

Minutes of a special meeting of the Gatwick Airport Consultative Committee (GATCOM) held on 26 November 2021 by videoconference.

Meeting held with pre-booked public attendance of 8 persons to observe proceedings.

GATCOM Members:

Tom Crowley	Chairman
Jeff Alexander	Gatwick Diamond Business
Claire Booth (substitute)	Vice-Chair, Passenger Advisory Group (PAG)
Cllr. Helyn Clack	Surrey County Council, (Vice-Chair)
Graeme Connor (substitute)	Airlines UK
Fran Downton	Tourism South East
Jonathan Drew	Chair, Gatwick Noise Management Executive Board
Cllr. Carolyn Evans	Charlwood Parish Council
Cllr. Malcolm Fillmore	Rusper Parish Council
Cllr. Mike George	Horley Town Council
Alan Jones	Burstow Parish Council
Cllr. Liz Kitchen	Horsham District Council
Cllr. Liz Lockwood	Tandridge District Council
Hugh McConnellogue	Gatwick Airline Operators Committee
Cllr. Margot McArthur	Kent County Council
Cllr. Atif Nawaz	Crawley Borough Council
Cllr. Caroline Salmon	Mole Valley District Council
Cllr. Rupert Simmons	East Sussex County Council
Richard Streatfield	Environmental and Amenity Groups
Cllr. Steve Waight	West Sussex County Council

Also in attendance:

Tim Norwood	Director of Corporate Affairs, Planning and Sustainability, Gatwick Airport Ltd (GAL)
Andy Sinclair	Head of Airspace Strategy & Engagement GAL
Melanie Wrightson	Stakeholder Engagement Manager GAL
Steve Mitchell	Noise Consultant GAL
Jonathan Deegan	DCO Lead, GAL
Richard Higgins	Surface Access Lead, GAL
Lee Howes	Airspace and Environmental Performance Manager, GAL
Craig Owen	Public Affairs Lead, GAL
Richard Lennard	Economic Partnerships Lead, GAL
Andrew Walters	Crawley Borough Council, DCO Consultant
Paula Street	GATCOM Secretariat
Suzannah Hill	GATCOM Secretariat

Apologies

73. Apologies were received from Cllr. Richard Biggs (Reigate and Banstead Borough Council), Chris Carter (Airlines UK), Ana Christie (Sussex Chamber of Commerce), Angie Hills (ABTA), Samantha Williams (PAG Chair), Matt Wragg (Coast to Capital Local Economic Partnership).

Gatwick Northern Runway Project: Pre-Application Consultation

a) GAL Presentation: Surface Access Considerations

74. Richard Higgins, Surface Access Lead, GAL presented an overview of the anticipated surface access impact of the proposed Gatwick Northern Runway Project and GAL's assumptions for meeting future capacity (copy of [presentation slides](#) attached to the signed minutes). Key points made in the presentation concerned the assessments GAL has undertaken, proposed mitigation, construction and parking together with plans for future monitoring. Mr Higgins explained that the information and full details were set out in [Chapter 12](#) of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PIER) published as part of the pre-application consultation material.

75. Members raised the following points:

- i. There was concern about an absence of data relating to the use of the road network north of the airport beyond the M23, particularly the A217 and the A23 where congestion is already experienced at various junctions on those roads between Horley and Redhill. GAL clarified that high level assessment work on the overall change across a wide network had been undertaken. A few notable changes had been identified but the assessment work had shown the level of change on some of the other routes to be of a much lower order. The A217 and A23 access into Longbridge roundabout was identified as part of local improvements needed but there was awareness of constraints further along those routes which contributed to traffic using the M23 as they got more congested. GAL advised that the consultation documents and supporting material provided more information on specific flows on local networks.
- ii. The possibility of Smart Motorways being discontinued was highlighted and it was questioned whether account had been taken of the impact should the M23 revert to a three-lane motorway from the current four-lane. GAL explained that while this was being debated there were no plans for the motorway to revert to three-lanes and assessments had been based on what was currently in place. GAL will take into account any change to SMART motorway policies should this be necessary.
- iii. Reference was made to price-driven parking and GAL's efforts to make parking in local roads, including those in Horley, unattractive to drivers from a price perspective. GAL acknowledged the current problems with unauthorised car parking activities in local roads close to the airport which continues to be discussed with key stakeholders. GAL's assessment assumed a reduction in off-airport parking but if that was not the case, GAL's preference is to reduce the impact but that did not necessarily mean providing additional car parking spaces. GAL continue to work with local authorities to address the issue.
- iv. GAL was asked to clarify whether it would pay for all the proposed highway mitigation schemes or whether the local authorities would need to fund some of the works. It was explained that the proposed mitigations were budgeted for as part of the project and GAL would not seek contributions from local authorities.
- v. The possibility that the local highway authorities, particularly Surrey County Council, may identify through their own assessments that further road improvements may be required as the DCO process continued. Reassurance was sought from GAL as to whether any additional works associated with the accommodating growth from the project would be funded by GAL. There was also an absence of any commitment from GAL to help fund public transport initiatives. GAL confirmed that it is committed to providing mitigation as identified as part of the project and modelling. The consultation material

makes clear that GAL is committed to increasing passenger and staff trips to the airport by public transport modes. The planning process will identify where there are impacts on particular road junctions. If GAL was to identify the need for additional mitigation on other parts of the network through revised modelling and further assessment, it would look to make contributions as part of the project.

- vi. It was questioned whether the substantial growth in passenger numbers would affect the future capacity of the M23 and M25. GAL explained that the plans drawn up related to traffic numbers in 2019 and traffic behaviour prior to the pandemic, but that the design of the Smart Motorway took into some future airport growth, but not the proposed northern runway project, alongside background growth. The assessment had therefore looked at possible impact at Junction 9 and the motorway spur. Included in the project was the widening of the eastbound spur but no other improvements were showing as being required. If additional improvements were identified as necessary through revised modelling, GAL would look, as part of the planning process, at how it would contribute to those improvements.
- vii. Timing of delivering the highway improvements mitigation was questioned. GAL confirmed that the assessment of need indicated highway improvements would be required after 2029, and that although there were plans for some modest improvements at the North and South Terminals prior to that date, those were not Northern Runway related.

b) GAL presentation – proposed noise envelope and proposed noise envelope scheme

76. GAL's Noise Consultant, Steve Mitchell, presented an overview of the proposed Northern Runway Project air noise mitigation and specifically the proposed Noise Insulation Scheme and proposed Noise Envelope (copy of [presentation slides](#) attached to the signed minutes). He also explained the process for development of the proposed noise envelope and confirmed that the DCO pre-application consultation signalled the start of the noise envelope development process. There was scope for interested parties to influence the final designs as the DCO process progressed. GATCOM also heard that a range of noise envelope options had been considered. The key focus was to provide a guarantee to local residents that the airport must be quieter than it was in 2019 before the Northern Runway can operate at its full planned capacity.

77. Members raised the following points for clarification:
- i. Whether GAL was prepared to go out to individual parish councils and speak to people about the noise mitigation schemes on how their properties might be affected, including what mitigations could be offered for listed buildings. Mr Mitchell made the point that the consultation closed on the following Wednesday so any input for the consultation would need to be made by then. It was agreed to discuss this particular request outside the meeting.
 - ii. What plans existed to deal with specified noise impacts on communities outside of the noise contours to be limited by the noise envelope, such as noise disturbance experienced in the northern parishes of East Sussex. It was explained that whilst these areas would fall outside the boundary of the proposed noise contours, the measures needed to meet the requirements of the noise envelope implied noise control, improvements and benefits would be felt in other areas beyond the noise contours boundaries.
 - iii. When would the noise insulation scheme be offered, given the long construction period. It was explained that the aircraft noise insulation scheme would be offered at the point at which the project construction commenced. GAL also confirmed that there would be another noise insulation scheme for

- the construction phase of the project which would be offered in advance of the construction works commencing. More information on that scheme would be given to GATCOM at a later date. It was possible that there would be an overlap of the two schemes which would be dealt with at that point in time.
- iv. Whether mitigation was available for houses with regard to ground noise vibration. It was confirmed that the noise insulation scheme covered ground noise.
 - v. Whether insulation provided by previous schemes could be updated as part of the new scheme. GAL explained that people could reapply for updated insulation under the new scheme.
 - vi. Whether any mitigation was intended to address aircraft engine testing and ground run noise. It was explained that the engine test pattern was not expected to change significantly as a result of the project although there was a reconfigured noise bund proposed for the western boundary of the airport.
 - vii. Whether there was a detailed zone map showing the neighbourhoods and roads that would be eligible for the scheme. It was explained that some larger scale maps were available in the PIER documentation but that higher resolution maps would be provided at a later date.
 - viii. Confirmation of the square kilometre areas covered in the forecast contour areas compared with the current 2019 contour areas and the justification for the use of those contour areas, particularly at night. It was confirmed that the current 2019 daytime 51 dB Leq area was 136.0sqkm and the night-time 45 dB Leq area was 159.4sqkm. The origin of using these contours is consistent with the DfT advice on the Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Levels.
 - ix. The need for reassurance that GAL will work closely and in a meaningful way with local authorities and stakeholders. There was concern that to date engagement with local authorities had been less than satisfactory. It was confirmed that GAL will work closely with local authorities post consultation as the project design evolves.

c) Local Authority Pre-application engagement

78. Andrew Walters, Crawley Borough Council's (CBC) Consultant provided an overview of his coordination role for the host and neighbouring local authorities and how the local authorities were collaborating in responding to and engaging with the Northern Runway DCO process.

79. Mr Walters was employed by CBC to work with all the Section 42 local authority consultees in supporting and coordinating their technical response throughout the DCO process. Mr Walters explained that following the close of GAL's pre-application consultation the local authorities' work would continue. GAL is under an obligation to inform the local authorities of its consultation findings and its response to enable the local authorities to further consider the proposed mitigation and GAL's commitments as the detailed design of the project evolved. The local authorities' objective is to be as proactive and supportive of the process as they can, within limits of resource and technical capacity, and to be active participants to find some level of common ground where all the parties can reach agreement and to narrow the range of examinations at the DCO hearing. The local authorities are not aiming to constrain the process but will aim to make the process as efficient as possible so that at the examination the Planning Inspector has a full understanding of shared common ground and where there are objections and issues around points for examination. The Secretary of State will make the final decision on the application based on the recommendations of the Planning Inspector.

80. To assist the local authorities' own technical teams review of GAL's consultation proposals and the PEIR they had jointly commissioned consultants [York Aviation](#) & [AECOM](#) to provide additional technical review of the consultation material to support their responses to the formal consultation.

81. Mr Walters explained that the Section 106 agreement to sit alongside the DCO will be negotiated and agreed between GAL as the promoter of the project and the lead host authority, CBC (working with the other local authorities). The views of GATCOM would need to be expressed meaningfully and formally to GAL and the local authorities.

d) Suggested GATCOM response to consultation

82. Paula Street, Deputy Secretary, gave an overview of the Secretariat's paper (copy attached to the signed minutes) containing a draft response to GAL's pre-application consultation for approval by the Committee. Mrs Street also advised that since the publication of the report comments had been received from some members suggesting revisions to the suggested draft GATCOM response set out in Appendix 1 of the Secretariat's paper. The comments received had been circulated to GATCOM members in advance of the meeting for consideration (copy also attached to the signed minutes).

83. The Chairman emphasised that GAL's Northern Runway project was a complex and contentious matter and that he wished to structure the Committee's debate firstly on the Secretariat's published report and proposed response to allow further questions and suggestions, following which the Committee would then be asked to consider the additional comments received from members in advance of the meeting. He also explained that in the event of the Committee's position on any of the proposed comments was unclear and no consensus reached then those comments would be included in an Annex to GATCOM's response.

84. Members indicated their general support for the approach taken in the suggested draft response set out in the Secretariat's report and raised the following points:

- i. Paragraph 28 – the airlines had concern about the suggestion that GATCOM request a change to the proposed hours of use of the Northern Runway so that its use was restricted for the full 8 hour night period. They believed the primary benefits of growth and resilience at Gatwick would be diminished without access to the additional capacity in that peak hour (06:00-07:00). Airlines would prefer the proposed noise envelope design was used as the mechanism to ensure any growth outside the night quota period (23:30 – 06:00) is controlled.
- ii. Paragraph 5 – a couple of members suggested the inclusion of reference to the impact of the project construction traffic and noise on Smallfield and Lingfield.
- iii. A request to make a more robust reference in the response to the importance of the project to the regional visitor economy and in helping the 'building back' of the tourism and hospitality sectors.
- iv. concern from airline representatives about any suggestion to restrict the number of ground engine runs as there were already restrictions in place at Gatwick. Any further restrictions could restrict operators in carrying out mandatory safety tasks, although restrictions through the night period would be acceptable. GATCOM noted the concerns but it was highlighted that the suggested response was seeking triggers to seek additional mitigation to address the potential increase in ground running activity.

85. The environmental and amenity groups' representative advised that they could not support the suggested response without the inclusion of the amendments they had put forward in advance of the meeting.

86. Mrs Street referred to the list of comments that had been received from some members in advance of the meeting which had been circulated to all members. The Committee considered each of the comments in turn and agreed the following revisions to GATCOM's response:

- i. Paragraph 3 – Change reference of “manage and mitigate” to “reduce and mitigate”.
- ii. Inclusion of a new paragraph after Paragraph 4 to advise that seeking a reduction in the noise climate (aircraft noise as well as airport ground noise) is of key importance to local communities and people under flight paths, particularly during the night time and that the design of the proposed noise envelope must be progressed in partnership with all key stakeholders, including local communities. GATCOM also wished to see a noise envelope implemented irrespective of the outcomes of the DCO process.
- iii. Paragraph 5 – change last sentence to ensure the proposed mitigation/compensation schemes are agreed in advance with local communities. Also to include reference to the impact of construction traffic routing and noise on the villages of Smallfield and Lingfield.
- iv. Paragraph 7 to include a reference seeking a commitment from GAL not to operate a three-runway airport in the longer term;
- v. Paragraph 10 – include at the end of sentence “and other key stakeholders, including communities.”
- vi. Paragraph 12 – change reference of “limit and minimise” to “reduce and minimise”
- vii. Paragraph 14 – include new second sentence “Any increased use of the Crawley Goods Yard and Railhead, especially at night, would also be a significant concern.”
- viii. Paragraph 20 - include new sentence at the end of paragraph “Any increase in parking should be fully justified in the context of a sustainable surface access strategy.”
- ix. Paragraph 25 - to include reference to traffic impact on the local roads in Surrey, East and West Sussex and Kent areas in the immediate vicinity of the airport, also on the local road network in Surrey and Kent when disruption is experienced on both the M25 and M23. It was also felt premature to include ‘land west of Ifield’ and this reference should be removed.
- x. Paragraph 28 - GATCOM to maintain its previous position in respect of using the northern runway at night (paragraph 3.5 of the Secretariat’s report refers) but to note the airlines’ concerns.
- xi. Paragraph 31 – include reference that GAL should undertake the CAP1129 process and report back to GATCOM regularly on progress with a view to it being implemented irrespective of the outcome of the DCO process. Reference also needed to be made to the involvement of Gatwick’s Noise Management Board.
- xii. Paragraph 32 – include new sentence at end of paragraph “This is in addition to any other matters that appear appropriate to the design team for the formulation of the noise envelope.”
- xiii. Paragraph 40 – change wording of paragraph to reflect that GAL has subsequently published missing air quality evidence and that interested parties have not had time to consider the new information and will therefore need to submit comments on this aspect post consultation.
- xiv. Paragraph 41 – include in last sentence “a qualitative assessment” on ultrafine particles.
- xv. After paragraph 41, add a new paragraph making reference to the World Health Organisation (WHO) recommendations in the revised guidance on ambient air pollution and the importance of GAL considering the implications of any potential change in the UK standards in its assessments.
- xvi. Paragraph 43 – change wording of last sentence to reflect the fact that while some members of GATCOM see the potential national and regional economic

benefits of Gatwick's proposals there are other members who do not consider the economic benefits to outweigh the significant negative impacts arising from the scale of growth.

- xvii. After paragraph 45, to add a new paragraph to reference the importance of the project to support the building back of the regional visitor economy and the effect of that on tourism jobs, careers and skills development. To also reference the need for GAL's Outline Employment, Skills and Business Strategy to include an Implementation Plan to provide greater detail on initiatives, targets, objectives and implementation processes, which may not be covered in this outline strategy.
87. Those matters where there was no overall consensus included:
- xviii. The need for expansion: Some members believed Gatwick's proposals were not consistent with the requirement in the Airports National Policy Statement for it to demonstrate need for the development that is additional to (or different from) the need which is met by the provision of a Northwest Runway at Heathrow. Whereas some members believed the proposals were consistent with Government policy both in the Aviation Policy Framework (March 2013) and the "Beyond the Horizon – Making best use of existing runways" (June 2018). GATCOM noted however that this concern and difference of opinion had been addressed to a certain extent in paragraph 44 of the draft response which made reference to those reports commissioned by other organisations as part of their responses to the consultation on the economic benefits of and need for the project. The draft response requests that GAL gives full consideration to and takes in account the conclusions of those reports.
- xix. Transport: GATCOM discussed the outcomes of GAL's assessments and noted that the draft response calls for further assessment. However, there were some members who believed that GATCOM's response did not go far enough and wished to see GAL give a commitment that there would be no increase in the number of people accessing the airport by road. Whereas other members generally supported GAL's transport plans and the ambitious sustainable mode share targets for both passengers accessing the airport as well as staff.
- xx. Paragraph 15 – the Environmental and Amenity Groups' representative sought the inclusion of a new sentence to state that many GATCOM members find it hard to see how the very substantial increase in emissions forecast by Gatwick can be consistent with the government's policy that aviation makes a significant and cost-effective contribution towards reducing global emissions. Not all members supported this particular view but it was noted that the draft response acknowledged that many GATCOM member organisations had serious concerns about the significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions and the impact on climate change arising from Gatwick's growth plans. GATCOM was supportive of GAL's commitment to low carbon growth and wished to see a reduction trajectory set and a process by which GAL's progress can be monitored and remedial action taken in the event reduction targets are not being met.
- xxi. Paragraph 20 – members discussed the Environmental and Amenity Groups' representative's concerns about GAL's figures for additional car parking spaces needed to accommodate the project. However there was no agreement or position reached on the assumptions made.

88. Mrs Street also referred members to the Environmental and Amenity Groups' representative's three points in their "overall position" - (1) that Gatwick has not made a credible case for expansion (2) that it has serious doubts about the compatibility of the proposals with government and local policies in multiple respects

and (3) that the consultation is not fit for purpose because it does not provide sufficient, accurate information to allow informed responses. However, members were of the view that the overall position did not align with the Committee's draft response and the additional points that had been agreed during the meeting. Members also commented that GATCOM had not been briefed on or had the opportunity to consider the reports commissioned by other organisations to support their own response to GAL's consultation and as such it was not therefore appropriate for GATCOM to comment on those points. GATCOM did not agree the inclusion of the three points in the Committee's response but highlighted that paragraph 44 of the draft response made reference to the reports commissioned by other organisations and the need for GAL to take into consideration the findings of those reports.

89. The Chairman referred GATCOM to the recommendations as set out in the Secretariat's report. It was agreed:

- (1) That, subject to the inclusion of additional comments agreed at the Special Meeting as set out above including the incorporation of an Annex to reflect those matters on which no consensus was reached; the suggested response set out in Appendix 1 of the Secretariat's report be approved and submitted to GAL;
- (2) That GAL be asked to report to a future meeting on those issues of common concern and how they are intended to be addressed, resolved and mitigated, so that all parties have a clear understanding of how the social, environmental and economic impacts and benefits of growth are considered;
- (3) That the draft Heads of Terms of the new Section 106 Agreement be shared with GATCOM at the earliest possible time as part of the DCO process;
- (4) That, at the appropriate time, GATCOM registers as an Interested Party in the DCO examination process and, if necessary, prepare to make written representations to the Planning Inspectorate; and
- (5) That GAL provide an update on the changes/updates made to the current extension of the Section 106 agreement to the GATCOM Steering Group meeting on 7 January.

90. The Environmental and Amenity Groups' representative advised however that he reserved judgement on the response agreed until community groups had seen the amended response. This position was noted.

Date of Next Meeting

91. It was noted that the next meeting of GATCOM was scheduled to take place on 20 January 2022 with the GATCOM Steering Group meeting taking place before that on 7 January.

Chairman