

Meeting note

Project name	Gatwick Airport Northern Runway
File reference	TR020005
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	10 February 2023
Meeting with	Gatwick Airport Limited
Venue	Microsoft Teams
Meeting objectives	Project update meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed, and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Feedback on draft documents

The Applicant and the Inspectorate discussed the feedback received from the Inspectorate on the Applicant's draft Development Consent Order (DCO) application documents submission. Please refer to **Annex A** of this meeting note for a copy of the feedback table.

The Inspectorate discussed some minor observations regarding the presentation of information within the draft Consultation Report; namely the section 48 notice.

The Applicant highlighted the Inspectorate's comment that certain consultees did not appear in the list of prescribed consultees within the draft Consultation Report. It was clarified that these parties were consulted under different names. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to clearly explain this in its final Consultation Report.

Consultation and engagement update

The Applicant confirmed that the Consultation Report was still in draft and provided an update on consultation. The Applicant had held over 80 topic working groups with their nearest local authorities, in which information and updates were provided on the methodology and assessment of impacts. These sessions were also recorded to provide access to local authority members that could not attend the sessions. Over 100 meetings had also been held with National Highways to discuss matters including modelling and project design.

The Applicant provided an overview of its engagement with Natural England (NE), as well as its preparation for the submission of a draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) documentation for further feedback from the Inspectorate. The Applicant explained that it has been challenging trying to gain traction in terms of engagement with NE and seek its input on the HRA Report. The Inspectorate advised that once received, it would review the draft HRA documentation and provide comments to the Applicant where possible.

Approach to matters regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority

The Applicant provided an update regarding matters regulated by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA). In terms of airspace change, the Applicant opened an Airspace Change Approval Notification that concluded in 2020. This approved the airspace change necessary for the proposed dual-runway operation. The Applicant advised that it had engaged extensively with the CAA regarding the scheme's safety case, and that the CAA had agreed to issue a Letter of No Impediment to cover matters related to airfield safety as well as their other areas of regulatory duty including economic regulation. The Inspectorate advised it would be helpful to include evidence of these discussions in the application submission alongside the letter and any other explanatory text to provide more information on these topic areas.

Socio-economic effects of property price impacts

The Applicant advised that it would not be completing a formal study, in the socio-economic chapter of the Environmental Statement as it does not believe socio-economic impacts would arise. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to provide an explanation on why it has formed this view in the application submission.

DCO application submission timeline and logistics

The Applicant anticipates that the DCO application would be submitted in spring 2023. The Inspectorate encouraged the Applicant to inform local authorities of any changes to submission in support of their forecasting and other resourcing constraints they might face.

It was agreed that the more detailed arrangements for the submission of the DCO application will be discussed in a further meeting around six to eight weeks prior to submission, and the Inspectorate advised it would issue warm-up letters to the Applicant and local authorities close to the anticipated submission date.

The Applicant queried whether hard copies of the DCO documents would need to be made available at deposit locations. The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that the requirements for inspecting documents in hard copy have been removed however providing accessibility to documents is still required and includes providing a website where the documents can be viewed and in some cases other methods such as USB sticks. The Applicant was reminded that if requested, it may be required (subject to any charge it may request) to provide hard copies of certain documents.

Any other business

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consider how it could demonstrate representative baselines for its assessments in view of the impacts on both commuter traffic and air travel due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Applicant confirmed that these issues were being discussed at its technical working groups and sensitivity testing of post-COVID downside scenarios were being developed.

The Inspectorate queried whether the Applicant had made Planning Performance Agreements (PPA) with the local authorities. The Applicant confirmed that engagement was still ongoing with the local authorities and that a PPA was put in place in September 2021. Discussions on a work plan for Statements of Common Ground were also confirmed to be underway. The Inspectorate suggested it would be helpful for the Applicant to make local authorities aware of the size of the application and subsequent documents they would be expected to review. It was also suggested that sending local authorities application documents in advance if possible would be beneficial.

Annex A



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway – TR020005

Section 51 advice regarding draft application documents submitted by Gatwick Airport Limited

On 20 December 2022 Gatwick Airport Limited submitted the following draft documents for review by the Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) as part of its Pre-application Service¹:

1. Consultation Report
2. Draft Development Consent Order
3. Draft Explanatory Memorandum
4. Project Description
5. Statement of Engagement

The advice recorded in the table below relates solely to matters raised upon the Planning Inspectorate's review of the draft application documents listed above. The advice is limited by the maturity of the documentation provided by the Applicant and the time available for consideration, and is raised without prejudice to the acceptance decision or the final decision about whether development consent should be granted.

¹ See <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/application-process/pre-application-service-for-applicants/>



Consultation Report		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section/ Table/ Appendix	Comment/ Question
1.	General	It is noted that parts of the main draft Consultation Report document are incomplete, including the conclusion chapter, some internal referencing, and several individual sections of the report. The observations provided as part of this feedback table are based only on the submitted information.
2.	General	It is noted that several of the Consultation Report appendices have not been provided as part of the draft submission, and therefore could not be reviewed. This includes Appendices B.3, B.4, B.8, B.10, and B.20.
3.	General	It would assist if sample letters, and other such documents, are provided without signatures; or alternatively for the signatures to be redacted before submission to the Inspectorate.
4.	Table 4.1	It would assist if the notification letter in relation to Regulation 8(1)(b) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 could be submitted as part of the final Consultation Report. The letter supplied as Appendix B.1 of the Consultation Report does not contain a notification in respect of Regulation 8(1)(b).
5.	Table 4.1	Table 4.1 states that Appendix B.8 identifies the key requirements of the guidance and explains how the Applicant had regard to this, however this appendix has not been supplied as part of the draft submission. It is considered that Appendix B.8 would be a useful document to submit as part of the final Consultation Report.
6.	Table 4.3	Evidence of the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) newspaper notices, as provided in Appendix B.5, should be signposted here.
7.	Table 4.4	Table 4.4 contains some incomplete signposting to sections of the Consultation Report intended to demonstrate how activities were carried out in accordance with the SoCC.



Consultation Report		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section/ Table/ Appendix	Comment/ Question
8.	Table 5.2	<p>It is noted that the following parties, identified by the Inspectorate as ‘A’ authorities, were not identified as such by the Applicant, but were consulted on a voluntary basis:</p> <p>Waverley Borough Council; Guildford Borough Council; Elmbridge Borough Council; Epsom & Ewell Borough Council; Wealden District Council; and Sevenoaks District Council.</p>
9.	Table 5.2	<p>It is noted that the following parties, identified by the Inspectorate as ‘A’ and ‘D’ authorities, were not identified as such by the Applicant, but were consulted on a voluntary basis:</p> <p>The Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames; London Borough of Croydon; Sutton Council; and London Borough of Bromley.</p>
10.	Table 5.2	<p>It is noted that the following parties, identified by the Inspectorate as ‘D’ authorities, were not identified as such by the Applicant, but were consulted on a voluntary basis:</p> <p>London Borough of Hounslow; London Borough of Hillingdon; London Borough of Richmond upon Thames; Bracknell Forest Council; Slough Borough Council; The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead; and Brighton and Hove City Council.</p>
11.	Paragraph 5.7.5	<p>It may be helpful to clarify here that the Inspectorate did not identify to the Applicant any persons under Regulation 11(1)(c) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 who may be affected by the Proposed Development.</p>



Consultation Report		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section/ Table/ Appendix	Comment/ Question
12.	Sections 5.10 and 6.10	These sections, together with one or more appendices referred to in paragraphs 5.9.5 and 6.9.6 which were not submitted in draft, are intended to set out how the Applicant had regard to responses to the Autumn 2021 and Summer 2022 Consultations, including whether responses led to changes to the application. These sections and appendices have not been supplied as part of the draft Consultation Report and therefore could not be reviewed. The Applicant should ensure that this information is provided as part of the final Consultation Report.
13.	Paragraph 6.7.1	It is noted that the Applicant did not consider it necessary to undertake a further round of section 48 publicity following the Autumn 2021 Consultation and ahead of the Summer 2022 Consultation, which paragraph 6.1.2 states comprised targeted statutory consultation and non-statutory project update consultation.
14.	Appendices A.1 and A.2	The title text on the first page of the submitted document does not display correctly.
15.	Appendix B.1	It would assist if the Inspectorate's section 46 acknowledgement letter could also be submitted as part of the final Consultation Report.
16.	Appendix B.2	The Applicant should ensure that, where possible, relevant evidence that the commitments within the final SoCC have been carried out is supplied with the final application. For example, the appendices evidencing the communication with local authorities throughout the consultation on the draft SoCC have not been provided as part of this draft document submission.



Consultation Report		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section/ Table/ Appendix	Comment/ Question
17.	Appendix B.2	<p>The Applicant has stated that the targeted consultation undertaken as part of the Summer 2022 Consultation was statutory in nature. Notwithstanding paragraph 5.3.1 of the SoCC which provides for the possibility of excluding certain unspecified commitments in the SoCC for any targeted consultations after the Autumn 2021 Consultation, if applying a strict interpretation of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) the following observations may be noted regarding certain commitments in the SoCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Paragraph 5.3.7 of the SoCC sets out that the Applicant would use a virtual exhibition as part of its consultation material. Although this was done as part of the Autumn 2021 Consultation, it is not stated to have been done as part of the Summer 2022 Consultation.• Paragraphs 5.2.5 and 5.3.11 of the SoCC set out that a Mobile Project Office (MPO) would be used as part of the consultation, however the Summer 2022 Consultation did not utilise the MPO consultation method (as confirmed in Table 4.4 in the Consultation Report).• Paragraph 5.1.8 of the SoCC states that “<i>The proposed application will also be publicised as required by Section 48 of the Planning Act.</i>” It is noted that this was not done for the Summer 2022 Consultation as it was not considered necessary (as per paragraph 6.7.1 of the Consultation Report).• No virtual workplace event was carried out for the Summer 2022 Consultation in line with 5.3.17 of the SoCC (as confirmed in Table 4.4 in the Consultation Report).• The Inspectorate notes that the targeted element of the Summer 2022 Consultation adopted a more targeted community consultation zone in comparison to the wider inner/ outer consultation zones used for the Autumn 2021 Consultation, as per paragraph 6.6.5 of the Consultation Report. This does not fully align with the commitments set out at paragraphs 5.2.3 and 5.3.18 of the SoCC.



Consultation Report		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section/ Table/ Appendix	Comment/ Question
18.	Appendix B.2	Paragraph 5.1.7 of the SoCC sets out the statutory consultees that would be consulted in accordance with section 42 of the PA2008, including host/ neighbouring local authorities, statutory bodies, and people with an interest in land that may be affected by the Proposed Development. It is noted that the targeted element of the Summer 2022 Consultation comprised a narrower pool of consultees in comparison to the Autumn 2021 Consultation.
19.	Appendix B.2	Paragraph 5.3.25 of the SoCC states that consultees would be able to respond to the consultation by using a specified freepost address. It is noted that freepost was an option offered to people to respond to both the Autumn 2021 and Summer 2022 Consultations, however the freepost address for the Summer 2022 Consultation was different to the address specified in the SoCC (as per paragraph 6.4.1 of the Consultation Report).
20.	Appendix B.2	Paragraph 5.3.2 of the SoCC sets out that several consultation documents would be available in different languages and formats, if requested, however it is unclear from the consultation documents that this was the case. Paragraph 5.6.13 of the Consultation Report, for example, states “ <i>The Consultation Summary Document was available in alternative formats and languages upon request</i> ”, however it is not clear from the document itself that it could be requested in alternative languages.
21.	Appendix B.2	Paragraph 5.1.9 of the SoCC states “ <i>Following completion of the consultation, we will consider all feedback, along with the results of on-going technical assessments, as we refine our proposals in preparation for submitting an application for a DCO.</i> ” Details of what regard was had to the consultation feedback, including any changes made to the scheme as a result of feedback, have not been provided as part of the draft documents submission, and should be included with the final application.



Consultation Report		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section/ Table/ Appendix	Comment/ Question
22.	Appendix B.2	Paragraphs 5.2.3 and 5.3.22 of the SoCC set out that social media channels would be used to publicise the consultation. With regards to the Autumn 2021 Consultation, paragraphs 5.7.9 to 5.7.16 of the Consultation Report confirm that social media channels were used to promote the consultation, however it would be helpful to supply samples evidencing that this commitment was fulfilled.
23.	Appendix B.2	The Inspectorate notes that it was not possible to use all the MPO locations set out in Table 5.3.2 of the SoCC for the Autumn 2021 Consultation due to certain venues withdrawing their agreement (as per paragraph 5.6.20 of the Consultation Report). Paragraph 5.3.13 of the SoCC accounts for possible changes to the MPO locations.
24.	Appendices B.3 and B.4	These appendices are missing from the draft submitted for review, however the final version of the Consultation Report should include the draft SoCC and evidence that the draft was sent to the host authorities.
25.	Appendix B.7	Although named Appendix B.7, when opened it is named Appendix B.2.
26.	Appendix B.7	Regarding the section 48 notice, the Planning Inspectorate has the following observations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The latest date on which consultation documents were available to inspect online or at the deposit locations may be inferred from information provided in paragraph 9; however, it may have been clearest to specify the actual date.• Paragraph 10 states that the Applicant will review requests for hard copies of the other documents on a case-by-case basis, and it is therefore unclear whether this is intended to reserve the right to decline requests. In terms of the charge, paragraph 10 only confirms that there is a maximum charge of £500 for one full set of consultation materials.



Consultation Report		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section/ Table/ Appendix	Comment/ Question
27.	Appendix B.18	If NHS England was consulted it should be listed here.
28.	Appendices B.18 and C.5	All relevant Clinical Commissioning Groups should be named in the list of prescribed consultees.
29.	Appendices B.18 and C.5	Energetics Gas Limited are not listed as having been consulted.
30.	Appendices B.18 and C.5	Energetics Electricity Limited are not listed as having been consulted.
31.	Appendices B.18 and C.5	Energy Assets Power Networks Limited are not listed as having been consulted.
32.	Appendix C.6	It would assist if the Inspectorate's section 46 acknowledgement letter could also be submitted as part of the final Consultation Report.



Draft Development Consent Order		
Ref No.	Article/ Requirement/ Schedule	Comment/ Question
33.	General	As a general point it is noted that a number of matters are either missing from this draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) or full details have not been provided, eg Works Nos, certain proposed timescales, detailed wording for a number of Schedules and some of the proposed Requirements.
34.	Pages 1 and 2, Contents	From Article 43 onwards the Articles listed in the Contents list do not tally with the actual Articles. Part 6 appears to be missing from the Contents list.
35.	Page 5 second paragraph and onwards	Suggest use of the term “ <i>Examining Authority</i> ” rather than “ <i>the Panel</i> ”.
36.	Page 7, Part 1(2)	Interpretation of “ <i>commence</i> ”. The Applicant has included a number of operations in (a) to (p) that would be excluded from the definition of commence but which have the potential to give rise to environmental effects. The Applicant may wish to review this list.
37.	Page 9, Part 1 2(3)	How would this relate to any specific distances that might need to be specified within the Schedule 2, Requirements?
38.	Page 9, Part 2 Article (Art) 3(2)	The Applicant may wish to explain the difference between “ <i>adjoining</i> ” and “ <i>sharing a common boundary with.</i> ”
39.	Page 10, Art 6	The Applicant may wish to further consider the drafting of this Article, and in particular 6(2) and 6(4).
40.	Page 11, Art 9(2)(a)	The Applicant should clarify whether this Article only relates to any planning consent (or deemed planning permission) that is extant and has been approved but for which the planning conditions are yet to be ‘discharged’, or whether it refers to all extant consents and deemed planning permissions.



Draft Development Consent Order		
Ref No.	Article/ Requirement/ Schedule	Comment/ Question
41.	Page 13, Art 12	The Applicant should consider and, if necessary, justify why it is seeking powers to alter streets that may lie outside the Order Limits and should also consider whether 28 days is a sufficient period of time before deemed consent applies.
42.	Page 21, Art 23(1)(d)	The Applicant may wish to specify how “ <i>which may be affected by the authorised development</i> ” is to be assessed and whether the intention of this Article is to allow for archaeological excavation works within the definition of “ <i>archaeological investigations</i> ”.
43.	Page 25, Article 30	The Applicant is yet to specify its intended time limit. In a number of recently made DCOs seven years is the most commonly used time period.
44.	Page 30, Article 30	The Applicant may wish to explain its reasoning regarding the exemptions that are sought in 30(4)(a) to (f).
45.	Page 33, Article 39	Are any measures or funding in lieu proposed for the long-term management of any replacement land?
46.	Pages 40 to 43, Schedule 1	As a general comment, there are a number of the proposed Works where further details will need to be provided.
47.	Pages 40 to 41, Schedule 1	Paragraph 5.2.3 of the Project Description chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) describes a key component of the project as “ <i>pier and stand alterations (including a proposed new pier)</i> ”. Schedule 1 includes the construction of a new pier, but does not include any other alterations to existing piers. The Applicant may wish to consider whether any further works to piers should be included in Schedule 1, and may wish to further clarify the pier and stand alterations that are proposed in the final application, including what is new build and how the existing is being altered.



Draft Development Consent Order		
Ref No.	Article/ Requirement/ Schedule	Comment/ Question
48.	Pages 43 to 45, Schedule 1	The Applicant has provided quite an extensive range of matters that it considers would fall within its definition of “ <i>associated development</i> ”. The Applicant should justify why some of these could not be included as specific Works.
49.	Page 46, Schedule 2, Interpretation	Some of the documents referenced in Schedule 2, 1. appear to be final versions whilst some are outline plans. The Applicant may wish to explain its approach to this.
50.	Page 46, Requirement (R) 2	The Applicant may wish to state which organisation(s) should provide approval in writing and whether consultation with any other organisations (for example Natural England or the Environment Agency) is to be stipulated.
51.	Page 47, R6	In R6(1) the Applicant may wish to consider its use of the word “ <i>substantially</i> ”. In 6(2) the Applicant has listed a number of plans. However, there are other plans that are customarily included within a Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) that the Applicant has not listed (for example a noise management plan, air quality management plan, lighting management plan and stakeholder communications plan). The Applicant should explain why these other plans are not specifically referenced within R6. In addition, R6 should set out who the relevant discharging authority is and which other organisations, if any, must be consulted.
52.	Page 48, R8	The Applicant may wish to include appropriate text to explain how R8 would relate to the pollution incident control plan that is required in R6(2)(c).
53.	Page 48, R9	The Applicant may wish to specify that consultation with the Environment Agency would be required.
54.	Page 48, R10 and R11	The Applicant may wish to consider whether R10(3) and R11(1) should refer to agreement in writing by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant highway authority.



Draft Development Consent Order		
Ref No.	Article/ Requirement/ Schedule	Comment/ Question
55.	Page 49, R12	The Applicant will need to consider whether an Outline Written Scheme of Investigation should be provided to accompany the submission. R12 should include appropriate provision for the analysis, publication and dissemination of results and subsequent archive deposition.
56.	Page 49, R13	R13 refers to protected species but should also cross-reference to an Ecological Management Plan and either in this Requirement, or a separate one, reference should be made to other ecological features such as breeding birds, hedgerows and trees.
57.	Page 50	As a general point, it is noted that only the subject headlines rather than the specific wording are provided for R14 to R18.
58.	Page 64, Protective Provisions	So far only 3 Protective Provisions are proposed. The Applicant will need to consider whether any other Protective Provisions will be required and should provide draft versions of these to accompany the application.
59.	Page 71, Part 4	The Applicant will need to consider the location, nature and quantum of all replacement land that is to be provided.
60.	Page 73, Procedure for approvals, consents and appeals	In Part 2 “ <i>working days</i> ” should be defined, and also in 2(2) the Applicant will need to consider whether 10 working days is a sufficient period of time.
61.	Page 75, 4(6)(b)	The Applicant should explain its reasoning for the tailpiece “ <i>(whether the appeal relates to that part of it or not)</i> ”.



Draft Development Consent Order		
Ref No.	Article/ Requirement/ Schedule	Comment/ Question
62.	Page 76, Documents to be Certified	There would appear to be a number of other documents which have been included for other DCOs but which are not specifically included among those listed in this Schedule. Examples of such documents include, but are not limited to, the following: Outline Employment and Skills Plan, Outline Lighting Plan, Outline Archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation, Outline Watercourse Crossing Method Statement, Outline Travel Plan, Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy and Arboricultural Method Statement.

Draft Explanatory Memorandum		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section	Comment/ Question
63.	Paragraph 1.2	In the first sentence is "...Schedules 2" correct?
64.	Section 2.4.12	It is not clear what is meant by " <i>environmental mitigation</i> " and also it is not clear whether the proposed landscape/ ecological planting would be for mitigation or would also include enhancement and biodiversity net gain.
65.	Paragraph 2.9	The Applicant may wish to provide a clearer indication of the " <i>several ancillary matters</i> " and relate this to paragraph 2.13 that refers to " <i>Other ancillary matters.</i> " Schedule 1(a) to (s) of the draft DCO defines a range of the associated development operations.
66.	Paragraph 3.4.1	It would be useful to know which activities the Applicant intends to exclude from the definition of commence.
67.	Paragraph 3.4.2	It is questionable how much benefit a " <i>non-exclusive list</i> " of actions might be.



Draft Explanatory Memorandum		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Section	Comment/ Question
68.	Paragraph 3.6, third sentence	Recommend that the term “ <i>small</i> ” is better defined by use of intended measurements or other figures.
69.	Paragraph 4.1	The Applicant will need to carefully consider its inclusion of any operations or works outside of the Order Limits, particularly those that might be considered to constitute development, and will need to justify why such works should not be included within the Order Limits.
70.	Paragraph 4.5	The Applicant may wish to consider indicating on the relevant plan the locations of all award drains.
71.	Paragraph 4.7	The Applicant should justify its use of limits of deviation in relation to each of the proposed Works and clarify how these have been assessed in the ES.
72.	Paragraph 6.9	It would be helpful if the phrase “ <i>archaeological investigations</i> ” could be clarified to explain whether or not this would include excavation works such as trial trenching.
73.	Paragraph 6.15	The Applicant may wish to provide further details on how “ <i>near the authorised development</i> ” would be ascertained and also the process for identifying any trees to be lost and communicating with the landowners regarding this and providing the details regarding compensation.
74.	Paragraph 9.5	The Applicant may wish to provide more details as to what “ <i>the ability to revise the control documents</i> ” would entail in practice.



Project Description		
Ref No.	Paragraph/ Table/ Footnote	Comment/ Question
75.	Page (p) 1, paragraph (para) 5.1.1	As a general point the Applicant will need to justify its reasoning behind the submission of any assessments used to inform the ES that were undertaken during the period of COVID-19 restrictions when travel patterns were different to what would be considered to be normal.
76.	p1, para 5.1.2	The first sentence of this paragraph is not grammatically correct.
77.	p1, para 5.2.2, second sentence; and para 5.2.3, final bullet point (bp)	The Applicant has referred to measures to “mitigate environmental effects” and “landscape/ecological planting and environmental mitigation”. However, the Applicant may wish to also reference the proposed measures for landscape/ecological compensation and biodiversity net gain.
78.	p2, Footnote 2	It would be helpful if the Applicant could confirm that the existing main (southern) runway has an Instrument Landing System (ILS). It is unclear whether or not as part of the Project the Applicant intends to upgrade the northern runway with an ILS. Also, it would be helpful if the Applicant could clarify whether planes could still take off in fog/low cloud on a non-instrument runway, even if they cannot land in such conditions.
79.	p3, para 5.2.12	It would be helpful if the Applicant could state whether the proposed reconfiguration of taxiways has been discussed and approved with the relevant industry safety authorities.
80.	p5, para 5.2.9, second sentence	For ease of reference it would be useful if the Applicant could clarify here whether the removed AOB and pumping station 17 were being replaced or not.



81.	p5, para 5.2.31, third sentence	The Applicant might wish to provide details about when this work is likely to be completed and how this has been assessed in the ES, ie do these works as completed form part of the baseline?
82.	p6, para 5.2.35	For clarity it might be preferable to separate out this bullet point list into those elements that are proposed to be reconfigured and those which are proposed to be relocated.
83.	p7, paras 5.2.38, 5.2.40 and 5.2.41	It would be helpful to state how the proposed replacement buildings would compare in scale and design to the existing buildings.
84.	p8, para 5.2.44	It might be useful to explain what conversion from a landside to an airside operation for the emergency control tower would mean in practice.
85.	p9, para 5.2.45	What was the response of the emergency services to the proposed Rendezvous Point North relocation?
86.	p9, para 5.2.52, third sentence	The other relevant ES chapter(s) (for example ground conditions and traffic) should demonstrate how a build of up to 10m below ground level for the additional hangar has been assessed.
87.	p10 and p11, paras 5.2.60 and 5.2.61	For improved clarity the Applicant should explain how the size of the proposed extensions would compare to the dimensions of the existing building(s).
88.	p11, para 5.2.66; and p12, para 5.2.67	The Applicant may wish to consider providing details of sustainable travel options for the proposed new office block and hotel facilities and also explaining the amount of car parking these new buildings would incorporate and, if none, how the car parking provision for these buildings would be accounted for.
89.	p12, para 5.2.68	Reference is made to three new car parks that “ <i>would be implemented in the absence of the Project to serve the projected increase in passenger numbers.</i> ” The Applicant should clarify whether these 3 car parks have already been consented or not, their stage of development and how they relate to the ES baseline that has been used for the assessment of traffic and other related impacts such as air quality.



90.	p13, para 5.2.73	The Applicant may wish to comment on whether there is already a Travel Plan in place for the airport and, if there is, provide either a full copy or summary report.
91.	p14, Table 5.2.3	In Table 5.2.3 it would be helpful if the Applicant could confirm whether the replacement spaces would be on a like for like basis with those lost, ie differentiate between staff parking, drop off/short stay and long stay car parking for the replacement spaces.
92.	p14, para 5.2.77, fifth bp	Further details on the type/quantum of investment in public transport service enhancements would be useful. How have these enhancements been accounted for in the traffic assessment?
93.	p15, paras 5.2.83 to 5.2.84	In the absence of detailed plans, it is difficult to understand all the details of the various highway works that are being proposed, for example the creation of a flyover above the existing roundabout with on and off slip roads.
94.	p15, para 5.2.81, fourth sentence.	Whilst it may be explained in more detail elsewhere, it might be beneficial to provide further details as to what the “ <i>Further local improvements</i> ” would constitute and how these have been assessed in the ES.
95.	p15, para 5.2.82, fourth sentence	This sentence might benefit from further explanation, particularly in terms of “ <i>raising the existing road over the bridge approximately 2.2 metres.</i> ”
96.	p16, para 5.2.85; and p17, para 5.2.93	The Applicant may wish to explain how a proposed noise barrier of only 1m in height would provide sufficient mitigation.
97.	p16, para 5.2.88	The fourth sentence refers to “ <i>Local improvements</i> ”. Are these improvements the same as the project proposes or different, and if they are different then do they already have consent?
98.	p16, paras 5.2.89 to 5.2.92	In the absence of detailed plans, it is difficult to understand all the details of the various highway works that are proposed, for example the elevated flyover and the new signalised junction.



99.	p16, para 5.2.90	Does the “8 metres above” in the fifth sentence refer to the clearance height or to the height on the upper surface of the elevated link?
100.	p17, para 5.2.94	The third bullet point refers to a “ <i>footway suitable for future use as a shared path</i> ”. The Applicant may wish to confirm whether its intention would be for this to be fully constructed and brought into use as such or whether this would only be space that was being retained to provide this option.
101.	p18, para 5.2.96	The third bullet point might benefit from confirmation as to whether there is any off-road cycle route along this part of the A23.
102.	p18, para 5.2.100	The Applicant should clarify how the rail improvements have been accounted for in the assessment of traffic and other relevant impacts.
103.	p19, para 5.2.103	The use of the +20% allowance for the airfield drainage elements would benefit from further explanation, ie regarding the “ <i>shorter projected design life</i> ”.
104.	p20, para 5.2.108	The Applicant should clarify how in practice the lowered car park x would be used to provide flood storage capacity and how any corresponding restrictions on the use of car park x would be implemented if part of it is to be used for long-term car parking via Purple Parking.
105.	p21, para 5.2.117	This paragraph could do with further clarification, eg when will the capacity issue be known and how long would any expansion works at Crawley STW take?
106.	p22, para 5.2.123, second bp	The Applicant may wish to provide further information regarding the proposed new public open space, eg does this lie within the proposed Order limits and how would it be managed and/or funded in the longer term?
107.	p22, para 5.2.123, third bp	How have the bird strike implications of any new wetland and pond creation been assessed? How would these areas be managed in this regard in the long term?



108.	p23, para 5.2.126, third bp	It would be helpful if the Applicant could confirm the respective areas of the land on the west bank of the River Mole and that of the public open space in Riverside Garden Park and Church Meadows that is to be lost.
109.	p23, para 5.2.126, sixth and seventh bps	As far as possible all proposed mitigation planting, including these two hedgerows, should be planted at the earliest available opportunity.
110.	p24, paras 5.2.129 to 5.3.132, third bp	The Applicant should state whether a Design Review Panel has been involved in assessing the design of the proposed new buildings and infrastructure. If not, then the Applicant should consider engaging the services of a Design Review Panel.
111.	p25, Table 5.31 (and elsewhere from para 5.3.7 onwards).	The Applicant may wish to re-evaluate the dates provided for the anticipated sequencing to make them as realistic as possible at this stage of the application process.
112.	p30, para 5.3.39; and p33, para 5.3.69	The Applicant may wish to explain the reasoning behind the differing dates provided for the different phases of the South Terminal hotel at car park H that are given in paragraphs 5.3.39 and 5.3.69. In addition, it would be helpful if the Applicant could provide further details regarding the proposed hotel provision as it is not clear whether the proposed 'South Terminal hotel at car park H Phase 1 and Phase 2' in the second and third bullet points of para 5.3.39 refer to a single hotel or two separate ones. It would be useful if Figure 5.2.1 could be updated so that it better reflects para 5.3.39 regarding the proposed hotel provision.
113.	p34, para 5.3.79	The Applicant may wish to clarify whether there would be any interim periods between the demolition of existing facilities and the operation of similar new facilities and, if there were, how operations would continue to function during any interim periods.
114.	p35, para 5.3.84	In the relevant chapters of the ES the Applicant will need to demonstrate how the worst case for issues such as noise, dust, air quality and traffic have been assessed for the construction working areas.



115.	p35, para 5.3.87, first bp	The Applicant should clarify whether crushing and screening operations would be conducted in the proposed waste processing area and, if so, the worst-case scenario for these operations in terms of noise, dust and air quality should be accounted for within the relevant assessments.
------	----------------------------	---

Statement of Engagement		
Ref No.	Paragraph	Comment/ Question
116.	Page 4-7, paragraph 4.3.5	The Applicant may wish to explain why a TWG was not initially formed to cover traffic and transportation issues and confirm whether the “ <i>Surface Access</i> ” that is referenced in paragraph 4.4.13 comprised a TWG. The Applicant should provide in an Appendix any presentations minutes/ meeting notes that are available from all of the various TWGs.

General

1. The Applicant should ensure that the final submitted application includes all the documentation/ information as required by Regulations 5 and 6 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009.
2. Where references are provided to other draft application documents it would be beneficial to provide the full title thereof inclusive of document reference number. Should further draft documents be provided for review, the Applicant may wish to consider providing a full list of known application documents (for purpose of signposting) as well as their respective reference number.
3. [\[MHCLG\] Application form guidance](#), paragraph 3, states: “*The application must be of a standard which the Secretary of State considers satisfactory: Section 37(3) of the Planning Act requires the application to specify the development to which it relates, be made in the prescribed form, be accompanied by the consultation report, and be accompanied by documents and information of a prescribed description. The Applications Regulations set out the prescribed form at Schedule 2, and prescribed documents and information at regulations 5 and 6.*”

