



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

The Applicant's Response to Deadline 8 Submissions

Book 10

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: AUGUST 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.77

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this Document	1

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Document

- 1.1.1 This document sets out the Applicant's response to the submissions received at Deadline 8. As per previous deadlines, the Applicant is mindful of the volume of information already submitted into the examination and has sought to limit the duplication of submissions it has already made on certain subjects. As such, the Applicant has not responded to every submission or point made and does not repeat submissions to one interested party where equivalent responses have been made to the same submission made by another party; instead, it has responded by exception where the submission raises a new matter and/or where the Applicant considers such a response may be helpful to the ExA. Silence on an issue, therefore, should not be interpreted as agreement – but instead a recognition of the approach taken by the Applicant in this document.
- 1.1.2 Where an Interested Party has made a materially new point, the Applicant has provided a response within the body to this document or as an appendix. As many of the Applicant's positions are already set out elsewhere within the Application (either in its Closing Submission, Statements of Common Ground or in earlier responses), the Applicant has sought to avoid duplication and instead provided signposting to the appropriate location within the Application Documents.
- 1.1.3 The Applicant has not provided responses to the submissions which contained general points of opposition or support as these matters have been responded to within the **Relevant Representation Report** [[REP1-048](#)].

Table 1: The Applicant's Response to Deadline 8 Submissions

Interested Party	Document Reference	Topic	Response or signposting
AIPUT	REP8-136	Compulsory Acquisition	Please refer to Chapter 24 (Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession) of the Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73) submitted at Deadline 9.
Arora Group	REP8-137	Compulsory Acquisition	Please refer to Chapter 24 (Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession) of the Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73) and the Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession – Status of Negotiations (Doc Ref. 10.71) submitted at Deadline 9.
CAGNE	REP8-143	DCO Requirements	<p>In relation to CAGNE's comments on the square bracketed Requirement 31(3) (construction sequencing – wastewater treatment works), please refer to paragraph 1.3.3 onwards of Appendix A to the Applicant's Response to Deadline 7 Submissions [REP8-116].</p> <p>In relation to CAGNE's comments on the ExA's requirements proposed in advance of ISH9, please refer to Appendix A to the Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions – ISH 9 Mitigation [REP8-107]. In any event those proposed requirements have since been superseded by those in the ExA's Proposed Schedule of Changes to the draft DCO [PD-028], which the Applicant has responded to in its Response to the ExA's Proposed Schedule of Changes to the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72).</p>

		Finch	Please refer to Greenhouse Gas Technical Note (Doc Ref. 10.79) and Chapter 8 (Greenhouse Gases) of the Closing Submission (Doc Ref. 10.73) submitted at Deadline 9.
	REP8-144	Noise	<p>Please refer to The Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72).</p> <p>Paragraph 11 notes <i>‘Any future noise limits should be based on an assessed forecast, to ensure that the environmental effects have been sufficiently considered and that they are achievable by the Airport.’</i> The Applicant concurs and notes the ExA’s proposals do not meet this requirement. The Applicant has also now demonstrated that they are not achievable by the airport.</p> <p>Paragraph 13 notes <i>‘The Applicant has presented the Central Case as its core case in their Environmental Statement (ES). They did this while having all results of the Updated Central Case (UCC) in their possession, and yet they chose not to present the UCC in their ES.’</i> This is not the case. The ES was published in July 2023. ERCD completed modelling of the UCC after which the noise modelling results were analysed and considered.</p> <p>Paragraph 14 notes. <i>‘We note that any noise limits should be based on a core case, as opposed to a sensitivity test such as the ‘Slower Fleet Transition’ (SFT) case.’</i> The Updated Central Case is not a sensitivity case as made clear in the D4 submission, it is the Applicant’s core case. So, it is right to set the noise limits on it.</p>

			<p>Paragraph 18 and 19 state: <i>‘Although hard to precisely calculate due to the lack of information within the ES, we have used the Applicant’s ‘rule of thumb’ to try to compare the Central Case reduction to that proposed by the ExA, whereby they state 20% area change is roughly approximate to 1 dB. Of all the cases, the Current Case most closely tracks the reduction apparently sought by the ExA, particularly up to 2038. The noise reduction proposed by the ExA in no case is met by that proposed by the ExA.’</i></p> <p>It is not clear what the last sentence means, but the Suono rule of thumb analysis indicates the Central Case may <i>‘to some extent track the ExA proposal’</i>, which presumably means it exceeds it in some years, and clearly after 2038. This also implies the Updated Central Case, ie the Applicant’s core case does not meet the ExA’s proposed noise limits, so the limits would be unworkable for the Applicant’s core case. Below under the Joint Legal Partnerships heading the Applicant provides a fuller commentary on their similar analysis. Please also see 10.72 Response to the ExA Proposed schedule of changes to the DCO, submitted at Deadline 9 for the Applicant’s full analysis of the Examining Authority’s two noise envelope limits proposals.</p>
	REP8-145	Air Quality	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the air quality submission by CAGNE and notes iteration of points set out by CAGNE at Deadline 4 [REP4-095]. The Applicant responded to the Deadline 4 submission by CAGNE at Deadline 6 [REP6-090], including a detailed response on verification and modelling approach at Section 5. A summary of the Applicant's position is set out within the closing submission (Doc Ref. 10.73) and the Applicant's position remains the same. Additional points</p>

		raised on monitoring and mitigation are addressed in Appendix C Response to the JLAs’ EMG Framework Paper [REP8-118] .
REP8-146	Airspace	<p>In relation to airspace change and airspace modernisation refer to the Deadline 1 Submission - 10.7 Capacity and Operations Summary Paper [REP1-053] para 1.2.12 which is further supported by the Deadline 3 Submission - 10.1.11 Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and the Civil Aviation Authority [REP3-068] para 2.3.1.3 and the Deadline 5 Submission - 10.1.20 Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and NATS (En-Route) Plc Version 1 [REP5-066] paras 2.3.1.8 - 2.3.1.10. While the London Gatwick operation will benefit as a result of the Airspace Modernisation programme, it is not required to deliver the Northern Runway Project.</p> <p>The environmental impacts of London Gatwick’s Airspace Modernisation project - as with all airports participating in the Airspace Modernisation programme - will be assessed under the CAA’s regulated airspace change process set out in CAP 1616. The airspace design options and the potential configurations that may result at this stage of London Gatwick’s airspace change project mean they are not yet able to be assessed cumulatively with this project; see the Deadline 4 Submission - 10.24 Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [REP4-031] para NV.1.10 and the Deadline 8 Submission - 10.62.3 The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH9 - Case for the Proposed Development [REP8-108] para 2.2.13.</p>
REP8-147	Socio-Economics	It is common ground between the Applicant and the JLAs that there are housing market pressures around the airport, including homelessness and that Crawley BC has declared a Housing Emergency. The Applicant remains of its view that there is a significant supply of housing within the wider area and that its workers are

			unlikely to have a significant impact. However, in recognition of the absence of good data on actual vacancy rates and the JLAs' concerns for risks of an increase in homelessness pressures on the Council, the Applicant and the JLAs have agreed to a Homelessness Prevention Fund that the Councils can draw down in the event that there are measurable impacts on the housing market as a result of the Project, which can then be used to either boost supply or to support those at risk of homelessness.
Charlwood Parish Council	REP8-139	Noise	The Applicant has supplied details of its estimates for the Home Relocation Assistance Scheme and separately for noise compensation in 10.63.1 The Applicant's Response to Actions - CAH2 Compulsory Acquisition [REP8-110] .
Christina Nanna Mary Coleman	REP8-140	Finch	Please refer to Greenhouse Gas Technical Note (Doc Ref. 10.79) and Closing Submission – Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 10.73).
	REP8-141	Water	Thames Water's position in relation to water environment matters of the project is discussed in the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Thames Water (Doc Ref. 10.1.17 v3). As noted throughout The Applicant's Response to the Written Representations [REP3-072] (Table 9.1, Table 14.1, Table 22.1, Table 43.1), hydraulic modelling of Gatwick's wastewater system was undertaken to inform the assessment of Project impacts reported in ES Appendix 11.9.7 Wastewater Assessment [APP-150] . This demonstrates that with the mitigation measures included in the Project (see Table 11.8.1), Gatwick's wastewater network would have adequate capacity to accommodate the increase in flows anticipated as a result of the Project. The

			<p>mitigation measures include the reduction in surface water ingress to the wastewater system as a result of network upgrades. The capacity of the public sewer network to which the private Gatwick wastewater system discharges and the downstream treatment works are the responsibility of Thames Water under the terms of its licence as the statutory authority. Discussions with Thames Water are ongoing to agree the quantity and distribution of discharges from the airport in the future. Thames Water are undertaking an assessment of the impact of the Project on their network and sewage treatment works at Horley and Crawley. The Applicant has provided an update on this position in response to ExA Question WE.2.2 at Deadline 7 [REP7-093].</p> <p>The email from SESW confirming their ability to meet the additional water demand from the Project was provided as part of the Applicant’s Response to Actions from ISH7: Other Environmental Matters [REP4-037].</p>
Dr J Cuthbert	REP8-151	Health	<p>Noise is addressed in Environmental Statement - Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration [APP-039]. The noise insulation scheme is set out in the Environmental Statement Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme [REP8-086]. Noise is also covered in ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043], section 18.8 on ‘Health and Wellbeing Effects from Changes in Noise Exposure’. The assessment concludes that the project should not result in any significant adverse effects to public health, a conclusion with which the national public health statutory health stakeholders agree [RR-4687].</p> <p>Air quality is addressed in Environmental Statement Chapter 13: Air Quality [APP-038]. Air quality is also covered in ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043], section 18.8 on ‘Health and Wellbeing Effects from Changes to Air</p>

			<p>Quality”. The assessment concludes that the project should not result in any significant adverse effects to public health, a conclusion with which the national public health statutory health stakeholders agree [RR-4687].</p> <p>Non-ionising radiation is addressed in ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043], section 18.8 on ‘Health and Wellbeing Effects from Understanding of Risk (Risk Perception)’. This includes confirmation of compliance with exposure standards set out in Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Voluntary Code of Practice and relevant ICNIRP public exposure guidelines. Environmental Statement Appendix 6.2.2 Scoping Opinion [APP-095] confirms that the wider issues relating to radiation are agreed as scoped out.</p>
East Sussex County Council	REP8-125	Surface Access Commitments	The Applicant has amended the SACs (Doc ref. 5.3) submitted at Deadline 9 so that there is express consideration of the service provision requested by ESCC in the Applicant's consideration of the optimum routes to achieve the mode share commitments pursuant to Commitment 5 of the SACs.
Environment Agency	REP8-123	Design Principles	<p>The Environment Agency’s Deadline 8 response acknowledges and welcomes the Applicant’s changes to the Design Principles [REP7-063] made at Deadline 7, which were made in response to the EA’s Deadline 6 Submission [REP6-098].</p> <p>No further response or changes are required.</p>
		Water	Please refer to the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Environment Agency (Doc Ref. 10.1.12 v3)

GACC	Greenhouse Gases	Please refer to Greenhouse Gas Technical Note (Doc Ref. 10.79) and Closing Submission 7 – Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 10.73).
	Water	<p>The HEWRAT assessment has shown that the annual average concentrations of the discharges for Copper (Cu) and Zinc (Zn) are significantly below the Environmental Quality Standards (EQS) (i.e. 1 µg/l for Copper and 10.9 µg/l for Zinc) under the pre-mitigation scenario. With the addition of treatment measures then these concentrations of heavy metals are further reduced by the treatment function of the SuDS measure. It is therefore considered that baseline monitoring of these outfalls is not required.</p> <p>The drainage system has been designed in line with the requirements of DMRB CG 501. This also considers events that exceed the design capacity. Exceedance routes up to the 1 in 100-year rainfall event, with an allowance for climate change shall be managed within the site extents. Overflow weirs are proposed at flow control chambers and basins/ponds to provide an exceedance route in case of blockage. A freeboard of 300mm is proposed for all basins and ponds to deal with events that exceed the design capacity. Drainage assets would be maintained in accordance with the procedures and requirements of the adopting highway authorities to ensure that all assets are able to perform as designed.</p> <p>With regards to the design life for the Project, The Applicant updated the Executive Summary of ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3 v4) at Deadline 6 to reiterate that the airfield and surface access highways improvements elements of the Project adopt separate design lives consistent with the character of these elements of the development and the effects when flooding occurs. The Applicant acknowledges in paragraph 0.1.19 of ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk</p>

			<p>Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3 v4) that the 100-year design life for the highways elements would extend to 2132. It is considered that, based on current predictions, an additional seven years of climate change beyond 2125 would not impact significantly on the assessment of flood risk for the Project. In any event, the Credible Maximum Scenario (CMS) would cover the additional seven years beyond 2025. The CMS sensitivity test of plus 40 per cent on the 1 per cent (1 in 100) AEP event has assessed the impact of the Project in the event of climate change impacts exceeding those currently predicted.</p> <p>Regarding wastewater concerns, Thames Water’s current position is set out in the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Thames Water (Doc Ref. 10.1.17 v3) As noted, GAL has agreed with Thames to fund a two-Phase modelling exercise to be undertaken in 2024 so that the capacities of the receiving infrastructure (process and network) can be assessed and verified to Thames’ internal modelling standards. The latest progress of these impact assessments is set out at item 2.22.5.2.</p> <p>GAL is providing mitigation for their own impacts, such as through the provision of an On-airport Wastewater Treatment Works, and it is for Thames Water to manage their infrastructure.</p> <p>The risk of flooding to the airport from fluvial, surface water, groundwater and sewer/water distribution infrastructure sources has been considered within Section 6 of ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3 v4). The provision of surface water drainage mitigation to mitigate surface water flood risk impacts within and outside the DCO Boundary is detailed within Section 7.3 of ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3 v4).</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>Regarding, the impact of the Project on flood peaks further downstream, paragraph 5.2.1 in ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment Annex 5: River Mole Fluvial Model Build Report (Doc Ref 5.3 v3) states the Upper Mole model extends 2.5km to fully assess the impacts of the Project and risk to any third parties downstream of the Project. As stated throughout The Applicant's Response to the Written Representations [REP3-072], ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3 v4) demonstrates that through the provision of a number of mitigation measures (see Section 7 of the FRA) the Project would not increase flood risk to other parties for its lifetime, taking the predicted impact of climate change into account. Figures 7.2.3, 7.2.4, 7.2.5 and 7.2.6 in the FRA indicate the Project would not increase flood depths to other parties including those downstream. Figure 2.1 in The Applicant's Response to the Written Representations [REP3-072] also demonstrates no increase to peak flows in the River Mole downstream of the Project for the Credible Maximum Scenario.</p>
		Surface Transport	<p>The strategic transport model considers air passengers by different journey purposes (business, leisure), origins (domestic, international) and flight type (short or long haul). Please refer to Sections 5.4 and 6 of Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260] which explain the detail of model components and model development.</p>
Gatwick Green 1 Limited	REP8-153	Compulsory acquisition	<p>Please refer to The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) - Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession [REP3-087]; and The Applicant's Response to ExQ2 - Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession [REP7-080], and Chapter 24 of the Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>

Holiday Extras	REP8-156	Parking	<p>In respect of the lawfulness of on-Airport car parking site MA-1, the Applicant notes the planning history for car parking on MA-1 is dated from 1989. This car park is not referred to in Table 1 of Planning Statement Appendix A - Gatwick Airport Planning History [REP7-056] because the Applicant took a focussed approach in preparing this table and included pertinent elements of Gatwick’s planning history and covered the time period from 2015 onward. It is also noted the Joint West Sussex Authorities took a similar approach in producing the Gatwick Airport Planning History in the Local Impact Report Appendix C [REP1-069] and only included selected major developments where conditions remain in perpetuity in respect of applications prior to 2005.</p> <p>In respect of compliance with Commitment 8A, the Applicant will rely on the data from the annual Gatwick Parking Survey (undertaken by CBC) to determine off airport supply. The Applicant has explained why the Gatwick Parking Survey data is a reliable source in The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions – ISH 8 Car Parking [REP6-079], at paragraphs 3.1.12-15. In addition, the Applicant will continue to invite long term off-airport car parking providers onto the Airport Transport Forum.</p> <p>The Applicant has amended the Surface Access Commitments (Doc ref. 5.3) submitted at Deadline 9 and responded to comments raised by the JLAs in respect of the timing of measures set out in Commitment 16 of the SACs in ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments Appendix A – JLAs Commentary on Surface Access Commitments Response Table (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>
	REP8-126	Works Plans	<p>This response points to the West Sussex Authorities’ comments on the Works Plans made at Deadline 7 [REP7-120]. The Applicant duly responded to these</p>

Joint Local Authorities			<p>comments at Deadline 8, within Section 9.2 of The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 7 Submissions [REP8-115]. No further comments have been provided by the JLAs and therefore no further response is required.</p>
		Parameter Plans	<p>The Applicant’s response is provided below, taking each matter in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Car Park H (Work No. 28) – the Applicant responded to the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Deadline 6 submission [REP6-111] on the Parameter Plans (including Car Park H) in Section 1.4 of The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096], and which it also pointed to Section 9.3 of The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 7 Submissions [REP8-115]. ▪ Maximum Heights of Associated Elements – following the update made to the Parameter Plans at Deadline 7, none of the Parameter Plans [REP7-020] specify separate maximum heights for associated elements. The maximum heights of the works (including associated elements such as plant, equipment and lighting columns) are specified as per the Parameter Plans [REP7-020]. ▪ North Terminal Long Stay car park (Work No. 32) - the Applicant responded to the Legal Partnership Authorities’ Deadline 6 submission [REP6-111] on the Parameter Plans (including North Terminal Long Stay car park) in Section 1.4 of The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096]. As above, the maximum height of this work is specified as per the Parameter Plans [REP7-020] (namely Drawing 990106).

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Car Park X (Work No. 31) – please refer to the Applicant’s response in Section 1.4 (Item 8) of The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096]. In short, the extent of the Parameter Plans [REP7-020] is based on the overall approach of assessing the project impacts based on the worst-case Rochdale envelope through the EIA process. This differs to the role of the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) which secures design aspects to be reflected in the detailed design. As such, no change to the Parameter Plans [REP7-020] is required. ▪ Pentagon Field (Work No. 41) – in response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO [PD-028], the Applicant has amended Schedule 13 in the Final DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1) and the description of Work No. 41 to specify the maximum height parameter for the ground works in this Works Area. The description of Work No. 41 has also been amended to provide additional detail, as per the ExA’s Proposed Changes albeit recognising that this detail was already secured under the existing control documents, e.g. the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3). ▪ Museum Field (Work No. 38) - in response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO [PD-028], the Applicant has amended Schedule 13 in the Final DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1) to specify the maximum height parameter for the ground works in this Works Area.
		Informative Sub Works Plans	The Informative Sub Works Plans [REP7-021] were provided to assist the Legal Partnership Authorities on the anticipated location of work components and the Applicant is pleased that the plans are considered helpful.

		<p>Code of Construction Practice</p>	<p>Paras 1.1.4 to 1.1.5 of The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096] explains why these plans are necessarily informative and therefore not secured under the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1). The Applicant’s position is unchanged and therefore no change to the Draft DCO is made on this basis.</p> <p>In respect of the construction noise barriers, please refer to reference 2.16.2.1 in the Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and Crawley Borough Council (Doc Ref. 10.1.1 v3)</p> <p>In respect of the construction compounds, the Applicant’s position remains as set out in Section 1.3 of The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096] (electronic pages 14 to 15). The Applicant has previously submitted a Zone of Theoretical Visibility of the Temporary Construction Compounds [REP4-040]. This demonstrates the limited visibility of the construction compounds as the only additional visible element outside of the airport or the permanent infrastructure of the Project.</p> <p>Any works (including the construction works or the works associated to the construction compounds) that would affect a Public Rights of Way (PRoW) would be subject to a PRoW Implementation Plan under DCO Requirement 22.</p> <p>In respect of paragraph 4.5.11 of the CoCP, this text is explaining that temporary buildings and structures may be required within the construction areas of the relevant works areas outside of the construction compounds.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------	---

	Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan	Please refer to the Applicant’s response in Appendix D: Response on Construction (Doc Ref. 10.77).
	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan	Please refer to the Applicant’s response in Appendix D: Response on Construction (Doc Ref. 10.77).
	Outline Arboricultural Vegetation Method Statement	<p>The general role of the Ecology Clerk of Works (ECoW) in the delivery of the Project’s construction is set out in section 6.1.3 of ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) (Doc Ref. 5.3), secured under DCO Requirement 7. This includes <i>‘undertaking pre-construction ecology surveys and overseeing works that may potentially affect ecological features (e.g. tree and habitat clearance) to ensure compliance with wildlife legislation. The ECoW will assist in delivering site inductions and toolbox talks on ecological issues and will monitor the implementation of the CoCP as it relates to ecology’</i>.</p> <p>The interaction between the oAVMS and the ECoW is set out in section 4.4.3 of the CoCP (Doc Ref. 5.3). This includes how tree clearance works will be planned with the ECoW.</p>
	Surface Access Commitments	Please refer to ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments - Appendix A – JLAs Commentary on Surface Access Commitments Response Table (Doc Ref. 5.3) and Closing Submission – Environmentally Managed Growth (Doc Ref. 10.73).

		<p>Planning Statement Appendix A – Planning History</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the JLAs’ agreement to 2no. planning conditions attached to CR/125/1979 are incompatible, one of which would be overridden by the DCO and the second which is covered by DCO Requirement 23.</p> <p>As explained in paras 1.3.3 and 1.4.1 of Appendix A: Planning History [REP7-056], the update to the document was based on the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report [REP1-068] (paragraph 4.18) and the Joint West Sussex Local Impact Report Appendices [REP1-069] (Appendix C), which the Applicant reviewed in full. Para 1.4.1 of Appendix A: Planning History explains the criteria applied to the inclusion of historic planning applications and therefore why there are inconsistencies between the Applicant’s list and the list contained in the Joint West Sussex LIR. The Applicant therefore disagrees that no justification has been given.</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the JLAs’ response at paras 13.6 to 13.9 in full. The Applicant’s latest position in respect of Article 9 is provided in The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72).</p>
		<p>Design and Access Statement</p>	<p>It should be noted by the JLAs, and as has been made clear throughout the DCO Application and Examination material, that the Design and Access Statement (‘DAS’) [AS-154 to AS-156, REP7-059 and REP7-061] is an illustrative document and not a control document (excluding Appendix 1 containing the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3)).</p>

			<p>The Applicant’s response to the JLAs on the DAS is provided below, taking each matter in turn and pointing to the relevant control document(s) to assist.</p> <p><u>Changes made in response to design comments</u></p> <p>The Applicant’s position on design is contained in Chapter 14 of the Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73). The Applicant considers it has positively responded to design-related comments from the JLAs (and other Interested Parties) where specific comments have been forthcoming. Notably, the Applicant has made substantial changes to the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) continuously and throughout the Examination, being the design-related control document, and again where specific comments have been provided by the JLAs and Interested Parties.</p> <p><u>On-airport WWTW (Work No. 44)</u></p> <p>In respect of Project Change 4 (On-airport WWTW) and following the acceptance of the Proposed Change, the Design Principles [REP8-090] were updated at Deadline 8 to include additional Design Principles relevant to the On-airport WWTW and the associated wastewater infrastructure. The Design Principles are a design-related control document, secured under Requirements 4, 5, 6 and 10 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1).</p> <p>ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1) explains the development scenarios under the Project with or without the On-airport WWTW.</p> <p><u>Pentagon Field (Work No. 41)</u></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>The description of ground works at Pentagon Field are contained in the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) (specifically Design Principle DLP19), secured under the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1). In the event that the JLAs consider there to be discrepancies with the DAS (albeit the Applicant is not aware of any and the JLAs have not explained what they consider the discrepancies to be), the Applicant would refer the JLAs to the Design Principles being the design-related control document secured under the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant would also refer the JLAs to The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) and the updated DCO Draft submitted at Deadline 9 where the wording of Work No. 41 has been amended by the Applicant to specify the maximum height parameter for the ground works in this Works Area.</p> <p><u>Reed Bed Compound</u></p> <p>The implementation, use and ultimate removal of the temporary construction compounds is controlled by the Code of Construction Practice (Doc Ref. 5.3) under DCO Requirement 7 and not the DAS.</p> <p><u>The Design Principles</u></p> <p>As set out above, the Applicant considers it has positively responded to comments on the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) from the JLAs (and other Interested Parties) where specific comments have been forthcoming. The Design Principles is the design-related control document, whereas the DAS is an illustrative document.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>The Applicant’s reasoning for excluding visuals or illustrations from the Design Principles is contained in Section 1.4 of The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096] (electronic pages 22 to 23).</p>
		<p>Design Principles</p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicant’s position above regarding the substantial changes that have been made to the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) throughout the Examination in response to comments from the JLAs, where specific comments from the JLAs have been forthcoming.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant wishes to highlight the additional design provisions that have been put forward through the Examination stage, such as the Design Adviser’s independent review, the relevant Authorities’ detailed design approval of the listed works and consultation on all remaining works, the securing of the Design Principles and the provision of a compliance statement. A more detailed summary of the changes made by the Applicant during the Examination stage on design aspects is contained in Chapter 14 of the Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p> <p><u>Achieving Good Design</u></p> <p>The Applicant disagrees that there is no vision of good design. The Project’s vision and objectives are set out in Section 3.1 of the DAS (Volume 1) [AS-154].</p> <p>Project-wide Design Principle D1 also clearly sets out the Applicant’s aspirations to achieve good design as part of the detailed design process and draws from the content of the ANPS (2018) and NNNPS (2024), as explained in para 1.4.5 of The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096].</p>

		<p>Under DCO Requirement 4, the Applicant must submit a ‘compliance statement’ as part of the detailed design consultation and approval process. This compliance statement must explain how the detailed design accords with the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) and must therefore explain how the detailed design proposals deliver good design in accordance with Design Principle D1.</p> <p><u>Schedule 12 (Listed Works)</u></p> <p>Please refer to 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, which provide the Applicant’s latest position on Schedule 12.</p> <p><u>References</u></p> <p>The Applicant has ensured that the updated Design Principles (Doc Ref 7.3) submitted at Deadline 9 refer to the latest document references. The Applicant has also removed reference to “<i>the National Park</i>” in Design Principle L4 in response to the JLAs’ comment.</p> <p><u>Drainage Principles</u></p> <p>The Applicant welcomes the JLAs response that it is “<i>generally satisfied with the drainage design principles</i>”.</p> <p>In respect of Design Principles DDP1 and DDP2, the wording of these Design Principles has previously been amended to reflect the stated climate change allowances as required by EA guidance in response to feedback from the</p>
--	--	---

			<p>Environment Agency ('EA') and which the EA has acknowledged in its Deadline 8 submission [REP8-123].</p> <p><u>Wastewater Treatment Works</u></p> <p>Following the ExA's acceptance of Project Change 4 (On-airport WWTW), the Design Principles [REP8-090] were updated at Deadline 8 to include additional Design Principles relevant to the On-airport WWTW and the associated wastewater infrastructure.</p>
		<p>Annex A – Design Advisor Role</p>	<p>The Applicant disagrees that “<i>few updates</i>” have been made to Annex A. The Applicant undertook a comprehensive review of the Legal Partnership Authorities' Deadline 6 comments [REP6-111] on works to be included in Schedule 12 and subject to the independent design review, and provided a response to each request in Section 1.4 of The Applicant's Response on Design Matters [REP7-096] (electronic pages 27 to 75), together with corresponding updates to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1) and Annex A of the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3).</p> <p>In respect of the content of Schedule 12 (Listed Works), please refer to The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) providing the Applicant's latest position on Schedule 12, alongside the updated Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1), in response to the ExA's suggested DCO changes. Notably, the following works are now specified in Schedule 12 in response to the ExA's suggested DCO changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aircraft hangar (Work No. 16);

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ North Terminal multi-storey car park (Work No. 22(g)); ▪ Car Park H office and multi-storey car park (Work No. 28(b) and (c)); ▪ Conversion of Destinations Place (Work No. 29); ▪ Car Park Y (Work No. 30); ▪ Car Park X (Work No. 31); <p>The Applicant has reviewed the JLAs’ revised list of works it considers should be included in Annex A and Schedule 12, and provided a response below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replacement CARE facility (Work No. 9) – the Applicant believes that the JLAs may have misunderstood the content of Work No. 9 and the proposal to replace the existing CARE facility. As explained in the Project proposals and reiterated in The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096], the replacement CARE facility relates to the replacement and repurposing of the existing CARE facility, i.e. the works do not comprise a ‘new’ design. The Applicant therefore remains of the view that the works do not require detailed design approval. ▪ New Hangar (Work No. 16) – this item of work has been added to Schedule 12, as explained above. The Applicant does not consider that this Work No. necessitates an independent Design Review in the context of the site-specific Design Principles, which the compliance statement will need to justify the proposals against, and in particular given its now-inclusion in Schedule 12. The Applicant also notes that the JLAs’ justification relates to the value of their input in the design process (i.e. of relevance to Schedule
--	--	--	--

			<p>12) and does not explain why they considers an independent review of this Work No. is necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ North Terminal building (Work No. 22(a) to (d), (f) and (g)) – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Work No. 22(a)-(c) and (g) have been added to Schedule 12, as explained above. ○ Work No. 22(d) and (f) relates to the construct of an autonomous vehicle station and reconfiguration of internal facilities. Of the former, this is considered to a minor element of work and not of a sufficient scale to warrant detailed design approval and an independent design approval. Of the latter, internal works would not normally require planning approval under the TCPA 1990 and therefore it is not considered justified to require detailed design approval or an independent design review of these works. Notably, the JLAs response does not specifically justify why it considers that the autonomous vehicle station (22(d)) and internal works (22(f)) require inclusion in Schedule 12 and Annex A. ▪ North Terminal forecourt (Work No. 24) – the JLAs response does not explain why it considers that the design of the NT forecourt should be included in Schedule 12 and / or Annex A. As such, the Applicant’s position remains unchanged. ▪ South Terminal building (Work No. 23(a) to (c)) and South Terminal forecourt (Work No. 25) – the extension to the South Terminal IDL under Work No. 23(a) is already included in Schedule 12, being the largest
--	--	--	--

		<p>element of this work. Work No. 23(b) and (c) relate to the reconfiguration of internal facilities and the construction of an autonomous vehicle station, and therefore the Applicant's views on these works as part of the NT works explained above are also applicable. The JLAs response also acknowledges that the ST works are not as visible as the NT works and indeed its response does not reference Work No. 23(b) in its justification. As such, the Applicant's position remains unchanged.</p>
	Statement of Commonality	<p>An updated Statement of Commonality (Doc Ref. 10.1) has been submitted at Deadline 9.</p>
	SoCG – Capacity and Operations	<p>The Applicant welcomes confirmation that the number of movements that can be accommodated in the baseline and NRP cases is agreed. The JLAs do not agree that the movement capacity will necessarily be filled – but that is an issue for forecasting. It is helpful that the capacity to provide for the movements which the Applicant forecasts will be taken up is agreed.</p> <p>Similar concerns were expressed at ISH9 see the response set out in Deadline 8 Submission - 10.62.3 The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH9 - Case for the Proposed Development [REP8-108] paras 2.2.2 – 2.2.7. In relation to sensitivity testing the ES does consider a conservative worst-case position, in that the forecast for the increased use of the WIZAD Standard Instrument Departure route - in the baseline case and with the Project - assumes that the London Terminal Control Area airspace becomes increasingly congested over time, due to the growth of air traffic across all of the London airports. This assumption sets the</p>

			<p>basis of the reasonable worst case for the purposes of environmental impact assessment.</p>
		SoCG -Forecasting and Need	<p>Following ISH9 the Applicant provided a document to York Aviation setting out its understanding of York’s position on its assumptions for peak growth, peak spreading, aircraft size and load factors in the future baseline, so that GAL could be sure it was not misrepresenting York’s position. York returned the document confirming GAL’s understanding. Emails have been exchanged but no further discussion has taken place, with GAL suggesting the parties understood their respective positions and that the draft SoCG [REP7-070] set them out clearly.</p> <p>The Applicant suggested that further progress was unlikely unless the JLAs could indicate areas where they thought the parties could move closer. None were suggested.</p> <p>The Applicant has prepared a further response to York Aviation’s forecasting submissions at D7 and D8 and this is attached as Appendix A to this document.</p>
		Future Baseline	<p>The “top-down” forecasts set out in Needs Case Technical Appendix [REP1-052] were done at the request of York Aviation and GAL has consistently confirmed that it strongly prefers its bottom-up forecasts, as paragraph 6.1.2 makes clear, :</p> <p><i>GAL prefers its bottom-up forecasts given the constrained nature of the airport today and the airport remaining constrained in the future with or without the Northern Runway. In those circumstances, actual market insight into how airlines, passengers and markets are likely to respond to new capacity at Gatwick is more useful than a theoretical allocation exercise. But, without prejudice to that position,</i></p>

		<p><i>GAL has nevertheless undertaken top-down forecasts to meet York Aviation’s request.</i></p> <p>The top-down forecasts are therefore a sensitivity test at most and it is not correct to say that the National Economic Assessment is not consistent with other aspects of the Applicant’s evidence.</p> <p>In particular, GAL does not accept the characterisation of its case as “<i>that there is no longer expected to be excess demand in the London system before 2040</i>” (JLAs paragraph 19.1). Substantial parts of the Applicant’s case have been devoted to demonstrating the excess of demand in the London system, and it is surprising that that should be challenged. The shortage of capacity has been apparent since the appointment of the Airports Commission. The ANPS documents the same (from paragraph 2.10) and the lack of capacity in the system has driven government policy and airport expansion applications (such as Luton’s DCO application) before and since that time. Heathrow and Gatwick have experienced excess demand in peak periods for a decade. The excess demand and its implications for airports and passengers is set out, for example, in the submitted Needs Case [APP-250] from Section 5 and in the Needs Case Technical Appendix [REP1-052] from Section 2.</p> <p>If the JLAs literally mean that they would not recognise an excess in demand until every airport has every slot full every day in the peak and off peak seasons, that would not be a realistic approach, or one which sits comfortably with government’s own analysis. The assumption for the economic exercise is that a tension due to</p>
--	--	---

			<p>excess demand and competition will characterise the market into the future, and that is entirely realistic.</p> <p>Those tensions have been apparent for a number of years and are forecast to increase. Beyond the Horizon MBU confirms (at paragraph 1.4) that growth in aviation demand in London has been greater than that forecast by the Airports Commission; but no notable capacity increments have been consented. And growth is forecast to continue. In this context, it is highly material that the latest government forecasts are those used by GAL. They were published in 2023 (the Jet Zero updated forecasts). These show forecast growth in real terms of 1.3% p.a. for the period 2018-2050, with stronger growth to 2040 (1.5%) and lower growth (0.9%) post 2040 ([REP1-052] at Table 19 on page 61). Both GAL and York consider that the slowdown in growth post 2040 may be exaggerated, but equally both recognise that the NRP will be close to capacity before then.</p> <p>The forecast growth amounts to demand for an additional 147mppa in the UK market between 2018 and 2050.</p> <p>The National Economic Assessment is based on GAL’s preferred forecasts and is entirely consistent with the environmental assessment of the scheme that was done on the basis of those forecasts. These forecasts have accompanying surface access and environment impacts modelling that allows for the proper estimation of the scheme’s environmental costs in a way that is fully consistent with the benefits.</p> <p>As set out in Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251] the assessment was done on a balanced basis and</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>excludes a number of factors that would otherwise have significantly increased the benefits.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore has confidence that its National Economic Assessment is robust and properly takes into account the costs and benefits of the scheme in a consistent manner.</p> <p>The JLAs are correct that if excess demand was lower then the benefits of relieving congestion would also be lower. This would have the effect of reducing both the user benefits and the producer disbenefits and consequently the wider economic benefits. However, it would also reduce the greenhouse gas and other marginal environmental costs.</p> <p>No alternative assessment is put forward by any party and the JLAs have not provided even a qualitative assessment to suggest (or assert) that the benefits do not significantly outweigh the adverse effects.</p> <p>For the submission, forecasts were prepared which assumed slower growth in demand in the London aviation market and lower passenger growth at Gatwick. An overview of these forecasts is presented in Annex A1.4 of APP-251 and in the Needs Case [APP-250]. In Annex A1.4, it is estimated that the Project would deliver a central NPV of £10.9 bn with the slower growth forecasts compared to £21.6 bn in the core scenario. This central estimate of the slower growth scenario used the environmental and other external costs estimated in for the core scenario. However, lower external costs could logically be justified in that scenario. As a result, this sensitivity analysis provides a conservative estimate of the NPV of the Project to the national economy.</p>
--	--	--	--

		Catalytic Employment	Refer to The Applicant’s Response to ISH9 Action Point 38 Updated Position on Catalytic Employment Benefits [AS-163] .
		Odour Reporting Process	The Applicant provided an Odour Monitoring and Management Plan (OMMP) [REP8-100] at Deadline 8, as updated at Deadline 8 to address the Examining Authorities and JLAs request to set out how action is secured in response to complaints of odour impact, as described in The Applicant’s Response to Actions ISH9 – Mitigation [REP8-111] . A summary of the Applicant’s position is set out within the Closing Submission 12 – Air Quality (Doc Ref. 10.73).
		AEF Sub on DfT projections	<p>In Section 22 of their submission, the JLAs comment on the Applicant’s response [REP7-095] to a submission at Deadline 6 from AEF who provided details from DfT of its carbon capacity forecasts [REP6-119].</p> <p>The JLAs note the caveats used by DfT in providing the information but state “<i>this highlights particular volatility in relation to smaller airports where individual airline decisions can make a large proportionate difference to the demand projections for individual airports. Clearly this does not apply to a larger airports, such as Gatwick..</i>” which is a manifestly unfair account of DfT’s text which states: ““<i>It should be noted that there is uncertainty when considering results at the level of individual airports, especially those subject to high levels of competition. Here local short-term, often commercial, drivers can have significant impact. Forecasts for smaller airports also have greater uncertainty and volatility...</i>”</p> <p>It would have been fair (and reasonably expected) for the JLAs to recognise and accept that the DfT states clearly:</p>

		<p>“- The data requested is attached, along with some relevant caveats</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Caveats that must be considered when viewing these forecasted figures - It should be noted that there is uncertainty when considering results at the level of individual airports, especially those subject to high levels of competition. Here local short-term, often commercial, drivers can have significant impact. - These airport level estimates should nevertheless be treated with caution, as the emphasis was national level forecasts when undergoing model calibration prior to publishing these forecasts. This approach was taken because local competition between airports for routes has little material effect on national level emissions - Airport level forecasts are therefore considered to have greater uncertainty and volatility, with the addition or removal of routes with competing airports. - This data should be viewed alongside all caveats outlined in the Jet Zero Strategy. - Caveats that must be considered when viewing these forecasted figures As the Jet Zero Modelling Framework explains at para 3.19, the purpose of the modelling is not to forecast throughput at individual airports - ‘Its purpose is limited to providing a consistent basis to better test the potential effectiveness of measures to meet net zero.’ “ <p>It is also incorrect for the JLAs to suggest that the DfT forecasts (which are not forecasts that should be relied on for individual airports) are “<i>more consistent with the JLA’s expectations, with 232,000 to 285,000 movements using Gatwick in 2038</i>”</p>
--	--	---

			<p><i>with the capacity provided by the NRP assumed to be in place”. The JLAs (low) estimate for Gatwick with the NRP is shown in Table 3 on page 21 of Appendix A to this document. That shows an estimate of 366,000 ATMs in 2038, largely the same as GAL’s forecast. It is disappointing that assertions like this are being made and having to be rebutted at Deadline 9.</i></p> <p><i>Next the JLAs record GAL’s response to AEF in [REP7-095] and say this: “It states that “If one wanted to understand the forecast consequences for Gatwick of the JZSOYO growth forecasts, therefore, it would be appropriate to look at GAL’s forecasts, which use those forecasts and were intended for that purpose”. Here, the Applicant appears to be accepting that its top down forecasts, based on Jet Zero - One year on are the most appropriate for considering how demand might build up at Gatwick.” As GAL has consistently explained, it stands by and strongly prefers its bottom up forecasts, which are commercially informed and shown in the Needs Case Technical Appendix [REP1-052] to have taken into account the JZSONO forecasts.</i></p> <p><i>The JLAs also suggest it is important to be cognisant of the policy support for the development of a third runway at Heathrow, which would slow the growth of Gatwick, if it was assumed to open in the period 2030 to 2038. Gatwick has never disagreed with that proposition, expressed in those terms.</i></p>
		Water	<p>The Applicant maintains its previous submissions and explanation as to why a variable design life has been adopted for the Project. The Executive Summary of ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3 v4) was updated at Deadline 6 to reiterate that the airfield and surface access highways improvements</p>

		elements of the Project adopt separate design lives consistent with the character of these elements of the development and the effects when flooding occurs.
	Invasive and Non Native Species	Please refer to ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 8 – Outline Invasive and Non-Native Species Management Strategy [REP8-044].
	Noise Policy	Please refer to the Applicant’s Closing Submission 10 – Noise (Doc Ref. 10.73).
	Noise	Please refer to the Applicant’s Closing Submission 10 – Noise (Doc Ref. 10.73) for the Applicants response to points 22.17, 22.27 and 22.28.
	Air Quality	The Applicant provided a response to the points raised in relation to the York Aviation air quality submission at Deadline 7 [REP7-095], the response includes detail on ARN calculation and modelling.
	Policy	<p>At pages 43 and 44, the JLAs address MBU policy and state: <i>“In section 6.4, the Applicant comments further on the JLAs’ position in relation to the Making Best Use policy (MBU)4. The JLAs stand by the position stated at paragraphs 3-8 of Appendix IV to REP6-099 and paragraphs 5 and 6 of Appendix B to REP7-104 that the policy support in the MBU is not independent on the requirement to assess the effects of any proposals by reference to robust projections of demand.”</i></p> <p>The Applicant has responded to this point on several occasions but to be clear;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has never been part of GAL’s case that the strength of forecast demand is somehow irrelevant to its case. GAL strongly believes that it has set out robust forecasts and that point is addressed again in Appendix A to this

			<p>document. However, GAL also notes that the JLAs accept the need for the Project in terms of both forecast demand [REP1-211] and its resilience benefits [REP1-068] and [REP4-052] and that York’s own estimates of forecast throughput exceed any estimate of the future baseline capacity of the airport. To the extent that York’s estimates may be lower than GAL’s, the JLAs have not used this to articulate a case that the policy does not apply or that the benefits do not outweigh the impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neither has it ever been part of GAL’s case that policy does not require all environmental and other effects to be taken into account. <p>It would, however, have been refreshing if the JLAs had recognised the strength of policy support and the weight which attaches to it.</p> <p>GAL’s position remains exactly as set out in REP7-095 at Section 6.4, whilst noting that the JLAs have again not responded to the point made there (at 6.4.6) about the proper approach to the interpretation of ANPS paragraphs 1.39 and 1.42.</p>
		<p>Appendix A Response on Design Matters</p>	<p><u>Schedule 12 (Listed Works)</u></p> <p>Please refer to The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) providing the Applicant’s latest position on Schedule 12, alongside the updated Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1), in response to the ExA’s suggested DCO changes. Notably, the following works are now specified in Schedule 12 in response to the ExA’s suggested DCO changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aircraft hangar (Work No. 16);

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ North Terminal multi-storey car park (Work No. 22(g)); ▪ Car Park H office and multi-storey car park (Work No. 28(b) and (c)); ▪ Conversion of Destinations Place (Work No. 29); ▪ Car Park Y (Work No. 30); ▪ Car Park X (Work No. 31); <p>The JLAs Deadline 7 Submission [REP8-126] contains two separate lists of works that it considers should be added to Schedule 12, namely in paragraph 15.12 and a separate list in Table 2, albeit the reason for the separation is unclear. The Applicant’s response to the list in paragraph 15.12 is provided above, which relates to Work No. 9, 16, 22, 23, 24 and 25. The Applicant’s response to the remaining works listed in Table 2 is provided below, excluding those that the JLAs have strike through (namely Work Nos. 4, 7, 11, 12, 14, 19, 20, 34 and 42) as no longer requested to be included in Schedule 12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Repositioned Northern Runway (Work No. 1) – the JLAs response re-confirms that it is satisfied with the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) in respect of the design appearance of the repositioned northern runway and the remaining concerns relate to the drainage assumptions of these works. In response and noting that the JLAs advised it would be content to remove this Work No. from their Schedule 12 request list subject to updated Design Principles, the Applicant has amended the site-specific Design Principle (Design Principle DBF1) (Doc Ref. 7.3) at Deadline 9 to reflect wording provided in the Applicant’s Response to Airfield Drainage Queries [REP4-
--	--	--	--

			<p>026]. The Applicant has not specifically referenced the [REP4-026] document, as the JLAs requested, as this was provided as a clarification document in response to queries raised by Surrey County Council and was not drafted as a control document, and notably not all of the information contained relates to the detailed design (e.g. some queries related to pollutant controls). The detailed drainage provisions for the repositioned northern runway will be subject to consultation requirements under DCO Requirement 10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pier 7 (Work No. 6) – the Applicant disagrees that Design Principle DBF7 does not provide clarity on the design and appearance of Pier 7, given it describes the building form, type of external materials and aesthetic of the building. The JLAs response is not specific on what element of DBF7 is not of sufficient clarity. In addition to this and as also explained in The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096], the CAA procedure for approval of changes to aerodrome infrastructure is extensive and follows a three-part process (which would include Work No. 6), meaning it is not considered necessary or appropriate that detailed design approval by a Local Planning Authority is also required. ▪ Replacement Motor Transport Facilities (Work No. 10) – the JLAs response repeats its same concerns at Deadline 6 [REP6-111] on the loss of existing tree and hedgerows and the site’s interaction with a watercourse. The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096] responded to these concerns, pointing to the relevant separate control documents. The Applicant’s position is therefore unchanged. Most notably, Work No. 10 relates to the removal and replacement of existing motor transport facilities
--	--	--	---

			<p>and not the construction of new structures or facilities that would entail a new design to then warrant detailed design approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Satellite Airport Fire Service Facility (Work No. 15) – this building serves an important safety and functional requirement, controlled by the CAA and its approval process. The Applicant remains of the view that given overriding functional and safety purpose of this building, which must be led by the CAA’s requirements, it is not considered appropriate or necessary that detailed design approval of Work No. 15 by a Local Planning Authority is required. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant put forward revised and additional site-specific Design Principles (DBF23 to DBF26) for the Aircraft Hangar at Deadline 7 in response to the JLAs feedback and which the Applicant considers to provide extensive detail on the scale, form, detailing, external materials, sustainability measures and components of Work No. 16. ▪ Hangar 7 support structures (Work No. 17) – in response to the JLAs comment, the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) have been updated at Deadline 9 to include an additional Design Principle (DBF26) describing what the Hangar 7 support structures comprise of. On this basis, the Applicant considers that the JLAs request has been addressed such that this Work No. has not been added to Schedule 12. ▪ Western Noise Mitigation Bund (Work No. 18) – no updated justification is provided to the JLAs against this Work No. and therefore the Applicant’s position remains unchanged.
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Car Park H (Work No. 28) – please refer to The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) regarding the changes to Schedule 12. ▪ Conversion of Destinations Place (Work No. 29) – please refer to The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO(Doc Ref. 10.72) regarding the changes to Schedule 12. ▪ Car Park Y (Work No. 30) – please refer to The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) regarding the changes to Schedule 12. ▪ Car Park X (Work No. 31) – please refer to The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) regarding the changes to Schedule 12. ▪ Decked Car Park (Work No. 32) – the Applicant disagrees that the JLAs previous comments have not been addressed. The Applicant considers that The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096] and updated Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) addressed the JLAs concerns. As the JLAs have not provided specific comments on their outstanding concerns, the Applicant is unable to address these comments. The Applicant’s position is therefore unchanged. ▪ Purple Parking (Work No. 33) – the JLAs response repeats its same concerns at Deadline 6 [REP6-111] on the tree retention and screening proposals. The Applicant’s Response on Design Matters [REP7-096] responded to these concerns, pointing to the relevant separate control
--	--	--	--

			<p>documents and through which the arboricultural works would be approved by CBC. The Applicant’s position in respect of Schedule 12 is therefore unchanged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Museum Field (Work No. 38) – the Applicant considers that the appearance of Museum Field is sufficiently detailed in the relevant Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) and through the objectives, proposals and indicative plan contained in the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (‘oLEMP’) (Doc Ref. 5.3) to inform the future detailed design stage. In respect of the final landform of Museum Field, please refer to The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) regarding Schedule 13 on maximum parameter heights. The site’s relationship to existing veteran trees is set out in the Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP8-065 to REP8-075], with arboricultural works and landscaping provisions to be subject to approval through the Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statement (‘oAVMS’) (Doc Ref. 5.3) and the oLEMP under DCO Requirements 8 and 28. On the basis of the design information already contained in the Design Principles, oLEMP, oAVMS and the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1) together with the various approval and consultation processes that would apply to the Museum Field, the Applicant does not consider that detailed design approval of Work No. 38 is also required. ▪ River Mole works (Work No. 39) – the JLAs response is unclear. As the JLAs note, the Applicant made clear that in updates at Deadline 7 that Design Principles DLP17 and DLP18 relate to this Work No. The Applicant has also made clear in the Design Principles submitted at Deadline 9 that
--	--	--	--

			<p>Design Principles DDP17 and DDP18 reflect to this Work No, which is believes is content of the JLA’s request. On this basis, the Applicant considers the JLAs response has been addressed such that this Work No. has not been added to Schedule 12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pentagon Field (Work No. 41) – please refer to The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) regarding the changes to the Works description and Schedule 13, which it considers also addresses the concerns raised by the JLAs. On this basis, the Applicant has not added Work No. 41 to Schedule 12. ▪ Constructed wetland (reed bed) treatment system (Work No. 43) – the Applicant disagrees with the JLAs response, given the level of detail provided in the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) relevant to this Work No. Additionally, the noise assessment of the noise mitigation measures was presented in the Change Application Report [AS-139] and specifically the Noise Assessment in Appendix D [AS-141], with the features then secured through the wording of the Design Principles. ▪ On-airport WWTW (Work No. 44) – following the acceptance of the Proposed Change, the Design Principles [REP8-090] were updated at Deadline 8 to include additional Design Principles relevant to the On-airport WWTW and the associated wastewater infrastructure. <p>In respect of the temporary construction compounds, please refer to the Applicant’s response above to Section 4 of the JLAs response.</p>
--	--	--	---

Joint Surrey Councils	REP8-127	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plans	Please refer to the Applicant’s response in Appendix D – Response on Construction (Doc Ref. 10.77).
		Written Scheme of Investigation	The Applicant can confirm that the JSC’s interpretation of paragraphs 9.1.1 - 9.1.3 of the revised WSI – Surrey [REP7-045] is correct.
		Third Change Application Report	Please refer to the Applicant’s response in Appendix D – Response on Construction (Doc Ref. 10.77).
		Outline Landscape Ecology Management Plan	<p>ES Appendix 8.8.1: Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3 v8) sets the overarching vision for the Project. The LEMPs for areas of replacement open space, including management and maintenance arrangements will be submitted to and approved by Crawley Borough Council before work commences as set out within Requirement 8(1) of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v11).</p> <p>Following further discussions with the Joint Local Authorities the Applicant understands that none of the authorities wish to own the replacement open space or have any associated management or monitoring obligations. The ExA have requested, in the ExA's proposed schedule of changes to the draft DCO [PD-028] that the Applicant amend Article 40 as drafted to ensure that the future maintenance of the replacement open space is assured indefinitely by the Applicant. The Applicant is content to provide this commitment and has adopted the proposed new drafting in materially the form proposed by the ExA (see</p>

			Responses to the ExA’s proposed schedule of changes to the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72).
		Active travel	Crossing provision at this location will be reviewed at the detailed design stage for the BaU Improvement Scheme as set out in the Applicant’s Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions (ExQ2) – Traffic and Transport [REP7-092] ref TT.2.12
Kent County Council	REP8-128	Traffic and Transport	Kent County Council accept that the 10% sensitivity test explained in Appendix A of The Applicant’s Response to ExQ2 – Traffic and Transport [REP7-092] is helpful and make reference to an implied increase in the magnitude of impact at the M23 / M25 interchange. This forms part of the Strategic Road Network and National Highways has agreed that no mitigation is required in that location.
Legal Partnership Authorities	REP8-165	Surface Access	Please refer to Appendix A of The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions – ISH9: Mitigation [REP8-107] and The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 7 Submissions: Appendix C Response to the JLA’s EMG Framework Paper [REP8-118].
		Noise	The JLA’s provide a Post hearing note that states: <i>‘Following the reiteration of a request by the Authorities for noise model verification data (at 01:15:27:00 - 01:16:30:16, ISH 9 Day 1 Part 2) the Applicant responded on several occasions between: 01:18:16:11 and 01:21:18:02, on ISH 9 Day 1 Part 2, that the information was confidential and could not be shared. The Applicant even claimed to have sought and received confirmation from the CAA that this was the case.’</i>

		<p>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 contradicted the explanation 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 Lmax noise levels. Termed the Aircraft Noise Performance database, ERCD has confirmed this is confidential and will not be released to the JLAs.</p> <p>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 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 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. It is commonly used to support other applications and examinations without question.</p>
	Air Quality	Please refer to Closing Submission 12 – Air Quality (Doc Ref. 10.73).
	Section 106	Please see the s106 Agreement (Doc Ref. 10.11) and the s106 Agreement Explanatory Memorandum (Doc Ref. 10.54).

		Landscape and Ecology	Please refer to the Applicant’s response in Appendix B: Response on Landscape and Ecology (Doc Ref. 10.77).
		Odour Management and Monitoring Plan	The Applicant provided an Odour Monitoring and Management Plan (OMMP) [REP8-100] at Deadline 8, as updated at Deadline 8 to address the Examining Authorities and JLAs request to set out how action is secured in response to complaints of odour impact, as described in The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH9 – Mitigation [REP8-111] . A summary of the Applicant's position is set out within the Closing Submission 12 – Air Quality (Doc Ref. 10.73).
		Draft DCO	Please refer to 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) for the Applicant's latest position on the draft DCO.
		Airport Boundary Plan	<p>The Glossary [REP3-004], including the Airport Boundary Plan, was provided as part of the original DCO Application in response to queries raised by the Local Authorities during the pre-application stage on the Project’s terminology. The Airport Boundary Plan was prepared and included in the Glossary in response to the Local Authorities’ queries on the relationship between the DCO Order Limits and the airport’s boundaries.</p> <p>As explained in the definitions within the Glossary [REP3-004], the boundary on the Airport Boundary Plan shows the boundary of Gatwick Airport. This differs from the DCO Order Limits which is dictated by the extent of the Project proposals.</p>

		Construction Dust Management Plan	The Applicant provided an updated Construction Dust Management Strategy (CDMS) at Deadline 8 (ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 9 [REP8-046]), which considers the comments received from the JLAs.
		Design and Access Statement	<p>The Applicant has made clear throughout the DCO Application and Examination material that the DAS [AS-154 to AS-156, REP7-059 and REP7-061] is an illustrative document and not a control document (excluding Appendix 1 containing the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3)).</p> <p>The Design Principles comprise the design-related control document, secured under Requirements 4, 5, 6 and 10 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1).</p> <p>As set out above in response to the JLAs [REP8-126], the Applicant’s position on design is contained in Chapter 14 of the Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73). The Applicant considers it has positively responded to design-related comments from the JLAs (and other Interested Parties) where specific comments have been forthcoming. Notably, the Applicant has made substantial changes to the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3) continuously and throughout the Examination, being the design-related control document, and again where specific comments have been provided by the JLAs and Interested Parties.</p>
		Certification of the ES – Schedule 14	The Applicant has amended how the Environmental Statement is to be certified in the latest version of the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v11) submitted at Deadline 9.
		Finch	Please refer to Greenhouse Gas Technical Note (Doc Ref. 10.79) and Closing Submission – Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 10.73).

	Water	As stated in the response to the JLAs, the Applicant maintains its previous submissions and explanation as to why a variable design life has been adopted for the Project provided within The Applicant’s Response to Deadline 7 Submissions [REP8-115]. The Executive Summary of ES Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref 5.3 V4) was updated at Deadline 6 to reiterate that the airfield and surface access highways improvements elements of the Project adopt separate design lives consistent with the character of these elements of the development and the effects when flooding occurs.
	Construction traffic	Please refer to Appendix D – Response on Construction (Doc Ref. 10.77).
	Parameter Plans	Please refer to the Applicant’s response to the JLAs’ Response to Deadline 7 submission [REP8-126] above, which raises the same point.
	Soil Management Strategy	In the Authorities’ Post Hearing Submission ISH9, the Authorities comment that <i>“there have been no revisions to the Soil Management Strategy document during the examination. A number of clarification queries were posed in ExA Q1 but further detail has not been added to the document.”</i> The applicant provided clarifications to the ExA [REP3-096] to explain where the relevant points are addressed within the Soil Management Strategy [APP-086].
	Works Plans	Please refer to The Applicant’s Response to Written Representations on Project Change 4 (Doc Ref. 10.76) which includes a response to the West

		Sussex Joint Local Authorities’ Comments on any further information / submission received by Deadline 6 [REP7-120].
	Written Scheme of Investigation	Please refer to the Applicant’s response in Appendix C: Response on Heritage (Doc Ref. 10.77).
REP8-164	Compulsory Acquisition	Please refer to Compulsory Acquisition and Temporary Possession – Status of Negotiations (Doc Ref. 10.71).
REP8-166	Airspace capacity	As explained at ISH9, in response to comparisons between this application and the Luton Rising DCO application, the Luton DCO is dependent on the changes associated with Airspace Modernisation, whereas the preferential geographical position of London Gatwick to the south of the London airspace means that Airspace Modernisation, while beneficial, is not needed to facilitate the Project, see the Deadline 5 Submission - 10.1.20 Statement of Common Ground between Gatwick Airport Limited and NATS (En-Route) Plc [REP5-066] paras 2.3.1.8 - 2.3.1.10. The positions of both applicants in relation to their respective dependencies on Airspace Modernisation are endorsed by NERL. Regardless, in terms of impact assessment, despite the Luton application’s dependence upon FASI-S it did not speculate what future airspace changes might be, or its consequent effects.
	Forecasts	At Section 4.1 the Authorities record their submissions at ISH9. There are a number of matters there with which the Applicant disagreed at the Hearing and which are recorded in [REP1-108] and not repeated here. However, Appendix A

			<p>does set out to address residual concerns emphasised by the JLAs, particularly in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the alleged mathematical inconsistency in the Applicant’s forecasts; • the ability to continue to grow traffic in the future baseline, including in relation to peak spreading and whether York Aviation has in fact made an allowance for peak spreading; • the statement: <i>Evidence supporting claims of disproportionate growth in off-peak slots compared to peak slots had not been seen; the reviewed evidence indicated the opposite.</i>” • Gatwick’s ability to attract traffic competitively; and • the pace of Gatwick’s recovery from the pandemic. <p>In relation to the Authorities’ statement “<i>If the Applicant believed there were errors in the Authorities calculations, clarification is requested.</i>” GAL engaged with York post ISH9 to confirm its understanding of York’s assumptions – that exchange forms Appendix 1 to Appendix A and it confirms GAL’s understanding.</p>
	REP8-167	Socio-economics	<p><u>Question 5.1 – Adequacy of Assessment at the Local Level</u></p> <p>The Applicant does not agree with the JLAs that there are potential negative impacts that have not been assessed and that these have to temper the weight that should be given to positive impacts.</p>

			<p>There is no evidence of an adverse socio-economic impact at any scale. The JLAs are implying that creating jobs can have an adverse effect. This has no basis in fact or in policy where the ANPS, along with local and national planning policy, is clear (at paragraph 4.4) that job creation is considered to be a positive and is strongly encouraged. It is not surprising, for instance that the Coast to Capital Strategic Economic Plan describes Gatwick as a gateway for trade, a national asset and the single biggest employment and business hub in the LEP area. It also states that Gatwick defines the opportunity for growing the LEP area’s economy (page 15) (Planning Statement paragraph 6.5.16) or that the Crawley Local Plan recognises that Gatwick Airport generates a significant number of economic benefits both directly through its own employment requirements but also, indirectly, through the wider benefits to the regional and local economy which make Crawley and the wider Gatwick Diamond area attractive to employers and businesses [APP-245].</p> <p>The JLAs’ post-hearing note refers out to paragraph 18.73 of REP1-068. This states:</p> <p><i>“the new jobs created at Gatwick could lead to labour shortages in the local authority areas in the FEMA”</i></p> <p>This provides no evidence of a likely impact. It simply states that something could happen. The only evidence it provides is that there were a number of vacancies advertised in the healthcare sector. It does not engage with the extensive</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>evidence provided by the Applicant about the levels of unemployment and worklessness and the Authorities' own forecasts of population growth.</p> <p>Indeed, it highlights why trying to consider labour market impacts at a local authority level makes no sense - it has to be done at the FEMA level because people commute from one local authority to another.</p> <p>The local benefits from the scheme are very significant and there is no evidence of any adverse effects at any scale that has been submitted to the Examination.</p> <p><u>Question 5.1 – National Level Assessment and Displacement issue</u></p> <p>The Applicant has confidence that its National Economic Assessment is robust and properly takes into account the costs and benefits of the scheme in a consistent manner. As set out in Needs Case Appendix 1 – National Economic Impact Assessment [APP-251] the assessment was done on a balanced basis and excludes a number of factors that would otherwise have significantly increased the benefits.</p> <p>For the submission, forecasts were prepared which assumed slower growth in demand in the London aviation market and lower passenger growth at Gatwick. An overview of these forecasts is presented in Annex A1.4 of APP-251. In Annex A1.4, it is estimated that the Project would deliver a central NPV of £10.9 bn with the slower growth forecasts compared to £21.6 bn in the core scenario. This central estimate of the slower growth scenario used the environmental and other external costs estimated in for the core scenario. However, lower external costs could logically be justified in that scenario. As a result, this sensitivity analysis</p>
--	--	--

		<p>provides a conservative estimate of the NPV of the Project to the national economy.</p> <p><u>Question 5.1 – Local Level</u> The JLAs state that the definition of local should be “<i>demonstrated rather than asserted</i>”. The Applicant has done this by reference to planning guidance, which is clear that assessments should be done at the level of the functional economic market rather than administrative boundaries. The Applicant therefore disagrees with the JLAs the use of functional economic market areas represents a shortcoming that should reduce the weight given to the local benefits.</p> <p><u>Question 5.1 – Securing Benefits</u></p> <p>The JLAs assert that post-consent securing mechanisms are required to secure benefits. Again, there is no evidence to support this position. The Applicant is very pleased to be working with the JLAs on the ESBS to enhance the benefits and ensure they are targeted towards local people as a priority. However, even without the ESBS the local benefits are still significant. The project will still deliver the benefits of more flights in terms of lower fares, more choice, better connectivity, increased employment and economic activity etc. It will still deliver over 3,000 direct jobs and significant supply chain benefits, most of which will go to local residents even without the interventions planned in the ESBS.</p> <p><u>Questions 5.2 and 5.3 – ESBS</u></p> <p>The topic of ESBS is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p>
--	--	---

		<p><u>Question 5.4 – provision of temporary housing options</u></p> <p>Refer to The Applicant’s Response to ISH9 action 36 – Confirm whether an estimate of the number of asylum seekers has been considered within the assessment [AS-162]. Regarding the NHB worker proportion, refer to the Applicant’s response in Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and Crawley Borough Council Version 3 (Doc Ref 10.1.1) issue 2.19.2.7.</p> <p><u>Question 5.5 – Worst-case scenario in terms of employment benefits</u></p> <p>The Applicant maintains its position that it has sufficiently presented a worst-case scenario. An assessment of the construction workforce, not just the peak is provided in a separate note in response to the Local Impact Reports. (The Applicant’s Response to Local Impact Reports Appendix D – Construction Labour Market and Accommodation Impacts [REP3-082]).</p> <p><u>Question 5.6 – Catalytic employment</u></p> <p>Refer to The Applicant’s Response to ISH9 Action Point 38 Updated Position on Catalytic Employment Benefits [AS-163]</p> <p><u>Question 5.7 – Monitoring vulnerable groups</u></p> <p>The Applicant’s position on monitoring is set out in The Applicant’s Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH9 - Socio-Economics [REP8-109] section 2.8, which confirmed it is not proposed that the population’s health outcomes be monitored. It would not be appropriate or proportionate to monitor individual clinical</p>
--	--	---

		<p>health outcomes. Population level monitoring in general is already undertaken and published by the Office for Health Improvement and Disparities, relevant links to which appear in ES Chapter 18: Health and Wellbeing [APP-043]. Project specific monitoring would not be feasible in terms of attributing causation at a population level. Large epidemiological studies would be required to achieve the outcome proposed, which would not be proportionate. General population health monitoring is not proportionate given that there is no evidence or likelihood that the project would result in any significant adverse effects to public health, an assessment conclusion with which the national public health statutory health stakeholders agree [RR-4687].</p> <p>ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice - Version 5 (Clean) [REP8-024] section 4.12 sets out community engagement commitments include around raising complaints. With regard to communications, refer to the additions in ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice – Annex 7 – Construction Communications and Engagement Plan [REP8-043] paragraphs 6.1.2 and 7.1.1.</p> <p><u>Question 5.8 – Hardship Fund</u></p> <p>The topic of the Hardship Fund is Agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement.</p> <p><u>Question 5.9 – Affordable housing completions</u></p> <p>The matter of operational housing effects was discussed by the Applicant and the JLAs at Topic Working Group sessions held on 06.08.2024 and 08.08.2024, subsequent to Issue Specific Hearing 9; and the JLAs have confirmed: <i>“the primary</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>focus of their concerns related to housing pressures during the construction period. While there are also concerns about the operational period, they acknowledged the Applicant's position regarding the lack of evidential support for a housing fund to address operational housing pressures.” [no 5.9, REP8-167]</i></p> <p>However, in response to the post-hearing note provided by the JLAs, the Applicant reiterates its position that requirements set out in Local Plans should be considered as the basis for the future trajectory of affordable housing delivery. This is particularly the case given that several of the JLAs have emerging local plans at an advanced stage (e.g. Crawley at Consultation on Main Modifications, Mid Sussex submitted for Examination), and have assessed their affordable housing delivery targets to be achievable and viable. In this context, there is no basis to assume future affordable housing targets planned by the JLAs would not be met.</p> <p>Further, the latest authority monitoring reports for Crawley Borough and Mid Sussex District show affordable housing completions in recent years that exceed current plan requirements of 40% and 30%, respectively. In 2021/22, Crawley’s affordable housing delivery was 51% of total net completions and 53% of net completions with planning permission (i.e., excluding prior approval). At paragraph 3.21 of the 2021/22 AMR, CBC note: <i>“As Table 3.4 shows, the significant proportion of completions benefitting from prior approval (as noted above) has affected the proportion of new units which are affordable. Including prior approvals, the affordable units comprise only 33% over the seven years in question, whereas if they are excluded (providing a fairer view of the implementation of Policy H4) the seven-year total sits at 46%, exceeding the 40% target.”</i> Likewise, in Mid Sussex affordable housing formed 42% of total completions in 2022/23. As such, the</p>
--	--	---

Applicant does not find that there is evidence of affordable housing completions “falling some way behind” local plan requirements.

Crawley Borough Council AMR 2021/22:

Table 3.4: The delivery of gross and net affordable housing 2015-22 against the average annual/quarterly figures from Policy H4⁹

Year	Gross delivery	Net delivery	As % of total net completions	As % of net completions with planning permission	Implied average H4 target	As % of H4 target
2015/16	113	113	21%	42%	136	83%
2016/17	145	144	24%	47%	136	106%
2017/18	146	146	40%	44%	136	107%
2018/19	166	166	32%	33%	136	122%
2019/20	168	166	37%	62%	136	122%
2020/21	213	213	38%	48%	136	157%
2021/22	183	183	51%	53%	136	135%
2015-22 Total	1134	1131	33%	46%	952	119%

Mid Sussex District Council AMR 2022/23:

Table 5: Housing completions during Plan period (DP4: Housing)

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Plan Requirement	876	876	876	876	876	876	876	876	876
Completions	630	868	912	843	661	1,003	1,116^a	1,187	1,053
Cumulative Requirement	876	1,752	2,628	3,504	4,380	5,256	6,132	7,008	7,884
Cumulative Completions	630	1,498	2,410	3,253	3,914	4,917	6,033	7,220	8,273
Over/Under Supply	-246	-254	-218	-251	-466	-339	-99	+212	+389

Table 7: Affordable Housing Completions

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	Cumulative Total
Affordable Housing Completions	221	113	168	97	102	214	245	349	369	1,878

	REP8-161	Case for the development	<p>Commenting on the Applicant’s response to ExQ CS2.3 the Authorities state: <i>“It is notable that on page 3 of this response, the Applicant claims that 75-76 mppa would not be attainable with the NRP if York Aviation’s assumptions regarding the daily and annual profile of demand are correct. This is material as it demonstrates further uncertainty regarding the forecasts for the NRP and the level of benefits that will be delivered.”</i></p> <p>As the Applicant’s response made clear, it is the nature of York’s estimate of an NRP capacity of 75-76 mppa that the Applicant disputes, not the ability of the NRP to achieve its forecast of 80.2mppa.</p> <p>This is explained in the response and further in Appendix A to this document. As the ExA will be aware, York suppress their estimate of the future baseline forecast to 57mppa, meaning that their estimate of 75-76mppa represents growth or a delta attributed to the NRP of c.18mppa, which GAL does not consider credible.</p> <p>There is no uncertainty about the forecast in GAL’s mind – the NRP would generate additional growth of 13mppa above a future baseline of 67.2mppa.</p> <p>The difficulties with York’s estimates are explained in Appendix A (Doc Ref. 10.77).</p> <p>The authorities also note: <i>“that the Applicant incorrectly relates the slower build up in traffic with the NRP to the timing of the provision of Charlie Box. Whilst earlier submissions had noted this as a factor that could influence the capacity deliverable, the slower build-up of traffic in the sensitivity test case set out in [REP4-049] derived solely from the Applicant’s top-down forecasts set out in [REP1-052].”</i> If the phased delivery of Charlie box is not now “a factor”, the</p>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	---

		<p>applicant is grateful. As set out in its response, GAL plans to phase the delivery of Chalie box to match its forecast growth.</p> <p>Issues relating to the top down forecast are discussed extensively elsewhere.</p>
	Finch	<p>Please refer to Greenhouse Gas Technical Note (Doc Ref. 10.79) and Closing Submission – Greenhouse Gases (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p>
	Ecology	<p>The LPA provide four reasons with respect to why they are of the view that mitigation for loss of woodland is required. Taking each point in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although there is a net loss of area of woodland as a result of the Project, there is an overall net gain in the number of trees, as set out in Appendix J of ES Appendix 8.10.1 – Tree Survey Report and Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP8-064 – REP8074]. The majority of woodland to be lost comprises highways planting from when the A23 was constructed circa 35 years ago. It is in poor ecological condition and, as set out in table 4.2.1 of ES Appendix 9.9.2 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Statement [REP8-076], will be replaced by woodland with a target condition of moderate – i.e. an improvement in the overall ecological condition compared to the baseline. As such, while there is a net loss in area, this is mitigated through an overall enhancement to the ecological condition of the woodland being replanted. 2. The time period to maturity of the woodland is recognised both within the impact assessment set out in section 9 of ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-034], where significant effects are identified until 2038, reducing below significance by 2047, and factored into the BNG

			<p>calculation through the ‘time to target condition’ modifier built into the metric meaning that woodland planting does not score many BNG units compared to other habitats where the time to target condition is shorter. This is also a factor specifically taken into account in the formulation of CBC’s Policy CH6, which provides for a multiplier of tree planting for this purpose.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Although there is a reduction in habitat connectivity for bats, the loss of woodland would not result in the severance of east-west connectivity along the A23. As set out in section 9.9.177 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-034] and described in oral argument at ISH8 and in the Written Summary of Oral Submission [REP6-082], the Project design team have worked to ensure that mature trees and scrub will be retained throughout the length of the Gatwick Stream where it passes through Riverside Garden Park to ensure a dark corridor, and hence connectivity, are maintained. 4. Although there is no requirement in any guidance with respect to BNG for projects to target specific habitat types in the delivery of BNG, the Project has included woodland planting within the indicative landscape drawings set out in ES Appendix 8.8.1 Outline Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plan (oLEMP) [REP8-058 – REP8-062] wherever it is practicable to do so from an airport safeguarding perspective. <p>As set out in the response to EN.2.2 [REP7-082], the Applicant does not consider that off-site mitigation or enhancement is required; the Project will, in the long term, mitigate the loss of woodland in accordance with local policy.</p> <p>The Applicant’s position with respect to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is set out within ES Appendix 9.9.2 [REP8-076]. The position adopted with respect to both</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>methodology and conclusions (including with respect to habitat trading) was agreed with Natural England via the Statement of Common Ground (sections 2.8.4.1, 2.8.4.2, 2.8.4.3) (Doc Ref. 10.1.15 v4), reiterated by Natural England in their response to Further Written Question EN.2.1 [REP7-116]. The Project will deliver a minimum of 19.64% habitat gain, 16.31% in watercourse gain and 10.83% in hedgerow gain. This gain is secured since the measures which contribute to the conclusions in ES Appendix 9.9.2 BNG Statement [REP8-076] are incorporated into ES Appendix 8.8.1 oLEMP [REP8-058 – REP8-062] such that they are reflected in the Landscape and Ecology Management Plans submitted pursuant to Requirement 8 of the dDCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v11) by virtue of the requirement that such plans must be substantially in accordance with the oLEMP. As such, the Applicant is of the strong view, supported by Natural England, that the Project does deliver significant and genuine BNG.</p>
		Capacity and Operations	<p>The environmental impacts of London Gatwick’s Airspace Modernisation project - as with all airports participating in the Airspace Modernisation programme - will be assessed under the CAA’s regulated airspace change process set out in CAP 1616.</p> <p>In relation to sensitivity testing the ES does consider a conservative worst-case position, in that the forecast for the increased use of the WIZAD Standard Instrument Departure route - in the baseline case and with the Project - assumes that the London Terminal Control Area airspace becomes increasingly congested over time, due to the growth of air traffic across all of the London airports. This assumption sets the basis of the reasonable worst case for the purposes of environmental impact assessment.</p>

			<p>Similar concerns were expressed at ISH9 see the response set out in the Deadline 8 Submission - 10.62.3 The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH9 - Case for the Proposed Development [REP8-108] paras 2.2.2-2.2.9, 2.2.13 and 2.2.18.</p> <p>WIZAD SID is operated in accordance with the associated conditions applied to its use.</p>
	Health and Wellbeing		<p>The Applicant's position on monitoring is set out in The Applicant's Written Summary of Oral Submissions ISH9 - Socio-Economics [REP8-109] section 2.8, which confirmed it is not proposed that the population's health outcomes be monitored. See also earlier in this document the Applicant's response to the Legal Partnership Authorities in relation to REP8-167 Socio-economics Question 5.7 – Monitoring vulnerable groups.</p> <p>Environmental Statement Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice [REP8-024] section 4.12 sets out community engagement commitments include around raising complaints. With regard to communications, please see the additions set out in Environmental Statement Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice - Annex 7 - Construction Communications and Engagement Plan [REP8-042] paragraphs 6.1.2 and 7.1.1.</p> <p>A summary of the Applicant's position is set out within the Air Quality Closing Submission (Doc Ref. 10.73).</p> <p>With regard to noise insulation and overheating, the Applicant's position is set out in Environmental Statement Appendix 14.9.10 Noise Insulation Scheme (Doc Ref. 5.3 v4). The Noise Insulation Scheme addresses overheating by providing</p>

		blinds, loft insulation, and acoustic ventilators specified to provide 2 fresh air changes per hour. These measures are intended to reduce overheating in any home rather than to address specific issues in particular homes.
	Historic Environment	Please refer to Appendix C: Response on Heritage (Doc Ref. 10.77).
	Land Use	<p>Commenting on the Applicant’s responses to ExQ2 [REP7-086] the Authorities <i>“suggested a revised description of works line 22, page 31[REP7-108] and also requested additional detail be provided including a parameter plan”</i></p> <p>The ExA has suggested changes to the wording of the description of the works at Pentagon Field and the Applicant’s response to this is contained in the Deadline 9 Draft DCO document (Doc Ref 2.1 v11).</p> <p>In the Authorities’ Post Hearing Submission ISH9, the Authorities comment that <i>“there have been no revisions to the Soil Management Strategy document during the examination. A number of clarification queries were posed in ExA WQ1 but further detail has not been added to the document.”</i></p> <p>The applicant provided clarifications to the ExA [REP3-096] to explain where the relevant points are addressed within the Soil Management Strategy [APP-086].</p>
	Socio-Economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SE.2.1 – ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice - Version 5 (Clean) [REP8-024] section 4.12 sets out community engagement commitments include around raising complaints. With regard to communications, refer to the additions in ES Appendix 5.3.2 Code of Construction Practice – Annex 7 –

			<p>Construction Communications and Engagement Plan [REP8-043] paragraphs 6.1.2 and 7.1.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SE.2.4 – The Applicant is confident that all statutory health and safety requirements would be met as is the requirement and this does not require separate securing through the DCO or s106. ▪ SE.2.5, SE.2.6, SE.2.7, SE.2.8 and SE.2.9 – The topic of the ESBS is agreed, subject to the s106 Agreement. ▪ SE.2.12 – ANPS para 4.5 requires a local assessment, not a local authority level assessment. The Applicant has provided data on impacts at the local level but maintains its position that conducting assessment at the local authority level is not necessary, appropriate, meaningful nor possible. ▪ SE.2.13 – Refer to the Applicant’s response in Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and Crawley Borough Council Version 3 (Doc Ref 10.1.1) issue 2.19.2.7. ▪ SE.2.16 – Refer to The Applicant’s Response to ISH9 Action Point 38 Updated Position on Catalytic Employment Benefits [AS-163].
		Traffic and Transport	<p>In relation to the Authorities’ response to TT.2.1, the strategic highway mode includes all of the relevant network and represents and responds to forecast congestion; it would therefore identify impacts related to congestion on the M25, and diversion of traffic onto other routes, if such congestion were forecast to occur.</p>

		<p>In relation to the Authorities’ response to TT.2.10, with reference to Appendix A of The Applicant’s Response to ExQ2 - Traffic and Transport [REP7-092] the 10% sensitivity test increases Airport-related traffic (trips with an origin or destination in one of the Gatwick zones in the model) by 10% above that in the core modelling scenarios used for the Application. The additional Airport-related traffic therefore reflects the same origins and destinations, and the same directional split (arrivals and departures at Gatwick), as in the core modelling, because the 10% increase in demand is applied to all Airport-related highway demand.</p>
REP8-162	Section 106	<p>Please see the s106 Agreement (Doc Ref. 10.11) and the s106 Agreement Explanatory Memorandum (Doc Ref. 10.54).</p>
REP8-168	Noise Appendix 1	<p>Appendix 1 to the Legal Partnership Authorities, Deadline 8 Submission - Response to Actions raised by the ExA at Issue Specific Hearing 9 [REP8-168] provides an analysis of the feasibility of the ExA’s Noise Envelope proposed limits (July 2024), i.e. 0.5dB noise reduction every 5 years from opening. The JLAs have undertaken AEDT noise modelling to test the feasibility of the Examining Authority’s noise envelope proposed limits. The Applicant welcomes this analysis, and having done its own noise modelling, comments as follows.</p> <p>In para 4 the JLAs note <i>‘it is not possible to look at different locations around the airport and expect to see similar reductions in noise at each point as time passes’</i>. The reasons are given, and the Applicant agrees as explained in ISH9. Therefore, the interpretation of the Examining Authority’s noise envelope proposal from now on is that it applies to contour areas. This understanding is agreed.</p> <p>The JLAs explain that their AEDT noise modelling is approximate, which is accepted. The Applicant concurs with the noise modelling method adopted to</p>

			<p>produce contour areas relating to the Examining Authority’s proposed noise limits. Table 1 provides the area limits for the daytime Leq 16 hr 51dB contour limits. The Applicant’s modelling agrees with these areas, within about 2%.</p> <p>Table 2 provides the night-time Leq 8 hr 45dB contour area limits, which appear to be in error, do not agree with the percentages quoted, and are very similar to the daytime which cannot possibly be correct as the 2019 baseline night contour is 17% larger than the day. The Applicant therefore does not have the night-time limits that the JLAs have modelled, making interpretation of the results impossible. Appendix 1 refers to Figure 1 and Figure 2 displaying the daytime and nighttime results of the noise modelling. Unfortunately, these two figures are missing, once again making it impossible to interpret the analysis that has been provided. However, the Applicant welcomes the analysis undertaken, and having carried out its own modelling can comment on the conclusions of the JLAs’ analysis as follows.</p> <p>Daytime</p> <p>The JLAs state <i>‘the central case baseline would be below the examining authority’s proposed noise limits until they converge in 2038’</i>. The Applicant’s modelling shows this baseline exceeding the limits beyond 2038 and not converging. However, the central case, as discussed elsewhere is not realistic and the Applicant’s core case is the Updated Central Case.</p> <p>The JLAs state <i>‘the central case with project broadly follows examining the authority’s noise limits...’</i> The Applicant’s modelling disagrees with the central case with project exceeding the examining authority’s proposed limits in all years. For example, in 2032 the Central Case with Project reported by the Applicant has an area of 125.1 which is well above the ExA’s proposed limit of 117 in this year.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>The JLAs note <i>‘the updated central case with project is above the noise limits at all times so would not be workable in terms of their fleet transition rates’</i>. The Applicant agrees with this conclusion, which confirms that, for the Applicant’s revised core case, the updated central case, the daytime noise limits would be exceeded by some margin (up to 30%), making those limits unworkable.</p> <p>Night-time</p> <p>As noted above, the Applicant does not have JLAs’ night time analysis results. However, we can comment on the conclusions as follows.</p> <p>The JLAs state <i>‘the central case baseline would be below the examining authority’s proposed noise limits until they converge in 2038’</i>. The Applicant’s modelling shows this baseline exceeding the limits beyond 2038 and not converging. However, the central case, as discussed elsewhere it is not realistic.</p> <p>The JLA’s state <i>‘the central case with project is also below the Examining Authority’s noise limits up to 2039’</i>. This is agreed, however the JLAs note the central case with project contours plateau at this point, meaning the examining authority’s noise limits would not be met after 2039. The JLAs note <i>‘it is possible that future aircraft may continue the trend of noise reductions’</i> and speculate that this might be enough to meet the examining authority’s noise limits beyond 2039 with the central case. However, it is equally possible that this will not happen, so even in the central case which is not the Applicant’s case, the noise limits would not be complied with after 2039. This indicates that even if the central case fleet prevailed, which it is not expected, the noise limits would not be workable.</p> <p>The JLAs note the updated central case with project would not comply. The Applicant agrees with this conclusion that confirms for the Applicant’s revised core</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>case, the updated central case, the daytime noise limits will be exceeded by some margin (up to 22%) making those limits unworkable.</p> <p>In conclusion the Applicant welcomes the contribution that the JLAs have provided, agrees with the interpretation of limits proposed by the examining authority, and the clear conclusion for the Applicant’s core case. For the updated central case, the noise limits would be breached significantly, and would not be workable.</p> <p>Please also see Response to the ExA Proposed schedule of changes to the DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) submitted at Deadline 9 for the Applicant’s full analysis of the Examining Authority’s two noise envelope limits proposals.</p>
		Noise Appendix 3	<p>In paragraph 1 the JLAs note: <i>‘At Gatwick Airport (Figure 2 reproduced below) there is a reasonably good association between the 48 LAeq 8h and one additional awakening contour. This is based on single runway operations. However, the association is not as strong as at Stanstead (Figure 4 reproduced below) so even under single runway operation it is not possible to conclude that the association between the 48dB LAeq8h and the one additional awakening will remain constant. The association at Heathrow is even less (Figure 3 reproduced below) and it shows the effect of dual runway operation at that location. Should the DCO be granted and the Airport resort to dual runway operation, then there is no guarantee that the association will remain as it is now and more likely it will depart from the 48 dB LAeq 8h. For this reason, the additional noise induced awakening needs to be specified separately to the 48 dB LAeq 8h contour’.</i></p> <p>The Applicant notes the JLAs note a reasonably good association between the 48 LAeq 8h and one additional awakening contour at Gatwick. The Applicant would expect this to continue with the northern runway project in operation because that</p>

		<p>runway would not operate for the majority of the night time, and not for arrivals. The JLAs' commentary on Heathrow only serves to prove the point already stated by the Applicant that an airport with a low number of night flights with larger noisier aircraft, may see a different awakenings plot relationship with Leq 8 hr and may consider awakenings differently, but Gatwick has over 125 flights in the night.</p> <p>In paragraph 5 the JLAs state: <i>'The Applicant states that the night effects will be controlled as the 48 dB LAeq 8h contour coincides with the proposed 54 LAeq16h contour. There are two issues with this, the 54 dB LAeq16h does not encompass all the area within 48 dB LAeq8h contour and the second issue is that the day contour should be mitigating daytime effects. To avoid nighttime effects may require different forms of mitigation.'</i> The Applicant notes the lines of the Leq 16 hr 54dB NIS contour and the Leq 8 hr 48dB contour are more closely aligned in the west of the airport than the east referred to here. The Applicant does not agree that to avoid the effects at night requires a different form of mitigation. The mitigation in the form of noise insulation is the same at night for during the day.</p>
	Air Quality	Please see the s106 Agreement (Doc Ref. 10.11) and the s106 Agreement Explanatory Memorandum (Doc Ref. 10.54).
	Socio-Economics	<p>Actions 15, 16, 17 – Matters relating to Housing and the Community Fund are agreed subject to the s106 Agreement.</p> <p>Action 34 – Housing is agreed subject to the s106 Agreement.</p> <p>Action 37 – Refer to The Applicant's Response to ISH9 Action Point 38 Updated Position on Catalytic Employment Benefits [AS-163]</p>

		Landscape	Please refer to the Applicant’s response in Appendix B: Response on Landscape and Ecology (Doc Ref. 10.77).
		Odour	The Applicant provided an Odour Monitoring and Management Plan (OMMP) [REP8-100] at Deadline 8, as updated at Deadline 8 to address the Examining Authorities and JLAs request to set out how action is secured in response to complaints of odour impact, as described in The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH9 – Mitigation [REP8-111]. A summary of the Applicant's position is set out within the closing submission (Doc Ref. 10.73).
	REP8-163	Draft DCO	<p>The Applicant has had regard to the comprehensive remarks of the JLAs on the draft DCO contained in this document and has addressed them, where they overlap with recommendations of the ExA, in The Applicant’s Response to the ExA’s Proposed Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 10.72) and otherwise in the Applicant's Closing Submissions (Doc Ref. 10.73) on the draft DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant would, however, like to clarify in response to the JLAs' query at row 32 of Part B of their submission that "historic data" in Requirement 9 (contaminated land and groundwater) refers to previous investigations, assessments and surveys undertaken in relation to ground and groundwater contamination. The prior reports containing this information that were reviewed within the ES are listed in ES Appendix 10.9.1: Preliminary Risk Assessment [APP-138].</p>

Marathon Asset Management	REP8-170	Protective provisions	The Applicant has agreed protective provisions and a Side Agreement with Southern Gas Networks. The version of protective provisions included in the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v11) reflects the agreed form.
Mole Valley District Council	REP8-129	Landscape	Please refer to the Applicant's response at Appendix B: Response on Landscape and Ecology (Doc Ref. 10.77).
National Highways	REP8-131	Design	Matters related to the design of the highway works, including relating to drainage details, are regulated by Requirement 6 of the draft DCO and must be in accordance with the surface access drainage strategy and subject to the approval of national highways.
		Draft DCO	The Applicant has amended Schedule 7 (land in which only new rights etc. may be acquired) in the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v11) submitted at Deadline 9 to provide greater specificity on the purposes for which rights are to be acquired. The Applicant would note that it is in National Highways' interest for the Applicant to not be unduly constrained as to the rights it can acquire to facilitate the delivery of the highway works.
Network Rail	REP8-132	Rail Enhancement Fund	The Applicant has consulted Network Rail on the further drafting of the Surface Access Commitments in relation to the Rail Enhancement Fund and the wording agreed with Network Rail is reflected in the updated submission of the Surface Access Commitments at Deadline 9.

New Economics Foundation	REP8-173	Missing evidence and catalytic employment	Refer to The Applicant’s Response to ISH9 Action Point 38 Updated Position on Catalytic Employment Benefits [AS-163] and Impact of the DfT TAG November 2023 update on the Applicant’s National Economic Impact Assessment [AS-164] .
Sloane Nominees Limited (long leaseholders of the Travelodge)	REP8-180	Compulsory acquisition	<p>Sloane Nominees Limited are a leaseholder of on land owned freehold by Gthe Applicant. As described in their representations, the Applicant reached out and sought to discuss the impacts of the Project on their land. The Applicant can confirm that meetings are continuing within the context of the Applicant's existing contractual arrangements with Slone Nominees Limited.</p> <p>Slone Nominees has raised a number of specific requests in relation to the Code of Construction Practice. The Applicant can confirm that the Code of Construction Practice and its appendices (DCO Requirement 7 and others) secure these measures. The CoCP was updated at Deadline 8 to refer explicitly to hotels in instances where their interests are particularly sensitive. The Applicant considers that the measures within the CoCP are sufficient to protect Slone Nominees Limited's interest and mitigate impacts from the Project on the operation of the Travelodge.</p>
Southern Gas Networks	REP8-181	Protective Provisions	The Applicant has agreed protective provisions and a Side Agreement with Southern Gas Networks. The version of protective provisions included in the draft DCO (Doc Ref. 2.1 v11) reflects the agreed form.

Stuart Roy Spencer	REP8-184	SIDs	<p>Please refer to Figure B3 of ERCD Report 2002 Noise Exposure Contours for Gatwick Airport 2019 which shows the 2019 routes assumed in the ES modelling including Routes 7 (BOGNA) and 8 (SFD).</p> <p>Diagram 2.1.1 in 5.3 Environmental Statement - Appendix 14.9.2 Air Noise Modelling [APP-172] shows the percentage of traffic on each route with around 20% on Route 7 consistent with the NATS heatmap from 2016/17.</p>
Vail Williams obo Windsor Developme nts	REP8-185	Safeguarding	<p>The Applicant has set out its position in respect of the safeguarded land in response to ExQ.2.1 [REP7-083].</p>
West Sussex Joint Local Authorities	REP8-134	WSI – West Sussex	<p>Please refer to the Applicant’s response set out at Appendix C: Response on Heritage (Doc Ref. 10.77).</p>