passenger numbers and freight movements; and conditional slot management.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The response does not address the numerous concerns associated with the noise envelope.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position on this matter.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024). The Applicant has not linked operational management and control with forecasts to provide any reasonable certainty that the predictions will be achieved or that the Applicant has the ability to manage the process. This is contrary to the requirement of the Airports National Policy Statement para 5.68 and the wider planning tests.</p>	<p>Plan, Section 8 of Chapter 14 of the ES and Section 4 of Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling, that are ongoing and will continue to control noise irrespective the DCO. The Night Restrictions is an example of one of a suite of measures enforced by the DfT that are assumed to continue outside the DCO by virtue of other applicable legal regimes.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) The Applicant has provided a full description of how the noise envelope will operate on a forward looking basis, beginning two years in advance of operations from the NRP commencing, so as to ensure the limits are not breached in 10.50.4 The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH8, Appendix A: Note on how the Applicant will plan to stay in the Envelope and why this will be effective. This approach is robust and will ensure that capacity cannot be made available where there is a forecast breach and that measures will be taken to prevent a breach arising.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling [APP-172]</p>	
<p>2.17.4.4</p>	<p>Lack of ongoing research to test adequacy of proposals</p>	<p>The ES utilises models to predict noise levels, the impacts, the locations of the impacts and inform mitigation. All decision-making is based on the knowledge described in the ES at the time of the determination of the application. There are no proposals for research to improve understanding as part of an iterative development of an environmental impact and management system.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The response does not address the issues raised by the Council.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position on this matter. The Applicant should note that they do not ensure that noise impacts are mitigated, and significant residual effects are identified in Table 14.13.1 [APP-039].</p> <p>Updated Position 12 August 2024</p> <p>The Applicant refers to a separate piece of work that they have declined to perform. That work consisted of two rounds of survey work. The first piece is substituted by the ANAS study but further work is required once the period of expansion subsides so that local exposure response functions to noise can be established. This will then inform decision making in respect of noise mitigation for noise exposure.</p> <p>The main thrust of this disagreement for which HDC has been very clear is that in providing a noise insulation scheme it expects the Applicant to perform both subjective and objective surveys to provide feedback about the scheme that can be used identify</p>	<p>GAL supports research into noise management in a number of areas and will continue to do so, as summarised in the Noise Action Plan secured via other legislative means. GAL commissions ERCD to carry out noise modelling including calibration every year. The Noise Envelope commits to a review of the data used to do this. GAL funds the Noise Management Board whose workplan covers a wide range of new ways to address noise impacts prioritised through community engagement. The Noise Action Plan includes a requirement to review the Noise Insulation Scheme which was last reviewed in 2019 with local authority input.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The noise mitigation measures secured through the DCO will ensure that noise impacts in the future are mitigated based on a series of worst case assumptions including the slower fleet transition. The noise insulation scheme for the Project relates to the future noise levels predicted in the noisiest future year, 2032 and will ensure significant effects on health and quality of life in the future are avoided in accordance with policy.</p> <p>The Noise Envelope includes a review process to ensure it remains relevant to future circumstances.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) As discussed with the JLAs in connection with the Section 106 agreement the CAA's Aircraft Noise Attitudes Study (ANAS) research study will provide sufficient coverage at Gatwick to research the effects of noise at the airport. The Applicant notes that Tandridge District Council has agreed this point in their SOCG. Table 14.13.1 is a summary of the ES chapter. It summarises as 'significant' air and ground noise impacts above SOAEL that are mitigated</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope [APP-177]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

		<p>unintended effects (such as overheating) and thereby inform subsequent phases of noise insulation scheme (including all the aspects of acoustics, ventilation and overheating) to ensure that there is continuous improvement in understanding and scheme delivery with the outcome of protecting public health.</p>	<p>through the NIS Inner Zone. In ES Chapter 14 section 14.9 these impacts are discussed fully and it is noted that the noise insulation meets the policy requirement to avoid significant effects of health and quality of life, as stated above.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9) The TWG discussed overheating and the NIS has been updated to reflect what the Applicant can provide to address this concern, see ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme Tracked [REP8-086]. The Airport's Noise Action Plan commits to reviewing the NIS every 5 years and it was one such review in 2019 that helped shape the current proposal.</p>		
2.17.4.5	Ground noise	<p>There seem to be little new provisions to control the ground noise from the Airport. During construction the noise bund is due to be removed but aircraft taxi-ing will continue. The creation of a flood area to the West of the runway will change the propagation characteristics of the sound and the Council is concerned about increases in ground noise as a result, particularly the lower frequencies.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Comments re: construction noise noted, however, this issue relates to ground noise, as differentiated in the ES.</p> <p>There are numerous errors in the ground noise assessment that need to be resolved before any meaningful discussion can be had. Additionally, it is not clear where barriers/ bunds are secured.</p> <p>Furthermore there is an expectation of ground noise modelling established so that the effects can be quantified.</p> <p>As there are existing controls over ground noise these ought to be modelled to determine how they change with the new configuration and the effect of the proposals to extinguish all other existing planning controls by virtue of the DCO.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The information provided in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101] does not fully address HDC's position. Ground noise should be assessed for all assessment scenarios. Engine ground running, auxiliary power unit and engine around taxi noise should all be included in LAeq,T ground noise predictions. Details of ground noise modelling both with and without the bund should be provided</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.1: Construction Noise and Vibration describes the Construction Noise Model identifying assumptions on the plant used, for which construction activities and in which period (day, night or both).</p> <p>Tables 14.9.1 and 14.9.2 provide predicted levels of construction noise for 24 periods during construction at community receptors in each of 12 receptors Areas, for daytime and night-time.</p> <p>Paras 14.9.5 and 14.9.46 of ES Chapter 14: Noise Vibration explain that construction will be carried out in accordance with ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice. Table 14.9.3 of Chapter 14, identifies relevant "Best Practical Means" measures which will be adopted. Where noise barriers have been identified as practicable they have been included within the assessment as discussed in paras 14.9.50 – 14.9.52.</p> <p>The need to minimise the time when part of the existing noise bund will be removed before the new bund and barrier are complete has been recognised and hence has been addressed in the construction programme. Where necessary to maintain noise screening a strip of the existing bund will be left during the construction as a temporary barrier.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix B - Ground Noise Fleet Assessment (Doc Ref 10.13.2) which provides an updated assessment of ground noise with the slower transition fleet and further details of how provision of noise insulation will be also based on predicted levels.</p> <p>As explained in ES Chapter 5: Project Description [REP1-016] (paras 5.2.93 to 5.2.94), the western end of the existing noise bund would be removed, before the new noise bund and wall is built to replace it. The western end would be removed within the first year of the airfield works, and there will be a period up to six months when part of the bund will be</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.1: Construction Noise and Vibration [APP-171]</p> <p>ES Chapter 14: Noise Vibration [APP-039]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Plan (REP1-021)</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>to identify any temporary likely significant effects. Ground noise should be included in the outer zone for noise insulation.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDCs position remains that the LAeq,T is the most appropriate metric so assess engine ground run noise, which the Applicant states "...lasts in the region of 30-60 minutes". This is particular important to understand effects of ground running activities at the western end of the Juliet runway. HDC would like to understand how receptors will be affected during the period when there will be no barrier/ bund in place to screen ground activities. This point could be addressed through a commitment that there would be no ground running activities at the western end of the Juliet runway during the period when the existing bund has been removed and he replacement barrier/bund fully built.</p> <p>HDC would welcome the Applicant providing detailed results of ground noise modelling identifying temporary significant effects when there is no barrier or bund in place. This should be in the form of noise contours in 3dB increments from LOAEL upwards (and change in noise contour) to identify temporary significant effects during the period when the existing bund has been demolished and before the new barrier/ bund is complete. HDC maintain their position that the ground noise insulation scheme should include an Outer Zone.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024) HDC is seeking a new requirement for a ground noise management plan to ensure that there are proper controls in place for the consideration and control of ground noise.</p> <p>Areas of Horsham District are likely to be affected by ground noise operations as a result of the use of the new taxiways and the impacts are not fully considered in the absence of the above information.</p>	<p>missing. ES Appendix 5.3.3: Indicative Construction Sequencing [REP2-016] shows the removal and replacement of the western noise mitigation as taking place between 2024 and 2026.</p> <p>Noise modelling was undertaken that showed during this period levels of ground noise could increase by up to 3dB at the nearest noise sensitive receptor, Westfield Place. This property is within the Noise Insulation Scheme Inner Zone and the Applicant would ensure the full package of noise insulation is offered and provided to this property before the bund is removed, as required by the property owner. The requirement to do so will be confirmed in updates to be made in the Code of Construction Practice, to ensure there is a clear secured need to follow this methodology. Noise modelling showed that further away beyond this property the greatest noise increase would be no more than 1dB during this temporary period, which would not generate any additional significant effects.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) Engine ground running is assessed as L_{max} levels because of its short duration (typically 2 minutes) and because it only occurs less than once a day. The above referenced report demonstrates that engine ground running, auxiliary power unit and engine around taxi noise do not contribute significantly to Leq noise levels from taxiing so including them would not change the conclusions of the assessment.</p> <p>The reason for not including an outer zone for ground noise are explained in ISH8 as recorded in para 2.2.15 of 10.49.3 The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH 8: Agenda Item 6 – Noise.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9) The Applicant has provided the ground noise modelling results for this temporary situation as reported above, ie 3dB increase at one property, Westfield Place, and no more than 1dB increase at others. The requirement to install noise insulation at Westfield place had been added to the CoCP so that significant effects will not arise.</p>		
2.17.4.6	Air Noise – Noise Envelope	<p>The process for the creation of a Noise Envelope did not facilitate the effective contribution of local authorities and community groups, contrary to CAP1129 guidance and good practice of other airports. The Council considers that the Noise Envelope, as presented, is not fit for purpose because it provides little incentive to stabilise noise levels let alone reduce them. It provides no local accountability and no meaningful penalties or sanctions if there is a failure in compliance.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.1: Construction Noise and Vibration describes the Construction Noise Model identifying assumptions on the plant used, for which construction activities and in which period (day, night or both).</p> <p>Tables 14.9.1 and 14.9.2 provide predicted levels of construction noise for 24 periods during construction at community receptors in each of 12 receptors Areas, for daytime and night-time.</p> <p>Paras 14.9.5 and 14.9.46 of ES Chapter 14: Noise Vibration explain that construction will be carried out in accordance with ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice. Table 14.9.3 of Chapter 14, identifies</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.1: Construction Noise and Vibration [APP-171]</p> <p>Tables 14.9.1, 14.9.2, 14.9.3 and paras 14.9.5 and 14.9.46 and 14.9.50 to 14.9.52 of</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Comments re: construction noise noted, however, this issue is about the noise envelope.</p> <p>Comments elsewhere on the noise envelope do not address these issues</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position that the Noise Envelope is not fit for purpose.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDC notes the additional information provided but this does not change the position of HDC. The HDC refers to the comments in [REP5-093] on the proposal for the Environmentally Managed Growth Framework and also notes that the Examining Authority felt it necessary to draft alternative proposals for requirements to completely replace those supplied by the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided no new information that assures the local authorities including the HDC that what they propose will achieve the controls necessary to meet with the requirements of paragraph 5.68 of the Airports National Policy Statement which places a test on the Secretary of State in considering the application.</p> <p>The HDC maintains it's position in it's comments about the Applicant's approach and continues to support the Environmentally Managed Growth Framework. In the absence of this HDC is pleased to support and assist the ExA in developing the proposals put forward in ISH9 agenda Annex B to achieve the outcome (please note that principles and outcomes were specified in [REP5-093] JLA submission.</p>	<p>relevant "Best Practical Means" measures which will be adopted. Where noise barriers have been identified as practicable they have been included within the assessment as discussed in paras 14.9.50 – 14.9.52.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024)</p> <p>Apologies for the above response that is not relevant. The noise envelope proposed in the DCO follows the guidance provided in CAP1129 including the need to consult on its development. Environmental Health Practitioners from Crawley, Reigate and Bansted, Mole Valley, Mid Sussex and Horsham were invited and variously attended six of the Noise Envelope Group Local Sub-Group and joint group meetings over summer 2022 as well as the TWG meetings to discuss the noise envelope proposals. An account of the material studied by the Noise Envelope Group and meetings held, is provided in ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [APP-179].</p> <p>We have explained within the Noise Envelope Group on several occasions that GAL does not control airline fleet procurement and that the airport sits within well-defined existing regulatory frameworks governing noise management, airport charges, slots and the requirement to consult on noise related actions which could be operating restrictions. Airline feedback to the Noise Envelope Group also explained that many factors can influence fleet procurement, some of which could be outside of the airlines' control.</p> <p>During consultation with the TWGs and the Noise Envelope Group (NEG) in summer 2022 the local authorities were consulted on the concept and make-up of a "Review Body" which would review and approve the outputs from the noise envelope when it becomes active. GAL's proposal for a sub-committee of GATCOM was opposed by the LPAs. The suggestion of having Local Authorities as the "Review Body" was also discussed during the NEG meetings and there was concern on the part of Community Representatives regarding there being a conflict of interest between economic benefit in that some councils receive money from the Airport as part of the S106 agreement but are impacted little by the noise from airlines using the airport. There was no clear resolution on the issue within the NEG and GAL subsequently decided that the CAA would be best placed to perform the function of Independent Reviewer as explained in ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope. The Local Authorities can monitor the outputs of the review process and in the case of a breach take enforcement action as appropriate.</p> <p>The Noise Envelope ensures accountability, and it also includes appropriate requirements for measures to be taken to address any breach,</p>	<p>ES Chapter 14: Noise Vibration [APP-039]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Plan [REP1-021]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [APP-179]</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--

			<p>including where appropriate restrictions on the operation of the airport until a breach is addressed.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) To the specific points: <i>The process for the creation of a Noise Envelope did not facilitate the effective contribution of local authorities and community groups, contrary to CAP1129 guidance and good practice of other airports.</i> We do not accept this and would suggest that any objective review of ES Appendices 14.9.8 Noise Envelope Group Output Report [APP-178] and 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023] would not support this conclusion.</p> <p>The Applicant also remains of the view that it went beyond what was envisaged by CAP1129, however, it also notes the CAA's response to ExQ1 [REP3-111] which states: <i>As a clarification, and as mentioned in the SOCG between the CAA and the Applicant, the most recent draft of which the Applicant is submitting at Deadline 3, the CAA notes that CAP1129 is not CAA guidance, but rather review of the noise envelope concept produced by the CAA to help the Government develop technical guidance on the concept.</i></p> <p>The Council considers that the Noise Envelope, as presented, is not fit for purpose because it provides little incentive to stabilise noise levels let alone reduce them. Following consideration of representations made by the Local Authorities GAL moved at ISH6 to noise envelope limits based on an Updated Central Case.</p> <p>The Applicant also provided a full description of how the noise envelope will operate on a forward looking basis, beginning two years in advance of operations from the NRP commencing, so as to ensure the limits are not breached in 10.50.4 The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH8, Appendix A: Note on how the Applicant will plan to stay in the Envelope and why this will be effective. This approach is robust and will ensure that capacity cannot be made available where there is a forecast breach and that measures will be taken to prevent a breach arising.</p> <p>The adoption of the Updated Central Case has the effect of stabilising noise the day Leq contour area to no greater than that in 2019, results in a smaller Leq night contour area than 2019, and provides a greater level of incentive to GAL owing to the extent of fleet change that must occur to enable capacity release while remaining within the envelope.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>It provides no local accountability and no meaningful penalties or sanctions if there is a failure in compliance.</p> <p>There is nothing in GAL's noise envelope proposal that would prevent the Local Authorities taking action against GAL for breach of the envelope under the provisions of the 2008 Planning Act.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has provided a full description of how the noise envelope will operate on a forward looking basis, beginning two years in advance of operations from the NRP commencing, so as to ensure the limits are not breached in 10.50.4 The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH8, Appendix A: Note on how the Applicant will plan to stay in the Envelope and why this will be effective. This approach is robust and will ensure that capacity cannot be made available where there is a forecast breach and that measures will be taken to prevent a breach arising.</u></p>		
2.17.4.7	Construction Noise	<p>The Applicant does not justify how the work is scheduled to ensure the impact of noise on residents is to be mitigated.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The comment relates to scheduling of construction work whereas the answer appears to relate to another matter. The comments are interesting nonetheless and if it appears elsewhere we will respond appropriately. It is observed that there are numerous errors in the construction noise assessment that need to be resolved before any meaningful discussion can be had.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Construction noise predictions are presented in Table 14.9.1 (daytime) and Table 14.9.2 (night-time) of Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration [APP-039]. There is some confusion regarding how these results apply to the construction noise assessment as they do not align with results presented in Table 3.1.2 and Table 3.1.3 [APP-171]. Paragraph 14.9.8 [APP-039] states: "The daytime SOAEL for residential receptors for construction noise is Leq, 12 hr 75 dB. This level of construction noise is not predicted at any of the representative community locations". This directly contradicts the identification of daytime exceedances of the SOAEL in paragraph 16.9.26 [APP-039]. The construction noise assessment assumes that percussive piling techniques will be avoided but there is no commitment to this in the Code of Construction Practice [REP4-007]. Percussive piling noise and vibration effects should be assessed unless a commitment can be made to avoid this method of piling.</p>	<p>GAL has considered the thresholds for noise mitigation carefully and proposed to offer noise insulation at levels below the DfT guidance, i.e. making the scheme more generous than others. The two zone scheme also provides a higher level of mitigation to these worst affected which GAL feels is appropriate. We welcome views on the details of this scheme and will work with stakeholders to develop those details including through discussions at the Noise Envelope Group. We have provided 100% easterly and 100% westerly operations noise predictions for ground noise, and operations noise predictions for air noise at the Community Representative Locations (See ES Appendix 14.9.2 Section 2, and discussion in para 14.9.67 to 14.9.84) however, these are provided for additional information and not used in the assessment of effects because the accepted criteria for judging those effects are the long-term average not the noise levels on a selection of the days when operations are only easterly or westerly.</p> <p>An enhanced NIS is to be introduced as part of the Project, with details included in ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme.</p> <p>The Government has been consulting on noise insulation schemes as part of its future aviation policy. In its consultation Aviation 2050 — the future of UK aviation (December 2018) it proposed a number of measures including: a) extending the noise insulation policy threshold beyond the current 63dB LAeq 16hr contour to 60dB LAeq 16hr. This is the average mode Leq 16 hr not single mode. The proposed scheme follows government guidance, in terms of the metric with which to define a noise insulation scheme, and in addition offers it at lower noise levels. For an airport such as Gatwick that has an uneven split between easterly and westerly operations in the summer (roughly 70/30) it would be unfair to use single mode contours that arise on 30% of days for some but 70% of days for others.</p>	<p>Section 14.8 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme [APP-180]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling [APP-172]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The July update does not adequately address the issues raised and raises further doubts and questions. For a DCO to be effective, it must ensure that all relevant information is secured within the DCO so there is transparency and it meets the planning tests including enforceability and workability. It is particularly important to ensure that all assumptions in the decision making process and mitigation are secured in the DCO. For example the Applicant identifies that no percussive piling technique has been assessed, but there is no commitment in the DCO or CoCP to prevent percussive piling from occurring. HDCs position is that a commitment to that effect should be secured. Chapter 14 explicitly uses noise barriers to avoid significant construction noise effects but the barriers are not secured in the DCO. The Applicant refers to and relies on "best practicable means" (bpm) and this includes the use of barriers. Reliance on bpm is not sufficient as the construction noise assessment <i>relies</i> on the specific height and alignment of these barriers to avoid significant effects. If the construction noise barriers are not secured in the DCO then the construction noise assessment cannot be relied upon.</p> <p>HDC urges the Applicant to address these matters throughout the Environmental Statement as they are simple to address and it is possible that some agreement may be reached.</p> <p>HDC have clearly identified where there are errors in the construction noise assessment. (It makes no guarantee that it has identified all errors as this is a task for the Applicant). However, the Applicant denies this and as such it is not possible to reach agreement until these matters are addressed to the satisfaction of the HDC.</p> <p>HDC would like to the Applicant to provide a fully revised and updated Chapter 14.</p>	<p>Further detail on implementation of the NIS is being prepared and will be shared with the TWG. Further prioritisation will use higher noise level bands to implement the scheme to those most affect first.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024)</p> <p>Apologies for the above response that is not relevant.</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.1: Construction Noise and Vibration describes the Construction Noise Model identifying assumptions on the plant used, for which construction activities and in which period (day, night or both). Paragraphs 14.9.1 to 14.9.3 of ES Chapter 14 explain how one or more of 17 activities has been modelled at each of 170 areas of works within one or more of 24 periods across the 15 year construction programme from 2024 to 2038. Para 14.9.3 explains how a worst case has been assessed in terms of possible overlap of works. Night work has been minimised to minimise impacts.</p> <p>The CoCP requires, as part of Best Practicable Means to minimise noise disturbance, noisy activities outside of normal working hours to be minimised (ES Appendix 5.3.2: Code of Construction Practice [APP-082] para 5.9.8). The Local Planning Authority will review the contractor's proposed Best Practicable Means to minimise noise disturbance in the Section 61 application before granting prior consent for the works to commence.</p> <p>The Applicant is not aware of errors in the construction noise assessment and requests that HDC shares their observations.</p> <p>Updated position [July 2024]</p> <p>The ES assesses the likely significant effects of the Project based on the likely methods of construction that do not include permissive piling,</p> <p>As noted in ES Paragraph 14.9.5 <i>Construction noise impacts are reported across the 12 Receptor Areas that together cover the land around the perimeter of airport and highways scheme, as for ground noise, shown in Figure 14.4.2. Noise levels have been modelled at all buildings across these areas and the numbers of receptors impacted above LOAEL and SOAEL levels at day and night are reported in ES Appendix 14.9.1: Construction Noise Modelling. In order to give a broad picture of the noise levels across the full construction period, noise levels for the works in each of the 24 periods are reported at an example receptor in each of the 12 receptor areas (see Figure 14.2.2).</i></p> <p>In total the construction noise model gave results for each phase of work at 5,600 properties. It is not practicable or necessary to report all of these. The majority result identified that impacts were not significant, and where</p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--

			<p>impacts are significant these have been reported. The modelled noise levels in Table 14.9.1 are for the 12 representative receptors described. In general, these are closest to the works, and so have the highest noise levels, but not in all cases because the closest receptor with the highest noise levels varies across the different phases of works within any assessment area. The approach to reporting the effects is to report how many properties are above the LOAEL and SOAEL (in the tables in Appendix 14.9.1), to apply mitigation, and to re-estimate how many properties are subject to residual impacts (in the tables in Appendix 14.9.1), and to discuss this area by area within Table 14.9.4. This way of reporting as numbers of properties above LOAEL and SOAEL was used in Appendix 14.9.1 of the PEIR and was also discussed in the Topic Working Group.</p> <p>Hence, for example, paragraph 14.9.8 discusses 8 receptors closer to the works with noise levels above SOAEL predicted despite Table 14.9.1 not including these in the 12 representative receptors. The paragraph explains that these are in the Longbridge Road and Balcombe Rd receptor areas, both of which include sizable worksites for which no one receptor can be chosen as representative of the worst case impacts.</p> <p>There are no errors identified in the assessment.</p> <p>The construction noise barriers identified in paras 14.9.50 – 14.9.512 were discussed and agreed as practicable with the GAL construction team. For example, they are located on site boundaries and will not interfere with access of other requirements. Paragraph 5.9.4 of the CoCP requires the contractor to use Best Practicable Means including the provision of noise barriers (bullet point 2). Therefore, if noise mitigation is required these noise barriers will be provided to meet this requirement. If the contractor finds other ways to reduce noise levels (for example through quieter plant) to avoid impacts they may not be. The Local Authority will be asked to vet the final choice of mitigation within the Section 61 Application before work begins to ensure the BPM requirement is met once the final methods of working are known.</p> <p>The ES assesses the likely significant effects of the Project based on the likely methods of construction that do not include permissive piling.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9)</p> <p>In their comment at Deadline 5 the council refers to paragraph 16.9.26, when it means 14.9.26. This paragraph refers to the range of predicted levels at all the receptors in the Longbridge Rd assessment area, whereas paragraph 14.9.8 is referring to the single representative community location within each of the assessment areas. These paragraphs do not contradict one another. No errors have been identified in the assessment.</p>		
2.17.4.8	Air Noise (Mitigation)	The proposals for mitigating aircraft noise rely on the noise insulation of properties. These proposals are too narrowly defined and should not solely be based on Leq. Grants should be based on	More in the future baseline, but not so as to require an airspace change. It is not used at night.	ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation	Not Agreed

	<p>single mode contours and not standard mode contours as the Applicant proposes. The Applicant must make provision for overheating assessments and overheating mitigation works due to the increased risk as a result of noise insulation and cover the ongoing costs of use and maintenance.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Applicant’s response appears to have been cut off and possibly relates to another matter,</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The DCO should contain a requirement that the northern runway will not normally be operated at night and will normally only be used for departures. Additionally, a commitment should be made that normal use is for Code C aircraft only. Ventilators are not sufficient for reducing overheating. The Applicant has not addressed the matter of overheating other than to offer blinds to windows exposed to direct sunlight (paragraph 4.2.4 [REP4-017]), which HDC deem as not sufficient.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024). The HDC position has not changed and there is no agreement.</p> <p>HDC additional comments on this matter: HDC considers that the Applicant has not shared the benefits by reference to the proposal for calculating no growth no development scenario as set out in the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Report, paragraph 2.3.13 of Appendix 6.2.2 [APP-095], The implication of that is that the Applicant should present the 2019 ATM with the 2029 fleet composition to show how improvements in technology would reduce noise levels around the airport.</p> <p>The Applicant has instead appeared to have shown the 2029 movements with baseline growth using the older fleet from 2019 to calculate the area impacted by noise. This is inappropriate and does not satisfy the requirements of the Planning Inspectorate, the local authorities or the principles of the formal environmental impact assessment process. It can only be described as a perverse interpretation of how such an assessment should be conducted and provides disproportionately high benefit to the airport with little, if any benefit to the communities affected.</p> <p>HDC retain the position that the noise insulation package, including dealing with overheating created as a result of the need to have windows closed. The offer by the Applicant is unsatisfactory and does not have regard to the cooling hierarchy and does not</p>	<p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.12 shows the 2032 baseline Leq 16 hr. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. For daytime, Figure 14.9.1 shows the 2032 with Project Leq 16 hr, the largest for any future year. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. Changes in air noise below LOAEL are not significant.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.3 shows the 2019 baseline N65. Horsham town is outside the N65 20 contour. For daytime, Figure 14.6.14 shows the 2032 baseline N65. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. For daytime, Figure 14.9.15 shows the 2032 N65 with the Project, the largest N65 contour for any future year with the Project. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. The contour is slightly larger than the baseline 2032 contour indicating slightly more events above Lmax 65dB. Using the online air noise viewer to look at the area in the North of Horsham Town in more detail, for example at postcode RH12 5JY just south of the A264 the number of events above Lmax 65dB is expected to increase from 23.2 to 24.8 as a result of the Project in the noisiest year, 2032 with the noisiest fleet. The addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.2.44 of the ES described how the reference to Sharing the Benefits of aircraft noise emission reduction has been removed from the government’s Overarching Aviation policy Statement in March 2023. We consulted on sharing the benefits through our Noise Envelope Group in summer 2022. An illustration of sharing the benefits was discussed and is reported in pages 165 to 175 of ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024) Apologies for the above response that is not relevant.</p> <p>Aircraft noise mitigation does not solely rely on Noise Insulation The Applicant does not rely solely on noise insulation to mitigate aircraft noise. Section 14.8 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039] summarises the approach noise mitigation consistent with the ICAO balanced approach. The Northern Runway will be operated using all these mitigation measures, it will not operate at night between 2300 and 0600, and it will be used for departures only.</p> <p>Single Mode Contours This issue has been discussed in the Topic Working Group Meetings. GAL responded to a technical note issued on behalf of Local Authorities on</p>	<p>Scheme Update Note [REP2-032].</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>address this matter adequately.</p> <p>It is essential that for those most affected the single mode contours are used as the basis for awarding who receives an offer of the noise insulation package as this reflects the <i>lived experience</i> of those who are most exposed to aviation noise.</p> <p>The JLAs have repeatedly highlighted that there is variation in the operation of the airport and that the split of Easterly to Westerly operation can vary from year to year and the only way to provide certainty is to HDC consider that it is completely consistent with the requirement of the three bullet points under paragraph 5.68 of the Airports National Policy Statement and the airport must update its scheme to reflect this.</p> <p>Despite a topic working group in July where many ideas of the local authorities that had been raised and suggestions made to have regard to the cooling hierarchy (contained in the Crawley Borough Council local plan), the Applicant has only provided limited updates to the scheme. The concerns of HDC have not been addressed.</p>	<p>6th January 2023 in relation to noise metrics. The response was circulated to Local Authorities on 3rd February 2023 as part of papers for Noise TWG 4 of 8th February 2023. The issue is addressed directly on page 374 of ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Eⁿvelope.</p> <p>Leq 16 hr and Leq 8 hour are defined as average modal split by DfT when defining LOAEL. This is because long term noise effects such as annoyance and sleep disturbance are not determined by either noise levels on westerly operating days or by noise levels on easterly operating days, but by the combination of both as experienced in the relevant proportions over the long term. CAP 1506 Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014: Aircraft Noise and Annoyance, Second Edition, July 2021 concludes: that <i>“Practically, this means that single-mode contours are unsuitable for decision making, but that they may be helpful for portraying exposure and changes to exposure. Of the average-day modes, the existing 92-day summer average mode was found to correlate better than shorter average modes. There was therefore no evidence found to support a change from the current practice of basing LAeq, 16h on an average summer day.”</i></p> <p>Single mode noise contours would not provide an appropriate representation of noise effects. However, GAL has issued information in the ES on noise levels on easterly and westerly days, because this may be helpful in illustrating changes in exposure. For this GAL chose 7 Community Representative Locations (See ES Figure 14.9.1) as described in para 14.9.150 and 14.9.151 of the ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration. Paras 14.9.152 to 14.9.158 of ES Chapter 14 describe the noise changes that the NRP will produce, including on easterly days and westerly days, using the data in terms of Leq, 16 hr, Leq 8 hr, N65, and N60 for average mode, westerly mode and easterly mode provided for 2032 with the Project, the 2032 base and 2019 base, for the central case and slower transition fleet in 14 tables 4.2.1 to 4.2.14 of ES Appendix 14.9.2: Air Noise Modelling.</p> <p>If 100% easterly contours were generated and reported they would extend further to the East than average mode contours. Likewise, if 100% westerly contours were generated and reported they would extend further to the West than average mode contours. If adopted for a noise insulation scheme as suggested these two additional areas to the East and West would be included. The additional area to the East would be within the combined 100% model split contours roughly 30% of the summer 92-day period, i.e. on average 28 days. The additional area to the West would be within the 100% model split contours roughly 70% of the summer 92-day period, i.e. on average 64 days. It would be inequitable to offer a noise insulation package to the additional area to the West and so the additional area to the East that is within the noise level 2.3 times less often.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>Overheating The Applicant has provided further details of the provision of noise insulation including the specification of acoustic ventilators to reduce overheating in ES Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme Update Note [REP2-032].</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024)</p> <p>Requirement 19 (2) of the DCO [REP6--6] states: <i>The repositioned northern runway must not be used between the hours of 23:00 – 06:00 but may be used between these hours where the main runway is temporarily non-operational by reason of an accident, incident or structural defect or when maintenance to the main runway is being undertaken.</i></p> <p>Requirement 19 (3) of the DCO [REP6-006] states: <i>(3) Subject to sub-paragraph (4), the repositioned northern runway must not be used:</i></p> <p><i>(a) for aircraft landings; or (b) for departures of aircraft larger than Code C aircraft.</i></p> <p>The matters requested are already secured.</p> <p>The Applicant has received specific comments on the NIS from the JLAs at Deadline 5, including relating to addressing overheating, and is arranging a TWG to discuss these and may then revise the NIS</p>		
2.17.4.9	Noise control regime	<p>There is a lack of confidence in the Applicant to deliver and implement a meaningful noise control regime that takes into account the needs of the local communities.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Council position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024): The Council position remains unchanged. The Applicant’s proposal is considered to be unworkable and unenforceable.</p>	<p>This is a general comment that will be discussed in the TWG. The DCO provides assurance that the various noise control measures including the Noise Envelope and the Noise Insulation Scheme will be delivered.</p> <p>Details of enforcement, compliance and engagement with local communities and stakeholders on the Noise Envelope have been set out previously in response to the issue at Row 13.109 of Table 13 in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): With regards the Noise Envelope the Applicant will develop the process and report in the year before dual runway commences to provide reassurance that the process is in place and working as planned before operations begin.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope [APP-177]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme [APP-180].</p>	Not Agreed

			<p>Updated Position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a full description of how the noise envelope will operate on a forward looking basis, beginning two years in advance of operations from the NRP commencing, so as to ensure the limits are not breached in 10.50.4 The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH8, Appendix A: Note on how the Applicant will plan to stay in the Envelope and why this will be effective. This approach is robust and will ensure that capacity cannot be made available where there is a forecast breach and that measures will be taken to prevent a breach arising.</p>		
2.17.4.10	Compensation	<p>There is no offer of compensation for people affected by the nuisance they are likely to experience. This should be addressed by the Applicant.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): While it is acknowledged that aviation noise is exempt from statutory claims – Civil Aviation Act 1982 This does not address compensation which should be made available over and above mitigation against noise impacts.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Council position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024): The Council position remains unchanged. Despite the Applicant's comments, compensation of circa£1,000 was offered in 2014 for the wide spaced Southern Runway proposal for residents within the 54 daytime LAeq area . HDC sees no reason why this should not apply now as the minimal level for compensation but taking into consideration a wider area. Compensation is not a substitute for mitigation.</p>	<p>The Noise Insulation Scheme is separate from the Noise Envelope.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The DCO which is sought does not alter any statutory basis on which compensation may be claimed in connection with the operation of the airport.</p>	ES Appendix 14.9.10: Noise Insulation Scheme [APP-180].	Not Agreed
2.17.4.11	Noise envelope	<p>The Applicant should take a “mitigate to grow” approach to protect communities affected by airport operations.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): There should be no allowance for Noise Envelope limits to increase over 2019 baseline contour areas.</p> <p>The noise envelope does none of the things that the applicant states.</p> <p>The Council has made suggestions as to how it may be possible to move toward these, which have not been take forward by the applicant.</p>	<p>The progress of the Luton Airport example was discussed in both the Noise Envelope Group and the TWG meetings. The review, monitoring and enforcement process in respect of the Limits included as part of the Noise Envelope are included in sections 6 to 8 of the Noise Envelope (including the provision for 5 yearly reviews – section 6.2).</p> <p>The purpose of the fixed noise limits being 9 years after opening is to give certainty that noise levels will reduce. GAL consider the Slower Transition Fleet forecasts for this period are sufficiently certain that GAL can commit to these limits.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The noise envelope as proposed limits noise and provides certainty of this by prescribing an annual forecasting, monitoring and reporting process to demonstrate compliance, with actions</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope [APP-177]</p> <p>GAL provided detailed explanations of the regulatory framework the Airport Operated within, and options for a review body in the Noise Envelope Group meetings in July 2022 (see ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Demonstrating that benefits are shared in 2038 is not appropriate and it should be demonstrated how benefits are shared for all assessment years. Sharing the benefits should be based on 2019 baseline levels. Use of the slower transition case means all benefits of new aircraft technology should go to the airport and none to the communities. The Applicant identifies the central case as the most likely so it should be used to define Noise Envelope limits.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDCs position is that the original Central Case is the most likely future fleet so would like to see the Noise Envelope limits and, hence, sharing the benefits based on the Central Case. HDCs position is that it is incorrect to account for future baseline growth and sharing the benefits should be based around future baseline scenarios where no growth in the 2019 fleet occurs. Provision of this information was requested by the Planning Inspectorate at scoping. HDC would firstly like to refer to the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Report in paragraph 2.3.13 of Appendix 6.2.2 [APP-095], which states: <i>“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”.</i> This request was ignored by the Applicant in its Scoping Response set out in 2.3.11 of Appendix 6.2.3 [APP-096]. This was raised in the Local Impact Report - Appendix C: Noise and Vibration District and Borough Profiles [REP1-100], which the Applicant again chose to ignore.</p> <p>Updated Position 12 August 2024 HDC maintain the position that the noise should progressively reduce and that capacity should not be released until such time as it can be demonstrated there will be a reduction in noise and that the benefits of new technology should be shared with the local communities. While HDC is pleased that the Applicant now appears to have reversed it’s decision that the “sharing the benefit” policy did not apply, it cannot agree with the calculation methodology that is contrary to the requests of the Planning Inspectorate and the local authorities and is not reasonable.</p>	<p>required to be taken to avoid and if necessary remedy a breach of the noise envelope limits. The council’s suggestion involves lower noise limits that may prevent the Applicant from realising the full capacity of the Project.</p> <p>The council also requests ‘<i>There should be no increase in noise limit from the 2019 baseline noise contour areas</i>’. ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039] paragraphs 14.2.40 to 14.2.48 describe the government’s latest policy statement of aviation noise <i>Policy Paper, Overarching Aviation Noise Policy, DfT, March 2023</i>. This includes the following: <i>We consider that “limit, and where possible reduce” remains appropriate wording. An overall reduction in total adverse effects is desirable, but in the context of sustainable growth an increase in total adverse effects may be offset by an increase in economic and consumer benefits</i>. Thus, current government policy allows increases in noise, as is inevitable in the year the runway opens, and in terms of contours areas is forecast above the 2019 baseline for daytime noise, but not night-time noise.</p> <p>The policy statement goes on: <i>In circumstances where there is an increase in total adverse effects, “limit” would mean to mitigate and minimise adverse effects, in line with the Noise Policy Statement for England.</i></p> <p>The policy recognises that growth may increase noise impacts and that this increase may be offset by an increase in economic and consumer benefits. It also places increased emphasis on mitigation in such cases. The Project proposes an appropriate range of mitigation measures, in addition to the existing controls that will continue in connection with the operation of the airport, and this includes a substantially improved Noise Insulation Scheme (NIS), as discussed in Section 14.9, in line with the Noise Policy Statement for England.</p> <p>The Applicant has also provided further explanation of the analysis of sharing the benefits in response to Examining Authority’s question NV.1.9 in The Applicant’s Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101] which concludes: <i>Following the same methodology, the GAL analysis showed that in 2038 when the Noise Envelope limits reduce, compared to the future 2038 baseline the degree of sharing the benefits would be 50% to the industry (as growth) and 50% to the community (as noise reduction) when measured in terms of the area of the day LOAEL with the Slower Transition Fleet. For night-time the degree of sharing the benefits would be 34% to the industry (as growth) and 66% to the community (as noise reduction). It was noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and there is a smaller benefit to the community, and that the Central Case fleet had not been assessed.</i></p>	<p>Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023]).</p> <p>GAL’s proposal is that the CAA will become the Independent Reviewer for the purposes of the noise envelope (see ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope [APP-177] paragraphs 6.1.6 – 6.2.4 and Sections 7 – 8).</p> <p>The Applicant’s Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101]</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Applicant has always noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and the Project/industry is allowed to grow and hence benefits of growth accrue to the Industry. The revised tighter noise envelope limits will ensure that noise does not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and will reduce thereafter so that by 2038 more than half the forecast benefit will go to the community – all of which is consistent with the ANPS requirement that benefits should be shared.</p> <p>Additionally, the growth from 2019 to 2029 in the baseline is not expected to increase noise above 2019 levels – and is only achievable as a result of the aviation industry’s investment in developing and equipping with quieter aircraft.</p> <p>The revised tighter noise envelope limits will ensure that noise does not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and will reduce thereafter so that by 2038 more than half the forecast benefit will go to the community – all of which is consistent with the ANPS requirement that benefits should be shared.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an assessment of noise impacts for the Updated Central Case fleet in ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004] which is identified to be the most likely. In oral evidence at ISH8 (summarised in The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH 8: Agenda Item 6 – Noise [REP6-080]) and in ES Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope - Version 3 – Tracked [REP6-056] submitted at Deadline 6 the Applicant confirmed its commitment to setting the noise envelope limits based on the Updated Central Case fleet.</p> <p>An illustration of how the benefits of noise improvements is shared is provided in ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [APP-179] pages 165 to 175 in respect of the slower transition fleet. The methodology adopted is described fully in that appendix, and is that referred to in the Inspector’s report on the Bristol Airport Planning Appeal Decision, Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/20/3259234, 2 February 2022. The Inspector in that decision considered sharing of the noise benefit in terms of the proportion of the full potential reduction in LOAEL and SOAEL contour areas possible due to fleet transition to quieter types, which is then taken up by ATM growth and the amount of reduction which is remaining. Page 168 of ES Appendix 14.9.9 provide a worked example of the method used for the Bristol airport case.</p> <p>Applied to this case, 2019 can be taken as the baseline starting point. -The full potential reduction in LOAEL contour area in a given year, eg 2038, is</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

the difference between the contour area with the 2019 fleet and the contour area with the fleet transitioned in the future baseline without the Project. The extent of the difference in the contour area which is then taken by ATM growth is the proportion of the benefit goes to the airport/industry, with the remaining share going to the community. Page 173 of Appendix 14.9.9 gives the calculation for the slower transition fleet. The results are reproduced in the table below along with the results of the same calculation using the Updated Central Case noise contour areas reported in **ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004].** and values for 2032 added.

	Daytime Benefit Share		Night Benefit Share	
	% to Community		% to Community	
	2032	2038	2032	2038
Slower Fleet Transition	-15%	50%	13%	66%
Updated Central Case Fleet	31%	58%	50%	69%

The following calculations show how these percentages are calculated for the Updated Central Case fleet (UCC) using the same methodology. The calculations for 2038 Slower Transition Fleet (SFT) are in Appendix 14.9.9 on p173 day and 175 night.

2038 UCC Day:

2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 101.7
 NE limit = 119.4
 Full benefit available = 144.0 - 101.7 = 42.3
 Community benefit = 144.0 - 119.4 = 24.6
 % share to community = 24.6 / 42.3 = 58%

2038 UCC Night:

2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 123.4
 NE limit = 134.6
 Full benefit available = 159.4 - 123.4 = 36.2
 Community benefit = 159.4 - 134.6 = 24.8
 % share to community 24.8 / 36.2 = 69%

2032 UCC Day:

2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 116.5
 NE Limit = 135.5
 Full benefit = 144.0 - 116.5 = 27.5
 Community benefit = 144.0 - 135.5 = 8.5
 % share to community = 8.5 / 27.5 = 31%

2032 UCC Night:

			<p>2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 134.5 NE Limit = 146.9 Full benefit available = 159.4-134.5 = 24.9 Community benefit = 159.4-146.9 = 12.5 % share to community = 12.5/24.9 = 50%</p> <p>2032 STF Day: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 125.6 NE Limit = 146.7 Full available benefit = 144.0-125.6 = 18.4 Community benefit = 144.0-146.7 = -2.7 % share to community = -2.7/18.4 = -15%</p> <p>2032 SFT Night: 2932 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 143.9 NE Limit = 157.4 Full available benefit = 159.4-143.9 = 15.5 Community benefit = 159.4-157.4 = 2.0 % share to community = 2.0/15.5 = 13%</p> <p>The change made to the noise envelope limits to reflect the Updated Central Case, increases the share of the benefits going to the community.</p> <p>In 2019 the area of the Leq16 hr day contour was 136.0 and the area of the Leq 8 hr night contour was 159.4. With the noise envelope limits now based on the Updated Central Case Leq, 16 hour day or Leq, 8 hour night contours, for any year of operation the noise envelope ensures that air noise contours do not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and that an amount of the benefit of technological improvements in noise is always required to be shared.</p> <p>As can be seen from the above, the extent to which the benefits of improvements in noise performance are shared with the community -is greater in 2038 than it is in 2032, and this is because in the early years there is anticipated to be a greater increase in the number of ATM's, which would be expected of any airport expansion project.</p> <p>The above summarises a calculation of how the benefits of improvements in aircraft noise performance are shared. There are also significant wider socio-economic benefits of the airport which arise from the point the runway opens and which are relevant to the consideration of the benefits of the Project as a whole.</p>		
2.17.4.12	Noise Envelope	The Zone of Influence for noise and vibrations stops short of the most populated areas of Horsham town, particularly the Land North of Horsham (Mowbray) strategic site which includes permission for	The study area includes this area where this falls within any of the noise contours provided.	ES Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration [APP-039].	Not Agreed

		<p>at least 2,750 new homes and other sensitive receptors, such as schools. There should be consideration of the interaction between the Project and other developments.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The study area should be explicitly defined for all assessment topics. Whilst the study area for ground noise and construction noise is illustrated in Figure 14.4-2 [APP-063], there is no information on how this was defined. As such, there is no guarantee that all receptors experiencing noise levels above LOAEL are identified.</p> <p>The airport is increasing its impact on an area which has been subject to publicly consulted and examined development plans. The Applicant has a responsibility mitigate its impact on these receptors.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The effect on the land to the North of Horsham is reflected in the N65 metric. On average in 2018 there was less than one movement per day. The increase in the just under 25 is a noticeable increase in effect on the population of the area when in the view of HDC this route should not be used with this degree of intensity under any scenario. Please can the Applicant confirm the LOAEL that it has applied to the N65 criteria ?</p> <p>Updated Position 12 August 2024</p> <p>The increase noted in the Applicant's position is believed to be directly related to growth at the airport. It is understood to arise mostly during the summer period when there is the most intense use of the airport. REP7-112 from the National Air Traffic Services suggests that the use of the route is as a result of ground congestion at the airport, not the use for which it is intended. HDC is also concerned that routes following similar initial departure paths for WIZAD will be required as a result of the cumulative effect of airport development including the Northern Runway proposal and that the preferred routes to the South of Gatwick, will have substantial effect on the Horsham area.</p>	<p>The potential for cumulative effects with other developments, is assessed in Section 14.11 of ES Chapter 14 including the role of local authority land use planning policy and guidance on noise. The online air noise viewer has been provided to assist local authorities in their land use planning.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): ES Paragraph 14.4.15 states how the study areas for each type of noise were defined:</p> <p><i>The study area for noise and vibration effects includes all receptors that may experience potential adverse impacts, i.e. the area where noise increases or decreases could occur above the threshold levels [ie LOAELs] used to assess effects.</i></p> <p>The Land North of Horsham (Mowbray) is located outside the largest LOAEL air noise contours, by a distance of about 2km so will not be significantly affected by the Project. It is in the area overflowed by the daytime (not night-time) departures on the WIZAD route both now and in the future. The Applicant's response to comment 2.17.4.13 below describes the noise change that is expected at postcode RH12 5JW which is approximately 500m from the development site that is referred to (so the noise levels on the site will be similar) and explains the number of noise events above Lmax 65dB (daytime) is expected to increase from 23.2 in the future baseline to 24.8 as a result of the Project in the noisiest year, 2032. The addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect.</p> <p>For ground and construction noise Figure 14.4.2 covers this area, and for air noise the various figures in the ES cover this area. The Applicant's position is that it has assessed all noise impacts above LOAEL as reported in the ES, and the HDC comment does not appear to suggest otherwise.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) The increase of just under 25 referred to by HDC is in the baseline, not as a result of the Project that would then add 1.6 more. The Applicant notes HDC's view that the 25 increase would be noticeable. There is no definition of LOAEL in terms of the N65 metric and this area remains well outside the Leq 16 hr 51dB LOAEL contour so is not significantly affected in the baseline or with the Project) .</p>		
2.17.4.13	Noise impacts	<p>While the Council supports the use of layout and design on-site to mitigate against the impacts of air, ground and road traffic noise on any other development, this should not negate the need for the Applicant to mitigate its own impacts. The possible increase in use of WIZAD (Route 9) means there will be an, as yet unquantifiable, impact on existing and new communities in proximity to the Airport.</p>	<p>The study area includes this area where this falls within any of the noise contours provided.</p> <p>The potential for cumulative effects with other developments, is assessed in Section 14.11 of ES Chapter 14 including the role of local authority land</p>	<p>ES Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration [APP-039].</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Supplementary noise metrics should be used supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects as a result of the increased used of WIZAD (route 9). In particular, the use of overflights would help understand how communities are affected.</p> <p>We will give this further consideration in light of information presented in the TWG of the 9th February 2024.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): If there are no plans for normal use of the WIZAD route at night, there should be a commitment in the DCO to that effect. Additionally, noise controls should be put in place to limit the normal use of the WIZAD route during the daytime.</p> <p>HDC maintain their position likely significant effects are not appropriately identified by the LAeq,T metric and supplementary metrics should be used to identify likely significant effects. Detailed overflight contours should be provided to identify impacts from intensified use of WIZAD.</p> <p>Updated Position 12 August 2024</p> <p>The position from deadline 5 remains unchanged. In addition:. The JLAs have recommended a requirement to control the use of WIZAD to ensure that there is no creeping increase in it's use. Proposed new route that follow the initial WIZAD similar south turn as a result of FASI-S may also need to be controlled in a similar fashion.</p>	<p>use planning policy and guidance on noise. The online air noise viewer has been provided to assist local authorities in their land use planning.</p> <p>As discussed in the TWGs the existing WIZAD SID is to be used more in the future baseline, but not so as to require an airspace change. It is not used at night.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.12 shows the 2032 baseline Leq 16 hr. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. For daytime, Figure 14.9.1 shows the 2032 with Project Leq 16 hr, the largest for any future year. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. Changes in air noise below LOAEL are not significant.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.3 shows the 2019 baseline N65. Horsham town is outside the N65 20 contour. For daytime, Figure 14.6.14 shows the 2032 baseline N65. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. For daytime, Figure 14.9.15 shows the 2032 N65 with the Project, the largest N65 contour for any future year with the Project. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. The contour is slightly larger than the baseline 2032 contour indicating slightly more events above Lmax 65dB. Using the online air noise viewer to look at the area in the North of Horsham Town in more detail, for example at postcode RH12 5JY just south of the A264 the number of events above Lmax 65dB is expected to increase from 23.2 to 24.8 as a result of the Project in the noisiest year, 2032 with the noisiest fleet. The addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.2.44 of the ES described how the reference to Sharing the Benefits of aircraft noise emission reduction has been removed from the government's Overarching Aviation policy Statement in March 2023. We consulted on sharing the benefits through our Noise Envelope Group in summer 2022.</p> <p>An illustration of sharing the benefits was discussed and is reported in pages 165 to 175 of ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Project does not seek to change the way the Route 9 Standard Instrument Departure is used, and this will remain as a tactical offload route only. It is not necessary for the DCO to secure this, as any process which sought to change this position would be subject to its own airspace change decision making process.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p>The use of supplementary metrics to assess the significance of air noise effects is contrary to CAA guidance CAP1616. The Applicant has made appropriate use of supplementary metrics (N65) to describe the noise change that can be expected, in accordance with that guidance.</p> <p>Overflight mapping is provided in the ES following CAP1616 guidance. Figure 14.6.18 shows the increase in overflights on the WIZAD route in the 2032 baseline compared to the 2019 baseline overflights mapped in Figure 14.6.9.</p>		
2.17.4.14	Noise Envelope	<p>The Applicant has worked on the assumption that Tier 1 developments south of the Airport fall within lower air noise contour bands, and indicate noise levels will be reduced over time. This does not take account of the increased use of WIZAD (Route 9).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Supplementary noise metrics should be used supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects as a result of the increased used of WIZAD (route 9). In particular, the use of overflights would help understand how communities are affected.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position likely significant effects are not appropriately identified by the LAeq,T metric and supplementary metrics should be used to identify likely significant effects. Detailed overflight contours should be provided to identify impacts from intensified use of WIZAD.</p> <p>Updated Position 12 August 2024 The position remains unchanged. Improvements to the overflight mapping and overflight mapping have been requested for all assessment years but not provided. The Applicant has not adequately dealt with consideration of the impact on that for all intents and purposes is newly regularly overflown. This includes provision of single mode operation and assessment in the manner consistent with airspace change which would inform the DCO process and the local communities.</p>	<p>The use of WIZAD have been taken into account and reported in the ES.</p> <p>The assumptions regarding the use of WIZAD have been set out previously in response to the issues raised at Rows 13.61 and 13.90 of Table 13 in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) The Applicant has explained the use of the various noise metrics to judge observable adverse effects due to noise. The response provided in 2.17.4.13 above gives details of the noise changes using these metrics and why the noise effects are not significant.</p> <p>As discussed in 2.17.4.14 above overflight mapping has been provided to show the changes in this areas. CAA guidance is clear that overflights are a supplementary metric not used to judge the significance of noise impacts.</p>	ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039].	Not Agreed
Other					
2.17.5.1	The Applicant's interpretation of national policy and the effect this has on the communities	The Council disagrees with the Applicant's interpretation of national policy in respect of noise and aviation noise policy statements. This has influenced their approach to the work. In consequence, the benefits of technological improvements are not being shared sufficiently with affected communities and the total adverse impacts	The noise envelope proposed in the DCO is consistent with government policy including the ANPS and NPSE and follows the guidance provided by the CAA in CAP1129. Criteria metrics and levels are discussed in detail with Noise Envelope Group.	ES Appendix 14.9.5: Air Noise Envelope Background [APP-175]	Not Agreed

	<p>affected by the airport operations (Air Noise)</p>	<p>of noise are not being mitigated. The approach does not appear consistent with the Noise Policy Statement for England.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): We will refer to the documents cited and then update accordingly.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Demonstrating that benefits are shared in 2038 is not appropriate and it should be demonstrated how benefits are shared for all assessment years. Sharing the benefits should be based on 2019 baseline levels. Use of the slower transition case means all benefits of new aircraft technology should go to the airport and none to the communities. The Applicant identifies the central case as the most likely so it should be used to define Noise Envelope limits.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): refer to row 2.17.4.11 for HDCs position on this matter</p>	<p>GAL notes the Council's disagreement and would be interested to understand how the Council interpret national policy and which specific parts of GAL's interpretation it disagrees with.</p> <p>GAL has consulted with the TWG since August 2021, explaining our proposed methodology and emerging finds and approach to mitigation. While it is not wholly clear what aspect of policy HDC refer to, we note that policy on sharing the benefits has been discussed at the Noise Envelope Group and our interpretation, as discussed in summer 2022 is recorded in ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope including in pages 165 to 175.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided further explanation of the analysis of sharing the benefits in response to Examining Authority's question NV.1.9 in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101] which concludes: <i>Following the same methodology, the GAL analysis showed that in 2038 when the Noise Envelope limits reduce, compared to the future 2038 baseline the degree of sharing the benefits would be 50% to the industry (as growth) and 50% to the community (as noise reduction) when measured in terms of the area of the day LOAEL with the Slower Transition Fleet. For night-time the degree of sharing the benefits would be 34% to the industry (as growth) and 66% to the community (as noise reduction). It was noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and there is a smaller benefit to the community, and that the Central Case fleet had not been assessed.</i></p> <p>The assessment of the Project against the future baseline reported in the ES shows larger impacts than when assessed against the current baseline, as explained in Section 9 of Chapter 14 of the ES. The ES provides a summary of the noise mitigation measures in use at the airport reported in the Noise Action Plan. GAL propose a Noise Insulation Scheme to address not only the impacts of the Project but the total impacts of the airport in the future worst-case year, consistent with government policy. The total adverse effects of noise are being mitigated and significant adverse effects on health and quality of life are being avoided..</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The Applicant has always noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and the Project/industry is allowed to grow and hence benefits of growth accrue to the Industry. The revised tighter noise envelope limits will ensure that noise does not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and will reduce thereafter so that by 2038 more than half the forecast benefit will go to the community – all of which is consistent with the ANPS requirement that benefits should be shared.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope [APP-177]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.8: Noise Envelope Group Output Report [APP-178]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023].</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101]</p>	
--	---	---	---	--	--

			<p>Additionally, the growth from 2019 to 2029 in the baseline is not expected to increase noise above 2019 levels – and is only achievable as a result of the aviation industry’s investment in developing and equipping with quieter aircraft.</p> <p>The revised tighter noise envelope limits will ensure that noise does not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and will reduce thereafter so that by 2038 more than half the forecast benefit will go to the community – all of which is consistent with the ANPS requirement that benefits should be shared.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) C10</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an assessment of noise impacts for the Updated Central Case fleet in ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004] which is identified to be the most likely. In oral evidence at ISH8 (summarised in The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH 8: Agenda Item 6 – Noise [REP6-080]) and in ES Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope - Version 3 – Tracked [REP6-056] submitted at Deadline 6 the Applicant confirmed its commitment to setting the noise envelope limits based on the Updated Central Case fleet.</p> <p>An illustration of how the benefits of noise improvements is shared is provided in ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [APP-179] pages 165 to 175 in respect of the slower transition fleet. The methodology adopted is described fully in that appendix, and is that referred to in the Inspector’s report on the Bristol Airport Planning Appeal Decision, Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/20/3259234, 2 February 2022. The Inspector in that decision considered sharing of the noise benefit in terms of the proportion of the full potential reduction in LOAEL and SOAEL contour areas possible due to fleet transition to quieter types, which is then taken up by ATM growth and the amount of reduction which is remaining. Page 168 of ES Appendix 14.9.9 provide a worked example of the method used for the Bristol airport case.</p> <p>Applied to this case, 2019 can be taken as the baseline starting point. -The full potential reduction in LOAEL contour area in a given year, eg 2038, is the difference between the contour area with the 2019 fleet and the contour area with the fleet transitioned in the future baseline without the Project. The extent of the difference in the contour area which is then taken by ATM growth is the proportion of the benefit goes to the airport/industry, with the remaining share going to the community. Page 173 of Appendix 14.9.9 gives the calculation for the slower transition fleet. The results are reproduced in the table below along with the results of the same calculation using the Updated Central Case noise contour areas reported in ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004]. and values for 2032 added.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

	Daytime Benefit Share		Night Benefit Share	
	% to Community		% to Community	
	2032	2038	2032	2038
Slower Fleet Transition	-15%	50%	13%	66%
Updated Central Case Fleet	31%	58%	50%	69%

The following calculations show how these percentages are calculated for the Updated Central Case fleet (UCC) using the same methodology. The calculations for 2038 Slower Transition Fleet (SFT) are in Appendix 14.9.9 on p173 day and 175 night.

2038 UCC Day:
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 101.7
 NE limit = 119.4
 Full benefit available = 144.0 - 101.7 = 42.3
 Community benefit = 144.0 - 119.4 = 24.6
 % share to community = 24.6 / 42.3 = 58%

2038 UCC Night:
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 123.4
 NE limit = 134.6
 Full benefit available = 159.4 - 123.4 = 36.2
 Community benefit = 159.4 - 134.6 = 24.8
 % share to community = 24.8 / 36.2 = 69%

2032 UCC Day:
 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 116.5
 NE Limit = 135.5
 Full benefit = 144.0 - 116.5 = 27.5
 Community benefit = 144.0 - 135.5 = 8.5
 % share to community = 8.5 / 27.5 = 31%

2032 UCC Night:
 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4
 2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 134.5
 NE Limit = 146.9
 Full benefit available = 159.4 - 134.5 = 24.9
 Community benefit = 159.4 - 146.9 = 12.5
 % share to community = 12.5 / 24.9 = 50%

2032 STF Day:
 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 125.6

			<p>NE Limit = 146.7 Full available benefit = 144.0-125.6 = 18.4 Community benefit = 144.0-146.7 = -2.7 % share to community = -2.7/18.4 = -15%</p> <p>2032 SFT Night: 2932 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 143.9 NE Limit = 157.4 Full available benefit = 159.4-143.9 = 15.5 Community benefit = 159.4-157.4 = 2.0 % share to community = 2.0/15.5 = 13%</p> <p>The change made to the noise envelope limits to reflect the Updated Central Case, increases the share of the benefits going to the community.</p> <p>In 2019 the area of the Leq16 hr day contour was 136.0 and the area of the Leq 8 hr night contour was 159.4. With the noise envelope limits now based on the Updated Central Case Leq, 16 hour day or Leq, 8 hour night contours, for any year of operation the noise envelope ensures that air noise contours do not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and that an amount of the benefit of technological improvements in noise is always required to be shared.</p> <p>As can be seen from the above, the extent to which the benefits of improvements in noise performance are shared with the community -is greater in 2038 than it is in 2032, and this is because in the early years there is anticipated to be a greater increase in the number of ATM's, which would be expected of any airport expansion project.</p> <p>The above summarises a calculation of how the benefits of improvements in aircraft noise performance are shared. There are also significant wider socio-economic benefits of the airport which arise from the point the runway opens and which are relevant to the consideration of the benefits of the Project as a whole.</p>		
2.17.5.2	Airspace Change	<p>The proposal will adversely affect the District's residents due to an increase in exposure to aircraft noise during the day and night. Furthermore, the FASI South work could lead to changes in airspace that result in increased overflight from both Heathrow and Gatwick and the cumulative impact is not taken into consideration.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): It would be helpful to undertake a 'worst case' assessment of potential airspace changes was undertaken so it could be understood if airspace changes could occur within Noise Envelope constraints.</p>	<p>FASI-S is not required (nor is any other airspace change) to enable dual runway operations at Gatwick.</p> <p>Although the proposed FASI-S airspace changes lie outside of the scope of this Project, should information on the outcome of FASI-S project become available at a time when the information can be taken into account during the examination of the DCO application, the implications of this, in terms of the environmental effects such as those associated with noise and other emissions, will be reviewed. Although the lateral tracks of the arrival and departure route structure around Gatwick will take some time to be determined through the airspace change process, improvements in the</p>	<p>Section 6 of ES Chapter 6: Approach to Environmental Assessment [APP-031]</p> <p>Section 9 of ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [APP-039]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>We continue to consider that FASI may have a cumulative effect that may result in additional impacts and that this ought to be taken into consideration at this stage.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Airspace changes should be able to occur within the constraints of the Noise Envelope. The Applicant should undertake a sensitivity test based on worst-case airspace design to confirm this.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDC maintain their position that there should be no allowance for Noise Envelope contour area limits to increase. As stated within the existing proposal this includes as a result of airspace change, force majeure or new engine technology for climate change adaptation. If the Applicant cannot provide certainty to the area then it suggests that the area and the extent of the contours should define the noise envelope as only in this way will it provide certainty to the community.</p>	<p>vertical design of routes can be expected to deliver both carbon and noise reduction benefits.</p> <p>For air noise, Tables 14.9.10 and 14.9.11 of ES Chapter 14 give the populations predicted to have various changes in noise from across 9 ranges. Only noise levels above LOAEL are reported. Paragraphs 14.9.102 to 14.9.104 describe where these significant changes are expected. 40 have changes above 3dB all above SOAEL. 40 have changes of 1dB above SOAEL. These are the 80 significantly affected by the Project.</p> <p>For ground noise the changes in noise and whether they are above LOAEL and/or SOAEL are described in the Section 8.1 of ES appendix 14.9.3 across each of the 12 noise sensitive receptor areas.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The proposed FASI-S airspace changes lie outside of the scope of this Project, and currently information on the outcome of FASI-S project is not available at a level required to be taken into account.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024)</p> <p>The Noise Envelope Document [REP5-030] details how an extraordinary review may be undertaken in the event of airspace change, There would also be no basis for or benefit of such a sensitivity test, as the FASI-S airspace change proposals are not at a stage where they are able to be assessed, as has been explained previously.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.3: Ground Noise Modelling [APP-173].</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.7: The Noise Envelope – Version 2 [REP5-030]</p>	
2.17.5.3	Noise envelope	<p>The benefits of technological improvements are not being shared sufficiently with affected communities.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Having reviewed the policy we do not consider that the requirement for sharing the benefits has been removed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Demonstrating that benefits are shared in 2038 is not appropriate and it should be demonstrated how benefits are shared for all assessment years. Sharing the benefits should be based on 2019 baseline levels. Use of the slower transition case means all benefits of new aircraft technology should go to the airport and none to the communities. The Applicant identifies the central case as the most likely so it should be used to define Noise Envelope limits.</p>	<p>Paragraph 14.2.44 of the ES described how the reference to Sharing the Benefits of aircraft noise emission reduction has been removed from the government's Overarching Aviation policy Statement in March 2023. We consulted on sharing the benefits through our Noise Envelope Group in summer 2022.</p> <p>An illustration of sharing the benefits was discussed and is reported in pages 165 to 175 of ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided further explanation of the analysis of sharing the benefits in response to Examining Authority's question NV.1.9 in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101] which concludes: Following the same methodology, the GAL analysis showed that in 2038 when the Noise Envelope limits reduce, compared to the future 2038 baseline the degree</p>	<p>ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.8: Noise Envelope Group Output Report [AS-023]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated position (12 August 2024) The Council's position is unchanged and it adds that the belated calculation for the sharing the benefits is not credible for the reasons stated above.</p>	<p>of sharing the benefits would be 50% to the industry (as growth) and 50% to the community (as noise reduction) when measured in terms of the area of the day LOAEL with the Slower Transition Fleet. For night-time the degree of sharing the benefits would be 34% to the industry (as growth) and 66% to the community (as noise reduction). It was noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and there is a smaller benefit to the community, and that the Central Case fleet had not been assessed.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024) The Applicant has always noted that in the early years after opening noise increases and the Project/industry is allowed to grow and hence benefits of growth accrue to the Industry. The revised tighter noise envelope limits will ensure that noise does not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and will reduce thereafter so that by 2038 more than half the forecast benefit will go to the community – all of which is consistent with the ANPS requirement that benefits should be shared.</p> <p>Additionally, the growth from 2019 to 2029 in the baseline is not expected to increase noise above 2019 levels – and is only achievable as a result of the aviation industry's investment in developing and equipping with quieter aircraft.</p> <p>The revised tighter noise envelope limits will ensure that noise does not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and will reduce thereafter so that by 2038 more than half the forecast benefit will go to the community – all of which is consistent with the ANPS requirement that benefits should be shared.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided an assessment of noise impacts for the Updated Central Case fleet in ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004] which is identified to be the most likely. In oral evidence at ISH8 (summarised in The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH 8: Agenda Item 6 – Noise [REP6-080]) and in ES Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope - Version 3 – Tracked [REP6-056] submitted at Deadline 6 the Applicant confirmed its commitment to setting the noise envelope limits based on the Updated Central Case fleet.</p> <p>An illustration of how the benefits of noise improvements is shared is provided in ES Appendix 14.9.9 Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [APP-179] pages 165 to 175 in respect of the slower transition fleet. The methodology adopted is described fully in that appendix, and is that referred to in the Inspector's report on the Bristol Airport Planning Appeal Decision, Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/W/20/3259234, 2 February 2022. The Inspector in that decision considered sharing of the noise benefit in terms of the proportion of the full potential reduction in LOAEL</p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

and SOAEL contour areas possible due to fleet transition to quieter types, which is then taken up by ATM growth and the amount of reduction which is remaining. Page 168 of ES Appendix 14.9.9 provide a worked example of the method used for the Bristol airport case.

Applied to this case, 2019 can be taken as the baseline starting point. -The full potential reduction in LOAEL contour area in a given year, eg 2038, is the difference between the contour area with the 2019 fleet and the contour area with the fleet transitioned in the future baseline without the Project. The extent of the difference in the contour area which is then taken by ATM growth is the proportion of the benefit goes to the airport/industry, with the remaining share going to the community. Page 173 of Appendix 14.9.9 gives the calculation for the slower transition fleet. The results are reproduced in the table below along with the results of the same calculation using the Updated Central Case noise contour areas reported in **ES Addendum - Updated Central Case Aircraft Fleet Report [REP4-004].** and values for 2032 added.

	Daytime Benefit Share		Night Benefit Share	
	% to Community		% to Community	
	2032	2038	2032	2038
Slower Fleet Transition	-15%	50%	13%	66%
Updated Central Case Fleet	31%	58%	50%	69%

The following calculations show how these percentages are calculated for the Updated Central Case fleet (UCC) using the same methodology. The calculations for 2038 Slower Transition Fleet (SFT) are in Appendix 14.9.9 on p173 day and 175 night.

2038 UCC Day:

2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 101.7
 NE limit = 119.4
 Full benefit available = 144.0 - 101.7 = 42.3
 Community benefit = 144.0 - 119.4 = 24.6
 % share to community = 24.6 / 42.3 = 58%

2038 UCC Night:

2038 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4
 2038 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 123.4
 NE limit = 134.6
 Full benefit available = 159.4 - 123.4 = 36.2
 Community benefit = 159.4 - 134.6 = 24.8
 % share to community 24.8 / 36.2 = 69%

2032 UCC Day:

2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0

			<p>2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 116.5 NE Limit = 135.5 Full benefit = 144.0-116.5 = 27.5 Community benefit = 144.0-135.5 = 8.5 % share to community = 8.5/27.5 = 31%</p> <p>2032 UCC Night: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2032 Baseline Contour Area with UCC fleet = 134.5 NE Limit = 146.9 Full benefit available = 159.4-134.5 = 24.9 Community benefit = 159.4-146.9 = 12.5 % share to community = 12.5/24.9 = 50%</p> <p>2032 STF Day: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 144.0 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 125.6 NE Limit = 146.7 Full available benefit = 144.0-125.6 = 18.4 Community benefit = 144.0-146.7 = -2.7 % share to community = -2.7/18.4 = -15%</p> <p>2032 SFT Night: 2032 Baseline Contour Area with 2019 fleet = 159.4 2032 Baseline Contour Area with STF fleet = 143.9 NE Limit = 157.4 Full available benefit = 159.4-143.9 = 15.5 Community benefit = 159.4-157.4 = 2.0 % share to community = 2.0/15.5 = 13%</p> <p>The change made to the noise envelope limits to reflect the Updated Central Case, increases the share of the benefits going to the community.</p> <p>In 2019 the area of the Leq16 hr day contour was 136.0 and the area of the Leq 8 hr night contour was 159.4. With the noise envelope limits now based on the Updated Central Case Leq, 16 hour day or Leq, 8 hour night contours, for any year of operation the noise envelope ensures that air noise contours do not exceed contour areas with one runway in 2019, and that an amount of the benefit of technological improvements in noise is always required to be shared.</p> <p>As can be seen from the above, the extent to which the benefits of improvements in noise performance are shared with the community -is greater in 2038 than it is in 2032, and this is because in the early years there is anticipated to be a greater increase in the number of ATM's, which would be expected of any airport expansion project.</p> <p>The above summarises a calculation of how the benefits of improvements in aircraft noise performance are shared. There are also significant wider</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			socio-economic benefits of the airport which arise from the point the runway opens and which are relevant to the consideration of the benefits of the Project as a whole.		
2.17.5.4	WIZAD route	<p>The use of the Northern Runway is considered to force the use of WIZAD (Route 9) that has the potential to affect the residents of Horsham town and nearby villages and impact current and emerging Local Plan allocations in the north of the District.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Supplementary noise metrics should be used supplement the primary metric assessment to identify likely significant effects as a result of the increased used of WIZAD (route 9). In particular, the use of overflights would help understand how communities are affected.</p> <p>While the Applicants comments are noted the Council's concerns about the impact on the District remain.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC maintain their position likely significant effects are not appropriately identified by the LAeq,T metric and supplementary metrics should be used to identify likely significant effects. Detailed overflight contours should be provided to identify impacts from intensified use of WIZAD.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024) HDC Position remains unchanged</p>	<p>As discussed in the TWGs the existing WIZAD SID is to be used more in the future baseline, but not so as to require an airspace change. It is not used at night.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.12 shows the 2032 baseline Leq 16 hr. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. For daytime, Figure 14.9.1 shows the 2032 with Project Leq 16 hr, the largest for any future year. Horsham town is outside the LOAEL. Changes in air noise below LOAEL are not significant.</p> <p>For daytime, Figure 14.6.3 shows the 2019 baseline N65. Horsham town is outside the N65 20 contour. For daytime, Figure 14.6.14 shows the 2032 baseline N65. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. For daytime, Figure 14.9.15 shows the 2032 N65 with the Project, the largest N65 contour for any future year with the Project. The northern part of Horsham town is within the N65 20 contour indicating more than 20 Lmax events on an average 16 hour summer day. The contour is slightly larger than the baseline 2032 contour indicating slightly more events above Lmax 65dB. Using the online air noise viewer to look at the area in the North of Horsham Town in more detail, for example at postcode RH12 5JY just south of the A264 the number of events above Lmax 65dB is expected to increase from 23.2 to 24.8 as a result of the Project in the noisiest year, 2032 with the noisiest fleet. The addition of 1.6 aircraft noise events above Lmax 65dB over an average 16 hour summer day would not lead to an increased noise effect.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.2.44 of the ES described how the reference to Sharing the Benefits of aircraft noise emission reduction has been removed from the government's Overarching Aviation policy Statement in March 2023. We consulted on sharing the benefits through our Noise Envelope Group in summer 2022.</p> <p>An illustration of sharing the benefits was discussed and is reported in pages 165 to 175 of ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) The Applicant has explained the use of the various noise metrics to judge observable adverse effects due to noise. The response provided in 2.17.4.13 above gives details of the noise changes using these metrics and why the noise effects are not significant.</p>	ES Appendix 14.9.9: Report on Engagement on the Noise Envelope [AS-023].	Not Agreed

			As discussed in 2.17.4.14 above overflight mapping has been provided to show the changes in this areas. CAA guidance is clear that overflights are a supplementary metric not used to judge the significance of noise impacts.		
2.2.2.10	Modelling (Ground Noise)	<p>Production of ground noise contours under appropriate modes including but not limited to single mode Easterly and Westerly for LAeq 16h and LAeq8, N above for day and night as well as awakenings (including cumulative with air noise). The model should be developed to inform the ground noise management plan to prevent and progressively reduce noise exposure.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): This is not an appropriate assessment of ground running noise. Engine ground running, auxiliary power unit and engine around taxi noise should all be included in LAeq,T ground noise predictions. Contour plots should be provided to allow better understanding of ground noise effects for each assessment year and scenario. It would be expected that LAeq and LAmx contour plots are provided. LAeq contours should be provided from the LOAEL upwards in 3dB increments.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The HDCs position remains that the LAeq,T is the most appropriate metric so assess engine ground run noise, which "...lasts in the region of 30-60 minutes". This is particular important to understand effects of ground running activities at the western end of the Juliet runway. HDC would like to understand how receptors will be affected during the period when there will be no barrier/ bund in place to screen ground activities. This point could be addressed through a commitment that there would be no ground running activities at the western end of the Juliet runway during the period when the existing bund has been removed and the replacement barrier/bund fully built.</p> <p>The absence of ongoing noise modelling and proposals for a ground noise management plan are of significant concern. As the Applicant has not come forward with a ground noise management plan proposal, the JLAS have recommended a requirement for this and fixed plant noise to the Examining Authority in the absence of agreement.</p>	<p>This is a new comment. The Applicant has provided Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix B - Ground Noise Fleet Assessment [REP3-071] which provides an assessment of ground noise with the Slower Transition Fleet and also provides ground noise contours for day and night, noting that as well as absolute levels of noise ground noise is assessed in terms of change in level and ambient noise levels. The response below comments on the suggested ground noise management plan.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix B - Ground Noise Fleet Assessment [REP3-071] provides an analysis showing the contribution of Engine Ground Running and APU usage to Leq 16 hr noise levels is not significant. It also provides SOAEL ground noise contours and explains why other factors including change in noise and exceedance of ambient noise are involved in the noise assessment which makes ground noise contours misleading.</p>	Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix B - Ground Noise Fleet Assessment [REP3-071]	Not Agreed
2.2.2.11	Ground Noise Management Plan	A ground noise management plan is required, as a certified document, for the purpose of preventing and where this cannot be achieved minimising the impacts of ground noise on the local community. The Best Available Techniques should be adopted	This is a new comment. The Applicant has provided Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix B - Ground Noise Fleet Assessment [REP3-071] and Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix E - Ground Noise Engine Ground Runs in		Not Agreed

		<p>within the plan to prevent or minimise the impacts occurring on the local community.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): HDC object to the use of complaints to demonstrate there are no noise impacts. Complaints are not appropriate as a means for identifying impacts. The ground noise insulation scheme should extend to the outer zone. The Applicant assumes that engine testing lasts for 0.7 minutes (42 seconds) for an average day. Ground noise should be assessed on the basis of a reasonable worst-case day.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024) No Change</p> <p>The Applicant has not included provision for an ongoing mechanism under the Planning Act 2008 regime for a Ground Noise Management Plan. It has not addressed the matter raised in this row.</p> <p>Proposed requirements for a Ground Noise Management Plan and a Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan have been made to the Inspector and it is considered that these are necessary for the development. At this time the HDC cannot agree with the Applicant's approach including the failure to address this matter.</p>	<p>Supporting Noise and Vibration [REP3-071] which together provide further details of ground noise and its mitigation. Appendix B of the SOCG supporting information summarises the position as follows:</p> <p><i>Ground noise at Gatwick Airport is mitigated through operating procedures and a sizeable noise bund running around the northern perimeter of the airport, up to 12m high in places, and the serpentine wall noise barrier that can be seen around the eastern apron area between the north and south terminals. There are no sections of apron or taxing routes along the south side of the airfield. The main housing area is to the north, is well screened by the noise bund and beyond Povey Cross Road. To the immediate east and west under the flight paths there is no housing, presumably for safety reasons. To the south there is mainly airport and commercial property with scattered housing on the far side of the Charlwood Road. To the northwest there is a single property and scattered properties before the village of Charlwood 700m from the nearest taxiway. Consequently, ground noise has not been a major concern reported by the local community in recent years.</i></p> <p>10.13 Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix E - Ground Noise Engine Ground Runs in Supporting Noise and Vibration [REP3-071] gives further details of engine running noise controls and also provides an analysis of complaints due to ground noise showing that in 10 years from the beginning of 2010 to the end of 2019, there was a total of 16 recorded noise complaints linked with ground noise. In contrast complaints from aircraft in flight, ie from aircraft in the air, peaked at 25,593 complaints in the 2019 year. During the pandemic there were more complaints from ground noise than usual, perhaps because ground noise became more noticeable in the context of other road, rail and air traffic noise reducing.</p> <p><i>The noise contours shown in Appendix 2 fall either within or close to the airport boundary as ground noise attenuates over distance, with screening in some cases and because of the existing and proposed mitigation measures. There are small numbers of receptors within the contours due to the relatively low number of properties nearby. This is consistent with the very low numbers of complaints received due to ground noise showing that compared to air noise, ground noise has a very small impact.</i></p> <p><i>The number of properties with potentially significant effects related to ground noise is 30 as explained in the following sections (please note that this is not simply calculated by the number of properties within the contours at Appendix 2, but also takes account of the change in noise from the Project compared to baseline and also the level of ground noise compared to other ambient noise largely due to road traffic). This is a small number compared to Air Noise. It is for this reason that the Noise Insulation Scheme has been developed primarily for Air Noise. The</i></p>		
--	--	---	--	--	--

			<p><i>properties that will be added to the air noise Inner Zone NIS to ensure that significant effects on health and quality of life due to ground noise are avoided are listed in Section 5.</i></p> <p>Consequently, the Applicant believes the existing and proposed committed measures to mitigate ground noise are well defined and secured, and that therefore there is no need for an additional noise management plan.</p> <p>Updated Position (July 2024) The reason for not including an outer zone for ground noise are explained in ISH8 as recorded in para 2.2.15 of 10.49.3 The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH 8: Agenda Item 6 – Noise.</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a full explanation of the engine ground running (EGR) noise assessment in the ES in Supporting Noise and Vibration Technical Notes to Statements of Common Ground, Appendix E - Ground Noise Engine Ground Runs (Doc Ref 10.13.5) [REP3-071]. Within this the information taken from the airport on the locations, duration and frequency of engine ground running that form the basis of the assessment is reported. This is also provided The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 - Noise and Vibration [REP3-101] ref NV.1.5.</p> <p>In the ES noise chapter [APP-039] it states, at paragraph 14.9.214, that in 2018 there were less than 200 EGR tests carried out across the year, which is based on a review of data supplied by the operations team. The actual recorded number of EGR tests in 2018 was 192 and for comparison, it was 195 in 2017 and 211 in 2019. The paragraph goes on to state that up to 267 EGR tests per year are forecast by 2038 with the Northern Runway Project. 267 EGRs per year is on average 0.7 EGRs per day, i.e. less than one per day.</p> <p>There are 4 locations where EGR tests can occur spaced around the airfield. –The highest noise levels at any given noise sensitive receptor (NSR) will be from the nearest EGR, because the others are a considerable distance from it. The most used location takes about 50% of EGRs, so the worst case occurrence of EGR noise at any NSR is 50% of 0.7 per day, i.e. 0.35/day.</p> <p>As explained in REP3-071, during an engine test, the engines are usually run at a thrust setting known as 'ground idle' for most of the time across a nominal test period in the region of 30 – 60 mins and only increase to higher thrust settings for brief periods within this. At ground idle noise levels are 10-15dB lower than at higher thrusts, (i.e. less than half as loud when judged subjectively) and do not contribute to Leq 16 hour noise levels significantly. From observations at Gatwick the typical period of the highest peak noise level with a sound power level of 148 dBA used in the predictions occur for up to 2 minutes during an engine test. The noise assessment uses this peak (Lmax) noise levels to assess noise impacts.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>REP3-071 provides an assessment of the peak noise levels in each assessment area. Significant impacts are not identified.</p> <p>The JLA's have asked how EGRs contribute to Leq 16 hour noise levels and suggest it should be included in the assessment of Leq 16 hour noise levels. The contribution of EGR noise to Leq 16 hr noise levels is given in REP3-071 as about 0.1dB ie it is negligible (the same is the case when considering a worst case day with 1 EGR). The key parameters in calculating this are the peak noise level, the number of EGRs per day and the duration of the noise. These are all summarised above, based on observations and measurements at Gatwick. The JLA's comment suggests these assumptions are outlandish. The Applicant has shown these assumptions are realistic and demonstrated that the contribution of EGR noise to Leq 16 hr noise levels is insignificant. So not including EGR noise in the Leq assessment does not under-estimate noise impacts, and the approach of assessing occasional noise in terms of the peak noise levels, Lmax is correct, as reported in the ES.</p> <p>.</p> <p>End Around Taxiways ES Paragraph 14.9.219 discussed end around taxiways ('EATs') noting that: <i>"In order to allow for a small number of Category F size aircraft- under dual runway operation, EATs have been incorporated into the design"</i>. The paragraph goes on to broadly describe three locations which may be affected by the usage of EATs: <i>"The only location which is affected by more than 1 dB L_{eq} through the inclusion of EATs (under westerly operation) is Westfield Place located adjacent to the end of the northern runway, within the Charlwood assessment area. The maximum noise levels (L_{max}) generated by the proposed EAT usage would be 2 to 4 dB higher than the currently modelled development case at two locations within the Bonnetts Lane assessment area (Amberley fields Campsite and Westfield House)"</i>. To be clear, the change of more than 1 dB L_{Aeq} at Westfield Place is actually only 1.2 dB and the change at the two locations within the Bonnetts Lane assessment area would be no more than 0.6 dB L_{Aeq}. The low numbers of Category F movements mean that the effects of EAT usage are generally better described by looking at maximum L_{max}) rather than average (L_{Aeq}) noise levels. Modelled L_{max} noise levels at all assessment locations for EAT usage are given in ES Appendix 14.9.3 Table 6.2.3. Under westerly operation, anticipated EAT usage generates 16 hr L_{Aeq} levels that are 10 dB or more below L_{Aeq} levels generated by taxiing at all but three locations (as discussed above where it makes an insignificant contribution). Under Easterly operation, 16 hr L_{Aeq} levels related to EAT usage are all more than 18 dB below L_{Aeq} levels generated by taxiing.</p> <p>Auxiliary Power Units ES paragraph 14.9.217 and 14.9.218 discuss auxiliary power unit ('APU') noise. Internal (GAL) airport reports indicate that APUs are very rarely used on stand and that this occurs less than 3% of the time based on</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>survey information. Modelled L_{max} noise levels from APU usage are given in ES Appendix 14.9.3 Table 6.2.3. Maximum levels generated by APU usage are generally comparable to or significantly lower than maximum levels generated by EAT usage and the APU usage is extremely low.</p> <p>Summary Where the worst-case maximum levels only have the potential to generate L_{Aeq} levels that are 10 dB (or more) below the L_{Aeq} generated by taxiing aircraft, this will not add significantly to predicted levels of ground noise from aircraft taxiing. The three locations where there is a potential for a small increase to L_{Aeq} relating to EAT usage have been identified at paragraph 14.9.219 of the ES. Effects at all other locations are better represented by using the secondary L_{max} metric which is reported for EGRs, EATs and APUs at tables 6.2.3 and 6.2.4 of Appendix 14.9.3 Ground Noise Modelling.</p>		
2.2.2.12	Compensation	<p>The airport needs to provide a fair and equitable scheme of compensation to affected individuals and the wider community. Such a scheme should be clearly stated, in part as a requirement with supporting information in a certified document.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Council position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated Position (12 August 2024): The Council position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>This is a new comment. Please see the Applicants response to Row 2.17.4.10 above.</p>		Not Agreed
2.2.2.13	Baseline aircraft noise data and validation	<p>HDC have added this matter after ISH9, where the Applicant refused to provide important information on baseline aircraft SEL and L_{max} noise data that underpins noise modelling along with how modelled noise levels at monitoring locations compared to measured noise levels. The JLAs have contacted the CAA who are willing to provide it with the permission of the Applicant. HDC request that the following information is provided:</p> <p>i) the results of statistical analysis of SEL and L_{max} 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.</p> <p>And:</p> <p>ii) a comparison of the measured SEL and L_{max} 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.</p>	<p>Updated position (Deadline 9) In ISH9 The Applicant explained how a mass of noise measurements are used by ERCD to calibrate the Gatwick model each year, and that a sample of that has been shared with the noise Topic Working Group last year. The Applicant did not say this noise measurement data is confidential to the CAA. This would have contacted the explanation he was providing that some of it has been shared. The Applicant actually said (See Recording of ISH9 Day 1 Part 2; 30 July 2024) time: 1:18:25) ‘<i>The databases that sit behind that are in fact confidential to the CAA</i>’. That database is the core of the model that it uses to predict SEL and L_{max} noise levels. Termed the Aircraft Noise Performance database, ERCD has confirmed this is confidential and will not be released to the JLAs. Since Deadline 8, ERCD has shared with the Applicant their analysis of 165,000 noise measurements carried out at 20 Noise and Track Keeping monitors around Gatwick in 2018 and 2019 used to validate the noise ANCON noise model that has been used for this Project. The Applicant understands ERCD has now supplied this dataset to the JLAs. The Applicant trusts this now puts an end to concerns that the ANCON model</p>		The Applicant considers this matter to be not agreed

		<p>Further Updated Deadline 9: At no times have the JLAs contested the use of ANCON or that the ANCON model is not properly validated, as asserted by the Applicant. However, the JLAs do not expect the model to perfectly replicate what happens in reality so it is perfectly reasonable that, for a DCO examination, there should be an understanding of any uncertainties in the modelling process. It is typical for an EIA to provide information on any modelling uncertainties and there was a complete lack of information on air noise modelling submitted with the ES. All information requests made by the JLAs have been completely reasonable in the context of a DCO examination.</p> <p>The Applicant states that the Air Noise Performance database is confidential when, in fact, it is freely available on the European Union Aviation Safety Agency website to be used under their Terms and Conditions. The JLAs have at no point made any requests for confidential ANCON database information and this information was only mentioned by the Applicant at ISH9 when attempting to justify why the actual information request had not been fulfilled. The JLAs have consistently requested baseline noise data from Gatwick’s Noise and Track Keeping (NTK) system and a comparison of ANCON noise model outputs against measured noise data. This information was provide for the Boeing 737-800 [REP6-600] but the Applicant rejected requests to provide similar information for aircraft that make up 75% of noise energy of the fleet (a modelling validation requirement from CAP2091). The noise data from the NTK was only received when the JLAs approached the CAA directly after ISH9. Whilst the JLAs are grateful to have finally received this information, it has come at a time that is too late to be used meaningfully in the examination to understand aircraft contributions to noise contours.</p>	<p>is not properly validated for this study. The Applicant has been clear from the start that the ANCON model is fully validated and is the best model for the Project.</p>		
<p>2.2.2.14</p>		<p>HDC have added this addition matter to set position is that the definition of mobilisation needs to be updated in line with the Thames Tideway project, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mobilisation up to 1 hour before and after core hours, with mobilisation activities defined as set out below. Note Mobilisation does NOT include lorry movements into or out of sites. - Timings and definition of mobilisation need to be updated in Code of construction practice. As set out in [REP1-100] p45 / 46 with mobilisation defined (as in the Thames Tideway Project) as: <p><i>Arrival and departure of the workforce at the site and movement to and from places of work (if parked engines shall be turned off and staff shall be considerate towards neighbours with no loud music or raised voices); general refuelling (from jerry cans only, use of fuel tractors and bowsers shall be limited to standard working hours); site inspections and safety checks, site meetings (briefings and quiet inspections / walkovers); site clean up (site house keeping that does not require the use of plant); site maintenance; and low</i></p>	<p>Updated position (Deadline 9) ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice - Version 4 - Tracked [REP7-023] addresses this point as follows:</p> <p><i>4.2.5 Outside the airport boundary, the core working hours will be 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday (excluding bank holidays) and 07:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.</i></p> <p><i>4.2.6 A period of up to one hour at the beginning and end of these core working periods is anticipated to be used for start-up and close-down of activities. This will include (but not be limited to) unloading, site briefings, inspection, refuelling, maintenance and general preparation work and housekeeping works. These activities will not include operation of plant or machinery that is likely to cause a disturbance to local residents or businesses.</i></p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary to copy from another project and the final sentence quoted from the CoCP above that excludes operations that are likely to cause disturbance to local residents or businesses addresses the concern fully.</p>		<p>The Applicant considers this matter to be agreed.</p>

		<i>key maintenance and safety checking of plant and machinery (providing this does not require or cause hammering or banging, etc). Mobilisation does NOT include lorry movements into or out of sites.</i>			
--	--	---	--	--	--

2.17. Planning and Policy

2.17.1 Table 2.17 sets out the position of both parties in relation to planning and policy matters.

Table 2.17 Statement of Common Ground – Planning and Policy Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
2.18.1.1	Incomplete and inconsistent consideration of local planning policies	<p>The Applicant has failed to include Horsham District Council’s local planning policies in the Planning Statement. In the ES chapters, local plan policy has been applied inconsistently. For example, for the Socio-Economics chapter paragraph 17.2.14 provides a table which lists adopted and emerging local planning policies relevant to Socio-Economics based on the local study area for this assessment and provides further detail in Appendix 17.2.1. The table of policies is considered incomplete. Furthermore, both the chapter and appendix provide limited analysis of how the Project aligns with the policies of Horsham District Council. Notably, consideration of some of the potential constraints brought about by the Project on the local authority area is absent from any of the analysis produced.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting outcomes of applicant’s review.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Response provided in REP4-042.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Applicant’s position has been noted. The Council is content to mark this matter as No Longer Being Pursued owing to specific issues raised elsewhere in the SoCG.</p>	<p>Relevant local policies are set out within the DCO Application, namely within the legislation and policy sections of the topic-specific ES Chapters 7 to 20 and Gatwick Airport-specific local plan policies and supplementary planning documents and guidance in Section 6.6 of the Planning Statement.</p> <p>In response to HDC’s comment, GAL will undertake a review of local policies within the ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics to identify any inconsistencies.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): A series of Local Planning Policy Compliance Tables [REP3-055] were submitted at Deadline 3. Annex C relates to HDC’s local planning policies and was prepared taking account of the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report [REP1-068].</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant’s response to CBC, HDC and MSDC comments on the Local Planning Policy Compliance Tables [REP3-055] is set out in paragraph 3.17.21 of The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-072]. As set out in that response, CBC, HDC and MSDC comments largely pointed to the content of the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report [REP1-068] and which the Applicant responded to at Deadline 3. The Applicant has no further responses to make on the LPAs’ submissions that have not been responded to within the Local Compliance Tables themselves, the Applicant’s Response to the Local Impact Report [REP3-078] or in subsequent submissions responding to the Local Authorities comments, including the Applicant’s Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] and in the Applicant’s Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-072].</p> <p>If HDC has outstanding concerns, the Applicant would suggest that this SoCG item is marked as ‘resolved’ or ‘no longer being pursued’ as any policy specific concerns are captured in other SoCG items.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic [APP-042] ES Chapter 18 Health and Wellbeing [APP-043]</p> <p>Planning Statement [APP-254].</p>	No Longer Being Pursued
2.18.1.2	Safeguarding of land for a wide-spaced additional runway	The land safeguarded for an additional runway is a very large area of land, around 700 hectares, some of which falls within Horsham District, although the vast extent is within Crawley Borough. The continued safeguarding of land reduces Crawley Borough Council’s ability to meet	This matter is not considered relevant to this DCO Application, instead to be dealt with via the Local Plan process.	n/a	Not Agreed

		<p>the Borough's own housing and employment needs which has implications for neighbouring authorities, such as Horsham District. The Applicant is not actively pursuing this as a growth option and should therefore review the safeguarding of land, given the scale of development proposed as part of the future baseline and Northern Runway Project as part of the DCO process.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The safeguarded land is a result of the growth aspirations of the airport vs the actual development proposed as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position is reflected in the response to ExQ GEN.1.5 [REP4-064]</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council has noted the Applicant's response to ExQ2 GEN.2.1 at Deadline 7.</p>	<p>As set out in GAL's representations to the CBC's Local Plan examination, GAL consider that the safeguarded land is required and justified as set out in the Gatwick Airport 2019 Masterplan. We are therefore not seeking to remove, review or amend the boundary or extent of the safeguarded land.</p> <p>GAL has made representations at every stage of CBC's Local Plan preparations objecting to its proposals to allocate employment land to the east of Balcombe Road in the safeguarded land. We continue to engage with CBC through the Local Plan examination.</p> <p>GAL continues to monitor Local Plan activity in host and neighbouring authorities and will make representations as and when required.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): In addition to the above response, the Applicant has also responded to a related question from the ExA, under ExQ1 GEN.1.5 [REP3-091] submitted at Deadline 3. The Applicant's response points to the appointed Local Plan Inspectors Preliminary Findings² on the draft Crawley Borough Local Plan which has established the principle of continued safeguarding having regard to national aviation policy. On this basis, the Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item.</p>		
<p>2.18.1.3</p>	<p>Justification by the Applicant regarding what forms part of the 'Authorised Development' in the NSIP and what parts are 'Associated Development'</p>	<p>There are 4no additional hotels proposed as part of the DCO but within the description of development outside of the DCO no additional hotels are proposed as part of the future baseline growth. The Council also notes that the hotels are not defined as operational use.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): If hotels are to be included as associated development within the DCO, additional controls are needed over these developments, including preventing hotel parking being created in future, and there would need to be some way any future operator would be signed into the airport surface access commitments. This would be to ensure that 'sufficient but no more' parking is provided on-airport consistent with the Applicant delivering upon its Surface Access Commitments.</p> <p>The maximum number of hotel bedrooms to be created for each works site should also be clearly specified in the DCO.</p>	<p>Further clarity is requested from HDC on this concern. As explained at earlier TWGs and in responses to previous Issues Trackers, the future baseline comprises developments which are either under construction, subject to planning permission or are reasonably expected to gain planning permission. There are no existing proposals for new hotel(s) that fall within these categories and are therefore excluded from the future baseline that has underpinned the environmental assessment, to provide a worse case assessment.</p> <p>In respect of hotel provisions being Associated Development as part of the Project proposals, an explanation of this was provided at the Planning TWG in November 2022 justified against the Planning Act 2008 and Government's supporting guidance, and no subsequent queries were raised by the LAs. A response was also provided against Item 3.93 in the October 2023 versions of the Issues Trackers.</p>	<p>a Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051]</p> <p>Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028]</p> <p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p> <p>Works Plans [REP3-011]</p> <p>Parameter Plans [AS-131]</p> <p>Design Principles [REP3-056]</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

² <https://crawley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2024-02/ID-026%20Post%20Hearings%20Letter%2031%20Jan%202024.pdf>

		<p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council is reviewing its on this matter</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council has noted the updated information provided by the Applicant stating that no additional parking will be provided for hotels. The Authorities have proposed a new requirement relating to hotel parking.</p>	<p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant submitted a Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] at Deadline 1 which provides further information on the provision and management of car parking in the context of the Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028].</p> <p>The design of the proposed hotels is controlled through the Draft DCO [REP3-006] via the Works Plans [REP3-011], Parameter Plans [AS-131] and the Design Principles [REP3-056] secured under DCO Requirement 4, including specific principles on hotel buildings under DBF3 and DBF4. These aspects control the physical limits of the hotel developments and their design. As such, a further control over the maximum number of hotel bedrooms is not necessary.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this matter.</p>		
2.18.1.4	Planning Statement	<p>When the Applicant expects the Letter of No Impediment referred to in paragraph 1.3.3 will be provided.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting receipt of letter</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council is reviewing its on this matter</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Submission of LoNI noted.</p>	<p>GAL expects CAA's letter of no impediment to be submitted early in the Examination stage. As confirmed in the Planning Statement (para 1.3.3), GAL is confident that there are no safety-related impediments why the Project should not progress and that this will be confirmed through the CAA's letter.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The draft Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) [REP3-068] submitted at Deadline 3 contains the CAA's draft Letter of No Impediment (LoNI) at Appendix 2. The Applicant believes these are final and complete with no further substantive changes expected. GAL understands that the CAA will provide signed versions of the SoCG and LoNI towards the end of examination.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this matter.</p>	Planning Statement [APP-245].	Resolved
2.18.1.5	Planning Statement	<p>How the changes mentioned in paragraphs 1.3.7 and 1.3.8 will be secured.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council is reviewing its position on this matter</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council, along with the other JLPAs have made submissions in relation to Requirement 19 at Deadline 7 to ensure the airport operates with the limits outlined within the ES.</p>	<p>Airspace within the UK is regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and managed by NATS En Route, which is a subdivision within the National Air Traffic Services. An explanation of the relationship between the DCO Project and airspace regulations was set out in paragraphs 3.3.10 to 3.3.13 of the Autumn 2021 Consultation, contained in Consultation Report Appendices, Part B, Volume 2.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Requirement 19 of the Draft DCO [REP3-006] secures the operation of the repositioned northern runway.</p>	Consultation Report Appendices, Part B, Volume 2 [APP-225].	Not Agreed

			Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this matter.		
2.18.1.6	Planning Statement	<p>Whether there is any legal precedent for the statement that it is “appropriate to use the policy framework of the [Airports National Policy Statement] as the primary framework against which the Project as a whole should be tested” (paragraph 1.5.19).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting legal advice.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council is reviewing its position on this matter.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council, along with other JLPAs, set out its position most recently in REP7-107, summarising the areas of agreement and disagreement. While the issue is not agreed, the JLPAs do not consider that the remaining areas of disagreement need to be resolved in order for a lawful decision on the DCO application to be made.</p>	<p>The Airport National Policy Statement (para 1.41) itself confirms that “the Secretary of State considers that the contents of the Airports NPS will be both important and relevant considerations in the determination of such an application [not comprising an application for the Heathrow Northwest Runway], particularly where it relates to London or the South East of England.”</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has responded on this matter through the Issue Specific Hearings and submissions to previous deadlines. Most notably in The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH1 [REP1-056], The Applicant’s Response to ISH1 Actions [REP1-062] and The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports [REP3-078]. The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item in response to those submissions.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this matter.</p>	<p>The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH1 [REP1-056]</p> <p>The Applicant’s Response to ISH1 Actions [REP1-062]</p> <p>The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports [REP3-078]</p>	Resolved
2.18.1.7	Planning Statement	<p>When further information regarding the proposed section 106 agreement will come forward and when negotiations will begin in earnest.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council acknowledges submission of a draft S106 to legal representatives.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council looks forward to further engagement with the Applicant in order to progress the S106 draft.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council, along with the other Authorities, continue to engage with the Applicant on a draft S106, noting that the Council, as a neighbouring authority, can not be a signatory to the S106.</p>	<p>GAL will issue a draft of the Section 106 Agreement in connection with the NRP to the local authorities. GAL looks forward to receiving initial feedback on the first draft and continuing engagement with the parties to ensure a final, signed version has been submitted by the close of the examination.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Joint Local Authorities and GAL are continue to work together and engaging on the draft Section 106 Agreement. At the time of writing, the Applicant and JLAs have agreed a series of meetings on each of the schedules of the s106 agreement.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant is continuing to engage with the Local Authorities on the drafting of the Section 106 Agreement.</p>	n/a	Resolved
2.18.1.8	Planning Statement	<p>Why the Applicant considers the provision of hotels (Works 26, 27, 28 and 29) falls within the scope of the DCO regime. The same point applies to the proposed commercial space</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): This matter is covered in other rows within this SoCG (2.18.1.3, 2.7.1.1)</p>	<p>An explanation of hotel and office provisions as Associated Development within the Project was provided at the Planning TWG in November 2022 justified against the Planning Act 2008 and Government’s supporting guidance, and no subsequent queries were raised by the LAs. A response was also provided on this against Item 3.93 in the October 2023 versions of the Issues Trackers.</p>	n/a	Covered by rows 2.18.1.3 and 2.7.1.1

			<p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item, or confirmation if this item can be marked as 'agreed'.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this matter.</p>		
2.18.1.9	Planning Statement	<p>How the Flood Resilience Statement will be secured (paragraph 5.5.8 and Table 5.2).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting response.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council welcomes this update</p>	<p>GAL will consider how best to secure the Flood Resilience Statement and confirm in due course.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Draft DCO [REP1-004] was updated at Deadline 1 to include Requirement 24 which secures the Flood Resilience Statement.</p>	n/a	Agreed
2.18.1.10	Planning Statement	<p>Whether an updated Mitigation Route Map will be prepared (stating, for example, which parts of the dDCO are relevant).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting update.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Response provided in REP4-042.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Update at Deadline 2 noted and issue resolved.</p>	<p>The Mitigation Route Map will be updated during the course of the DCO Examination to reflect any changes / updates made through the process. The next iteration (and any subsequent updates) will specify the relevant schedule/requirement of the draft DCO, as requested by HDC.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The updated Mitigation Route Map [REP2-011] submitted at Deadline 2 identifies which part of the Draft DCO [REP3-006] is relevant to specific mitigation / commitment.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Clarity is required from HDC on this matter as REP4-042 does not contain comments on the Mitigation Route Map.</p>	ES Appendix 5.2.3 Mitigation Route Map [APP-078]	Resolved
2.18.1.11	Planning Statement	<p>Why highway improvements will not be in place and open to the public until after the northern runway comes into commercial use (paragraph 7.2.9);</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council would appreciate further detail from the Applicant on where the schedule of highways improvements has been justified, and whether this is, in part, as a result of the mode share targets not being met until up to three years following the northern runway coming into operation</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council defer to Highways Authorities on this matter.</p>	<p>An explanation of the timing of the surface access improvement works is contained further in the Planning Statement, within Section 8.4. Further detail is also contained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and the Transport Assessment, underpinned by the traffic modelling.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item, or confirmation if this item can be marked as 'agreed'.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Matters requested by HDC are contained in the Planning Statement, ES Chapter 12 and Transport Assessment as referenced in the original response.</p>	<p>Planning Statement [APP-245]</p> <p>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [APP-037]</p> <p>Transport Assessment [APP-258].</p>	No longer being pursued

<p>2.18.1.12</p>	<p>Planning Statement</p>	<p>Why the Planning Policy Compliance Tables appear to make no reference at all to local plan policies (contrasting with the Manston DCO where, in the decision letter, the Secretary of State listed the Thanet Local Plan as an important and relevant matter in the context of policy compliance).</p> <p>Why there is no reference to local plan policies in the following sections: Air Quality (8.5); Noise and Vibration (8.6); Greenhouse Gas Emissions (8.7); Biodiversity and Ecological Conservation (8.9); Agricultural Land Use and Recreation (8.10); Resource and Waste Management (8.11); Flood Risk (8.12); Water Environment (Water Quality and Resources) (8.13); Historic Environment (8.14); Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources (Visual Impacts) (8.15); Geology and Ground Conditions (8.16); Artificial Light, Smoke and Steam (8.17); Major Accidents and Disasters (8.18); Health and Wellbeing (8.19); Sustainability (8.20); Community Compensation (8.21); Community Engagement (8.22).</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Response provided in REP4-042.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Areas remain where the Council disagrees with the Applicant's position on compliance with local policy requirements. On balance, it can be agreed that these specifics are being pursued elsewhere in the SoCG.</p>	<p>Relevant local policies are set out within the DCO Application, namely within the legislation and policy sections of the topic-specific ES Chapters (namely ES Chapter 7 to 20) and Gatwick Airport-specific local plan policies in Section 6.6 of the Planning Statement. The purpose of the Planning Policy Compliance Table is to set out and consider relevant national policies against the Project proposals, in recognition that the Government's National Policy Statements provide the primary planning policy framework for NSIPs under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): A series of Local Planning Policy Compliance Tables [REP3-055] were submitted at Deadline 3. Annex C relates to HDC's local planning policies and was prepared taking account of the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report [REP1-068].</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's response to CBC, HDC and MSDC comments on the Local Planning Policy Compliance Tables [REP3-055] is set out in paragraph 3.17.21 of The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-072]. As set out in that response, CBC, HDC and MSDC comments largely pointed to the content of the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report [REP1-068] and which the Applicant responded to at Deadline 3. The Applicant has no further responses to make on the LPAs' submissions that have not been responded to within the Local Compliance Tables themselves, the Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Report [REP3-078] or in subsequent submissions responding to the Local Authorities comments, including the Applicant's Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] and in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-072].</p> <p>If HDC has outstanding concerns, the Applicant would suggest that this SoCG item is marked as 'resolved' or 'no longer being pursued' as any policy specific concerns are captured in other SoCG items.</p>	<p>Planning Statement [APP-245].</p>	<p>Issue covered elsewhere in SoCG</p>
<p>2.18.1.13</p>	<p>Planning Statement</p>	<p>The adequacy of Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (ESBS) (paragraph 8.3).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): While the overarching objectives of the ESBS are welcomed, further detail is required on how this will benefit Horsham District. Further detail around engagement with providers is required.</p>	<p>Please may HDC provide further detail on this concern or confirm if its concerns on the ESBS are covered elsewhere in its RRs and PADSS (and therefore responded to elsewhere in these Issues Tables).</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant's welcomes HDC's support on the ESBS's overarching objectives. The ESBS has been subject to discussions at Issue Specific Hearing 3 contained in The Applicant's Written Summary of ISH3 Oral Submissions [REP1-</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement</p>

		<p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position on the ESBS and the dIP is reflected in REP4-042</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council continues to engage with the applicant on the ESBS, Implementation Plan and Thematic Plans.</p>	<p>058] and The Applicant's Response to ISH3 Actions [REP1-064] were submitted at Deadline 1. Subsequent to this, a draft ESBS Implementation Plan [REP3-069] has been submitted at Deadline 3 including further information on the activities to be delivered and who GAL will work with partners and stakeholders.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): REP4-042 simply points to the West Sussex Local Authorities Deadline 4 Submissions for comments on the ESBS. The Applicant's response to these comments is contained in The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [REP5-072]. The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this SoCG item.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement</p>		
2.18.1.14	Planning Statement	<p>Whether the replacement open space land secured by article 40 of the dDCO is suitable in terms of location, size and amenity (paragraph 7.2.9);</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council has no further comment to make on this matter at this stage</p>	<p>ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation provides an assessment of the potential effects of the Project on areas of open space and the provision of replacement open space. The Statement of Reasons (Section 10) also explains the approach to the acquisition of open space land/rights over open space land.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item, or confirmation if this item can be marked as 'agreed'.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): On the basis of HDC's Deadline 5 response, this SoCG item has been marked as resolved.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 19 Agricultural Land Use and Recreation [APP-044]</p> <p>Statement of Reasons [AS-008]</p>	Resolved
2.18.1.15	Planning Statement	<p>Why the dDCO does not make any provision about securing that Site Waste Management Plans follow the template in the Construction Resources and Waste Management Plan.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council will review and provide a further update</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council defers to the local waste planning authority on this matter.</p>	<p>The Construction Resources and Waste Management Plan (CRWMP) is an Annex to the Code of Construction Practice to be secured as a certified document and under Requirement 7 of the draft DCO. Paragraph 1.4.1 explains that the CRWMP will be implemented through the preparation of site waste management plans and which is also referenced under the Code of Construction Practice, to be secured as a certified document and under Requirement 7 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant's latest response on the CRWMP and its associated Site Waste Management Plans is contained in The Applicant's Response to ExQ1 DCO.1.47 [REP3-089]. The content of the CRWMP [APP-087] makes clear that the SWMPs will follow the SWMP template contained in Annex A of the CRWMP.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Plan [REP1-021]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice Annex 5 Construction Resources and Waste Management Plan [APP-087]</p> <p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p>	No longer pursuing

			Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this matter.		
2.18.1.16	Planning Statement	<p>Regarding the proposed flood risk mitigation, it is not clear how the timing of the River Mole works (Work No.39) and Car Park Y attenuation tank (Work No. 30(a)) will be secured; similarly, it is not clear where the culverts and syphons are secured.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting legal advice.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council has no further comment to make on this matter at this stage</p>	<p>The cited works are anticipated to take place early in the construction timetable – see Section 5.3 of ES Chapter 5: Project Description and ES Appendix 5.3.3: Indicative Construction Sequencing. GAL will consider further whether it is appropriate to secure the timing of their delivery.</p> <p>Culverts and syphons are included in the design principles in Appendix A1 of the Design and Access Statement (Volume 5) and their delivery is therefore secured in the draft DCO by Requirements 4 and 5, which require detailed designs to be approved by the relevant planning or highway authority prior to commencement. The detailed designs must be in accordance with the design principles.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Draft DCO [REP1-004] was updated at Deadline 1 to update Requirement 23 (Flood Compensation Delivery Plan) to include Work Nos. 30(a) and 39. DCO Requirement 23 requires that a Flood Compensation Delivery Plan is submitted and approved by Crawley Borough Council, on consultation with the Environment Agency, and setting out the timeframe for delivery for flood compensation works – now including Work Nos. 30(a) and 39.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): On the basis of HDC’s Deadline 5 response, this SoCG item has been marked as resolved.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 5: Project Description [REP1-016]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.3: Indicative Construction Sequencing [APP-088]</p> <p>Appendix A1 of the Design and Access Statement: Volume 5 [APP-257]</p> <p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p>	Resolved
2.18.1.17	Planning Statement	<p>Section 8.16 (Geology and Ground Conditions) refers to “existing legislative regimes” for spillages and storage facilities. Aside from the Control of Pollution (Oil Storage) (England) Regulations, are any other regimes relevant?</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council has no further comment to make on this matter at this stage</p>	<p>Legislation in place to protect existing geology and ground conditions is set out in Section 10.2 of ES Chapter 10: Geology and Ground Conditions.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item, or confirmation if this item can be marked as ‘agreed’.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): On the basis of HDC’s Deadline 5 response, this SoCG item has been marked as resolved.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 10: Geology and Ground Conditions [APP-035]</p>	Resolved
2.18.1.18	Planning Statement	<p>It is not clear how the mitigation referred to in paragraph 8.17.11 (Artificial Light, Smoke and Steam) will be secured;</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council has no further comment to make on this matter at this stage</p>	<p>Mitigation measures for lighting are contained within the design principles, in Appendix A1 of the Design and Access Statement (Volume 5) and secured under the draft DCO (i.e. Requirements 4, 5 and 10).</p>	<p>Design and Access Statement Volume 5 [APP-257]</p> <p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p>	Resolved

			<p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item, or confirmation if this item can be marked as 'agreed'.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): On the basis of HDC's Deadline 5 response, this SoCG item has been marked as resolved.</p>		
2.18.1.19	Land West of Ifield	<p>The Council is currently conducting a Local Plan Review and it is expected that Regulation 19 will be published in January 2024. Homes England is promoting the site Land West of Ifield as a strategic allocation in the emerging Horsham District Local Plan (HDLP). At the time of writing, no formal decisions have been taken by the Council regarding the emerging HDLP as to whether this site will be allocated or not.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Response noted.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council anticipates issuing an update in relation to the draft Local Plan at Deadline 6.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Horsham District Local Plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in July 2024. Issues relating to the treatment of local plan allocations are covered elsewhere in this SoCG, there the item can be marked as No Longer Pursuing.</p>	<p>Noted. No response required.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item, or confirmation if this item can be marked as 'agreed' or 'no longer pursuing'.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this matter.</p>	n/a	No longer pursuing
2.18.1.20	Safeguarded Land	<p>The Applicant should commit to limiting the Airport to a two-runway operation, thereby releasing the land safeguarded for an additional runway, and agree to a voluntary cap on passenger throughput, should the DCO be consented.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The comment relates to the need for future safeguarding should the NRP be approved (i.e. in the next Local Plan) given the significant constraint it imposes on housing and employment development in Crawley borough. This prevents economic development in the borough which could be a positive benefit from the NRP, hence it is considered relevant.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position is reflected in the response to ExQ GEN.1.5 [REP4-064].</p> <p>Suggestion this item could be merged with 2.18.1.2</p>	<p>As set out in GAL's representations to the CBC Local Plan, GAL consider that the safeguarded land is required and justified as set out in the Gatwick Airport 2019 Masterplan. We are therefore not seeking to remove, review or amend the boundary or extent of the safeguarded land.</p> <p>Appendix 2 of GAL's representations dated 3rd November 2023 to the Planning Inspectors' Matter Issues and Questions on the Crawley Borough Council Local Plan Examination sets out an overview of relevant national and local policy, guidance and documents relating to the need to continue to safeguard land at Gatwick Airport for a new runway. There is a clear longstanding policy commitment which is supported by Government to safeguard land at airports to maintain a supply of land for future national requirements and to ensure that inappropriate developments do not hinder sustainable aviation growth. Indeed, it is a policy that CBC have themselves adopted and recognised in full within the current and previous versions of their Local Plan, and which were found to be sound.</p>	n/a	Covered by Row 2.18.1.2

			<p>Updated position (April 2024): In addition to the above response, the Applicant has also responded to a related question from the ExA, under ExQ1 GEN.1.5 [REP3-091] submitted at Deadline 3. The Applicant's response points to the appointed Local Plan Inspectors Preliminary Findings³ on the draft Crawley Borough Local Plan which has established the principle of continued safeguarding having regard to national aviation policy. On this basis, the Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): On the basis of HDC's Deadline 5 response, this SoCG item has been marked as covered by Row 2.18.1.2.</p>		
2.18.1.21	Airport Operator Permitted Development Rights:	<p>The Applicant benefits from significant Permitted Development rights as an airport operator, some of which the Council considers are incompatible with the proposals presented as part of the Project and we therefore consider that a number of these should be removed as part of the DCO to ensure that the commitments to be secured by the Order are achieved, should be application be consented.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council does not propose removal of all PD rights but suggests the compatibility of existing PD rights with the DCO should be explored further as part of the examination process.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The latest response deals specifically with permitted development rights in relation to the runway, but does not address other permitted development rights or whether the Applicant agrees this should be considered further.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 8): The Council welcomes the ExA's proposed Requirement to remove permitted development rights in relation to park in order to secure the content of the SAC. If permitted development rights persist, this undermines the forecasts as what can appear an apparently insignificant change to the ground manoeuvring area can have substantial changes to the airport capacity and can therefore influence the predictions on fleet, capacity and environmental effects. For the DCO to be effective, permitted development rights should be extinguished for any matter that has potential to increase capacity.</p>	<p>It is necessary that Gatwick Airport Limited, as the airport operator, can continue to rely on its extant permitted development rights to facilitate the ongoing operation of the airport and to allow for minor works to be separately consented without needing to rely on an amendment to a DCO (should the application be approved) which would be disproportionate and impractical in the circumstances. This is set out in Article 9(5) of the draft DCO.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The relationship between the Project proposals and permitted development rights is set out in The Applicant's Response to ISH1 Actions [REP1-062] and in response to ExQ1 CS.1.23 [REP3-084] submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to ISH1 Actions [REP1-062]</p> <p>ExQ1 CS.1.23 [REP3-084]</p>	Not Agreed

³ <https://crawley.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2024-02/ID-026%20Post%20Hearings%20Letter%2031%20Jan%202024.pdf>

2.18. Project Elements and Approach to Mitigation

2.18.1 Table 2.18 sets out the position of both parties in relation to project elements and approach to mitigation matters.

Table 2.18 Statement of Common Ground – Project Elements and Approach to Mitigation Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
2.19.1.1	Lack of effective controls and enforceable measures to sustainably manage the growth of the Airport	<p>The growth of the Airport should be contained within agreed environmental parameters and managed through control mechanisms, which will ensure mitigation is sufficient and effective.</p> <p>The Applicant has not presented proposals that will ensure effective control mechanisms necessary to ensure the Airport’s growth is managed within expected and agreed environmental parameters in the short and long terms. This will unfairly impact the environment and communities affected by airport operations and should be addressed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Notwithstanding concerns with some of the environmental controls proposed, HDC welcomes ongoing engagement on appropriate controls. Further information is required. Proposed that the Green Controlled Growth approach taken at Luton Airport should be followed</p> <p>dated Position (Deadline 5): The Council is currently reviewing its position on this matter.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council continues to promote the Environmentally Managed Growth Framework as a mechanism for ensuring growth at the airport does not impact on various environmental thresholds.</p>	<p>The Applicant has included as part of the Application the mitigation identified as being necessary under the Environmental Statement to address the potential adverse impacts of the Project. Specific to those environmental topics and impacts which are considered most sensitive to airport growth (noise, carbon, surface access and air quality), the relevant mitigation is primarily contained within the Noise Envelope, Surface Access Commitments and Carbon Action Plan documents, each secured as requirements to, and to be certified as part of, the draft DCO (with additional air quality mitigation proposed to be included within the s106 Agreement). Each of those ‘control’ documents sets out bespoke independent governance, monitoring and mitigation arrangements to ensure the proper functioning and delivery of the underlying mitigation/commitments.</p> <p>The extents and parameters of the Project would be secured through the draft DCO, namely Schedule 1 in defined the authorised development and Schedule 12 setting out the certified documents, including the series of application drawings submitted for approval.</p> <p>The Mitigation Route Map sets out how the Project’s mitigation measures would be legally secured.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has responded on this matter through the Issue Specific Hearings and submissions to previous deadlines. Most notably in The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH2 [REP1-057] and The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports [REP3-078]. The Applicant would welcome an updated position or response from HDC against this SoCG item in response to those submissions.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant would kindly request an updated position from HDC on this matter.</p>	<p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p> <p>ES Appendix 14.9.7 The Noise Envelope [APP-177]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.2 Carbon Action Plan [APP-091]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments [APP-090].</p> <p>The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions from ISH2 [REP1-057]</p> <p>The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports [REP3-078]</p>	Not Agreed
2.19.1.2	Limited engagement on the proposed Section 106 and	To date, there has been very limited engagement on the draft Heads of Terms and any potential Section 106 contributions. It is expected that	GAL will issue a draft of the Section 106 Agreement in connection with the NRP to the local authorities. GAL looks forward to	n/a	Resolved

	an overall lack of acknowledgement of the Airport's expansion on Horsham District's infrastructure, facilities and services and the quality of life of the District's communities	<p>there will be a significant discrepancy between the Applicant and Horsham District Council (along with the other affected local authorities) on the scope and scale of funding required to mitigate the impacts of the Project.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting draft S106.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council looks forward to further engagement with the Applicant in order to progress the S106 draft</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Engagement on the s106 is ongoing, noting that the Council cannot be a signatory.</p>	<p>receiving initial feedback on the first draft and continuing engagement with the parties to ensure a final, signed version has been submitted by the close of the examination.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Joint Local Authorities and GAL are continue to work together and engaging on the draft Section 106 Agreement. At the time of writing, the Applicant and JLAs have agreed a series of meetings on each of the schedules of the s106 agreement.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant is continuing to engage with the Local Authorities on the drafting of the Section 106 Agreement.</p>		
2.19.1.3	Section 106 agreement	<p>The Council is very concerned about the expansion of the Airport presented by the Applicant as the "future baseline". The scale of growth is significant and has the potential for numerous impacts on Horsham District that are outside of the Northern Runway Project. We understand that the Applicant has publicly indicated that the existing Section 106 will be updated and rolled forward until such time as the new Section 106 is in place and will capture this additional future baseline growth. The Council asks that the Applicant makes every effort to protect communities affected by airport operations, both as part of this Project and from the growth coming forward outside of the DCO.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting draft S106.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council looks forward to further engagement with the Applicant in order to progress the S106 draft</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Engagement on the s106 is ongoing, noting that the Council cannot be a signatory.</p>	<p>GAL will issue a draft of the Section 106 Agreement in connection with the NRP to the local authorities. GAL looks forward to receiving initial feedback on the first draft and continuing engagement with the parties to ensure a final, signed version has been submitted by the close of the examination.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Joint Local Authorities and GAL are continue to work together and engaging on the draft Section 106 Agreement. At the time of writing, the Applicant and JLAs have agreed a series of meetings on each of the schedules of the s106 agreement.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant is continuing to engage with the Local Authorities on the drafting of the Section 106 Agreement.</p>	n/a	Resolved
2.19.1.4	Mitigation and compensation	<p>The Council is very concerned about the limited proposals for mitigation and community compensation which, as currently presented, will be unlikely to mitigate the likely adverse impacts arising from the Project in accordance with the expectations set out in national aviation policy. The Council has had regard to, and would like to highlight to the Examining Authority, the significant package of mitigation and community compensation, contained within a series of 11 pledges for the local community, that the Applicant put forward in its bid to the Airports Commission in 2015 in relation to the short-listed options for expanding London airport capacity.</p>	<p>Please may HDC provide further detail on this concern or confirm if its concerns on mitigation are covered elsewhere in its RRs and PADSS (and therefore responded to elsewhere in these Issues Tables).</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has put forward a comprehensive package of mitigation and enhancement measures as part of the NRP's DCO application. This includes community-focused packages put forward under the Section 106 Agreement, which is subject to ongoing discussions between the Joint Local Authorities and GAL.</p>	n/a	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): There is a gap in the measures put forward in the Applicant's 2015 bid to the Airports Commission in relation to, and in order to address requirements of, national aviation policy, and the current proposal. The concerns the Council has with the current proposal are covered in more detail elsewhere in this document, however this point stands as an overarching issue which has been consistently raised by the Council in its responses to the 2018 Draft Masterplan consultation and the Gatwick NRP Statutory Consultation (2021).</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council looks forward to further engagement with the Applicant in order to progress the S106 draft and other appropriate mechanisms</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Discussions relating to the s106 and controls are ongoing on specific matters.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 9): in line with the Joint Position Statement to be published at Deadline 9, and notwithstanding the package agreed in respect of the S106, the Council still has significant concerns about the need for controls on the growth of the airport. These concerns are assuaged by the EMG proposal put forward by the JLAs, which the Council considers to be the minimum level of control acceptable and which the Applicant does not consider to be necessary. While significant progress has been made on many areas, as reflected in the Joint Position Statement, the Council's concern about matters outside the scope of the S106 remain.</p>	<p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant is continuing to engage with the Local Authorities on the drafting of the Section 106 Agreement. The Applicant would also kindly request clarity from HDC on why this matter has been marked as 'not agreed' given discussions are ongoing.</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

2.19. Socio-Economics and Economics

2.19.1 Table 2.20 sets out the position of both parties in relation to socio-economics and economics matters.

Table 2.19 Statement of Common Ground – Socio-Economics and Economics Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
2.20.1.1	Use of out-of-date data sources	<p>Census 2011 data being relied upon for a number of different assessments, for example, data on dwelling vacancy and economic activity, amongst other data, which is significantly out of date. Several Baseline Data Tables are out of date and do not use the most recent data sources available at the time. This includes education data on shortfall/surplus which needs to be tested with relevant local education authorities.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Applicant should source up-to-data for all data sources used in the chapter to avoid adopting an inconsistent approach to the assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant should obtain up-to-data for all data sources used in the chapter to avoid adopting an inconsistent approach to the assessment. Latest update by Applicant has not provided this.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): This issue is not longer being pursued.</p>	<p>The analysis presented in the PEIR was primarily based on 2019 data (i.e. pre-Covid) given that the economy and wider socio-economic conditions are expected to rebound to pre-pandemic levels before the Project’s commencement. For the same reasons, the same approach is carried over in the ES, however, where appropriate, relevant data sources such as labour market and employment indicators have been updated to reflect the latest available position based on data availability.</p> <p>There is no effect on demand for school places so updating the baseline will make no difference to the assessment of effects.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided data from the 2021 Census in its response to Action 5 of Issue Specific Hearing 3.</p> <p>The Applicant has also provided a response during Issue Specific Hearing 3 on using a mixture of pre-Covid and post-Covid data. Some data has inevitably changed since submission of the application and will continue to change but it does not materially change the assessment. There is also no requirement to update data throughout the Examination as new data becomes available. Pre-Covid data was used as it provides a benchmark against which the economy would operate at a normal level or operating in normal conditions. However, where there have been updates to data or new data was available, it was incorporated into the assessment. Therefore, a blend of pre- and post-Covid data was used as some post-Covid data was volatile due to the effects of Covid, which meant 2019 remained most suitable for some data.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): No change</p>	<p>n/a</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): ISH3 Action Point 5 in The Applicant’s Response to Actions ISH2-5 [REP2-005]</p> <p>Deadline 1 Submission – Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 3: Socio-economics [REP1-058] – Section 3.1</p>	No longer pursuing
2.20.1.2	Use of out-of-date data sources	<p>The assessment of housing and population relies on out-of-date data and should be using up-to-date information given it will impact on labour supply/housing conclusions. The assessment also makes optimistic projections on housing and does not appear to fully consider existing constraints.</p>	<p>The analysis presented in the PEIR was primarily based on 2019 data (i.e. pre-Covid) given that the economy and wider socio-economic conditions are expected to rebound to pre-pandemic levels before the Project’s commencement. For the same reasons, the same approach is carried over in the ES, however, where</p>	n/a	No longer pursuing

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Applicant should source up-to-data for all data sources used in the chapter to avoid adopting an inconsistent approach to the assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant should obtain up-to-data for all data sources used in the chapter to avoid adopting an inconsistent approach to the assessment. Latest update by Applicant has not provided this.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): See row 2.20.1.1</p>	<p>appropriate, relevant data sources such as labour market and employment indicators have been updated to reflect the latest available position based on data availability.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please refer to the response at Row 2.20.1.1 of this Table.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): No change</p>		
2.20.1.3	Certainty of development	<p>The Applicant appears to rely on the certainty of development being delivered to support growth at the Airport, whilst also assessing the same development as being too uncertain to include in other elements of the Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Applicant hasn't provided a reasonable explanation for not undertaking a cumulative assessment of construction socio-economic effects. This assessment should be undertaken. In terms of operation, the Applicant is not identifying local issues because they haven't undertaken an assessment of impacts at a local authority level.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has not undertaken a robust cumulative assessment of construction socio-economic effects nor have they undertaken an assessment of impacts at a local authority level to understand local implications of the Project.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024) HDC's general position in respect of assessment methodology reflects that set out at Issue Specific Hearing 9 whereby its Counsel stated that the absence of a local authority level assessment is not a legal deficiency in the ES but is a shortcoming affecting the weight given to benefits within the planning balance related to the socio-economic assessment. The consequences of the absence of a local level assessment could in some way be alleviated through the ESBS however this will depend on the extent to which it addresses local need As such this remains Not Agreed. See Row 2.20.4.1 in respect of ESBS.</p>	<p>The cumulative effects assessment has been undertaken in accordance with the approach set out in PINS Advice Note 17 and the approach is described in ES Chapter 20 Cumulative Effects and Inter-relationships of the ES. This includes the development of a long list and short list of other developments that have been used for the cumulative effects assessment provided in the ES. Whilst this chapter also provides a summary of the cumulative effects per topic, the detailed cumulative effects assessments are within the topic chapters of the ES.</p> <p>In terms of traffic modelling, as set out in Section 12.11 of ES Chapter 12, cumulative developments have been considered in accordance with Department for Transport (DfT) Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG) and developments with uncertainty levels of 'near certain' or 'more than likely' are included in the future baseline. West of Ifield was identified with an uncertainty level of 'reasonably foreseeable' and therefore not included in the future baseline but in a separate scenario together with Horley Employment Park and Gatwick Green following comments from local stakeholders. This assessment scenario is based on the best available information about the uses and floorspace proposed for the three sites. Given the level of uncertainty, the assessment is undertaken for the core scenarios of 2029, 2032 and 2047.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): A bottom-up cumulative assessment of construction activity over the next 10 years would show significantly more labour available than there is demand because most construction projects over that time period are not yet planned.</p> <p>ES Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects contains a housing assessment at a local authority level and</p>	<p>ES Chapter 20: Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships [APP-045].</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [APP-042] – Table 17.6.6 and Section 17.9</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to Local Impact Reports Appendix D – Construction Labour Market and Accommodation Impacts [REP3-082]</p> <p>ISH3 Action Point 5 in the Applicant's Response to Actions ISH2-5 [REP2-005]</p> <p>Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction</p>	No longer pursued, subject to the s106 Agreement

			<p>the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearings includes a local authority-level assessment for all authorities where more than one non-home based worker is expected to be based (Crawley, Reigate and Banstead, Mole Valley, Mid Sussex, Tandridge, Horsham and Croydon).</p> <p>Construction employment at the local authority level is provided in ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical note.</p> <p>Additionally, an assessment of effects provided at different spatial levels including FEMA is provided in Table 17.6.6 and Section 17.9 in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic. A further response is provided in the Construction Labour Market and Accommodation Impacts note in response to Local Impact Reports.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): This matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement and therefore it is considered that the absence of a local level assessment is no longer being pursued.</p>	<p>Workforce Distribution Technical Note [APP-199]</p>	
Assessment Methodology					
<p>2.20.2.1</p>	<p>No consideration of effects at a local authority level and concerns with the approach to the assessment of effects</p>	<p>Despite being raised as a gap in the assessment at several Socioeconomic Topic Working Group meetings between the Applicant and the Authorities and the Council's formal response to the Applicant's section 42 consultation, there is still no assessment of effects undertaken at a local authority level. The impacts of the Project on key variables such as employment, labour market, housing (including affordable), social infrastructure and temporary accommodation need to be assessed given they affect both functioning and decision making at the local level. Assessment of effects on the labour market, population, temporary accommodation, construction noise impacts on residents, community facilities, and construction employment need to be revisited. The Council holds concerns in relation to the magnitude criteria used and sensitivity grading for identified receptors. Assessment based on the different study areas are unlikely to fully capture the impacts on Horsham District. There are also concerns with the Cumulative Effects Assessment for the local authority areas in the FEMA, including Horsham District.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): An assessment of impacts is required at the local authority level.</p>	<p>Detailed analysis of the construction employment expected to be generated by the Project is provided in ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note, including an assessment of the potential construction labour supply and their spatial distribution. This data has informed the assessment of the labour market within Section 17.9 of ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic.</p> <p>Wider effects of the construction phase have been assessed in terms of potential impacts on the construction supply chain measured relative to the scale of construction sector enterprises (as opposed to employment which is used for direct effects only) in each of the assessment areas.</p> <p>GAL's response reiterated that an assessment of the potential demand for housing during the construction phase has been added to the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economics [APP-042]</p> <p>ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note [APP-199]</p> <p>Section 17.9 of ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic [APP-042]</p> <p>Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of</p>	<p>No longer pursued, subject to the s106 Agreement</p>

		<p>Concerns related to sensitivity and magnitude criteria for several socio-economic receptors.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant should undertake an assessment of impacts at local authority level, take account of existing constraints and determine the local implications of the Scheme.</p> <p>Given response from Applicant, HDC has remaining concerns related to sensitivity and magnitude criteria for several socio-economic receptors.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDC's position is as set out at Issue Specific Hearing 9 whereby its Counsel stated that the absence of a local authority level assessment is not a legal deficiency in the ES but is a shortcoming affecting the weight given to benefits within the planning balance related to the socio-economic assessment. The consequences of the absence of a local level assessment could in some way be alleviated through the ESBS however this will depend on the extent to which it addresses local need. As such this remains Not Agreed. See 2.20.4.1 in respect of ESBS.</p>	<p>As set out in response to point 3.4, impacts are assessed at the appropriate functional spatial scale and with additional information also provided at local authority level.</p> <p>As shown in ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economics, the thresholds applied vary across receptors and geographies. These are ultimately based on a professional judgment, however proposed thresholds were presented during Topic Working Groups for comment.</p> <p>Section 17.4 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic sets out in detail the updated approach adopted in the ES in relation to defining magnitude and sensitivity.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please refer to the response at Row 2.20.1.3 of this Table for assessment of impacts at the local authority level.</p> <p>The magnitude criteria in ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic have been based upon industry best practice. The Applicant has also justified sensitivity at various socio-economic receptors in Table 17.6.6.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): This matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement and therefore it is considered that the absence of a local level assessment is no longer being pursued.</p>	<p>Population and Housing Effects [APP-201].</p>	
<p>2.20.2.2</p>	<p>The approach to analysis of housing delivery does not analyse the full range of inputs required when determining local housing needs or requirements at a housing market area or local level (such as market signals, affordable housing or constraints on housing supply).</p>	<p>There needs to be a more granular assessment of housing delivery in the area in particular of future supply, as well as the unmet affordable housing need to inform the assessment. The Applicant fails to consider the complex reasons why Plans have not been delivered in line with national policy, and the local and national issues in planning that have prevented this.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Applicant needs to undertake a more granular assessment of housing delivery in the local area particularly recognising the unmet affordable housing need.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): This principal issue has been removed.</p>	<p>In response to the Autumn 2021 consultation greater clarity was sought on the number, type, quality, and location of jobs created by the Project; GAL's response set out the further work that would be undertaken in this regard, including assessing the impact on temporary housing need during construction and housing need across different tenures during operation. In the Summer 2022 response a similar comment was made, that housing affordability should be considered and include types and tenures for new workers and concerns that the assessment did not take account of the type and quality of employment being generated and how this translates into the need for different types of housing. GAL's response reiterated that the potential need for affordable housing in the operational phase was included in the analysis.</p>	<p>Consultation Report Annex A Consultation Issues Tables Autumn 2021 [APP-219]</p> <p>Consultation Report Annex C Consultation Issues Tables Summer 2022 [APP-221]</p>	<p>Issue Removed at D3</p>

			<p>The Assessment of Population and Housing Effects contains specific analysis of housing need during the construction phase, including the scope within the private rented sector and another housing types/tenures to accommodate potential demand (based on peak employment). It also analysed, based on a breakdown of Project jobs by National Socio-Economic Classification, the potential need for affordable housing and compared this with existing assessments of affordable housing needs undertaken by local authorities, recent delivery affordable housing delivery rates, local plan policies for affordable housing and pipeline supply (based on large-scale strategic schemes and the proportion of affordable housing they expect to deliver). The analysis concludes that the potential tenure demands associated with the Project are unlikely to have any impact on affordable housing demands beyond what is already emerging or being planned for.</p> <p>A similar comment was made in response to the Autumn 2021 consultation; GAL's response stated that the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects adopts the same approach as applied in Strategic Housing Market Assessments which are typically prepared for the purposes of plan-making.</p> <p>Following other comments raised on the approach taken to assessing housing effects which were received in the Autumn 2021 and Summer 2022 consultations (and as outlined in GAL's responses), a range of analysis has been added to the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects throughout the process, including analysis of potential affordable housing demand (based on a breakdown of jobs by classification), temporary housing demand during construction, additional commentary on housing trajectory points raised (including past delivery trends and potential impacts of water/nutrient neutrality) and additional detailed outputs at a local authority level.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): This matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p>	<p>Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201] Section 6 and 7.</p>	
<p>2.20.2.3</p>	<p>Comments raised by local authorities not sufficiently captured</p>	<p>Paragraph 17.3.6 provides a table that summarises consultation and engagement through the Socio-economic Topic Working Group. The chapter does not capture the significant extent or detail of comments raised by the local authorities particularly on the scope of the assessment, assessment approach and study area.</p>	<p>Issues trackers have been updated and shared with the local authorities.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): We are not aware of any issues that have not been addressed in the Chapter that are not captured through individual issues in the Tracker and the Statement of Common Ground.</p>	<p>n/a</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Deadline 1 Submission Relevant</p>	<p>No longer pursued, subject to the s106 Agreement</p>

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issues in the tracker have not been addressed. Local authorities have also raised a significant number of comments during TWG meetings which have not been referenced in the socio-economic chapter.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Issues in the tracker remain unaddressed. Written feedback was shared with the Applicant in relation to a number of concerns in relation to the socio-economic assessment and methodology.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024) Updated position (12 August 2024): HDC's general position in respect of assessment methodology reflects that set out at Issue Specific Hearing 9 whereby its Counsel stated that the absence of a local authority level assessment is not a legal deficiency in the ES but is a shortcoming affecting the weight given to benefits within the planning balance related to the socio-economic assessment. The consequences of the absence of a local level assessment could in some way be alleviated through the ESBS however this will depend on the extent to which it addresses local need. As such this remains Not Agreed. See Row 2.20.4.1 in respect of ESBS.</p>	<p>For the reasons set out elsewhere in this table, the Applicant is not proposing changes to the Chapter. Responses to specific issues around the approach to assessment, including spatial scales are set out above and below. If there are additional issues not captured in the tracker we are happy for HDC to raise them and the Applicant will respond.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): This matter will be discussed further at a TWG. It would be helpful if the Council could state which matters have not been addressed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement and therefore it is considered that the absence of a local level assessment is no longer being pursued.</p>	<p>Representations Report [REP1-048]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to Written Representations [REP3-072]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Reports [REP3-078]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) – Socio-Economic Effects [REP3-103]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to ExA's Written Questions (Q1) – General and Cross-Topic [REP3-091]</p>	
2.20.2.4	Age of data for estimating construction employment and forecasting availability of temporary accommodation	<p>There is a need to revisit the approach to estimating construction employment and forecasting availability of temporary accommodation given reliance on old data and not accounting for local variations.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Up-to-date data should be used to inform the assessment of impacts related to construction employment and temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Local Authorities have set out their response to the "Construction Labor Market and Accommodation Impacts" note in their Deadline 4 response.</p> <p>In addition, specifically in relation to housing concerns, please refer to Deadline 3 West Sussex Joint Local Authorities response [REP3-117] Sections 2.2 and 2.3.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): This issue is no longer being pursued.</p>	<p>The estimate of construction employment is provided by GAL's construction team. The estimate is sound.</p> <p>See 3.28 for a response on the availability of accommodation.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a revised assessment of the housing need during construction using updated data from the 2021 Census and has provided a further assessment of the construction workforce in a separate note in response to the Local Impact Reports.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): This matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note [APP-199].</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): ISH3 Action Point 5 in the Applicant's Response to Actions ISH2-5 [REP2-005]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to Local</p>	No longer being pursued

				Impact Reports Appendix D – Construction Labour Market and Accommodation Impacts [REP3-082]	
2.20.2.5	Approach and calculations in relation to operational employment	<p>Clarification is required from the Applicant with regards to its approach and calculations in relation to operational employment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Applicant needs to explain their assumptions in relation to additionality, catalytic effects have been overestimated.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024) Updated position (12 August 2024): The position in relation to direct, indirect, induced sectors is agreed. SEE Row 2.20.3.1 for position on CATALYTIC employment.</p>	<p>The approach to calculating operational employment is fully explained in the ES chapter and appendices.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant understands that the estimate of operational employment is now agreed (email from York Aviation on 9th April 2024).</p> <p>Discussions about the catalytic methodology are ongoing.</p> <p>The underlying methodology for calculating the total of DII and Catalytic is net of displacement. It is the net change in employment expected across the region from the growth of the airport, net of any displacement or crowding out. No individual assumptions are made – it is inherent in the methodology.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant has provided an explanatory note on catalytic employment.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact Assessment [APP-200].</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) – Socio-Economic Effects [REP3-103] – SE.1.20.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Explanatory note on Catalytic Employment [REP7-077]</p>	Agreed, but see 2.20.3.1 for position in relation to Catalytic employment
2.20.2.6	Sensitivity and magnitude gradings	<p>The Applicant should revisit sensitivity and magnitude gradings for several assessments in the socio-economic chapter.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Council has concerns related to sensitivity and magnitude criteria for several socio-economic receptors.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Given response from Applicant, HDC has remaining concerns related to sensitivity and magnitude criteria for several socio-economic receptors.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDC acknowledge the Applicant's further explanation at the TWG that the scale of magnitude and sensitivity criteria are based on professional judgement. Its position is that no further discussion will resolve its concerns and as such it is content to consider this No Longer Pursued and for the ExA to consider in determining weight afforded to the assessment within the overall planning balance.</p>	<p>As shown in ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economics, the thresholds applied vary across receptors and geographies. These are ultimately based on a professional judgment, however proposed thresholds were presented during Topic Working Groups for comment.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The magnitude criteria in ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic have been based upon industry best practice. The Applicant has also justified sensitivity at various socio-economic receptors in Table 17.6.6.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): This matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economics [APP-042] Table 17.4.5-6.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [APP-042] – Table 17.6.6.</p>	No longer pursued

<p>2.20.2.7</p>	<p>Assessment of impacts at a local authority level</p>	<p>The assessment of socio-economic effects has been undertaken at different geographical levels but has not assessed impacts at a local authority level. This is despite ongoing issues concerning labour supply, housing (inc. affordable) and temporary accommodation in the local authorities located close to the Project. The Council has particular concerns about how Horsham District is not sufficiently represented within the Local Study Area and that impacts in Horsham District may be diluted in the wider Labour Market Area. As a result of this approach, the assessment does not identify specific impacts on Horsham District which we consider to be inadequate.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Assessment is required at the local authority level to inform potential implications on labour supply, future housing growth and demand for affordable housing, temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Whilst the Applicant presented their method and assessment at the TWG sessions, these were not agreed with by the local authorities who provided written feedback on their concerns to the Applicant.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Assessment is required at the local authority level to inform potential implications on labour supply, future housing growth and demand for affordable housing, temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Applicant states the methodology of the assessment was discussed and agreed through the TWG meetings, we note there is no mention of this in their updated position. It is incorrect to say there was an agreement. There was no agreement and written feedback was shared with the Applicant in relation to these concerns.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Position is as per Row 2.20.2.1</p>	<p>An overview of the baseline environment is set out in Section 17.6 of ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic, including the economic and labour market baseline, population and housing baseline, and community facilities baseline. Detailed data is provided in ES Appendix 17.6.1: Socio-Economic Data Tables for all of the socio-economic characteristics profiled across all the study areas, as well as at the individual Local Authority level.</p> <p>The methodology and presentation of the assessment was discussed and agreed through a series of Socio-Economics TWGs, including sessions on 16th May, 7th July, 28th September, 18th November and 6th December 2022, and 31st July 2023.</p> <p>A range of geographies are used on the basis that significant effects on socio-economic receptors might differ in geography depending on the receptor. This includes the Project Site Boundary, Local Study Area, North West Sussex Functional Economic Market Area (also the same as the North West Sussex Housing Market Area, 'NWS HMA'), Labour Market Area and Six Authorities Area. Reasoning and justification for these is given within the Socio-Economic Chapter. Local authority level outputs are also provided. A further study area has also been adopted for the purposes of assessing housing effects, as housing effects are felt across housing market areas which are not reflected in any of the other geographies. In response to the Summer 2022 consultation it was commented the analysis did not address previous concerns about most of the demand for housing being concentrated in the NWS HMA. Subsequently, for the assessment of population and housing effects, outputs are given at a local authority level within Annexes including for the key scenarios a total specifically for the NWS HMA.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please refer to the response at Row 2.20.1.3 of this Table.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): This matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement and therefore it is considered that the absence of a local level assessment is no longer being pursued.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [APP-042]</p> <p>ES Appendix 17.6.1: Socio-Economic Data Tables [APP-197].</p>	<p>No longer pursued, subject to the s106 Agreement</p>
<p>2.20.2.8</p>	<p>Zone of Influence</p>	<p>The Zone of Influence should be extended to reflect the likely impacts on conurbations in the north of the District as the current 8km boundary does</p>	<p>Please refer to the ES assessment for details.</p>	<p>Table 17.11.1 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-</p>	<p>Consolidated into row 2.6.2.3</p>

		<p>not take into account the inevitable socio-economic impacts, particularly for housing and affordable housing need.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Question has not been responded to. Applicant hasn't provided sufficient rationale for why the ZOI shouldn't be extended.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Please can Applicant clarify that ZOI extends to reflect the likely impacts on conurbations in the north of the District.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): This issue is being addressed through discussions around row 2.6.2.3</p>	<p>Updated position (April 2024): The Zone of Influence extends beyond the LSA, which is the area where receptors are most likely to be impacted upon the Project and contain the cumulative schemes that are also most likely to impact upon the receptors.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Zone of Influence relates only to the Cumulative Assessment in the chapter. The assessment of population and housing effects is done at the level of Housing Market Areas across the region. This matter can be discussed further at a TWG.</p>	<p>Economic [APP-042].</p>	
Assessment					
<p>2.20.3.1</p>	<p>Overstatement of the wider, catalytic, and national level economic benefits of the NRP.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting input from York Aviation.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Although further discussions have been held, there has not been any productive progress on this outstanding area of disagreement since the submission of Statements of Common Ground at Deadline 5.</p> <p>In overall terms, there remains concern that aspects of the benefits may have been overstated, particularly in terms of the national level economic benefits and this could weigh too highly in the planning balance.</p> <p>At a more local level, there is concern that the catalytic benefits to local employment are simply not robust and appear more likely to have been overstated. It remains uncertain whether the assessment of these effects represents a worst case in terms of the economic benefits to be realised nor broader consequences. This links to the absence of any robust sensitivity testing of the demand forecasts, again meaning that a reasonable worst case cannot be assessed in terms of either downside risks to benefits or upside potential to effects.</p>	<p>Catalytic impacts refers to the economic activity of firms that are not in the indirect or induced footprint of the airport choosing to locate near the airport because of the connectivity that it offers. The catalytic effect is derived as a residual from total net impacts and footprint impacts. Total net impacts are estimated on the basis of an elasticity relationship we have derived between air traffic and local employment. This elasticity relationship represents a net relationship as it accounts for the net increase in local employment generated by an increase in air traffic.</p> <p>The assessment of national impacts follows DfT's TAG and assesses costs and benefits from the scheme where possible given the available data and information at the time of submission. While this type of assessment is not required for private-sector schemes, we use TAG welfare analysis as it is considered a useful framework to assess and present the economic impacts (costs and benefits) of the Project that are additional at the national level. Benefits included in the Net Present Value calculations exclude impacts that would potentially double-count benefits (e.g. trade benefits are quantified but not included in the NPV).</p> <p>We are arranging a TWG meeting to address these issues in early January 2024.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Following further TWGs, the Applicant is providing a further explanatory note.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.9.2 Local Economic Impact Assessment [APP-200]</p> <p>Needs Case Appendix 1 - National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251].</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) – Socio-Economic Effects [REP3-103] – SE.1.20.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Explanatory note on Catalytic Employment [REP7-077]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

			<p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant has provided an explanatory note on catalytic employment.</p> <p>Updated position (August 2024): The Applicant submitted an updated explanatory note on catalytic employment in response to the actions from ISH9. It's final position is set out in that note and the socio-economic section of the Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>	<p>The Applicant's Response to ISH9 Action Point 38 Updated Position on Catalytic Employment Benefits [AS-163]</p>	
2.20.3.2	Impacts on affordable housing	<p>Paragraph 7.5.1 recognises that the Project is likely to generate demand for affordable rented housing which is greater than the number of homes in the existing stock. If this exercise is done at a local authority level, then the figures are very different and the true impacts at local authority level are being hidden. Secondly, assessment goes on to conclude that despite the demand from the Project being skewed towards affordable housing, there are unlikely to be impacts on affordable housing beyond what is emerging or planned for. However, analysis of completions by local authority (Table 7.4.1) has demonstrated that the delivery frequently does not meet the need, and therefore a shortfall is likely. On that basis, the conclusion that the Project is unlikely to have any impact on affordable housing demand beyond what is planned for does not appear well founded.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Project will increase pressures on supply of affordable housing.</p> <p>Applicant should undertake assessment at local authority level.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Please refer to Deadline 3 West Sussex Joint Local Authorities response [REP3-117] Sections 2.2 and 2.3.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Gatwick Airport is located in an area facing housing pressures. There will be housing impacts during the operational phase but the JLAs agree that these will not require mitigation. With regards operational labour market effects, the consequences of the absence of a local level assessment could in some way be alleviated through the ESBS however this will depend on the extent to which it addresses local need. See 2.19.4.1 in respect of ESBS</p>	<p>Paragraph 7.5.1 talks about proportions not numbers. The absolute level of demand is significantly lower than the supply of stock.</p> <p>The proportions being delivered are higher than the proportion of demand from workers.</p> <p>In addition, many of the workers will already be resident in the area so will not constitute new housing demand.</p> <p>The analysis concludes that the potential tenure demands associated with the Project are unlikely to have any impact on affordable housing demands beyond what is already emerging or being planned for.</p> <p>As set out in response to point 3.4, impacts are assessed at the appropriate functional spatial scale and with additional information also provided at local authority level.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant restated its position in Issue Specific Hearing 3 – information is provided on impacts at local authority level but the assessment of significance is (correctly) done at the functional market area level.</p> <p>ES Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects contains a housing assessment at a local authority level and the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearings includes a local authority-level assessment for all authorities where more than one non-home based worker is expected to be based (Crawley, Reigate and Banstead, Mole Valley, Mid Sussex, Tandridge, Horsham and Croydon).</p> <p>Construction employment at the local authority level is provided in ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical note.</p>	<p>Consultation Report Annex A, Consultation Issues Tables Autumn 2021 [APP-219]</p> <p>Consultation Report Annex C, Consultation Issues Tables Summer 2022 [APP-221]</p> <p>ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201].</p> <p>Section 4.25 of Deadline 1 Submission Relevant Representations Report [REP1-048]</p> <p>ISH3 Action Point 5 in the Applicant's Response to Actions ISH2-5 [REP2-005]</p> <p>Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction</p>	Agreed, subject to Section 106

			<p>Updated position (July 2024): This matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>	<p>Workforce Distribution Technical Note [APP-199]</p>	
2.20.3.3	Impact of the Project on residential and commercial property prices	<p>The Council does not agree with the scoping out of the impact on property prices as a result of the Project. The reference to the PPG and the Land Compensation Act 1973 (LCA) have been arbitrarily applied – indeed an assessment of the impact on residential and commercial properties should have been undertaken to determine whether payment is required under the LCA. The references to National Planning Practice Guidance are inconsistent, relying on the PPG on the one hand to discount the scoping in of the effect on property prices and then suggesting in the Planning Statement that the “NPPG does not set policy tests for NSIPs” (para 6.4.5). In the Second Scoping Opinion dated October 2019, PINS stated: “The ES should assess any likely significant effects associated with the Proposed Development in relation to [the Project’s effects on property value]”.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): PINs advised that the applicant should undertake an assessment of impacts on property prices. Applicant advised at a TWG meeting that they would be undertaking this assessment. Applicant has acknowledged in the ES there will be an adverse impact on property prices. The Council considers this should be scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): As set out at 1.13 of the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Comments on The Applicant’s Response to The ExA’s Written Questions (ExQ1) [REP4-071], and whilst appreciating the point about commercial sensitivity, the council retains concern that the Applicant has not provided further information despite this being a long-standing request from PINS. The Partnership Authorities await the views of the ExA as to whether the Applicant’s written response (as noted in its updated April 2024 position) is considered to be satisfactory.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): HDC acknowledge that the Applicant has provided additional explanation in the form of its response to question SE 2.11 from the Examining Authority. As discussed at the TWG meeting (06.08.24) HDC retains its position yet is satisfied not to pursue this further as the Examining Authority will take this matter into consideration itself.</p>	<p>GAL has not included a specific assessment of effects on property prices in the ES for the reasons set out in Table 17.4.2 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic.</p> <p>Impacts on residential property values have not been included in scoping for other comparable DCO projects (e.g. Heathrow, Manston, Luton).</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has further explained its position in response to question SE.1.13 from the Examining Authority.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant has further explained its position in response to question SE.2.11 from the Examining Authority.</p>	<p>Table 17.4.2 of ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economic [APP-042].</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): SE.1.13 of The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Written Questions (ExQ1) – Socio-Economic Effects [REP3-103]</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): SE.2.11 of Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ2) – Socio-Economic Effects [REP7-091]</p>	No longer being pursued

<p>2.20.3.4</p>	<p>Assessment of impacts on labour supply and labour supply constraints</p>	<p>Some aspects of the conclusions drawn in relation to the impacts on labour supply do not appear to be robust and should be re-visited to ensure a realistic assessment (including a worst-case scenario for construction workers) and should be undertaken at a local authority level.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Applicant hasn't taken account of existing labour market constraints and an assessment of impact at local authority level should be undertaken.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has not taken account of current labour supply constraints within the local area and The Local Authorities have set out their concerns in their Deadline 4 response.</p> <p>Assessment is required at the local authority level to inform potential implications on labour supply, future housing growth and demand for affordable housing, temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): There is a shortage of skills, not a shortage of workers. This skills shortage needs to be addressed through the ESBS.</p>	<p>As shown in ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economics, the thresholds applied vary across receptors and geographies. These are ultimately based on a professional judgment, however proposed thresholds were presented during Topic Working Groups for comment.</p> <p>Detailed analysis of the construction employment expected to be generated by the Project is provided in ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note, including an assessment of the potential construction labour supply and their spatial distribution. This data has informed the assessment of the labour market within Section 17.9 of ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic.</p> <p>Wider effects of the construction phase have been assessed in terms of potential impacts on the construction supply chain measured relative to the scale of construction sector enterprises (as opposed to employment which is used for direct effects only) in each of the assessment areas.</p> <p>GAL's response reiterated that an assessment of the potential demand for housing during the construction phase has been added to the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects.</p> <p>As set out in response to point 3.4, impacts are assessed at the appropriate functional spatial scale and with additional information also provided at local authority level.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please refer to the response at Row 2.20.1.3 of this Table.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): There is no such thing as a local authority labour market. This is correctly assessed at the functional labour market area. There is no evidence that there would be adverse labour market effects. The matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p> <p>The latest CITB Labour Market Intelligence Report for the South East (https://www.citb.co.uk/media/vjlpqwg0/ctb1003_csn-rep_regional_south-east_aw2.pdf) now includes the NRP in its forecasts and is still showing a decline in activity in the infrastructure sector from 2024-2028. This remains the best consideration of cumulative demand for relevant skilled workers. GAL therefore retains its position that there will not be a shortage of</p>	<p>ES Chapter 17 Socio-Economics [APP-042]</p> <p>ES Appendix 17.9.1: Gatwick Construction Workforce Distribution Technical Note [APP-199]</p> <p>Section 17.9 of ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economic [APP-042]</p> <p>Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201].</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
------------------------	---	---	---	--	---------------

			workers (and even if there were, GAL would not be responsible for mitigating it).		
2.20.3.5	Wider economic benefits	<p>The wider economic benefits of the Project are considered to be substantially overstated and this is material to assessing the balance between such benefits and any environmental impacts.</p> <p>The wider economic benefits of the proposed development have been overstated due to the failure to adequately distinguish the demand that could be met at Gatwick from the demand which could only be met at Heathrow and the economic value that is specific to operations at Heathrow. The methodology by which the wider catalytic impacts in the local area has been assessed is not robust and little reliance can be placed on this assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting input from York Aviation.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): There has not been any productive progress on this outstanding area of disagreement since the submission of Statements of Common Ground at Deadline 5.</p> <p>In overall terms, there remains concern that aspects of the benefits may have been overstated, particularly in terms of the national level economic benefits and this could weigh too highly in the planning balance.</p> <p>At a more local level, there is concern that the catalytic benefits to local employment are simply not robust and appear more likely to have been overstated. However, because of the uncertainties regarding how the methodology has been applied in the UK context, it is also possible that the impacts could have been understated. If so, this would give rise to further concerns regarding the implications for the local housing market. It remains uncertain whether the assessment of these effects represents a worst case in terms of the economic benefits to be realised nor broader consequences. This links to the absence of any robust sensitivity testing of the demand forecasts, again meaning that a reasonable worst case cannot be assessed in terms of either downside risks to benefits or upside potential to effects.</p>	<p>The assessment of national impacts follows DfT's TAG and assesses costs and benefits from the scheme. While this type of assessment is not required for private-sector schemes, we use TAG welfare analysis as it is considered a useful framework to assess and present the economic impacts (costs and benefits) of the Project that are additional at the national level. Benefits included in the Net Present Value calculations exclude impacts that would potentially double-count benefits (e.g. trade benefits are quantified but not included in the NPV).</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please refer to the response at Row 2.20.3.1 of this Table.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant has provided an explanatory note on catalytic employment.</p> <p>Updated position (August 2024): The Applicant submitted an updated explanatory note on catalytic employment in response to the actions from ISH9. It's final position is set out in that note and the socio-economic section of the Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>	<p>Needs Case Appendix 1 - National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251].</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Explanatory note on Catalytic Employment [REP7-077])</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to ISH9 Action Point 38 Updated Position on Catalytic Employment Benefits [AS-163]</p>	Not Agreed
2.20.3.6	Evidence to support conclusions on labour supply and housing demand	<p>There is no evidence for the Applicant's conclusion that there will be no labour supply issues or impacts on housing demand.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Applicant hasn't taken account of existing labour market constraints and an assessment of impact at local authority level should be undertaken.</p>	As outlined in GAL's response to the Autumn 2021 consultation, the assessment of Population and Housing Effects adopts the same approach (using PopGroup) as applied in Strategic Housing Market Assessments which are typically prepared for the purposes of plan-making. It adopts demographic-led, housing-led and employment-led scenarios which are appropriate for the purposes of assessing housing and labour market impacts for EIA purposes. Working outputs (in the form of headline figures, charts, graphs and tables)	Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201] Section 5 Labour Supply Analysis and Annexes 7 and 8	Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.

		<p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has not taken account of current labour supply constraints within the local area and The Local Authorities have set out their concerns in their Deadline 4 response.</p> <p>Assessment is required at the local authority level to inform potential implications on labour supply, future housing growth and demand for affordable housing, temporary accommodation.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Authorities requested at the TWG meeting (06.08.24) that the Applicant provide further details of future skills shortages. HDC's position overall in respect of the implications of this is as set out at Issue Specific Hearing 9 whereby its Counsel stated that the absence of a local authority level assessment is not a legal deficiency in the ES but is a shortcoming affecting the weight given to benefits within the planning balance related to the socio-economic assessment. The consequences of the absence of a local level assessment could in some way be alleviated through the ESBS however this will depend on the extent to which it addresses local need.</p>	<p>were presented during Topic Working Groups. GAL's response to the Summer 2022 consultation also clarified the approach taken in the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects, namely that housing trajectories give a future baseline (in terms of anticipated levels of housing, population and labour force growth) and that these outcomes are compared with the housing demand which would be generated based on economic forecasts (from Cambridge Econometrics) plus the Project, to identify any potential shortfalls. The Assessment of Population and Housing Effects gives a detailed labour supply analysis for each local authority and housing market area within the study area, plus the study area as a whole. Graphs and headline figures are presented in the main report for ease of reading however full local authority level outputs are provided as Annexes in response to comments made by local authorities requesting this additional detail.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please refer to the response at Row 2.20.1.3 of this Table.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): There is no such thing as a local authority labour market. This is correctly assessed at the functional labour market area. There is no evidence that there would be adverse labour market effects. The matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p> <p>The latest CITB Labour Market Intelligence Report for the South East (https://www.citb.co.uk/media/vjlpqwg0/ctb1003_csn-rep_regional_south-east_aw2.pdf) now includes the NRP in its forecasts and is still showing a decline in activity in the infrastructure sector from 2024-2028. This remains the best consideration of cumulative demand for relevant skilled workers. GAL therefore retains its position that there will not be a shortage of workers (and even if there were, GAL would not be responsible for mitigating it).</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>	<p>Consultation Report Annex B – Autumn 2021 Consultation Consultee Response Summaries [APP-220]</p> <p>Consultation Report Annex D Summer 2022 Consultation Consultee Response Summaries [APP-222].</p>	
2.20.3.7	Local impact on labour supply	<p>The Council does not consider that the local impact on labour supply issues resulting from cumulative developments has been sufficiently explored.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Applicant hasn't provided a reasonable explanation for not undertaking a cumulative assessment of</p>	<p>The assessment shows that across the study area as a whole there is a labour surplus even with the project as well as a surplus in individual housing market areas except Croydon and East Surrey.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201].</p>	<p>No longer pursued, subject to the s106 Agreement</p>

		<p>construction socio-economic effects. This assessment should be undertaken.</p> <p>In terms of operation, the Applicant is not identifying local issues because they haven't undertaken an assessment of impacts at a local authority level.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): The Applicant has not undertaken a robust cumulative assessment of construction socio-economic effects nor have they undertaken an assessment of impacts at a local authority level to understand local implications of the Project.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Authorities requested at the TWG meeting (06.08.24) that the Applicant provide further details of future skills shortages. HDC's position overall in respect of the implications of this is as set out at Issue Specific Hearing 9 whereby its Counsel stated that the absence of a local authority level assessment is not a legal deficiency in the ES but is a shortcoming affecting the weight given to benefits within the planning balance related to the socio-economic assessment. The consequences of the absence of a local level assessment could in some way be alleviated through the ESBS however this will depend on the extent to which it addresses local need.</p>	<p>The assessment is very conservative in assuming all jobs are net additional above the forecasts and that there is no change in employment or economic activity rates or commuting.</p> <p>As set out in response to point 3.4, impacts are assessed at the appropriate functional spatial scale and with additional information also provided at local authority level.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please refer to the response at Row 2.20.1.3 of this Table. Additionally, the Applicant has provided a labour supply analysis at different spatial scales in Section 5 of ES Appendix 17.9.3: Assessment of Population and Housing Effects.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): There is no such thing as a local authority labour market. This is correctly assessed at the functional labour market area. There is no evidence that there would be adverse labour market effects. The matter will be discussed further at a TWG.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement and therefore it is considered that the absence of a local level assessment is no longer being pursued.</p>		
Mitigation and Compensation					
2.20.4.1	Lack of information on ESBS Implementation Plan, performance, measurable targets, funding and financial management, monitoring and reporting. Route map from ESBS to Implementation Plan is not identified.	<p>Options identified in the ESBS are not necessarily directly aligned with local specific issues and need. The document states that performance, financial management, monitoring and reporting systems will be set out in detail in the Implementation Plan. It is unclear why the Applicant is unable to provide further details on these arrangements within the ESBS in order to provide sufficient reassurance that appropriate systems will be in place. The ESBS also provides no explanation on whether it would differentiate between the provision and outputs offered through the DCO vs. provision and outputs offered in a Business as Usual (BAU) scenario. Furthermore, the ESBS does not set out any process for how the Implementation Plan would be developed. Given the Applicant is currently suggesting that the majority of the relevant content for the local authorities will be set out in the Implementation Plan, it is essential that the Applicant provides further details on the process for delivering this.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): More detailed information is required in the ESBS as set out in our response.</p>	<p>Please refer to ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (APP-198) for details.</p> <p>The plan will include more specific detail on the objectives, initiatives and activities, targets, milestones, implementation processes and partners, including how objectives will be met at the local level. The approach to monitoring and evaluation of actions and impacts will be included. GAL recognises that the skills, employment and business growth and productivity fields are dynamic and fast-moving in terms of national and local policy responses, skill needs and demands and technological changes. The project will be delivered over a period of 15+ years. Thus, the strategy and implementation plan will need to incorporate capacity for the projects and associated targets and outcomes to flex and change in response effectively to changing circumstances as required.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy [APP-198].</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Draft Section 106 Agreement Annex: ESBS Implementation Plan [REP3-069]</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Appendix 6 of Draft Section 106</p>	Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.

		<p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Local Authorities have set out their concerns with regards to the ESBS in their Deadline 4 response.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The council welcomes the updated Draft ESBS Implementation Plan being provided by the Applicant. Example Thematic/delivery Plans have also been shared offline by the Applicant which present further detail. The review of these is ongoing by HDC and the Authorities. It is understood that an updated ESBS and ESBS Implementation Plan will be submitted at Deadline 8a which will necessitate further response to be included.</p>	<p>Updated position (April 2024): The ESBS Implementation Plan will describe how GAL will collaborate with partners to define and implement a clear regional 'identity' and promotion strategy. Initial scoping research, informed by a partner workshop, has just completed and the recommendations will inform the Implementation Plan. The Implementation Plan will include specific delivery plans for each of the 6 themes in the ESBS. These Delivery Plans will differentiate between BAU activity related to the relevant theme, details of any pilot activity currently being undertaken in that theme, and proposed delivery post consent.</p> <p>To support the development of the draft Implementation Plan, workshops were held on 25 March and 8 April with relevant stakeholders and representatives of the Joint Local Authorities. To assist this work GAL shared examples of draft delivery plans (covering two ESBS themes) and used the workshop to explore delivery against each ESBS theme - including clear information on current BAU activity, and ESBS pilot activity. This work will continue at a workshop with JLAs on 30 May and will be used to inform the draft Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant has provided an updated ESBS Implementation Plan and discussions will continue at future workshops with JLAs.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>	<p>Agreement Version 2 [REP6-063]</p>	
<p>2.20.4.2</p>	<p>Alignment with local needs - Lack of clarity around how the ESBS will deliver benefits to Horsham District residents and businesses</p>	<p>It is noted that the focus for ESBS investment and actions will be directed towards the areas most likely to be affected by the construction and operational phases of the development. The Applicant is asked to clarify which "parts of Horsham" (para 1.1.9, ES Appendix 17.8.1) would see the delivery of these activities. The Council would expect that the ESBS would seek to deliver activities across the entire District – there is concern that the spatial context described in this paragraph relates to the Local Study Area which is not sufficient in reflecting Horsham District as it contains only a small rural part of the District. The strategy should ensure that the Project delivers economic benefits to Horsham District.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): More detailed information is required in the ESBS as set out in our response.</p>	<p>Please refer to ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy (APP-198) for details.</p> <p>The plan will include more specific detail on the objectives, initiatives and activities, targets, milestones, implementation processes and partners, including how objectives will be met at the local level. The approach to monitoring and evaluation of actions and impacts will be included. GAL recognises that the skills, employment and business growth and productivity fields are dynamic and fast-moving in terms of national and local policy responses, skill needs and demands and technological changes. The project will be delivered over a period of 15+ years. Thus, the strategy and implementation plan will need to incorporate capacity for the projects and associated targets and outcomes to flex and</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy [APP-198].</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Appendix 6 of Draft Section 106 Agreement Version 2 [REP6-063]</p>	<p>Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>

		<p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Local Authorities have set out their concerns with regards to the ESBS in their Deadline 4 response.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): See position in 2.20.4.1.</p>	<p>change in response effectively to changing circumstances as required.</p> <p>The ESBS Implementation Plan will describe how GAL will collaborate with partners to define and implement a clear regional 'identity' and promotion strategy. Initial scoping research, informed by a partner workshop, has just completed and the recommendations will inform the Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please see the response at Row 2.20.4.1 of this Table.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant has provided an updated ESBS Implementation Plan and discussions will continue at future workshops with JLAs.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>		
2.20.4.3	ESBS	<p>The objectives of the ESBS are supported but without more specific details and commitment, it is difficult to see how the overall benefits will be delivered. The delivery of an on-site STEM centre could be a significant benefit but there is no real commitment (or costs). There does not appear to have been any engagement with education, training and employment support providers. This will be critical in the delivery of the wider benefits.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): More detailed information is required in the ESBS as set out in our response.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Local Authorities have set out their concerns with regards to the ESBS in their Deadline 4 response.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): See position in 2.20.4.1.</p>	<p>The ESBS includes specific engagement with schools and Careers Hubs.</p> <p>Through the ESBS and its Implementation Plans, GAL will ensure that its contractors and sub-contractors contribute to the delivery of the agreed ESBS objectives (including Social Value). The ESBS also proposes engagement with schools and Careers Hubs.</p> <p>The ESBS sets out the overarching strategy for how GAL will engage with stakeholders including FE/HE (Further Education/Higher Education). This will be supported by an Implementation Plan that will provide more detail on that engagement. As it draws up the Implementation Plan, GAL will consult with local authorities on which partners need to be involved.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Please see the response at Row 2.20.4.1 of this Table.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant has provided an updated ESBS Implementation Plan and discussions will continue at future workshops with JLAs.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 17.8.1 Employment, Skills and Business Strategy [APP-198].</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Appendix 6 of Draft Section 106 Agreement Version 2 [REP6-063]</p>	<p>Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>

Other					
2.20.5.1	Water neutrality implications for affordable housing delivery and incorrect AMR details used for Horsham District	<p>It is not correct for the Applicant to surmise at 4.3.11 that the Local Authorities (as of August 2021) would have been able to take account of water neutrality implications on housing delivery through their trajectories. Whilst there was at the time an awareness and emerging understanding of water neutrality, work was being undertaken to address these issues through the Local Plan process. Issue of the Natural England Position Statement in September 2021 instantly applied water neutrality requirements to planning applications, effectively stopping development as planning applications could not be consented without having demonstrated water neutrality. As such, the housing delivery implications of water neutrality were not fully understood as of August 2021. Furthermore, the Applicant has not used the latest housing delivery reports which would take account of these issues (the 2020/21 Authority Monitoring Report for Horsham District Council has been used despite the more recent 2021/22 report being publicly available from December 2022). The implications of the recent CG Fry v SoS and Somerset Council High Court judgment (June 2023) will also need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Applicant has not directly answered the question.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): In a topic working group, the Council confirmed that the requirement water neutrality has stalled housing delivery in the District (Horsham District Council's 2022/23 AMR shows that permission has been granted for 180 homes, with 396 completions in the same period. It was also confirmed that a water offsetting scheme is being set up to allow Local Plan development to come forward. See Row 2.20.3.2 in respect of overall impact on Affordable Housing in the context of the S106</p>	<p>Analysis of the potential impact of water neutrality on housing trajectories is included in the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects, including justification for why – on the basis of this analysis - this was not taken forward within the scenario modelling.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has reviewed the 2021/22 AMR referred to by Horsham District Council – Figure 6 of that AMR shows the Council's housing trajectory. The total envisaged number of dwellings from 2024/25 (the year in which Project construction begins) up to 2030/31 (the end of the plan period, where the Council's trajectory ends) is 4,960. Annex 3 Table A3.2 of ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects shows the housing trajectory from the Council's earlier (2020/21) AMR which was used in the modelling; this totals 4,883 for the same period. On this basis, the use of the AMR referred to by the Council would have no material impact on the conclusions of the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the 2021/22 AMR referred to by Horsham District Council states (para 1.9) "This AMR is based on the position of development being able to demonstrate 'water neutrality'...". This is the same statement that was made in the 2020/21 AMR which informed the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (at para 1.9 of the 2020/21 AMR). The Council's overall position in relation to water neutrality therefore does not appear to have changed. The Applicant's position as set out in ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects (as referred to earlier) remains.</p>	<p>Para 4.3.8 onwards of ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201].</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Annex 3 Table A3.2 of ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201]</p>	No longer being pursued
2.20.5.2	Water neutrality	<p>There is no acknowledgement of the impact the requirement for development to be water neutral will have on the housing being delivered during the Project's construction and operation.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Applicant should undertake an assessment of impacts at the local authority to robustly determine implications of the Scheme.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 5): Applicant should undertake an assessment of impacts at the local authority to robustly determine implications of the Scheme.</p>	<p>Analysis of the potential impact of water neutrality on housing trajectories is included in the Assessment of Population and Housing Effects, including justification for why – on the basis of this analysis - this was not taken forward within the scenario modelling.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant restated its position in Issue Specific Hearing 3 – information is provided on impacts at local authority level but the assessment of significance is (correctly) done at the functional market area level.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): No change</p>	<p>Para 4.3.8 onwards of ES Appendix 17.9.3 Assessment of Population and Housing Effects [APP-201].</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Deadline 1 Submission – Written Summary of</p>	No longer being pursued

		<p>Updated position (12 August 2024): In a topic working group, the Council confirmed that the requirement water neutrality has stalled housing delivery in the District (Horsham District Council's 2022/23 AMR shows that permission has been granted for 180 homes, with 396 completions in the same period. It was also confirmed that a water offsetting scheme is being set up to allow Local Plan development to come forward. See Row 2.20.3.2 in respect of overall impact on Affordable Housing in the context of the S106</p>		<p>Oral Submissions from Issue Specific Hearing 3: Socio-economics [REP1-058] – Section 3.2</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

2.20. Traffic and Transport

2.20.1 Table 2.1 sets out the position of both parties in relation to traffic and transport matters.

Table 2.20 Statement of Common Ground – Traffic and Transport Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
2.21.1.1	Transport modelling data	<p>The Council is concerned about the historic nature of the data used to inform the baseline conditions across a number of different modes and what implications this has for testing the likely effects of the Project. For example, the differences between the rail and bus frequencies from 2016 being modelled compared with the current 2022 baseline for services via Horsham District (7.4 Transport Assessment, Tables 6.3.1 and 6.4.2) are very different and our concern is that the frequencies being modelled will suggest there is greater public transport capacity available than there actually will be in reality. Staff travel data based on 2016 and 2019 information needs to be updated to reflect 2023 staff travel survey. There are also concerns with the assessment of cumulative impacts on rail capacity.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Further information is awaited.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): Concerns remain about the extent to which modelling to date allows the Projects impacts to be fully understood. Further modelling is required to establish the impacts the project will have on the local transport network.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position is reflected in REP4-042</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council defers to WSCC as the Highways Authority on the issue of transport modelling data and understands that discussion on technical matters is ongoing.</p>	<p>The Examining Authority has made a Procedural Decision dated 24 October 2023 to request the Applicant to provide a detailed response to look at accounting for COVID-19 in the transport modelling. This work is being undertaken for submission to the ExA in due course and will include analysis regarding the changes in public transport frequencies since the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>The 2023 staff travel survey is currently being analysed and will be shared with HDC in due course.</p> <p>Updated response (Deadline 1): The response to the ExA's Procedural Decision on accounting for Covid-19 in the transport modelling has been submitted and is available on the Project Webpage.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): As set out in the Transport Assessment [REP3-051] at paragraph 11.3.4 bus and coach operators respond to sustained increases in demand by increasing the number of services. Therefore the future baseline reflects measures which the Applicant is proposing to take as part of the current ASAS, together with the commercial response of the bus and coach industry to increase demand in general (paragraph 11.3.14). While changes in frequencies have been seen since Covid, the expected recovery and growth at the airport should see the level of services resume to the pre-pandemic level in the future year scenarios. Funding to support bus service enhancements is secured in the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004].</p> <p>2023 staff travel survey information has been submitted at Deadline 2 as part of The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005] - see Section 4.2 and Appendix D.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The modelling which supports the assessment of the Project has been undertaken in accordance with industry guidance, including the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance and the strategic transport model covers a large area including Horsham District Council, allowing impacts of the Project</p>	<p>Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling [AS-121] and its Appendices [AS-122]</p> <p>Post Covid VISSIM Sensitivity Tests for 2032 and 2047 [REP3-108]</p> <p>Environmental Appraisal of the Post-Covid 19 Traffic Data for the ES [REP5-068]</p>	Not Agreed

			<p>in that area to be identified. In addition to the information provided in the Application, the Applicant has undertaken further strategic modelling for post-Covid conditions (Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling [AS-121], Post Covid VISSIM Sensitivity Tests for 2032 and 2047 [REP3-108] and Environmental Appraisal of the Post-Covid 19 Traffic Data for the ES [REP5-068])</p>		
<p>2.21.1.2</p>	<p>Modelling inputs</p>	<p>The Council has a number of concerns with regard to the core modelling scenario. There is concern that the exclusion of certain developments, such as Land West of Ifield and Heathrow R3, but the inclusion of transport improvements such as the SMART motorway improvements on the M25 (J10-16) (which has now been cancelled), may skew the results of the transport assessment. The concern is that the scenario assessed may not provide a realistic worst-case assessment.</p> <p>The Council does not agree that sites, such as Land West of Ifield, should be excluded from the core modelling scenario while growth from future housing trajectory is being relied upon in the socio-economic assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The development is included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan as a site allocation. Suggest given the scale and proximity that the status of this development in relation to the core scenario is kept under review.</p> <p>Suggest that Heathrow R3 should be assessed as part of the main CEA. Applicant has not sufficiently justified its approach to considering Heathrow R3.</p> <p>Await further transport modelling.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council’s position is reflected in REP4-042</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council notes that updated modelling scenarios took account of updated infrastructure assumptions, however remains concerned at the extent to which Land West of Ifield has been accounted for in the transport assessment.</p>	<p>This issue has been responded to previously at Rows 5.23 (Land West of Ifield) and 5.122 (Heathrow) of Table 5 in Appendix 1.</p> <p>The approach taken to considering future development West of Ifield is described in Annex B (Strategic Transport Modelling Report) of the Transport Assessment. This development is not sufficiently certain to be included in the core scenarios for the assessment of the Project, but has been included in a separate cumulative scenario which is described in Chapter 14 of Annex B of the Transport Assessment and in Section 12.11 of ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</p> <p>Paragraphs 8.1.4 to 8.1.6 of the Transport Assessment describe the approach taken to the third runway at Heathrow, which is not included in the assessment of the Project. This approach provides a conservative assessment from a traffic and transport perspective. If Heathrow’s third runway was to come forward, traffic levels at Gatwick would be likely to decline in the period immediately following the opening of the third runway, meaning that the impacts of the Project, such as traffic and therefore associated noise and emissions would be lower than are reported in the DCO Application. By not including the Heathrow third runway, the assessment is therefore conservative. However, by 2047, there would be little difference between demand at Gatwick Airport with or without the Heathrow third runway and accordingly the outcomes reported in the DCO Application for this scenario would be unchanged irrespective of developments at Heathrow.</p> <p>The transport modelling follows DfT’s Transport Appraisal Guidance advice relating to the treatment of growth, including specific developments that are “near certain” or “more than likely” in core scenarios. At the time the transport modelling was undertaken the assumptions regarding smart motorways between J10-16 were classified as “more than likely”. Given that the Examining Authority has made a Procedural Decision dated 24 October 2023 to request the Applicant to look at accounting for COVID-19 in the transport modelling, sensitivity tests are being undertaken which will also look</p>	<p>Annex B of the Transport Assessment [APP-260]</p> <p>Section 12.11 of ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [REP3-016]</p> <p>Paragraphs 8.1.4 to 8.1.6 of the Transport Assessment [REP3-058]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

			<p>at changes in infrastructure assumptions. This work is being undertaken for submission to the ExA in due course.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The updated modelling to account for Covid has also considered infrastructure scheme changes including the M25 J10-16 Smart Motorways cancellation, the details are in the sensitivity testing presented in Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling [AS-121].</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>		
2.21.1.3	2,500 robotic parking spaces should not be included in the future baseline	<p>The Council endorses the view of Crawley Borough Council that the proposed 2,500 robotic parking should not be included as permitted development and therefore part of the baseline. The current temporary trial for 100 robotic spaces is not comparable. It would significantly increase parking capacity and the highways impact will need to be considered in full.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL advise that the proposed increase in spaces via robotic parking would come forward as Permitted Development through a phased approach, with Crawley Borough Council to be consulted at the appropriate times. As part of PDR consultation, Crawley Borough Council would ask GAL to demonstrate that a proposed increase in parking is justified by evidence of demonstrable need and having regard to GAL's surface access commitments.</p> <p>At the present time, the proposed 2,500 space increase has not been justified by evidence, which GAL would presumably provide at the time of each PDR consultation. If that is the case, it is unclear what (if any) evidence is presently in place to demonstrate that a substantial 2,500 space increase through PDR would be consistent with the 'demonstrable need' approach and the meeting of surface access commitments placed on GAL through the S106 legal agreement.</p> <p>GAL appears to be assuming that all 2,500 PDR parking spaces can be taken as a given at this stage. However, this is some way in advance of the individual PDR consultations that GAL advise would be submitted in 2024/25/26. Given that each of those PDR consultations would be expected to be supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate 'sufficient but no more parking' than is needed to ensure GAL's mode share obligations can be met, it is not considered appropriate for GAL to simply assume, without justification, that 2,500 spaces through PDR can be considered as forming part of the baseline. It would be more appropriate if GAL were to include this parking as part of the DCO.</p>	<p>This issue has been responded to previously at Row 5.102 of Table 5 in Appendix 1.</p> <p>Robotic parking is proposed to be extended over a larger area of existing car park to provide the additional 2,500 spaces in three phases - 500 spaces in 2024 and 1000 spaces in each of 2025 and 2026. These further phases will come forward as permitted development subject to GDPO consultations with Crawley Borough Council. The location of car parking is assessed as part of the modelling work and therefore the impact of this parking is fully assessed.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a further response on robotic parking at section 4.6 of The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005] which notes that the intensification of the parking use as a result of the conversion of existing self-park spaces to robotic parking spaces will come forward in advance of the Project as permitted development (pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 8, Class F of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 ("GPDO"), subject to the prior consultation requirements with the local planning authority as set out in the GPDO.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): As noted in The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISH8 Car parking [REP6-084], the planned introduction of robotics technology to increase parking capacity by 2,500 spaces is a future baseline project irrespective of the Northern Runway Project. The Applicant will bring these forward under its PDR as necessary with due regard to policy requirements.</p> <p>The Applicant is preparing a response to the ExA's Rule 17 request [PD-025] to be submitted at Deadline 8 which will contain further detail on robotic parking provision.</p>	<p>Highway impact contained in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Transport Assessment [REP3-058] and associated annexes.</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISH8 Car parking [REP6-084]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): The full 2,500 spaces are included in the parking baseline on the assumption of a successful Permitted Development consultation that would be required by the Applicant. This is not considered to be a robust approach given the uncertainty that the Applicant could provide evidence of the spaces being required.</p> <p>Update Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position on the uncertainty of this 2,500 parking capacity coming forward remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council notes that in the Applicant's response to the ExA's Rule 17 letter requesting further information on car parking [Application Document Ref 10.64] it confirms its position that the 2,500 robotic spaces would be delivered irrespective of the Project coming forward. The Council continues to support CBC's position that the spaces should form part of the DCO.</p>			
2.21.1.4	2,500 robotic parking spaces should not be included in the future baseline	<p>The Council agrees with the position of Crawley Borough Council that the 2,500 robotic parking spaces currently forming part of the baseline should be removed. We also agree that the airport operator's permitted development rights should be reviewed as part of the DCO within the context of achieving the Surface Access Commitments.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): GAL advise that the proposed increase in spaces via robotic parking would come forward as Permitted Development through a phased approach, with Crawley Borough Council to be consulted at the appropriate times. As part of PDR consultation, Crawley Borough Council would ask GAL to demonstrate that a proposed increase in parking is justified by evidence of demonstrable need and having regard to GAL's surface access commitments as per Local Plan Policy GAT3 and the S106 legal agreement.</p> <p>At the present time, the proposed 2,500 space increase has not been justified by evidence, which GAL would presumably provide at the time of each PDR consultation. If that is the case, it is unclear what (if any) evidence is presently in place to demonstrate that a substantial 2,500 space increase through PDR would be consistent with the 'demonstrable need' approach and the meeting of surface access commitments placed on GAL through the S106 legal agreement.</p> <p>GAL appears to be assuming that all 2,500 PDR parking spaces can be taken as a given at this stage. However, this is some way in advance of the individual PDR consultations that GAL advise would be submitted in 2024/25/26. Given that each of those PDR consultations would be expected to be supported by sufficient evidence to demonstrate 'sufficient but no more parking' than is needed to ensure GAL's mode share</p>	<p>As explained in Section 4.4 of ES Chapter 4, a GPDO Consultation was submitted for a trial of Robotic Parking in 2019 (Crawley Borough Council reference CR/2018/0935/CON). The trial was delayed due to COVID-19 pandemic. It is proposed to extend robotic parking over a larger area of existing car park to provide the additional 2,500 spaces in three phases - 500 spaces in 2024 and 1000 spaces in each of 2025 and 2026. These further phases will also come forward as permitted development subject to GPDO consultations with Crawley Borough Council.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant has provided a further response on robotic parking at section 4.6 of The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005] which notes that the intensification of the parking use as a result of the conversion of existing self-park spaces to robotic parking spaces will come forward in advance of the Project as permitted development (pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 8, Class F of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 ("GPDO"), subject to the prior consultation requirements with the local planning authority as set out in the GPDO.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): As noted in The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISH8 Car parking [REP6-084], the planned introduction of robotics technology to increase parking capacity by 2,500 spaces is a future baseline project irrespective of the Northern Runway Project. The Applicant will bring these forward under its PDR as necessary with due regard to policy requirements.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 4 Existing Site and Operation [APP-029]</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISH8 Car parking [REP6-084]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>obligations can be met, it is not considered appropriate for GAL to simply assume, without justification, that 2,500 spaces through PDR can be considered as forming part of the baseline. It would be more appropriate if GAL were to include this parking as part of the DCO.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): The full 2,500 spaces are included in the parking baseline on the assumption of a successful Permitted Development consultation that would be required by the Applicant. This is not considered to be a robust approach given the uncertainty that the Applicant could provide evidence of the spaces being required.</p> <p>Update Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position on the uncertainty of this 2,500 parking capacity coming forward remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council notes that in the Applicant's response to the ExA's Rule 17 letter requesting further information on car parking [REP8-114] it confirms its position that the 2,500 robotic spaces would be delivered irrespective of the Project coming forward. The Council continues to support CBC's position that the spaces should form part of the DCO.</p>	<p>The Applicant is preparing a response to the ExA's Rule 17 request [PD-025] to be submitted at Deadline 8 which will contain further detail on robotic parking provision.</p>		
2.21.1.5	Impact on Covid-19 on baseline	<p>The impact of the Covid 19 pandemic on the availability of data is acknowledged, however, the Council considers that the historic nature of the data may have implications for any robust testing of the likely effects of the Project. This includes (but is not limited to) the modelling data relating to bus and rail services serving Horsham District with the discordance between 2016 and 2022 frequencies, plus the staff travel survey which should be updated to reflect the latest 2023 data. There is also concern about whether the consideration of travellers with luggage and public transport capacity is robust enough.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Await further transport modelling and travel survey data.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council defers to WSCC, as the Highways Authority, on this matter.</p>	<p>The Examining Authority has made a Procedural Decision dated 24 October 2023 to request the Applicant to provide a detailed response to look at accounting for COVID-19 in the transport modelling. This work is being undertaken for submission to the ExA in due course and will include analysis regarding the changes in public transport frequencies since the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>The 2023 staff travel survey is currently being analysed and results will be shared with HDC once available.</p> <p>The rail crowding analysis provides forecasts of the proportion of seats taken in each scenario. All seats are available for passenger use, and overhead luggage racks, space under seats, and luggage compartments provided throughout the train are available for luggage.</p> <p>Updated response (Deadline 1): The response to the ExA's Procedural Decision on accounting for Covid-19 in the transport modelling has been submitted and is available on the Project Webpage.</p>	Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling [AS-121] and its Appendices [AS-122]	No longer being pursued

			<p>Updated position (April 2024): No further updates on the impact of Covid-19. 2023 staff travel survey information has been submitted at Deadline 2 as part of The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005] - see Section 4.2 and Appendix D.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): Clarification has been provided on this issue and no further comments are made at Deadline 5 by Horsham District Council. The Applicant would suggest that this issue is resolved.</p>		
2.21.1.6	Reliance on future infrastructure improvements	<p>Concern about the reliance on future infrastructure improvements, some of which are to be delivered by third parties, and the implications if these do not come forward or are delayed.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Elements of the transport infrastructure, i.e. relating to West of Ifield, have been assumed as coming forward to support the development enough for the development not to result in a significant impact on the road or rail network, however the CEA transport assessment has not included the construction phase of this development. This results in a favourable outcome for the applicant and is not representative of the actual impacts during construction.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 1): The Council acknowledges that the extent of the mitigation should be proportionate and that the Applicant should not be expected to mitigate the impacts of other development. Nonetheless, the Council's concern that the Applicant's assessments tend to include assumptions about future development which presents a favourable outcome for the Project remain. This includes assumptions about the delivery of infrastructure which will indirectly support the Project despite there being the same lack of certainty that such future improvements will come forward as the elements which have the potential for negative cumulative effects.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council's position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>The future year scenarios contain infrastructure with an uncertainty level of 'near certain' or 'more than likely'. This follows TAG guidance set out in TAG unit M4 'Forecasting Uncertainty'. Development and infrastructure which is considered less certain is not included in the future year scenarios for either future baseline or with Project. This and the forecasting assumptions are summarised in Chapters 6 to 8 of the Transport Assessment and set out in detail in Chapters 6 to 8 of Annex B (Strategic Transport Modelling Report) of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The cumulative development scenarios in the modelling for the application draw on information that was available at the time about other developments, including that at West of Ifield. No construction phase information was available for that development. All assumptions regarding West of Ifield's inclusion in the cumulative development test were provided by Homes England's consultants and discussed with West Sussex County Council in stakeholder engagement in September 2022. In any event the promoter of that development would need to demonstrate that its proposals did not create adverse effects and to mitigate any such effects that were predicted to arise; the Applicant is not required to mitigate the unknown effects of others' development proposals particularly where those are at a less certain stage.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): No further update. No further comments are made at Deadline 5 by Horsham District Council. The Applicant would suggest that this issue is resolved.</p>	<p>Chapters 6 to 8 of Transport Assessment [REP3-058]</p> <p>Chapters 6 to 8 of Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260]</p>	Not agreed
2.21.1.7	Rail mode share assumptions	<p>The Applicant anticipates an increase in rail mode share whilst also finding capacity on the railway will not be exceeded despite providing no mitigation. The Council questions whether data used to calculate impact on railway versus capacity is averaged or considers the worst-case, i.e., whether this is peak times of year (start of school holidays vs. midweek during term time, for example). It is unclear what level of certainty the</p>	<p>The transport model used for the application represents an average June weekday which is detailed in section 3.6 of Annex B (Strategic Transport Modelling Report). This included calibrating the number of services and seats as detailed in section 5.2 of Annex B (Strategic Transport Modelling Report).</p>	<p>Chapters 6 to 8 of Transport Assessment [REP3-058]</p> <p>Chapters 5.2 & 6 to 8</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Applicant has placed on mitigation by other developments given that any enhancements will be secured by third parties.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The rail modelling should include sensitivity testing to establish capacity on the network during peak times of year. While it is understood the difference between June and August peak days is forecast to reduce in future this is not considered a robust justification for not assessing an actual peak day.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Updated note. Awaiting progress of discussions between the Applicant and NR.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council's concerns on the rail mode share assumptions remains.</p>	<p>The future year scenarios contain infrastructure with an uncertainty level of 'near certain' or 'more than likely'. This follows TAG guidance set out in TAG unit M4 'Forecasting Uncertainty'. Development and infrastructure which is considered less certain is not included in the future year scenarios for either future baseline or with Project. This and the forecasting assumptions are summarised in Chapters 6 to 8 of the Transport Assessment and set out in detail in Chapters 6 to 8 of Annex B (Strategic Transport Modelling Report) of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The assessment of the impacts and effects of the Project is not reliant on mitigation that may or may not be delivered by other developments.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant provided a technical note commenting on the use of June as a basis for the transport modelling, which forms Appendix B to The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005]. Discussions with NR are ongoing and the topic of rail crowding and peak analysis is part of that. Updates will be provided as the discussions with NR are progressed.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant submitted a Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Network Rail [REP5-063] at Deadline 5 and continues to engage with Network Rail on outstanding matters.</p>	<p>of Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260]</p>	
Assessment Methodology					
2.21.2.1	Focus of modelling	<p>It is the Council's view that the proposed increase in passenger numbers would result in an increase in daily traffic flows on roads in Horsham District that already suffer congestion as detailed in the Council's evidence supporting our emerging Local Plan 1. The Council is concerned that the Applicant has placed to narrow a focus on the immediate vicinity of the Airport and existing capacity issues across the wider transport network could be exacerbated, and new issues caused, by the Project without sufficient mitigation.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council would like to reiterate the importance of ambitious mode share targets to ensure the outcomes of the transport modelling are reflected during Construction and Operation phases.</p> <p>The Council is also concerned at the lack of support for a new multi-modal transport link from the A264 to the A23 in order to address the cumulative impacts of other development alongside the Project.</p>	<p>The transport modelling covers a large area which includes all roads in neighbouring Districts, as indicated in Diagram 5.3.3 of the Transport Assessment. A magnitude of impact assessment was undertaken across the modelled area to understand the impact of the Project on junctions and links within the model. This process is outlined in Chapters 5 and 12 of the Transport Assessment and in section 6.12 of Annex B (Strategic Transport Modelling Report) of the Transport Assessment. The assessment results are presented in Section 12.8 of Annex B of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024):The commitments being made and the way in which they are structured are appropriate in the context of the anticipated rate of growth which is forecast for dual runway operations at the airport . The updated version of the Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028] sets out a monitoring strategy which is in keeping with the existing process for monitoring ASAS</p>	<p>Chapters 5, 12 and 13 of Transport Assessment [REP3-058]</p> <p>Sections 6.12 and 12.8 of Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report of the Transport Assessment [APP-260]</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council defers to WSCC as the Highways Authority on the issue of modelling and understands discussions are ongoing.</p>	<p>targets and the development of Action Plans in consultation with the Transport Forum Steering Group.</p> <p>The assessment of the Project does not require the delivery of a new multi-modal transport link to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>		
2.21.2.2	Modelling assumptions	<p>There are concerns with the assessments that have been undertaken in terms of the modelling assumptions, the thresholds that have been used to assess the magnitude of impacts, what has formed the core scenario, and how this is consistent with the assessments undertaken for other topics, and whether it is robust enough to provide for a realistic assessment.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council would like to reiterate the importance of ambitious mode share targets to ensure the outcomes of the transport modelling are reflected during Construction and Operation phases.</p> <p>The Council is also concerned at the lack of support for a new multi-modal transport link from the A264 to the A23 in order to address the cumulative impacts of other development alongside the Project.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council defers to WSCC as the Highways Authority on the issue of modelling and understands discussions are ongoing.</p>	<p>A magnitude of impact assessment was undertaken across the modelled area to understand the impact of the Project on junctions and links within the model. This process is outlined in Chapters 5 and 12 of the Transport Assessment and in section 6.12 of Annex B (Strategic Transport Modelling Report) of the Transport Assessment. The assessment results are presented in Section 12.8 of Annex B of the Transport Assessment. This assessment was discussed with stakeholders and at Topic Working Groups; the criteria used in the magnitude of impact assessment were amended following the Autumn 2021 Consultation following feedback from stakeholders at that time.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The commitments being made and the way in which they are structured are appropriate in the context of the anticipated rate of growth which is forecast for dual runway operations at the airport . The updated version of the Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028] sets out a monitoring strategy which is in keeping with the existing process for monitoring ASAS targets and the development of Action Plans in consultation with the Transport Forum Steering Group.</p> <p>The assessment of the Project does not require the delivery of a new multi-modal transport link to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>Chapters 5, 12 and 13 of Transport Assessment [REP3-058]</p> <p>Sections 6.12 and 12.8 of Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report of the Transport Assessment [APP-260]</p>	Not Agreed
2.21.2.3		<p>It is unclear to what extent junctions not in proximity to the Airport have been considered, given a cumulative effect may have impacts further afield than the Project alone.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council would like to reiterate the importance of ambitious mode share targets to ensure the outcomes of the transport modelling are reflected during Construction and Operation phases.</p>	<p>The transport modelling covers a large area which includes all roads in neighbouring Districts, as indicated in Diagram 5.3.3 of the Transport Assessment. A magnitude of impact assessment was undertaken across the modelled area to understand the impact of the Project on junctions and links within the model. This process is outlined in Chapters 5 and 12 of the Transport Assessment and in section 6.12 of Annex B (Strategic Transport Modelling Report) of the Transport Assessment. The assessment results are presented in Section 12.8 of Annex B of the Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>Chapters 5, 12 and 13 of Transport Assessment [REP3-058]</p> <p>Sections 6.12 and 12.8 of Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report of the Transport</p>	Not Agreed

		<p>The Council is also concerned at the lack of support for a new multi-modal transport link from the A264 to the A23 in order to address the cumulative impacts of other development alongside the Project.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council's position that wider enhancements to the local road network should be considered remains unchanged.</p>	<p>Updated position (April 2024): The commitments being made and the way in which they are structured are appropriate in the context of the anticipated rate of growth which is forecast for dual runway operations at the airport . The updated version of the Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028] sets out a monitoring strategy which is in keeping with the existing process for monitoring ASAS targets and the development of Action Plans in consultation with the Transport Forum Steering Group.</p> <p>The assessment of the Project does not require the delivery of a new multi-modal transport link to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>	<p>Assessment [APP-260]</p>	
Assessment					
2.21.3.1	Driver delay effects	<p>The Council questions the flawed approach of relying on other developments to mitigate the Applicant's own impacts on driver delay effects and road safety sufficiently to allow the Applicant to not have to provide any mitigation for the Applicant's development.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Ch 12 Para 12.11.55 states that other development will mitigate their own impacts to the extent that the project will not have any residual cumulative impacts. HDC questions the robustness of this approach.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The item in the PADSS submitted at Deadline 2 has been refocused and is superseded by the item in row 2.8.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council's concerns on the approach remain. Discussions in relation to the SAC are ongoing.</p>	<p>No significant adverse effects are expected for driver delay as a result of the Project and road safety is expected to be improved as a consequence of delivering the highway works which form part of the Project.</p> <p>The assessment is inherently cumulative as it includes other development and infrastructure proposals which are considered sufficiently certain (in line with guidance in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance). Additionally a cumulative assessment has been undertaken to consider the outcomes with the Project, should development at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and West of Ifield come forward, but the Project is not relying on those developments to mitigate its impacts, nor is the Project responsible for mitigating the impacts of those developments.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): This item in row 2.7 in Horsham District Councils PADSS [REP2-046] which appears to be removed. The Applicant would seek confirmation if this item is resolved.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): With reference to what is now row 2.7 in the District Council's PADSS [REP5-091], the Applicant has considered options for new or amended bus services and additional active travel measures to support the mode share commitments being made in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]. The SACs provide for reasonable financial support for the bus services identified in the document, or others providing equivalent accessibility, in pursuit of achieving the mode share commitments which are set out in the SACs and secured through Requirement 20 of the draft DCO [REP6-006].</p>	<p>Chapter 12 of Transport Assessment [REP3-058] and associated annexes.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [REP3-016].</p>	Not Agreed
Mitigation and Compensation					

<p>2.21.4.1</p>	<p>Absence of an Airport Surface Access Strategy</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments (paras 2.1.9 and 5.1.2) highlight that an ASAS has not been prepared to support the NRP proposals. Ch.12 Traffic and Transport, Table 12.3.2, p.20 also details that the Car Parking Strategy will be part of the future ASAS and it is not clear how the proposed parking numbers fit within the wider surface access strategy. The Council is concerned that the lack of a clear strategy risks the Applicant's objectives and commitments not being secured through the DCO.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Await further information.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position is reflected in point 2.79 of REP4-042</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council remains concerned that the lack of any ASAS at this stage means there are questions as to how the Applicant will ensure the mode share targets in the SAC would be achieved under the Project. This is one reason the Council, along with the other Joint Local Authorities, put forward their proposal for an Environmentally Managed Growth Framework [REP4-050, REP5-093]</p> <p>Subject to submissions made by the Legal Partnership Authorities at Deadline 9, the Council is broadly very supportive of the ExA's potential amendments to Schedule 2 of the draft DCO, in relation to Surface Access requirement 20, in order to address the concerns around uncertainty.</p> <p>The Council welcomes the provision of the Transport Mitigation Funds, and discussions on these are ongoing to ensure they are sufficient and can be adequately administered.</p>	<p>Further information is being prepared on car parking and will be shared with HDC in due course.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A Car Parking Strategy has been submitted as part of Deadline 1.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant submitted the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] at Deadline 1 which provides further information about the approach it proposes to take to delivering and managing car parking.</p> <p>The relationship between the Surface Access Commitments and a future ASAS for the Project is set out in section 2 of the updated Surface Access Commitments document [REP3-028] which has been submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): With reference to point 2.79 of REP4-042, the Applicant's position in relation to preparation of an 'outline' ASAS for the Project remains that this is not necessary. ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030] explains the relationship between the SACs and the future Project ASAS,</p> <p>In relation to bus priority measures, the Applicant does not consider it necessary for the SACs to include these to mitigate the impacts of the Project; the modelling and assessment work does not show these to be necessary. Nevertheless, the SACs and Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063] contain provision for members of the TFSG to propose additional sustainable transport measures for funding from the Sustainable Transport Fund and also provide the Transport Mitigation Fund for the purpose of addressing unforeseen impacts arising as result of the Project.</p>	<p>Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]</p> <p>Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>
<p>2.21.4.2</p>	<p>Surface Access Commitments (SACs) and Target Mode Shares</p>	<p>Concerns are held about the Surface Access Commitments that underpin the creation of a new Surface Access Strategy and the approach to meeting and monitoring these targets. Some of the concerns include: – Commitment 1, to ensure 55% of passenger journeys is made by public transport is not considered ambitious or of sufficient challenge. Prior to the Pandemic the airport achieved 47.8% public transport modal share in the 12 months up to March 2020 (Paragraph 12.6.11 ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport). – Target mode shares set out as Commitments are only set out as percentages. The percentages masks trends in absolute numbers and permit significant increases in car trips to and from the airport. – Insufficient evidence and justification are provided to demonstrate how the mitigation proposed can provide sufficient sustainable and active travel infrastructure to successfully meet the some of the target modal splits. – Commitments are made in relation to bus and</p>	<p>Our mode share commitments within the Surface Access Commitments document represent the position we are committing to achieve, based on our modelling of mode choice and transport network operation. The SAC also includes a section on our further aspirations, which includes more ambitious mode share targets which we will be working towards, but we have set the committed mode shares and the timescales within which they are to be achieved explicitly to ensure that the core surface access outcomes set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and in the Transport Assessment are delivered.</p> <p>The commitments are expressed as percentages as this is the convention for mode shares. Our commitments will see increases in the number of people using sustainable transport modes. We are aware that our forecasts also anticipate an increase in vehicular</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [REP3-016]</p> <p>Transport Assessment [REP3-058] and associated annexes.</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

		<p>coach service provision. Determination of mode of travel takes into a variety of factors rather than just provision of service. The applicant has not assessed or considered the attractiveness of modes or how this could be increased. For example, by providing enhanced bus priority measures to provide journey time savings. There are no proposed enhancements for services connecting locations within Horsham District to Gatwick Airport which is very disappointing. As a minimum support for Route 200 which operates between Horsham and Gatwick Airport should be included as part of the service enhancements.</p> <p>Funding for services should be expanded and enhanced, both with a commitment to fund beyond the short-term (i.e to ensure the coach services running to the airport are viable) and with some investment in indirect journeys to and from the airport, such as journeys from home to coach terminals, with a view to minimising the use of private vehicle. – Commitment 8 indicates that there will be support for local authorities affected by unauthorised car parking in areas near to the Airport, however, there is a lack of details around the nature and scale of funding and how any monies will be distributed. – The timescale within which the Applicant will meet the mode share commitments are inadequate, and the Council considered these should be met, where appropriate, at the time the second runway becomes operational. As the Surface Access Commitments stand, the second runway can be operation for three years without these targets being achieved.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): No additional information provided so position remains as before</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 3): Further detail is set out in the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report. Should the SACs not be met the proposed approach allows for higher levels of vehicular traffic than is targeted by the SACs for a substantial period of time. The Applicant will produce an Action Plan to address the failure to meet the targets. This does not provide sufficient control and the Highway Authority advocate a Green controlled Growth approach, similar to that adopted by Luton Airport.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council’s position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council’s position, alongside that of the highways authority WSCC, is that concerns over the SAC and mode share targets remain. More detailed comments are set out in the Joint Local Authorities’ response to Deadline 6 submissions [REP7-103 (Section 2), REP7-104].</p>	<p>traffic and our proposed highway works are designed to address this in the immediate vicinity. Our transport modelling reported in the Transport Assessment identifies the potential impact of that additional traffic in the wider area.</p> <p>The interventions we propose in the SACs have been included in our modelling, which provides confidence that the mode share commitments can be achieved with those interventions in place. The bus and coach service enhancements were developed with consideration of services which would be most likely to make greatest difference to mode shares.</p> <p>The further aspirations identified in the SAC document acknowledge that there may be further opportunities to enhance public transport services and we are committed to using the Sustainable Transport Fund to support measures that will help to achieve the mode share commitments. For the specific bus and coach enhancements identified in the SAC document we are committing to funding those for a minimum of five years.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): An updated version of ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028] has been submitted at Deadline 3 which adds further detail to the commitments related to the interventions.</p> <p>In relation to the Green Controlled Growth approach, the commitments being made by the Applicant and the way in which they are structured are appropriate in the context of the anticipated rate of growth which is forecast for dual runway operations at the airport . The updated version of the Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028] sets out a monitoring strategy which is in keeping with the existing process for monitoring ASAS targets and the development of Action Plans in consultation with the Transport Forum Steering Group. The Sustainable Transport Fund and bus and coach contributions are secured in the draft S106 Agreement [REP2-004] to support the increased use of sustainable modes of travel services. The Applicant is also committing to provide a Transport Mitigation Fund, which is secured in the draft DCO S106 Agreement [REP2-004] and would be available to address impacts over and above what was modelled and which were not anticipated.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant’s position as set out above remains unchanged. The Applicant has responded to the JLAs’ EMG Framework Paper [REP5-093] in The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 5 Submissions – Response to JLAs’</p>	<p>The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 5 Submissions – Response to JLAs’ EMG Framework Paper [REP6-093]</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>EMG Framework Paper [REP6-093] noting that the aggregate surface access mitigation proposed for the Project is comprehensive, including that in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030] which was revised at Deadline 6 to incorporate further comments from the JLAs and is secured through Requirement 20 of the draft DCO [REP6-006].</p>		
<p>2.21.4.3</p>	<p>Transport impacts, mitigation and commitments</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment states that journey times on key routes within Horsham District (A24 and A264) will increase both with and without the Project, although the changes resulting from the Project are not expected to be significant. The Council is very concerned at the potential impacts on the transport network in the District and the absence of sufficient mitigation. Outstanding issues around the modelling and inputs being subject to change plus the issues the Council has indicated with regard to the assessment of capacity are concerning. Parts of the Cumulative Effects Assessment have assumed a level of mitigation will be provided by all other developments which will reduce the overall level of impact on the transport network to a point where no mitigation by the Project is necessary. This is a flawed approach. The mitigation as proposed is insufficient and there is inadequate detail on the level of funding associated with the various funds detailed in the Mitigation Route Map and how this will be distributed to fund improvements e.g., no indication of scale of funding associated with the Transport Mitigation Fund. Commitments are currently considered to lack robustness, sufficient to be secured as part of the DCO e.g., Commitments 5, 6 and 7 in the SAC detail that the Applicant will “provide reasonable support for services” but it is not clear what constitutes “reasonable support”, nor who will be responsible for determining this. As currently proposed the details are not sufficient to provide assurances to those responsible for delivering the services or to secure meaningful provision of improvements.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Await information on SAC.</p> <p>The Council is not content that the socioeconomic benefits being promoted for Horsham district are consistent with the conclusion that there will be only relatively minor impacts on the highway, rail and bus network in Horsham district.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): The mitigation as proposed is insufficient and there is inadequate detail on the level of funding associated with the various funds detailed in the Mitigation Route Map and how this will be distributed to fund improvements. As currently proposed the details are not sufficient to provide assurances to those responsible for delivering the services or to secure meaningful provision of improvements.</p>	<p>The assessment undertaken does not show significant adverse effects which will require mitigation in Horsham District. As indicated in Diagrams 12.3.1 and 12.3.2 in the Transport Assessment, the Airport is well located to the strategic highway network and 69% to 75% of airport traffic is forecast to use the M23 Spur. A small proportion (4% to 5%) is expected to be travelling southwest towards Horsham. Journey times through Horsham District (routes 5 and 7 shown in Diagram 12.5.1 of the Transport Assessment) have been assessed and the Project is not expected to have a significant impact. Junctions with medium and high magnitudes of impact have been reviewed in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment and no junctions experiencing this level of impact are identified in Horsham District.</p> <p>The assessment is inherently cumulative as it includes other development and infrastructure proposals which are considered sufficiently certain (in line with guidance in the DfT’s Transport Appraisal Guidance). Additionally a cumulative assessment has been undertaken to consider the outcomes with the Project, should development at Horley Business Park, Gatwick Green and West of Ifield come forward, but the Project is not relying on those developments to mitigate its impacts, nor is the Project responsible for mitigating the impacts of those developments.</p> <p>Further information is being prepared on the application of these measures in support of the Surface Access Commitments.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The position remains unchanged that the assessment undertaken does not show significant adverse effects which will require mitigation in Horsham District. The Applicant will continue to engage with Horsham District Council on this matter. The Applicant has submitted an updated version of ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028] which contains additional detail on the commitments related to surface access interventions. Funding associated with the Surface Access Commitments is set out in the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP2-004] Schedule 3.</p>	<p>Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment [REP3-058] and associated annexes</p> <p>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [REP3-016]</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]</p> <p>Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

		<p>Consideration of meaningful enhancements and improvements to encourage active and public transport in direct and indirect journeys to the airport from Horsham District.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council notes the provision of the Transport Mitigation Fund, and discussions on these are ongoing to ensure they are sufficient and can be adequately administered.</p>	<p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged. Further updates to ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030] and the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063] have been submitted at Deadline 6.</p>		
2.21.4.4	Bus service enhancements	<p>The Council requests that the assumptions regarding the use of public transport to access the Airport are properly interrogated and understood and that sufficient capacity exists within public transport infrastructure to meet the significant expansion the Airport is proposing. This is especially important in relation to bus services and rail capacity (with further consideration on the absence of mitigation proposed by the Applicant). The Council is disappointed that the Applicant has not proposed bus service enhancements to Route 200 which operates between Horsham, Crawley and Gatwick Airport and would wish to see this incorporated into the proposals for service enhancements.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Further work required to provide clarity around the securing of sufficient bus services to meet the future demand, particularly given the need for more ambitious mode share commitments.</p> <p>Enhancements to bus services within Horsham district to and from the airport are required.</p> <p>The Council is also concerned at the lack of support for a new multi-modal transport link from the A264 to the A23 in order to address the cumulative impacts of other development alongside the Project.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): Funding is welcomed, and the Council considers this is important as part of a comprehensive strategy to improve attractiveness of bus services from Horsham District to the airport.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The funding stream remains under discussion with the Applicant to ensure this is sufficient and can be adequately administered.</p> <p>The Council's position that the Applicant should consider support for the multi-modal corridor remains unchanged.</p>	<p>A comprehensive assessment has been undertaken for rail capacity in the Transport Assessment. The assessment for the 'with Project' scenarios also includes the bus and coach enhancements set out in the Surface Access Commitments document. Other bus and coach services are assumed to be responsive to demand, based on GAL's experience with funding for buses and discussions with operators to date. Clarification is sought as to the specific assumptions which the authority is querying.</p> <p>Regarding route 200, the Surface Access Commitments document sets out bus and coach services identified and included in the modelling work, and GAL is committed to provide reasonable financial support in relation to those services, or others which result in an equivalent level of public transport accessibility.</p> <p>The routes identified are based on the likely catchments to maximise the potential of achieving the committed mode shares.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 to the draft DCO S106 Agreement [REP2-004] secures a minimum £10 million investment from the Applicant to support the introduction or operation or use of bus and coach services.</p> <p>The assessment of the Project does not require the delivery of the multi-modal transport link to mitigate impacts.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant notes the District Council's welcome for the funding for bus and coach provision. The Applicant's position on the additional bus and coach services identified in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030] has not changed.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]</p> <p>Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063]</p>	Not Agreed

2.21.4.5	Funding to support development	<p>Given the expansion proposed at the Airport and housing growth in and around Horsham and Crawley (which the Airport is relying upon for its future labour supply) it is the Council's expectation that the Applicant supports / contributes to identified transport upgrades required to support development.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council considers this mitigation is directly related to the impact of the project. GAL are reliant on the housing being delivered as "other development" to facilitate the project in socioeconomic terms, including upgrades to the transport network to facilitate this development, therefore contributions should be required.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged..</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council's position that the Applicant should consider support for the multi-modal corridor remains unchanged.</p>	<p>GAL has undertaken its assessment of the Project to identify where the Project may give rise to significant adverse effects and, where necessary, to identify appropriate mitigation of those effects. The Project is not responsible for mitigating the impacts associated with other developments nor for providing funding or infrastructure to facilitate other developments unless such measures are directly related to the impacts of the Project (rather than to the impacts of the other developments in question)</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): No update to Applicant's position.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>	n/a	Not Agreed
2.21.4.6	Timing of SAC commitments	<p>Commitments, such as those around mode share targets, made in the Surface Access Commitments document, should be achieved at the point the Northern Runway comes into operation, not three years after this date.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issue not addressed.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Subject to submissions made by the Legal Partnership Authorities at Deadline 9, the Council is broadly very supportive of the ExA's potential amendments to Schedule 2 of the draft DCO, in relation to Surface Access requirement 20, in order to address the concerns around the timing of the mode share targets.</p>	<p>Our mode share commitments within the Surface Access Commitments document represent the position we are committing to achieve, based on our modelling of mode choice and transport network operation. Other commitments which we are making to interventions which will allow us to achieve these mode share targets will come into effect earlier than three years after dual runway operations start, as it will be necessary to put those into place to influence travel behaviour and achieve our mode share commitments.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The position remains unchanged. The Applicant will continue to engage with Horsham District Council on this matter.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>	ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]	Not Agreed
2.21.4.7	Mode share commitments	<p>Mode share commitments are not considered to be sufficiently ambitious and there is a lack of adequate mitigation to encourage a shift towards active and sustainable travel. These measures should go further than providing additional services, but also consider how to enhance sustainable transport journeys to increase uptake and encourage travel via modes other than private vehicle.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issue not addressed.</p>	<p>Our mode share commitments within the Surface Access Commitments document represent the position we are committing to achieve, based on our modelling of mode choice and transport network operation. The SAC also includes a section on our further aspirations, which includes more ambitious mode share targets which we will be working towards, but we have set the committed mode shares explicitly to ensure that the core surface access outcomes set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and in the Transport Assessment are delivered.</p>	ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]	Not Agreed

		<p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council's concerns over the SAC and mode share targets remain. More detailed comments are set out in the Joint Local Authorities' response to Deadline 6 submissions [REP7-103 (Section 2), REP7-104].</p> <p>The Council share's West Sussex County Council's (as Highways Authority) concerns that the Applicant has not explored how bus priority measures could be implemented to enhance the attractiveness of sustainable transport modes in order to maximise journeys made via sustainable transport modes (as set out in the the Airport NPS).</p>	<p>Updated position (April 2024): The position remains unchanged. The Applicant will continue to engage with Horsham District Council on this matter.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>		
2.21.4.8	Actions should targets not be met	<p>As currently presented, there is a lack of commitment by the Applicant to take sufficient action if targets are not met and there are no sanctions or penalties. Failure to meet the targets is likely to have wider implications for the transport network which will need addressing.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Issue not addressed.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged..</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): Subject to submissions made by the Legal Partnership Authorities at Deadline 9, the Council is broadly very supportive of the ExA's potential amendments to Schedule 2 of the draft DCO, in relation to Surface Access requirement 20, in order to address the concerns around the timing of the mode share targets.</p>	<p>The SAC set out the monitoring strategy which is in keeping with the existing process for monitoring ASAS targets and the development of Actions Plans in consultation with the Transport Forum Steering Group.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): An updated Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028] document has been submitted at Deadline 3 which provide further detail on the approach to monitoring progress towards the mode share commitments and actions to be taken in the event that it is considered that those mode shares may not be achieved.</p> <p>The Applicant's position remains unchanged. Further updates to ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030] and the Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP6-063] have been submitted at Deadline 6.</p>	<p>Section 6 of the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.6 of Chapter 12 of ES Traffic and Transport [REP3-016]</p>	Not Agreed
2.21.4.9	Airport Surface Access Strategy	<p>Absence of an Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) and a finalised Car Parking Strategy to support the Project is disappointing and should be secured by the DCO to ensure that mode share commitments are met. The Applicant should provide more detail on measures and interventions, even if these are subject to later revision.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting further information.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged..</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council still has concerns relating to the SAC and ASAS. Changes considered necessary by the Joint Local Authorities at Deadline 7 [REP7-104].</p>	<p>Further work on car parking is being undertaken and results will be shared with HDC once available.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A Car Parking Strategy has been submitted as part of the Deadline 1 submission.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): No update to Applicant's position.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged</p>	<p>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030]</p> <p>Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051]</p>	Not Agreed

<p>2.21.4.10</p>	<p>Mitigation for traffic impacts in Horsham</p>	<p>It is the Council's view that traffic and transport impacts will be experienced within Horsham District such that mitigation is required but very little has been proposed by the Applicant that will directly ensure impacts experienced within Horsham District are sufficiently mitigated. Additionally, where funds are proposed as part of the Surface Access Commitments there is inadequate information in relation to the scale and nature of support.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council is not satisfied that the socioeconomic benefits of the Project being suggested for Horsham district are consistent with the conclusion that there will be only relatively minor impacts on the highway, rail and bus network in Horsham district and that, subsequently, no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged..</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council notes the provision of the Transport Mitigation Fund, and discussions on these are ongoing. Subject to submissions made by the Legal Partnership Authorities at Deadline 9, the Council is broadly very supportive of the ExA's potential amendments to Schedule 2 of the draft DCO, in relation to Surface Access requirement 20, in order to address the concerns around possible traffic and transport impacts in Horsham District.</p>	<p>The assessment undertaken does not show significant adverse effects which will require mitigation in Horsham District. As indicated in Diagrams 12.3.1 and 12.3.2 in the Transport Assessment, the Airport is well located to the strategic highway network and 69% to 75% of airport traffic is forecast to use the M23 Spur. A small proportion (4% to 5%) is expected to be travelling southwest towards Horsham. Journey times through Horsham District (routes 5 and 7 shown in Diagram 12.5.1 of the Transport Assessment) have been assessed and the Project is not expected to have a significant impact. Junctions with medium and high magnitudes of impact have been reviewed in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment and no junctions experiencing this level of impact are identified in Horsham District.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): No update to Applicant's position.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged</p>	<p>Chapter 12 of Transport Assessment [REP3-058] and associated annexes.</p> <p>ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport [REP3-016].</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>
<p>Other</p>					
<p>2.21.5.1</p>	<p>Passenger and staff parking</p>	<p>The methodology to derive the proposed parking provision of an additional 1,100 spaces for passengers is not clear, nor how this fits with the wider mode share targets. Similarly, the loss of 1,150 spaces for staff parking also needs to be explained given the increase in staff numbers in both the with and without project scenarios.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting further information.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 3): Concerns over the acute loss of staff spaces, as opposed to the gradual reduction referred to previously by the applicant. Further analysis is key to any staff parking strategy. Clarification is required around the approach to staff parking reduction. The most up to date staff travel data must be taken into account to inform an approach to staff parking which meets the aspiration to increase staff travel by sustainable modes.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged..</p>	<p>Further information is being prepared on car parking and will be shared with HDC in due course.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A Car Parking Strategy has been submitted as part of the Deadline 1 submission.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): The Applicant submitted the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] at Deadline 1 which provides further information about the approach it proposes to take to delivering and managing car parking.</p> <p>The Applicant has also provided additional background to the calculation of future passenger parking demand in The Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions (1) [REP3-104], specifically in response to questions TT.1.38, TT.1.39 and TT.1.41 which provide further narrative on the use of Park & Fly trip volumes to determine future parking demand and the anticipated levels of parking provision in the assessment years of 2029, 2032 and 2047.</p>	<p>Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051]</p>	<p>Not Agreed</p>

		<p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council has noted the Applicant's commitments on parking associated with the Annual Monitoring Report but further detail on how the results of these will be used to inform changes to staff and passenger parking provision is required. The concern around the justification for the additional 1,100 spaces remains.</p> <p>The Council will continue to engage on the proposed amendment to the DCO removing permitted development rights relating to additional car parking provision.</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to maintaining staff parking provision at no more than the level of provision in 2019 (6,090 spaces). Although some staff car parking may be lost as a result of construction, the Applicant will replace this through reallocation of space in other car parks, to the extent necessary to provide capacity for staff parking in the context of progress towards the mode share commitments set out in the Surface Access Commitments [REP3-029]. Any allocation of staff spaces to specific locations will be limited to replacement only, with no net increase.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged. The Applicant undertakes its staff travel survey every two years and will continue to do so as part of the commitments in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP6-030] in conjunction with on-airport staff parking surveys (monthly) and other data collection to support the preparation of the Annual Monitoring Report and determine any changes to staff parking that are required, within the context of there being no net increase.</p>		
2.21.5.2	Car parking	<p>The Council agrees that car parking should only be provided as and when necessary, however, the methodology in relation to the proposed car parking requirements is not clear and requires further justification.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Awaiting further information.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged..</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council continues to engage on the car parking requirements in the context of meeting Surface Access Commitments.</p>	<p>Further information is being prepared on car parking, including on the justification for the proposals. This will be shared with HDC once available.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): A Car Parking Strategy has been submitted as part of the Deadline 1 submission.</p> <p>Updated position (April 2024): No further update.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): The Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>	Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051]	Not Agreed

2.21. Waste and Materials

2.21.1 **Table 2.21** sets out the position of both parties in relation to waste and materials matters.

Table 2.21 Statement of Common Ground – Waste and Materials Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Waste and Materials</i>					

2.22. Water Environment

2.22.1 Table 2.22 sets out the position of both parties in relation to water environment matters.

Table 2.22 Statement of Common Ground – Water Environment Matters

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
Baseline					
There are no issues relating to the baseline for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.					
Assessment Methodology					
There are no issues relating to the assessment methodology for this topic within this Statement of Common Ground.					
Assessment					
2.23.3.1	Wastewater capacity of the wider network and implications for current and emerging Local Plan development	<p>As the Applicant has identified, the capacity of the public sewer network to which the Gatwick wastewater system discharges is the responsibility of Thames Water. The Council has also been advised by Thames Water that an assessment of the impact of wider projected development in the local area on their sewage treatment works at Horley and Crawley is being undertaken, however this information is still awaited. Given the cumulative impact of the Project and current and emerging Local Plan growth in the area, the Council is concerned about the capacity of the Crawley Wastewater Treatment works to meet this growth and what implications any necessary network reinforcement may have on the timescales for development coming forward.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council would like to be kept updated as discussions with TW progress, particularly in light of the development being proposed in the north of Horsham District and within TW's supply area.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged, however the notification of a change to the project in relation to the wastewater treatment capacity has been noted.</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council has noted the additional draft DCO wording presenting the wastewater treatment works as an alternative should the DCO be made including a restriction on growth subject to any necessary infrastructure upgrade works being implemented by Thames Water. The outcome of this issue is not sufficiently certain.</p>	<p>Discussions with Thames Water are ongoing and continue with regard to the impact of the proposed scheme on Crawley WwTW. No impediment has been raised by TW to date.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): Please refer to Thames Water's submission [REP3-149] and the Applicant's Response to ExQ1 WE.1.8 [REP3-105] submitted at Deadline 3 which reflects the current position of the parties.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 9): The Applicant's position on the wastewater treatment works and controls are set out the water and draft DCO, section 106 obligations and control documents sections of the Applicant's Closing Submission (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>	<p>Para 5.3.2 of ES Appendix 11.9.6: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-147]</p> <p>Para 8.1.5 of ES Appendix 11.9.7 Wastewater Assessment [APP-150]</p>	Not Agreed
Mitigation and Compensation					
2.23.4.1	Requirement for synergy between flood mitigation strategies	Land West of Ifield is a strategic site promoted by Homes England through the Council's Local Plan Review. Given the proximity of the site (1km) to the Airport - and should development come forward in both locations - it is important that there is synergy between the respective flood mitigation	The proposed mitigation measures are specific to the Project designed to deal directly with its impact in flood risk. No flood risk mitigation is placed outside the NRP boundary.	Section 11.11 of ES Chapter 11 Water Environment [APP-036]	No longer being pursued

		<p>strategies. This does not appear to have been sufficiently considered in the CEA.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): The Council requests this is kept under review as the examination progresses.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's position remains unchanged..</p> <p>Updated position (12 August 2024): The Council defers to the Lead Local Flood Authority on this matter.</p>	<p>A screening of other developments and plans has been undertaken and determined that the NRP would not affect other developments as reported in the Cumulative Effects Assessment.</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): No update to current position.</p>	<p>ES Appendix 20.4.1 Cumulative Effects Assessment [APP-216]</p>	
Other					
2.23.5.1	Water Neutrality	<p>Whilst the Airport is not within the Sussex North Water Supply Area, the Council considers that it is imperative that the Applicant maximises the scope for water efficiency savings, given the serious water stress across the South East of England.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 1): Request that this is kept under discussion to ensure water efficiency is maximised.</p> <p>Updated Position (Deadline 5): The Council's welcomes the Applicant's intention to consider measures for water efficiency and would like to see this commitment secured as the examination progresses.</p> <p>Updated position (Deadline 2): The Council welcomes the Applicant's commitment to BREEAM Excellent (or equivalent) rating in relation to water standards.</p>	<p>The Water Management Plan sets out potential measures to reduce water stress at the airport. As an appendix to the CoCP the WMP is secured via Requirement 7 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>Separately to the NRP, GAL will deliver water efficiency measures as part of their Second Decade of Change that will reduce water use at the airport by 50% by 2030 (compared to 2019).</p> <p>Updated Position (April 2024): Within the Design Principles [REP3-056] secured by DCO Requirements 4 and 5, GAL makes a commitment to consider "measures to reduce water use and increase re-use across new buildings" in the detailed design of new buildings in principle BF2 under Built Form.</p> <p>Updated position (July 2024): As set out above, the design principles are secured by the DCO. Detailed design is required to accord with the design principles.</p>	<p>Section 4 of ES Appendix 11.9.8 Water Supply Assessment [APP-151]</p> <p>Draft DCO [REP3-006]</p> <p>Section 10.8 of ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice Annex 1 - Water Management Plan [APP-083]</p>	Agreed

3 Signatures

3.1.1 The above SoCG is agreed between the following:

Duly authorised for and on behalf of Gatwick Airport Limited, The Applicant	Name	Jonathan Deegan
	Job Title	Planning & Environment Lead
	Date	21/08/2024
	Signature	
Duly authorised for and on behalf of Horsham District Council	Name	Barbara Childs
	Job Title	Director of Place
	Date	21 st August 2024
	Signature	

Appendix 1: Record of Engagement Undertaken

Date	Form of Correspondence	Details
13 February 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG on DCO Application
7 March 2019	In-Person Meeting	NRP update given to Gatwick Officers Group
8 May 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG on NRP update
5 June 2019	In-Person Meeting	NRP update given to Local Authorities Gatwick Officers Group
20 August 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Land Environment
21 August 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Surface Access and Transport
28 August 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Air Quality, Carbon and Climate Change, and Major Accidents and Disasters
28 August 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Economics and Employment
29 August 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG Meeting on Noise
3 September 2019	In-Person Meeting	Technical Officers Group Meeting
18 September 2019	In-Person Meeting	Health Stakeholder meeting
26 September 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG on MAAD
27 November 2019	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Consultation Update
27 January 2020	In-Person Meeting	TWG Air Quality, Carbon and Climate Change and MAAD
30 January 2020	In-Person Meeting	TWG Economics and Employment
3 February 2020	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Land Based Topics
4 February 2020	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Surface Access
5 February 2020	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Noise
6 February 2020	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Water Environment
26 February 2020	In-Person Meeting	TWG on Consultation Update
27 July 2021	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	TWG on Surface Access
29 July 2021	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	TWG Landscape, Visual and Land and Water Environment
3 August 2021	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	TWG on Economy, Employment, Housing and Health
4 August 2021	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	TWG on Health and Wellbeing
5 August 2021	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	TWG on Land Use and Recreation, Geology, Heritage, and Ecology
12 August 2021	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	TWG on Air Quality, Carbon and Climate Change, and MAAD
16 March 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	TWG on Post Consultation Update
4 May 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise
10 May 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Land and Water Environment
11 May 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
12 May 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning (Mitigation update and Design)
16 May 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Econ & Soc-Econ
17 May 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport

25 May 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning (Forecasting & Capacity)
07 June 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise
09 June 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Land and Water Environment
14 June 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Econ & Soc-Econ
15 June 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport
20 June 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Health & MAAD
21 June 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
28 June 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise
29 June 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Land & Water Environment
5 July 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning (Mitigation Update and Design)
7 July 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Econ & Soc-Econ
14 July 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
26 July 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport
27 July 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Health & MAAD
8 August 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning B (Forecast & Capacity)
16 September 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning B (Forecast & Capacity)
26 September 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Land & Water Environment
27 September 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport
28 September 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Econ/Soc-Econ
3 October 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Carbon & Climate Change
4 October 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Health
14 October 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise
19 October 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning A (Mitigation Update & Design)
21 October 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
31 October 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Land & Water
1 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport
2 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Econ/Soc-Econ
7 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Carbon & Climate Change
8 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Health
8 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Biodiversity Sub-Group Meeting
10 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	Minerals Scoping meeting with WSCC/SCC

18 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Econ/Soc-Econ (mop up session)
23 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning A (Mitigation Update & Design)
24 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning B (Forecast & Capacity)
29 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise
30 November 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	LLFA/GAL meeting on FRA and River Mole culvert
2 December 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Land & Water
5 December 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport
6 December 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
8 December 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Carbon & Climate Change
12 December 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Major Accidents & Disasters
14 December 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise (Noise Envelope)
14 December 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Biodiversity Sub-Group Meeting
14 December 2022	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Econ/Soc-Econ
4 January 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise
10 January 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Land & Water
16 January 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
17 January 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning (Mitigation Update and Design)
18 January 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Carbon
19 January 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Health and MAAD
31 January 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport
8 February 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise
9 February 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Land & Water
7 March 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning B (Forecast and Capacity)
13 March 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air-Quality
14 March 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Planning B (Forecast and Capacity)
10 November 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport (Highways)
11 December 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Greenhouse Gases
12 December 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Employment Skills & Business Strategy
13 December 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
15 December 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Transport (Post-COVID Modelling)
20 December 2023	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise

9 February 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Ops and Capacity
15 February 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Catalytic Impacts Assessment
15 February 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Needs and Forecasting
25 March	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on ESBS
8 April 2024	In Person Meeting	ESBS Strategy Workshop
15 April 2024	In Person Site Visit	York Aviation (on behalf of JLA's) NRP visit to the Old Control Tower simulator
22 April 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
29 April 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	s106 Community Fund
29 April 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	s106 Surface Access
9 May 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Transport Modelling GAL/Surrey CC
10 May 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	s106 Biodiversity
10 May 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	s106 Noise
10 May 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	s106 Air Quality
10 May 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Transport Modelling GAL/WSCC
14 May 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Landscape Visuals
15 May 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Transport Modelling GAL/SCC
30 May 2024	In-Person Meeting	Draft ESBS Implementation Plan Workshop
31 May 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG Historic Environment WSCC
7 th June 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Ordinary watercourses with WSCC, SCC and GAL
11 th June 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	PROW and active travel
14 th June 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams	Catalytic Impacts Assessment with York Aviation/GAL
24 th June 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Lane Rental and Permit Scheme
28 th June 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Capacity meeting with York Aviation/GAL
2 nd July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Community Fund with Community Foundations
2 nd July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Design Principles
5 th July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Air Quality
11 th July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	ESBS Stakeholder Workshop 3
9 th July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Update on Brook Farm active travel proposals
12 th July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	WIZAD SID discussion with York Aviation, David Monk and GAL

18 th July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Noise with EHOS from JLAs
24 th July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Transport meeting with SCC and GAL
25 th July 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	Transport meeting with WSCC and GAL
6 th August 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Socio-economics
8 th August 2024	Virtual Meeting – MS Teams (Recorded)	TWG on Socio-economics (wash up session on asylum seekers)