



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and Joint Local Authorities – Capacity and Operations – Clean Version

Book 10

VERSION: 2.0

DATE: AUGUST 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.1.18

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

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 the Joint Local Authorities on matters pertaining to the Capacity and Operations topic. For the avoidance of doubt, the Joint Local Authorities includes; Crawley Borough Council, East Sussex County Council, Horsham District Council, Kent County Council, Mid Sussex District Council, Mole Valley District Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Surrey County Council, Tandridge District Council and West Sussex County Council.

1.1.6 A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between the parties is detailed in **Appendix 1** of the respective individual SoCG documents.

1.1.7 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 between the parties. Future iterations will be submitted at examination deadlines until it is finalised. Both parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as discussions progress, to ensure it is comprehensive and up to date.

1.1.8 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 to them 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.

1.2. Capacity and Operations

1.2.1 Table 1.1 sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

Table 1.1 Statement of Common Ground Matters

| Reference | Matter | Gatwick Airport Limited Position | Stakeholder Position | Signposting | Status |
|-----------|----------------------|--|---|---|--------|
| 1.1.1 | 2018 Baseline | The 2018 runway infrastructure and operation at London Gatwick is set out in Section 2 of the Capacity and Operations Summary Paper [REP1-053] . In 2018 the busy day achieved 931 ATM (934 scheduled). The baseline operates within a CAA approved safety regime. | The description of the current infrastructure is agreed and the level of movements on a busy day in 2018 noted. | Section 2 of the Capacity and Operations Summary Paper [REP1-053] and Table 2 of the Appendix: Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054] | Agreed |
| 1.1.2 | Future Baseline | The infrastructure in the Future Baseline mirrors the 2018 baseline infrastructure with the addition of the Rapid Exit Taxiway (RET), which is already in operation, and the associated removal of the exit taxiway Echo and the addition of the Pier 6 Western Extension. This infrastructure configuration is capable of delivering 954 ATM on a busy day, with a peak runway declaration of 55 ATM/hour; a declaration that has been scheduled and achieved since 2017. The future baseline runway infrastructure is already operating within a CAA approved safety regime. | The description of the infrastructure in the Future Baseline is agreed and simulation modelling shows that up to 55 movements per hour and 870 daily aircraft movements between 06.00 and 22.00 local time as modelled (Table 3 of REP1-054) can be accommodated on a busy day albeit that delay levels are relatively high and there is no realistic headroom for the number of daily movements to be increased within acceptable service standards on the basis of current operational practices. | Table 2 of the Appendix: Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054] | Agreed |
| 1.1.3 | Proposed Development | The infrastructure for the proposed development is described in Section 4 Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054] . Under the proposed development the airfield is capable of consistently delivering 1132 ATM on a busy day by 2038, with a peak runway declaration of 69 ATM/hour. | The description of the infrastructure with the Proposed Development is agreed and simulation modelling shows that the projected number of movements on a busy day can be accommodated (see above) with very limited headroom for the number of daily movements to be increased within acceptable service standards on the basis of current operational practices. | Section 4 & table 2 of the Appendix: Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054] | Agreed |
| 1.1.4 | Aerodrome Safety | The Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and the Civil Aviation Authority [REP3-068] sets out that in relation to Aerodrome Certification, including safety, the CAA sees no impediment to the approval of the Development. | The position of the CAA is noted regarding the ability of the proposed development to meet the required standards for aerodrome certification. However, this does not imply any particular capacity of throughput as attainable from the two runways. | The Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and the Civil Aviation Authority [REP3-068] at Deadline 3. | Agreed |
| 1.1.5 | Runway directions | Runway 26 is the primary direction for runway operations in the peak and should be the focus for any capacity analysis. | Agreed. | Para 4.1.5 of Appendix: Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054] | Agreed |
| 1.1.6 | Modelling | The modelled holding times are a reasonable estimation of the expected holding times under the future baseline and proposed development schedules. Whilst GAL believe the 'current performance' modelling times are worst case, due to the lack of consideration of the future initiatives, it can be agreed that the holding times in the 'current performance' modelled scenarios are operationally | The calibration of the simulation model would suggest that the holding times and delays may be marginally understated. With that caveat, it is accepted that the modelled results present a reasonable picture of the operation in both the Baseline and NRP cases. To the extent that there is a risk that holding times and delays may be understated, these could be ameliorated by the proposed future initiatives, which may improve resilience. | Section 7 of Appendix: Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054] | Agreed |

| | | | | | |
|-------|--|--|---|---|------------|
| | | deliverable, and any future initiatives will only improve resilience with consequential improvements to holding times. | | | |
| 1.1.7 | Resilience | In 2018 the levels of resilience exhibited in the London Gatwick ecosystem were lower than desired. Actions being taken to improve this, that are within the Airport's control, include: an additional Rapid Exit Taxiway (RET), Time Based Separation (TBS), Reduced Departure Separation (RDS) and the enhanced departure sequence capability projects, which are all either already in place or will be in place by the end of 2025. These will support in increasing resilience and deliver improved holding times. | The proposed new initiatives are noted. However, the actual effect of these on delays and holding times is not yet known and, other than the RET, have not yet been implemented. Hence, the extent of any improvement to holding times or resilience cannot yet be quantified or relied on to increase the capacity of the runway or runways above that assessed, as accepted by the Applicant at It is understood that the modelling of Baseline capacity already allows for the impact of the RET in the Baseline Case, noting that the new RET cannot be used during dual runway operations so cannot be used to enhance capacity in the NRP case. | Section 4.4 of Appendix: Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054] | Agreed |
| 1.1.8 | Resilience and delay | In any proposal of this scale there a risk that delays may be above those modelled due to events that cannot be included in the modelling of a normal busy day. For this proposal, this risk of increased delay is sufficiently mitigated by the fact that it has not been possible to include all the resilience benefits of the future performance initiative projects in the modelling (and which are identified in Section 4.4 & 7 of Appendix: Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054]). These resilience benefits include improvements to the airport's ability to maintain peak operating capability across a broader range of weather conditions (TBS), across air traffic controller skill levels (TBS, enhanced departure sequencing), and across a broader range of adverse airspace network issues and short-term departure SID demand imbalances (enhanced departure sequencing, RDS). While GAL does not claim that these initiatives will add to available capacity, it is reasonably assumed that the planned improvements will enhance the airport's resilience. | The Applicant's position in relation to the potential tools available to improve the resilience of the Airport's operation in varying circumstances is noted. It is accepted that these tools could assist in managing the risk of increased delays in poorer weather conditions or when there are other disruptions. | Section 4.4 & 7 of Appendix: Airfield Capacity Study [REP1-054] | Agreed |
| 1.1.9 | Standard Instrument Departure (SID) Routes | The existing Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs) are set out Section 2 of the Capacity and Operations Summary Paper [REP1-053] . No airspace change is required to enable airfield throughput capacity in both the Future Baseline and under the Proposed Development. See Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and NATS (En Route) Plc [REP5-066] statement 2.3.1.1. | It is agreed that the operation of the NRP does not directly require an airspace change to facilitate dual runway operations. However, the growth of air traffic across the London system as a whole, including that delivered by the NRP, is expected to require airspace change under the FASI-S programme. It is noted that the Applicant is already promoting airspace change to the south of the Airport for early implementation under FASI-S and the Statement of Need document as submitted to the CAA Airspace Change portal does refer to the ability to increase capacity and make best use of existing runways as part of the rationale for the change. Hence, there would appear to be some linkage between the increased traffic with the NRP and the need for airspace change. | Section 2 of the Capacity and Operations Summary Paper [REP1-053] Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and NATS (En Route) Plc [REP5-066] statement 2.3.1.1. | Not Agreed |

| | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|---|------------|
| 1.1.10 | Airspace Management | NATS has existing measures in place to manage the flow of air traffic in the London Terminal Control Area (LTMA) airspace efficiently and to ensure the sector/airspace loading remains within safe operational parameters. | Agreed. | Section 4.4 Dual Runway Airspace of Capacity and Operations Summary Paper [REP1-053] . | Agreed |
| 1.1.11 | Airspace - WIZAD Standard Instrument Departure (SID) Route | The assumption for the increased use of the WIZAD Standard Instrument Departure (SID) route - in the baseline case and with the NRP - is based upon increasing air traffic congestion over time in the airspace to the north of London Gatwick in the London Terminal Control Area (LTMA) airspace, due to the growth of air traffic across all of the London airports. This assumption sets the basis of a reasonable worst case for the purposes of environmental impact assessment only. The environmental impacts of WIZAD are covered separately. | <p>The Applicant has included detailed information on expanded use of the WIZAD SID (Route 9) and has made clear predictions about its future use advising that by 2038 up to approximately 9% of west bound departing traffic will use the route. The Applicant states that this is a combination of baseline growth and northern runway. The Applicant states that this is only included for Environmental Impact Assessment purposes but the JLAs have stated that the assessment lacks the necessary information to inform the impacts. Examples include details of overflights and thus the impact on the route.</p> <p>Whilst the physical SID design does not change, SIDs are also subject to conditions. The nature of the use of Route 9 does change substantially as a direct result of airport expansion due to the inter-relationship between increasing airport infrastructure capacity and limited airspace capacity serving the area.</p> | | Not Agreed |
| 1.1.12 | Airspace - WIZAD Standard Instrument Departure (SID) Route | The WIZAD SID is not required to achieve the airfield throughput capacity under the Proposed Development. The WIZAD SID is not a flight plannable route and was not used in the airfield throughput capacity modelling. GAL does not require, nor has any intention to request, an airspace change in order deliberately redistribute air traffic on to the WIZAD SID. | <p>Although use of WIZAD SID has reportedly not been assumed to model the capacity of the runway, this is because it is a relief route for the Runway 26 LAM (Lambourne) route and it is assumed the 26 LAM will absorb the capacity requirements. It is accepted that use of WIZAD SID is not required to enable the hourly throughput of the NRP to be achieved.</p> <p>However, the JLAs consider it likely that, under current airspace structures before modernisation, increase traffic on 26 LAM as a consequence of the NRP would add to the congestion in the LTMA and as a direct result lead to the redistribution of traffic to Route 9 WIZAD.</p> <p>At the same time that Gatwick is increasing the volumes of aircraft by expansion, other airports may be doing the same which would likely increase the transferral of ATMs to Route 9 WIZAD.</p> <p>As airspace is becoming increasingly congested then the impact of delays, for example, due to holding aircraft can also result in increased congestion.</p> <p>As WIZAD SID is being relied upon as a relief the increased use of WIZAD is related to all airport expansion. This is material to the consideration of the application and its environmental effects.</p> | | Not Agreed |

| | | | | | |
|--------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|------------|
| | | | <p>With regard to the statement that there are no plans to request an airspace change to utilise this route that appears to be true as there is an intention to use it without seeking change (or by providing the information necessary for consideration of an airspace change process). The JLAs consider that there is a clear change in the way the WIZAD SID was intended to be used and as such it should be subject to formal airspace change assessment.</p> <p>The Applicant has clearly set out its options for airspace change under FASI-S in the round of briefings in January 2024. In this, as part of the London Airspace South Gatwick Departure Options, routes with an early left turn trajectory over Horsham that are virtually identical to the early part of the WIZAD route <i>“have been identified as suitable for early deployment and form part of the London Airspace South.”</i> The diagrams, whilst being marked for information only, clearly show departure to the South of the airport intensifying the impact across the Horsham and Mid Sussex Districts. It is possible that these routes, if they develop, will be given different titles but the impacts will be upon similar populations to those households under WIZAD.</p> | | |
| 1.1.13 | Airspace modernisation and FASI-South | <p>An improvement in airspace capacity and resilience is an outcome defined in the stage 1 submission of the London Gatwick Future Airspace Strategy Implementation - South (FASI-S) airspace change.</p> <p>During stage 2 of the airspace change process the airfield throughput capacity under the Proposed Development was set as a requirement of NERL’s FASI-S project.</p> <p>The Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and NATS (En Route) Plc [REP5-066] sets out the view of NERL in that ‘London Airspace South is expected to increase network capacity in the immediate vicinity to the south of the airport’ and that the ‘...beneficial geographical location of London Gatwick, that lies to the south of the congested and complex heart of the London Terminal Control Area airspace, and the supporting airspace that lies to its south, means it is easier to take forward airspace change here compared to the north of London Gatwick, which would involve the other main London airports.</p> <p>The JLAs have expressed concern that FASI-S may reduce airfield throughput capacity. GAL believes that any risk that the airspace modernisation project will reduce capacity is mitigated by the inclusion of NRP airfield capacity requirements in stages 1 and 2 of the FASI-S airspace change process.</p> | <p>The JLAs have not stated that FASI-S would reduce the capacity of the airfield and it is noted that the NRP forecasts have been built into the assumptions being used to test FASI-S options. However, it remains the case that the airspace changes under FASI-S are likely to be required in order ensure that the uplift in movements with the NRP can be accommodated in the airspace more widely. This may have consequential implications for the assessment of the environmental effects of the NRP and the appropriate mitigations.</p> <p>The JLAs note that the CAA, which must approve airspace change proposals, does state in its Statement of Common Ground with the Applicant [REP3-068] that <i>“It is the case that it is too early in the Airspace Modernisation programme to say what trade-offs will be required to resolve any conflict between the sponsors of separate airspace changes, or between different objectives. Therefore, it is also too early to say what benefits individual airports might achieve from airspace modernisation, whilst recognising that one of the goals for the AMS is to provide greater capacity overall.”</i></p> <p>There remain some residual doubts about the extent to which the full uplift in movements claimed for the NRP will be capable of being accommodated in full. At the very least,</p> | <p>Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and NATS (En Route) Plc [REP5-066] statement 2.3.1.9 CAA Airspace Change Portal Airspace Modernisation Gatwick Airport Step 2A - Submission Document - Options Development and Evaluation, page 15 Movement data and page 22 - Northern Runway Project Step 2B - Submission Document - Initial Options Appraisal, page 30 Northern Runway)</p> | Not Agreed |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|------------|
| | | | accommodating the uplift is likely to necessitate some changes in airspace in the vicinity of the Airport. | | |
| 1.1.14 | Airspace modernisation and FASI-South | <p>The airspace change under the auspices of FASI-S is independent of the NRP DCO.</p> <p>The London Gatwick local airspace requirements for a busy single runway operation or a close-parallel dual runway operation are the same.</p> <p>The London Gatwick FASI-S project will deliver a solution that is fit for either outcome, i.e. the Future Baseline and under the proposed development.</p> <p>This airspace change under FASI-S will primarily increase London Gatwick resilience rather than capacity.</p> | <p>Although technically independent, there is a potential interaction between the FASI-S programme to ensure sufficient airspace capacity overall and the possibility of consequential changes to Gatwick's local airspace. The implications of such potential changes have not been considered as part of the Applicant's environmental assessment and this gives rise to concern as to whether the consequences of FASI-S would give rise to differential environmental impacts.</p> | | Not Agreed |

2 Signatures

2.1.1 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 the Joint Local Authorities | Name | |
| | Job Title | Head of Economic Development and Planning |
| | Date | 21/08/24 |
| | Signature |  |