

Meeting note

Project name	Gatwick Airport Northern Runway
File reference	TR020005
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	19 May 2023
Meeting with	Gatwick Airport Limited (the Applicant)
Venue	Microsoft Teams
Meeting objectives	Pre-submission logistics 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.

Pre-submission matters

The Inspectorate explained that it would be shortly issuing pre-submission ‘warm-up’ letters to the Applicant, comprising the Acceptance fee request letter and a second letter requesting the submission of the Applicant’s Geographic Information System (GIS) shapefile, local authority contact information, and an electronic application document index. The Inspectorate noted that the Applicant had already provided the electronic index. The Inspectorate advised that it would also be sending out ‘warm-up’ letters to the local authorities once in receipt of the relevant contact information.

The Inspectorate queried how the Applicant planned to submit the application documents. The Applicant confirmed that it planned to use SharePoint¹. The Inspectorate explained that it did not have a preferred submission platform, however it stressed the importance of testing the chosen platform to ensure files were accessible to the Inspectorate’s Case Team. It was established that the Development Consent Order (DCO) application documents would be published following the Acceptance stage, should the application be accepted for examination.

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant to ensure that all PDF documents within its DCO application were searchable, and that any confidential application documents should be submitted with an accompanying ‘holding’ document which could be

¹ Post-meeting note: The Applicant has since advised that it proposes to use a dedicated file transfer service instead of SharePoint.

published in its place. The Applicant was referred to [Advice Note 6](#) for further guidance on file size and document submission details.

The Inspectorate advised that although hard copy application documents would not be required at Acceptance, an Examining Authority (ExA) may request certain hard copy documents, such as plans or the DCO, during Examination (should the application be accepted for Examination).

The Inspectorate advised the Applicant that during Acceptance it was possible for the Inspectorate to request to be provided with all responses to the Applicant's statutory consultation under Regulation 5(5) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. The Applicant was advised to ensure it was prepared for this eventuality.

Intended post-Acceptance programme

The Applicant provided an overview of its intended programme following the Acceptance stage. The Applicant's intention was for the Relevant Representation period to commence in early August 2023 for approximately six weeks. Any updated application documents sought post-Acceptance would be submitted to the Inspectorate to ensure they were available in time for the Relevant Representation period. The Inspectorate also urged the Applicant to begin considering possible hearing venues and audio/ visual production companies, with attention paid to any possible local elections that may affect hearings or the wider Relevant Representation timeline.

Any other business

The Applicant explained that the 10 local authorities closest to the Proposed Development had been engaging as a group throughout the consultation process to date, and queried whether a joint Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the group would be acceptable. The Inspectorate advised that this is ultimately the decision of an appointed ExA; however, the Inspectorate advised the Applicant to consider whether a joint SoCG may be problematic if the authorities were affected differently by certain issues.

