



Horsham  
District  
Council



## **Gatwick Northern Runway Project DCO (Project Reference: TR020005)**

**Deadline 6 Submission (26 June 2024)**

**Crawley Borough Council (IP Ref: GATW-AFP107),**

**West Sussex County Council (IP Ref: 20044715),**

**Horsham District Council (IP Ref: 20044739) and**

**Mid Sussex District Council (IP Ref: 20044737)**

### **1. Overview**

1.1 This document provides a response at Deadline 6 (26 June 2024) from the above West Sussex Joint Local Authorities comprising Crawley Borough Council, West Sussex County Council, Mid Sussex District Council and Horsham District Council (hereafter the "Authorities") on the following responses to the Applicant's Deadline 5 Submissions :

- [REP5-018] 4.7 Parameter Plans - For Approval Version 3
- [REP5-019] 4.8.2 Surface Access Highways Plans – Engineering Section Drawings - For Approval Version 2
- [REP5 -026] 5.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.9.3 Water Quality HEWRAT Assessment Version 2 (Tracked)
- [REP5-027] 5.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment - Annexes 3-6 Version 2
- [REP5-031] 7.3 Design and Access Statement Appendix 1 - Design Principles Version 4 (Clean) / [REP5-032] (Tracked) in respect of drainage commentary (tied to commentary documents above)
- [REP5-067] 10.31 Outline Reptile Mitigation Strategy Version 1
- [REP5-068] 10.32 Environmental Appraisal of the Impact of the Post-Covid 19 Traffic Data for the Environmental Statement Version 1
- [REP5-069] 10.33 Supporting Ecology Technical Notes Version 1 Document Index
- [REP5-070] 10.35 Response to Rule 17 Letter Waste Management Assessment Version 1

- [REP5-072] 10.38 The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions Version 1
- [REP5-073] 10.38 Appendix A - Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities - Air Quality Version 1
- [REP5-078] 10.38 Appendix F - Note on Pentagon Field Version 1
- [REP5-108], Updated PADSSs from Network Rail

## **1. [REP5-018] 4.7 Parameter Plans - For Approval Version 3**

1.1 There are no detailed comments in respect of the amended parameter plans which have not altered significantly from the earlier revision and show the maximum heights as reflected in Schedule 13.

1.2 There are two points of clarification sought in respect of these documents.

- In respect of Works Plan 99101 P02 – Works Area 28 (Car Park H). It appears from the written text in the ES Chapter 8, page 81 Table 8.7.1 which sets out the maximum design scenarios [APP-033] that the wireline plans are based on a maximum height of building at 27m with no reference to any 'associated elements' such as roof plant or lighting Columns. The plans show an additional 6m added to the top of this parameter drawing 'associated elements'. Are the visualisations correct for the site given the commentary in the Chapter 8 of the ES or do they need to be redrawn to account for the additional 6 metres?.
- It is unclear why the Applicant has adopted a different approach has been adopted for Works Area 28. The Authorities would like confirmation that for all other parameter plans the maximum height includes all plant and equipment and in the case of the decked and multi-storey car parks includes the height of any proposed lighting columns.

## **2. [REP5-019] 4.8.2 Surface Access Highways Plans – Engineering Section Drawings - For Approval Version 2**

2.1 WSCC as Highway Authority note that the Applicant has submitted revised Surface Access Highway Plans - Engineering Section Drawings [REP5-019] at Deadline 5. The Highway Authority note that these have been updated regarding engagement with National Highways, in relation to the Vertical Limits of Deviation for the surface access works. The Highway Authority have reviewed these revised plans and have no comments to make on them at this time.

**3. [REP5 –026] 5.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.9.3 Water Quality HEWRAT Assessment Version 2 (Tracked)**

3.1 The Applicant has responded stating that the water quality assessment during the operational phase of the proposed Highway works has been assessed using the HEWRAT approach (2.1.3, 2.1.4 and 2.1.5). The Applicant has decided to use the SuDS manual simple index approach to carry out the car park car parking surface water quality assessment. It is noted that under 2.1.5 step 3 the use of SuDS has been proposed to mitigate the potential pollution from the highway works based on the HEWRAT assessment. Ideally, the Applicant should use the SuDS manual approach it is adopting for the car park assessment as the primary assessment tool for the proposed highway works since the mitigation features are SuDS based, but as a minimum the Applicant should use the SuDS manual assessment as a secondary control measure to prove that water quality assessment has been properly covered. This approach will also provide a common assessment tool for all water quality related matters rather than cherry picking the assessment tool that suits them on the same water quality issue.

**4. [REP5-027] 5.3 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment - Annexes 3-6 Version 2**

4.1 The Applicant has stated in 1.1.1 that there are no changes made because no new substantive impacts have been identified and the conclusions reported in the original report are unchanged. It has also made a statement in 1.3.8 that where an increase in flood risk offsite was identified mitigation was developed and included to ensure no increase in offsite flood risk for the duration of the project incorporating the predicted effects of climate change and that any increases to flood risk onsite would be managed through Gatwick's existing flood management response procedures. This statement makes it clear that residual risks were not taken into consideration and used to influence the design of mitigation features. It is important to state here that *National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS)* paragraph 5.94 explains the need for developers to provide a Flood Risk assessment and identifies the need for residual risks to be taken into consideration when flood mitigation strategies are proposed for road infrastructure. Furthermore, the *Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS)* Paragraphs 5.147 and 5.148 requires that the impact of climate change should be considered over the lifetime of the proposed development and that the Applicant, ExA and the Secretary of State should take this into account in decision taking.

4.2 It is stated in 3.2.1 that the 25% climate change (CC) has been used to design the mitigation measures and the 40% CC adopted as a

sensitivity test for an exceedance event. While the Applicant's use of the 25% 2080's epoch is based on the EA's CC allowance, it should be noted that the 2080's epoch is up to 2125 while the Applicant's proposal is to commence the use of the both the airfield and the surface access infrastructure in 2032 and with a 100 years life span the structures are meant to fulfil their structural obligation requirement up to 2132. This is seven years after the 2080's epoch. Therefore, the Authorities consider that the Applicant should either use a 40% CC to design the mitigation measures or states what consideration has been given to the time period between 2125 and 2132 in relation to the design of the flood compensation/mitigation strategy.

- 4.3 Relating to the adopted lifetime of the airfield works of 40 years, it is understood from our desk top studies that most of the Applicant's present structures that can be classified as airfield structures are well over forty years in age and are currently in use. Although the Applicant has stated that a joint 100 years mitigation strategy has been developed for both the surface and airfield access works, the Authorities are requesting a categorical statement or further information on the Applicant's proposal to how these structures will be dealt with after 2072.

**5. [REP5-031] 7.3 Design and Access Statement Appendix 1 - Design Principles Version 4 (Clean) / [REP5-032] (Tracked)**

- 5.1 The following comment relates to drainage commentary set in the proceeding sections (3 and 4). Further detailed comments on this document are set out in the Joint Authorities response as Design Note appended to the ISH8 Actions Response Document.
- 5.2 The Authorities would recommend that the climate change allowance is increased to 40%, as per our previous comments to DDP1. No further comments from the Authorities regarding drainage solutions related to ecology.

**6. [REP5-067] 10.31 Outline Reptile Mitigation Strategy Version 1**

- 6.1 This strategy is welcomed. It is requested that the following are addressed:
- Whilst it is recognised that grass snake was the only reptile species encountered during the reptile surveys in 2019, this strategy should cover all reptile species, including slow-worm, if subsequently found to be present.
  - Section 1.1.2 states that the ECoW will instruct a full reptile survey where potential reptile habitat has to be cleared. If there is a high

likelihood of reptiles being present, might it not be best to instigate trapping and translocation immediately rather than conduct another reptile survey? It would be helpful to have a brief explanation of what constitutes a full reptile survey, if that is indeed proposed.

- It would be helpful if the Reptile Mitigation Strategy could include an indicative timescale for the creation and establishment of the Museum Field receptor site. It is critically important that it is created and fully established before any reptiles are released. Whilst the site chosen in Museum Field is existing pasture bounded to the west by mature hedgerow and to the north by the tree-lined Man's Brook, a range of habitat enhancements are proposed, including the creation of species-rich grassland and the planting of mixed scrub and broadleaved woodland. Presumably these habitat enhancements will therefore be undertaken in advance.
- It would also be helpful to understand whether there is any possibility of reptiles being released into the Museum Field receptor site before construction works have ceased elsewhere within the Museum Field/Brook Farm area. If so, measures may be required to exclude reptiles from construction sites.
- Section 2.3.5 suggests that the reptile receptor site will be subdivided into compartments. The purpose of these compartments isn't understood.
- The species and number of reptiles found during any survey, and trapping and translocation exercise, must be fully documented and reported.

## **7. [REP5-068] 10.32 Environmental Appraisal of the Impact of the Post-Covid 19 Traffic Data for the Environmental Statement Version 1**

- 7.1 West Sussex County Council (WSCC) as Highway Authority, have reviewed 10.32 Environmental Appraisal of the Impact of the Post Covid 19 Traffic Data for the Environmental Statement Version 1 [REP5-068]. This document was submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 5 and is as a result of the ExA's Procedural Decision [PD-006] requesting further information on the impact of the Department for Transport's (DfT) updated Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG) Unit M4 of May 2023, regarding the impacts of the Covid 19 pandemic. The Applicant previously submitted the technical note, Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling [AS-121]. This note presented the revised transport modelling that was undertaken to take account of the changes to travel as a result of Covid 19 and used post Covid traffic data. REP5-068 presents the Applicant's environmental appraisal of the post-Covid 19 transport modelling and sets out how the environmental effects of the project compared with those originally presented within the Environmental Statement. The Applicant has

assessed the traffic and transport environmental effects of the revised post-Covid transport modelling on severance, driver delay, pedestrian and cyclist amenity and effects of crowding on rail services on public transport amenity.

- 7.2 The post Covid 19 transport modelling showed that a 2023 present day scenario was forecast to experience generally lower traffic flows than those originally observed when using 2016 traffic data. The modelling work also showed that forecasts for the future year scenarios (2029, 2032, 2038 and 2047) were also lower than those originally presented in both the Transport Assessment [REP3-058] and ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [REP3-106].
- 7.3 The post-Covid 19 transport modelling has the effect of reducing the environmental impacts related to Traffic and Transport, when compared to the assessment included in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [REP3-016]. There are some different locations identified, as potentially experiencing environmental impacts as a result of the Project, however overall, the Applicant concludes that the post-Covid 19 modelling does not indicate any new or materially different significant effects.
- 7.4 WSCC, as Highway Authority, note the conclusions drawn in relation to the environmental impacts of the traffic and transport implications of the post-Covid 19 modelling.
- 7.5 In terms of greenhouse gas emissions, the Applicant notes there will be a minor reduction in the use of public transport leading in turn to an increase in private car journeys. The impact of this is an increase in greenhouse gas emissions of less than 1% annually. The impact on the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Carbon Budgets is less than 0.1%. It is concluded that there will be not materials change to the outcome of the GHG assessment presented in the Environmental Statement. Furthermore, no material impacts were identified in terms of Climate Change impacts beyond those already identified in the Climate Change chapter of the Environmental Statement.
- 7.6 For air quality we welcome the approach taken to the air quality assessment to determine an air quality study area for road traffic using a conventional approach, unlike the inappropriate approach taken in REP5-081. Additionally, the provision of pollutant concentrations and changes in concentrations for 2047 from road traffic is also welcomed. However, it appears that other sources of pollutants have not been updated for 2047, but have been represented using 2038 predictions. Further information to understand how the predictions would change if these other sources were updated for 2047 is requested.

- 7.7 We note the numbers of links being screened in for 2029, 2032 and 2038 listed in Table 3.5 and that 5% of the ARN changes in 2047. Some associated figures or shapefiles of these areas would be helpful for the Authorities to visualise these locations.
- 7.8 It should be noted that the Authorities' reservations concerning how appropriate the 2029 assessment scenario is for air quality remain as described below.

**8. [REP5-069] 10.33 Supporting Ecology Technical Notes Version 1 Document Index**

- 8.1 The Authorities welcome this additional information on hedgerows, and bats and noise. The survey findings and conclusions are noted.
- 8.2 The submission of hedgerow survey data is welcomed and substantiates their findings within section 3.3 of ES Appendix 9.6.2 Ecology Survey Report [APP-125] with regard to important hedgerows.

**9. [REP5-070] 10.35 Response to Rule 17 Letter Waste Management Assessment Version 1**

- 9.1 The Authorities note the response to the Rule 17 letter (REP5-070) regarding waste management assessments, that points to other documents that form part of the examination. The Authorities have no specific comments to this document; however, it should be noted that comments have been submitted on other documents related to waste management, and some issues still remain.

**10. [REP5-072] 10.38 The Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions Version – Response to ExQ1**

**Table 5 - Cumulative Effects from the Legal Partnership Authorities**

- 10.1 The Authorities remain extremely concerned at the quantum of development which has been excluded from the modelling, and consider that, if the Applicant is reliant on this level of future development coming forward to support the Project in socioeconomic terms, it stands to reason the same level of future development must be tested under the core scenario.
- 10.2 The Applicant makes reference to the Authorities' comments on Land West of Southwater. It should be clarified that the concern raised by the Authorities relates to the draft Local Plan allocation (HA3: Land

North West of Southwater) for 1,000 homes, 4.0ha of commercial space, primary and secondary schools and not to the development currently under construction. The Horsham District Local Plan is now due for submission in early July 2024.

**Table 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation**

- 10.3 EN.1.5 Biodiversity Net Gain: The Authorities note the Applicant’s response regarding the BNG baseline.
- 10.4 EN.1.7 Reprovision of Woodland Habitat: The Applicant’s response does not address our concerns regarding loss of woodland and the need to provide additional compensatory woodland planting, either on-site or off-site.
- 10.5 The Authorities are pleased to hear that the Applicant is considering additional tree planting across the Order Limits.
- 10.6 The Applicant’s response does not address our points regarding new planting, including off-site, and bird strike risk. The JLAs welcome response at ISH8 that proposing to meet CBLP Policy CH6 which requires replacement tree planting (or offsite funding) to reflect the maturity of trees to be lost, and await information as to how this is to be achieved.
- 10.7 EN.1.9 Monitoring and Maintenance of Woodland Planting: Response acknowledged.
- 10.8 EN.1.12 Light Spill from MSCP Y: The Authorities acknowledge the response regarding measures to ensure that lighting does not impact bats or the quality of the woodland.
- 10.9 EN.1.13 Bat Roost Surveys: The Authorities welcome this update on tree climbing surveys for bat roosts. They reiterate that mitigation measures may need to be updated, pending results.
- 10.10 EN.1.14 Great Crested Newts: The Authorities note the response that a draft GCN mitigation licence is being prepared for submission to Natural England and that this will contain details of the approach to mitigation, translocation and receptor sites. It would, however, be helpful to be aware of some of the details, including the location of the receptor sites, advance management requirements of the receptor sites and measures to maintain existing GCN populations.

**Table 9: General and Cross-Topic from the Legal Partnership Authorities**

- 10.11 With regard to the Applicant’s response to GEN 1.5, Crawley Borough Council (CBC) awaits receipt of the Local Plan Inspectors’ Final Report



but would note that the proposed allocation of land formerly safeguarded for a potential future southern runway removes a relatively small area of land from safeguarding, lying to the east of the airport and identified on the southern runway masterplan for car parking. As set out at Paragraph 18 of the Inspectors' Post Hearings Advice Letter (31 January 2024), the Council's approach to the safeguarded land, and the principle of a strategic employment land allocation at Gatwick Green is found to be soundly based. The Applicant is correct in its response that the reference to a Plan review trigger in paragraph 1.33 of the Adopted Local Plan is incorrect – this falls within paragraphs 1.38 and 1.39, as well as the cited paragraph 9.17.

- 10.12 Whilst CBC accepts that it is not the role of DCO examination to consider the anticipated need for a full wide-spaced southern runway at Gatwick in the future, nor to determine national aviation policy, CBC does consider that, should a decision be made in support of the Northern Runway project, there should then follow national consideration of the future of safeguarding requirements. As stated in the Authorities' response, CBC would seek this from the Secretary of State to provide certainty.

**Table 13: Landscape, Townscape and Visual Resources**

- 10.13 The Applicant's response to point C states that the temporary removal of a 12m section of hedgerow will be required within H32. This has not been identified within the Tree Retention and Removals Plans found within the Code of Construction Practice Annex 6 – Outline Arboricultural and Vegetation Method Statements [REP3-022, REP3-023, REP3-024, REP3-025, REP3-026, REP3-027]. Nor has it been identified how such replacement planting has been accounted for within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP4-012, REP4-013, REP4-014, REP4-015, REP4-016].

**Table 17 - Socio-Economic from the Legal Partnership Authorities**

- 10.14 SE1.5 There is no acknowledgment in the Applicant's response of the skills shortages that have been evidenced in JLA submissions, including LIR [REP1-068]. As stated previously, the Local Authorities raised these concerns at the Topic Working Group meetings and it appears that the Applicant is still failing to acknowledge this.
- 10.15 SE.1.6 Whilst further discussion on Steering Group membership is welcomed, at time of submission of this response (26<sup>th</sup> June) there is no Topic Working Group programmed with GAL. (Note there is a Workshop in July to discuss the ESBS and IP)

- 10.16 SE 1.13 The Authorities believe they have provided sufficient rationale for why an assessment of property prices should be undertaken. GAL themselves stated at one of the Topic Working Group meetings that they would do this. The Applicant has not provided further information despite this being a long-standing request from PINS, and the Authorities await the views of the ExA as to whether the Applicant's written response is considered satisfactory.

#### **Table 20 - Traffic and Transport**

- 10.17 TT.1.3: The Authorities note the Applicant's confirmation (also clarified at ISH8) that its transport model includes all car trips to and from the Airport, including for authorised on-airport car parks that are not operated by GAL. The Authorities consider the Applicant's terminology, referring to non-GAL operated authorised on-airport car parks as 'off-airport', to be unnecessarily confusing. The Applicant's definition does not reflect the approach of Local Plan Policy GAT3, which is clear in treating all passenger parking within the Airport Boundary (as shown on the Local Plan Map) as 'on-airport', irrespective of the operator. To avoid unnecessary ambiguity, the Applicant should use terminology that is consistent with the Crawley Local Plan GAT3 approach to 'on-airport', or (as discussed at ISH8) provide clear explanation in its documentation clarifying its alternative definition of 'on-airport', and confirming (as set out in Table 20) that trips to/from non-GAL operated on-airport car parks are included in the transport modelling.

#### **Table 45 - Traffic and Transport**

- 10.18 **17.1N:** Please refer to the Authorities' response to Table 20 (TT.1.3) above.
- 10.19 **17.1.O:** The Authorities note the Applicant's response explaining that 2023 Staff Travel Survey results reflect a point in time at which the airport is continuing to recover from the pandemic and that it has not therefore fed into strategic modelling work. Future staff travel surveys will be important in monitoring compliance with the SACs.
- The Highway Authority previously requested further transport modelling information to enable them to fully appraise the forecast traffic impact of the project. This was set out in West Sussex LIR [REP1- 068] and in the Authorities' comments on submissions received at Deadline1 [REP2-042]. In relation to further information being provided on queue lengths, the Applicant has stated that this information is being worked through with National Highways and that it will be shared with WSCC when the information is finalised. This is expected to be before Deadline 6. At the time of writing this information has yet to be provided but WSCC as Highway Authority shall review and comment upon it once it is received.

- The Highway Authority have previously requested that a standalone LINSIG model is developed for the signalised junction at North Terminal. This is because it would provide metrics, such as Practical Reserve Capacity (PRC) or Degree of Saturation (DoS), that aren't provided by the VISSIM model. These metrics which would better quantify junction performance and capacity and therefore provide a better understanding of the likely impacts of the project on this part of the network. The Applicant has previously stated that a standalone LINSIG model was not required because it was part of the VISSIM model area. So, it is welcomed that the Applicant has now confirmed that they are going to undertake a standalone LINSIG model. As and when this is received the Highway Authority will review and provide comment upon it.
- The Highway Authority have requested further information from the Applicant about the potential for Strategic Road Network (SRN) traffic displacing onto the local road network, due to capacity issues on the SRN, and suggested a Select Link Analysis could be undertaken. The Highway Authority met with the Applicant on the 10<sup>th</sup> May 2024 to discuss transport modelling matters. Further information in relation to this request has been provided and is being assessed by the Highway Authority. The Highway Authority will continue to engage with the Applicant in relation to these transport modelling matters.
- In relation to Reference 17.1C, and the Joint Local Authorities request for the inclusion of a Highway Structural Maintenance Contribution within the S106 agreement, this remains a point of disagreement between the parties. The Joint Local Authorities are of the view that a contribution is necessary to mitigate the increase in costs of maintaining, in a good state of repair, the local road network during the construction period, due to the forecast increase in HGVs as a direct result of the project. The Applicant does not consider it necessary and is of the view that the Transport Mitigation Fund (TMF) would cover these matters. The TMF is for unforeseen impacts of the project and the likely damage to the carriageway, as a result of increased HGV movement associated with the construction of the project, is not an unforeseen impact. Also, as currently drafted the TMF is only required to be set up on commencement of dual runway operations and therefore substantial construction, and potential damage to the highway, could have occurred prior to the fund being available for use. Therefore, the Joint Local Authorities remain of the view that a Highway Structural Maintenance Contribution is required to cover the additional damage to the highway asset that could occur as a direct result of the Project, and that such a request, accords with Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. The precedent for such payments has been set in other DCOs, including

the Sizewell C DCO. The Highway Authority will continue to engage with the Applicant with a view to agreeing the inclusion of an appropriately worded obligation in the S106 agreement.

- Reference 17.1G highlights the Applicant's response to the Local Authorities request to consider bus priority measures, in order to implement infrastructure which will offer journey time savings to sustainable modes of transport and therefore increase their potential attractiveness over the use of private cars. Bus priority measures would also assist in contributing to maximising the use of sustainable modes of travel as much as possible, as is required by the Airports National Policy Statement. The Applicant's response in row 2.20.4.4 of the Statement of Common Ground with Crawley Borough Council [REP5-037] is noted. However, concerns remain that no bus priority mitigation has been put forward by the Applicant. The emerging Crawley Local Plan Transport Study, in Table 6-2, identifies the locations in and around Crawley that would benefit from bus priority measures. The bus operators have also identified various locations in the locality which would benefit from bus priority measures and have also stated their preference for the relocating of the bus stops in North Terminal to Northway. This would provide quicker access and egress from the terminal. All of these measures would assist in enhancing the attractiveness of bus travel to and from the airport and offer time savings and improve journey reliability.
- With regards reference 17.1k, and the Highway Authority's request for additional active and sustainable travel mitigation, this concern remains. The proposed highway works do include various highway works that can be considered a betterment for pedestrians and cyclists when compared to the existing infrastructure. However, the proposed highway works are entirely focussed around the immediate vicinity of the airport. The Applicant has not provided any wider improvements along key corridors between the airport and the residential areas where workers could reside. The Crawley Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans identifies various improvements along various key corridors that would help to connect staff with the airport via high quality active travel corridors. The lack of infrastructure improvements in the wider area leads the Highway Authority to question as to how Commitment 4, in the Surface Access Commitments [APP3-028] is going to be met. Commitment 4 requires at least 15% of airport staff journeys within 8km of the airport to be made by active modes of travel. As a whole, Gatwick's employees generally drive to work. In their 2023 Staff Travel to Work Survey 72% of staff travelled to work by car. Only 1% cycled and another 1% walked and the percentage of staff cycling to work had actually fallen from previous surveys in 2016. The Highway Authority therefore considers the need for additional mitigation necessary to ensure the appropriate infrastructure is in

place to encourage a modal shift towards walking and cycling for staff within closer proximity of the airport. A meeting was held with the Applicant on the 11<sup>th</sup> June to discuss these matters. The Highway Authority set out their concerns and provided the Applicant with potential mitigation measures for their consideration.

10.20 At this meeting held with the Applicant on 11<sup>th</sup> June, it was again discussed the disappointment with regards to improvements to the PRow network. In relation to the PRow network potential improvements for consideration within the DCO limits include:

- a commitment to upgrade Sussex Border Path (from a footpath to a bridleway) adjacent to the Airport and into Surrey edged in red on the attached plan. This gives the opportunity to provide a road crossing link for Bridleway users into Riverside Garden Park.
- a commitment to explore the upgrade of footpaths 360Sy (south of the lagoon), 361Sy, 358Sy and 359Sy from footpath to bridleway east of the railway within the DCO Limits. To support improved active travel to and from the airport and to improve the recreational access for local residents impacted by development.

Outside the DCO Limits the following could be considered:

- a commitment to explore/contribute towards the upgrades of footpaths 351Sy, 1527, 1526, 1526/1, 1524, 1528 and 353Sy from footpath to bridleway(located within the purple polygons on the attached plan) to improve active travel links from local area to and from airport which would benefit employees and would also improve a cohesive active travel network for recreational users.

10.21 The Authorities would also note that there was a meeting held with the Applicant on the 24<sup>th</sup> June, which was a productive discussion of how the inclusion of a Permit Scheme and Lane Rental could be of benefit to all parties. This matter is now with the Applicant to consider their position.

#### **Table 46 - Socio-Economics and Local Economy**

10.22 Para 2.118/2.119 To reiterate, an assessment of impacts is required at the local authority level to determine the local implications of the Proposed Scheme. The assessment as it stands fails to adequately capture this. The JLAs have signposted local evidence of skills shortages in the LIR [REP- 068], such as that produced by Future Sussex. The applicant has not responded to this local evidence. The

Authorities do not agree that skills shortages are not a barrier to accessing employment – clearly people need to have appropriate skills in order to be suitable candidates for jobs. The Applicant’s response also fails to recognise that many of those not in work may have multiple barriers to work and more in-depth support is required, such as 1:1 support and training. The ESBS and Implementation Plans need to be clear how skills shortages in local area will be addressed, including details of funding allocated.

- 10.23 Para 2.122 The Applicant’s critique of the more precautionary approach applied at Lower Thames Crossing (i.e. saying that it is not a realistic comparator) does not tell the whole story. The Lower Thames Crossing approach was informed by a Workers Accommodation Report ([TR010032-001497-7.18 Workers Accommodation Report.pdf](#) ([planninginspectorate.gov.uk](#)) – this provides finer grain research on the labour market as a whole. Hinkley was used to benchmark, amongst other DCOs, so for the Applicant to say the Lower Thames Crossing solely relied on Hinkley is not correct. The Authorities note that the Applicant has not responded on the more precautionary NHB worker assumptions used for Luton Airport.

#### **Table 47 - Cumulative Effects**

- 10.24 In Table 47, Ref 2.98 the Applicant states that the likely delivery timescales of the proposed West of Ifield site mean “*the extent to which any cumulative effect would arise with the NRP is considered negligible*”. This is on the basis that the Horsham District Local Plan (Strategic Policy HA3) acknowledges that only part of the site will be delivered by 2040. It should be pointed out that Part 1 of HA3 allocates the site as “*a comprehensive new neighbourhood to deliver the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities to meet the longer-term development of approximately 3,000 homes, of which it is anticipated at least 1,600 will be delivered in the period to 2040*”. Delivery of a wide range of infrastructure (transport and other supporting elements) would be delivered alongside the 1,600 homes, including significant work to mitigate impact on the local road network, much of which is used locally to access the Airport. A substantial proportion of this infrastructure is likely to be under construction in conjunction with construction of the Project itself.

#### **Table 57 - Planning Statement Appendix D Sustainability**

- 10.25 The response given by the Applicant is inconsistent with the approach taken to the consideration of Local Plan policies for neighbouring authorities for other topic areas. Matters addressed in the Sustainability Statement, outlined by the Applicant in para 1.4.5 [[REP3-054](#)], extend beyond the host authorities’ boundaries. Consequently, the Project has the potential to impact Horsham District

Council and Mid Sussex District Council and the Local Plan policies of both authority areas should be taken into account in the assessment of the Project's overall sustainability.

### **Water Environment**

- 10.26 **Table 26, WE.1.6** -The Authorities maintain that a higher allowance of 40% should be applied to the airfield works. Our comments on this are included in the Statement of Common Ground (REP5-055, Table 2.21, Reference 2.22.4.4). This was then raised again at ISH7 (REP4-058). The Authorities do not consider that the response provided has addressed this point.
- 10.27 **Table 43, 10.1A 10.38** – The Authorities maintain that a higher allowance of 40% should be applied to the airfield works. Our comments on this are included in the Statement of Common Ground (REP5-055, Table 2.21, Reference 2.22.4.4). This was then raised again at ISH7 (please refer to the D4 summary note submitted by the Legal Partnership Authorities for further information). The Authorities do not consider that the response provided has addressed this point.
- 10.28 **10.39 Rainfall Data** - The Applicant has provided sufficient justification for not using FEH22 in this stage of the design. The Authorities consider that this response has addressed this point and we have no further comments.
- 10.29 **Restriction of Post-Development Runoff Rates to QMED =** Appendix 11.9.6 Flood Risk Assessment - Annex 2 states that post development runoff rates will be limited to the 1% AEP greenfield rate where possible, rather than QBAR greenfield runoff rates. The Authorities seek clarification of the QBAR greenfield runoff rates for each catchment to compare against the proposed post-development runoff rates for each catchment.
- 10.30 A meeting to discuss ordinary watercourse consents for the Project was held with the Applicant on 7<sup>th</sup> June at which it was recognised that a greater number of ordinary watercourse consents will be required than suggested. The LLFAs are now waiting to hear from the Applicant as to whether they wish to include Protective Provisions within the dDCO or alternatively apply for consent as and when it is required (possibly in batches, depending on phasing of the works) with the details being confirmed during the detailed design stage post DCO decision.

### **Table 58 - Operational Waste Management Strategy**

- 10.31 The Applicant has failed to address a principal matter of concern regarding the justification for the loss of decentralised energy generation on-site, resulting in waste likely being managed lower

down the waste hierarchy (paragraph 7.11.3 of REP4-031, and REP3-118).

- 10.32 The Authorities welcome the Applicant's acceptance that the timing for the approval of the Operational Waste Management Plan should be brought forward, and that Requirement 25 of the Draft DCO will reflect this. Comments on the Draft DCO have been submitted separately via a Joint Legal Partnership Authorities response.
- 10.33 The Authorities, at paragraph 7.11.8 of REP4-031, raised concern regarding an on-going review mechanism or commitment to review operational waste management that would allow for improvement to waste management. The Applicant's response focuses on the Operational Waste Management Plan being prepared in accordance with the Operational Waste Management Strategy (REP3-070), that accords with targets that are set that are consistent with the ANPS 2018. This is accepted, however the point raised is regarding continued improvements, beyond the approval of the Operational Waste Management Plan by the relevant authority, and about longer-term targets. If national policy changes, to require higher levels of recycling for example, how would the Applicant address this?
- 10.34 At paragraph 7.11.9 of REP4-031, the Authorities have once again raised concerns about the design of the CARE facility, to minimise the impacts associated with operating a waste facility. The focus of the Applicant's response is on the environmental permitting regime. Whilst the permitting regimes of other regulatory bodies should be assumed to operate effectively, the focus in planning should be on whether the development itself (in this case, the CARE facility), is an acceptable use of the land, and the impacts of those uses can be addressed, before granting of permission (as set out in PPG Waste (paragraphs 050 – 052)). Furthermore, the NPPW (paragraph 7) states that when determining applications, consideration should be given to the likely impact on the local environment and the criteria set out in in Appendix B. Appendix B of NPPW includes a number of criteria that are related to operating waste facilities. Given detailed information on the design of the CARE facility will be addressed at a later date, should development consent be granted, it is important that the design principles are sufficient in ensuring the CARE is designed to minimise the impacts that may arise from its operation.

**11. [REP5-073] 10.38 Appendix A - Response to West Sussex Joint Local Authorities - Air Quality Version 1**

- 11.1 Appendix A of the Authorities Deadline 3 Submission – 'Comments on any further information/submissions received by Deadline 2' [REP3-117] included a total of 40 air quality matters that further clarification was being sought from the Applicant.



- 11.2 Agreement has been achieved (or no further discussion is required) on 18 matters including: A.4, A.5, A.7, A.9, A.12, A.13, A.15, A.16, A.17, A.18, A.21, A.22, A.26, A.27, A.29, A.31, A.33 and A.40.
- 11.3 Progress is being made on nine matters including: no. A.6, A.10, A.11, A.23, A.24, A.25, A.30, A.36 and A.39.
- 11.4 Whilst there is still disagreement on 13 matters including: A.1, A.2, A.3, A.8, A.14, A.19, A.20, A.28, A.32, A.34, A.35, A.37 and A.38.
- 11.5 The matters which progress is being made on or where there remains disagreement are described below.
- 11.6 It should also be noted that there remains disagreement on three areas not included within [REP3-117]. This includes the matters described in Deadline 4 Submission – ‘Issue Specific Hearing 7 Post-Hearing submission’ [REP4-058] including:
- Operational odour;
  - 2047 modelling of non-road sources (e.g. aviation); and
  - Ultrafine particulates.
- 11.7 Operational odour associated with aviation fuel has not been assessed quantitatively by the Applicant. This is despite modelling identifying areas where odour might already be an issue having previously been undertaken by the Applicant in 2019. Absence of such an assessment is especially important given the Applicant is seeking to remove residents’ right to take action in nuisance due to odour (Article 49 of the DCO). Given this failure odour monitoring proposals in s106 should be funded by the Applicant.
- 11.8 Concerning ultrafine particulates (UFP) the Applicant has failed to appropriately assess the likely change in ultrafine particle exposure as their current assessment approach is fundamentally incorrect. Given this failure full funding for UFP monitoring to 2047 from the commencement of project should be provided.
- 11.9 Lastly, the Applicant has not yet provided a response to the local authorities review of the Air Quality Action Plan presented in Deadline 4 Submission – ‘Review of Air Quality Action Plan [REP2-004] and Construction Dust Management Plan’ [REP4-053].

### **Areas of Progress**

- 11.10 *Matter A.6 Modelled Scenarios* - A remaining clarification is requested on which background years have been utilised in the different scenarios, this has been provided for emission rates.
- 11.11 *Matter A.10 Technical Issues regarding the Air Quality Assessment* - The ADMS5 response is accepted, along with the CARE Facility

response. The specifics of the designated habitat queries have not been addressed. The congestion approach accepted.

- 11.12 *Matter A.11 Air Quality Receptors* - The provision of information on receptors by local authority is welcomed. The point concerning receptors on figures being made was that members of the public and people without access to shapefiles will not be able to follow the information within the ES without improved figures. This means the ES is incomplete.
- 11.13 *Matter A.23 Heating Plant Modelling* - The clarification provides a cross reference to paragraph 3.9.19 [APP 158] '*The energy team provided forecasts of natural gas consumption for GAL and third parties and, separately, for standalone third parties. These included medium-ambition scenarios for the future year scenarios with and without the Project. For each of the future year scenarios, the natural gas consumption projections were used to scale emissions from 2018.*' This relates to likely natural gas consumption, but does not set out how this was then used to determine where it was appropriate to spatially include emission sources for future development, such as hotels.
- 11.14 *Matter A.24 Asphalt Batching* - It is noted that a total of six batching plants were modelled to represent either concrete or asphalt activities. However, it is unclear that the emissions from both processes are equivalent and so whether this approach is appropriate.
- 11.15 *Matter A.25 Dust Management Plan (DMP)* - The provision of a draft Construction Dust Management Plan and the subsequent updates to the plan following the AECOM review are welcome. There are a small number of remaining areas further work/discussion is needed:
- Confirmation is requested that all areas of the proposed development will be covered by an individual DMP.
  - A plan of the high-risk areas included in the CDMP Strategy would be helpful to the local authorities along with the table of high-risk areas (Table 4.1);
  - The need for the local authorities to request compliant information or elevated dust soiling data should be replaced with an automatic process that provides this information. The local authorities are not going to know when to ask otherwise and so will not be aware of issues for their residents.
  - Further information is requested on how local authorities would gain access to real time monitoring data e.g. Osiris data and other monitoring data (e.g. dust soiling) and visual inspection records (e.g. sharepoint of files updated monthly).
  - Confirmation is sought that each area specific DMP will include a map showing the spatial extent of the works area, proximity to the surrounding and the proposed monitoring locations.
  - Environmental Statement Appendix 5.3.2 CoCP Annex 9 - Construction Dust Management Strategy Version 1 [REP5-022] Para 3.1.1 - Can this be changed to ensure that when a dust

management plan is sent for approval by the local planning authority, that in situations where the dust impacts are potentially in a neighbouring authority that a copy of the proposed management plan will also be sent to the Environmental Health department of that authority so they may feed back to the planning authority responsible for approving the report.

- Additional paragraphs or a section is required on dust soiling and deposition techniques, as dust soiling and deposition are only currently mentioned in the context of reporting.

11.16 *Matter A.30 Air quality monitoring* - It noted that reference to reporting additional techniques has been included in the draft CDMP Strategy but only in the reporting section (paragraph 5.7.14). Further information on dust deposition and soiling techniques should be added in prior to the reporting paragraph, similar to that provided for Osiris monitoring.

11.17 *Matter A.36 CTMP measures* - Wheel washing provision is more clearly set out, there is no further progress on low emission plant and fleet. The local authorities still request the Applicant to meet Stage V Non-Road Mobile Machinery as previously committed to by the Applicant within the ES and at Issue Specific Hearing 7 for the duration of construction and not just after 2030. Information has not been provided by the Applicant to explain what the implications are of this change for the air quality assessment presented within the ES [APP-038].

11.18 *Matter A.39 No reference to Environmental Permitting Legislation in reference to an Asphalt Plant-* The response notes that licences would be required and obtained as needed. Clarification is sought that the Applicant is referring to Environmental Permits.

### **Areas of Disagreement**

11.19 *Matter A.1 Assessment Scenarios* - In relation to airport growth we have reviewed the clarification paragraphs within Transport Assessment Report [APP-258] and in particular paragraph 152 which sets out:

'The construction arrangements at that time have therefore been overlaid on the strategic model for the 2029 with Project scenario, as at this time the northern runway is assumed to have opened [emphasis added] and additional demand would be present on the highway network.'

11.20 In this paragraph GAL appear to be stating that the operation of the northern runway forms part of the future baseline upon which Highways construction works have then been assessed. If this correct the applicant have treated part of the Project for which DCO is being sought as committed development, where permission has already been obtained.

- 11.21 This is inappropriate, and the Applicant should consider the effects on the road network and air quality from the Project as a whole from the combination of operational and construction activities. Specifically, comparing a future baseline without the operation of the northern runway against a situation where the northern runway is in operation and the Highways works are underway (i.e. the Project). This would show the change in traffic and air quality associated with the combined operational and construction effects associated with the Project that the DCO is being sought.
- 11.22 Without this scenario the air quality effects of the Project in 2029 cannot be assessed and the significance of air quality effects determined. This is because the study area for the Projects combined operational and construction effects is unknown, nor have the receptors that would be affected been identified (human health or designated habitats) nor is the level of traffic change and the associated change in air quality known. This means the ES is incomplete.
- 11.23 A traffic dataset and air quality assessment update is required to appropriately consider the combined effects of the Project in 2029.
- 11.24 *Matter A.2 Ecology Assessment* - This point relates to whether the ecology results can be relied upon due to concern over the scenario considered for the 2029 year. As the position concerning scenarios (where the Applicant has treated Airfield operations as committed development) is not agreed this point in turn is not agreed.
- 11.25 *Matter A.3 Emission Ceiling* - Points concerning the CARE Facility can be agreed. However, the key point about why heating plant emissions reduce with increased development associated with proposals has not been answered. The response only provides sign posting to the origin of the data. Concerning why traffic emissions decreases the response states in para 1.4.5 [REP5-073] *'In terms of traffic flows, the decreases are because the construction scenarios introduce capacity constraint in the area around the airport which has a displacement effect of traffic routing through this corridor'*. This is important as it indicates why it is important to model the air quality effects associated with a combined operational and construction scenario and not just superimposed construction on top of the operational scenario. As if the construction TM reduces capacity around the Airport, it is uncertain where the additional operational traffic would reroute to in combination with construction traffic and what the air quality study area would be for an appropriate combined scenario, currently all that can be observed is the study area associated with the construction activities. This means that it is not known what receptors would be affected in 2029, what the change in concentrations would be, nor the total concentrations. In summary, an evaluation of air quality significance is not currently possible for the 2029 scenario. This means the ES is incomplete. A traffic dataset and air quality

assessment update is required to appropriately consider the combined effects of the Project in 2029.

- 11.26 *Matter A.8 Affected Road Network* - It is still not possible to look at each individual scenario ARN to understand if the scenarios and the changes in traffic and pollutant concentrations for each scenario are logical.
- 11.27 *Matter A.14 Cumulative Effects and Inter-Relationships* - As the position concerning scenarios is not agreed this point in turn is not agreed.
- 11.28 *Matter A.19 Low emission buses* - Low emission buses are not committed to within the response and therefore this point is not agreed. The local authorities request that the commitment to low emission buses is included within the DCO.
- 11.29 *Matter A.20 Modal shift* - Information on how sensitive air quality predictions are to modal shift achievement is not provided. Therefore, the Applicant should include sanctions within the Surface Access Commitment [REP3-028] for non-compliance. Environmental Managed Growth proposals would help ensure mode shift commitments are met or mitigated by capping growth.
- 11.30 *Matter A.28 Complaints information wording* - Information on complaints should be shared with local authorities without the authorities having to request information. This will support the local authorities in their role to confirm the effectiveness of mitigation measures.
- 11.31 *Matter A.32 Odour mitigation* - The response does not list any additional measures nor set out what the industry guidance is that is referred to. We would welcome a more proactive approach to odour management in the form of a draft Odour Management Plan (OMP) within the CoCP for approval by the LPA, to provide additional confidence in the control measures in place during the construction phase.
- 11.32 *Matter A.34 CTMP Access* - No further information has been provided by the Applicant to explain the level of likely use of the contingency access. Further information is still required on the use and monitoring of this contingency route. Sanctions may also be needed to ensure that this route is not used excessively.
- 11.33 *Matter A.35 CTMP Monitoring* - The response appears to indicate that a very basic review of monitoring data to check whether air quality is exceeding air quality standards along would be used. Rather than a monitoring system with different thresholds below the air quality standards to determine when a risk of exceedance is emerging to allow action to be taken ahead of any exceedance. The local authorities concerns about how the Applicant's "Restrictions and Monitoring" within the CTMP would identify, monitor and control

construction traffic utilising routes through the J10 M23 and Crawley's AQMA.

- 11.34 The Applicant's response refers to Section 2 of the Draft AQAP which it says sets out measures and monitoring commitments related to the construction phase.
- 11.35 Section 2 of the Draft AQAP doesn't give any more detail on how measures or monitoring would protect air quality – it simply refers back to the CTMP and CWTP without giving any further detail.
- 11.36 *Matter A.37 Buildability report clarity* - As the position concerning scenarios is not agreed this point in turn is not agreed.
- 11.37 *Matter A.38 Travel plan monitoring framework* - The cross reference provided has been reviewed and the annual monitoring approach is noted. However, there is no mention of how air quality monitoring will be considered along with all the other transport metrics. Environmental Managed Growth proposals would be useful to incorporate air quality within the monitoring.

**12. [REP5-078] 10.38 Appendix F - Note on Pentagon Field Version 1**

- 12.1 The Authorities welcome the additional information provided by the Applicant on the proposed use of Pentagon Field as a spoil receptor site for approximately 100,000m<sup>3</sup> of spoil and resultant works to improve its ecological habitat and biodiversity.
- 12.2 The Authorities continue to object to use of this land for soil deposition.
- 12.3 While the additional information is helpful, there remain fundamental concerns about the lack of controls for soil deposition on this site due to the absence of parameter plans and any detail on final landform, lack of survey plans and lack of clarity about the amount of soil being deposited being referenced in any control document.
- 12.4 The estimated volume of material quoted in the document appears to be based on the level of excavation needed from other Works sites however, there is no evidence provided to verify the amounts and quantities. It is also unclear how the Applicants can be certain of the placement of this volume of spoil on the site given that detailed survey work including topography does not appear to have been carried out to date (paragraph 1.5.1). It is questionable what the site levels are and the volume of material that could be accommodated and therefore what excess soil may need to be exported off site resulting in further traffic movements. The suggested 4-metre-high re-profiling above ground level remains ambiguous and unreliable as it is not clear where the 4m is being measured from on Pentagon Field which has an extensive works area measuring 8.8 hectares.

- 12.5 It is also unclear on what basis the wireline drawings which inform the landscape and visual assessment were generated in the Environment Statement [REP4-014] in the absence of any survey information. These visualisations are not considered to be sufficiently detailed to be relied upon to create the final landform as is suggested by paragraph 1.3.5.
- 12.6 Paragraph 1.3.2 suggests that further works such as hardstanding and temporary internal roads would need to be laid to facilitate operations on the site. It is unclear where such provision would be accommodated within the site and whether this would impact on existing trees or hedges. Furthermore, the northwestern section of the site is located within floodplain and it is unclear how these ground levels are to be safeguarded if the works compound is to be on this northern part of the site (presumably close the works access)? How will increased flooding be prevented?
- 12.7 The suggested site access is located in the northern boundary (paragraph 1.4.4), the location of which is unclear in any of the supporting information. There are concerns that an access on this boundary would not only disrupt footpath 359Sy but also result in tree and hedge loss along the boundary as it would be anticipated any access would need to be widened and reinforced to accommodate the lorries. It is also unclear what impact this might have on drainage including the drainage ditches adjacent to the footpath. The photograph below (taken looking east towards Balcombe Road) from footpath 359Sy shows the northern field boundary and drainage ditch on the left.



- 12.8 The tree removal plan (sheet 8 of 13) [REP3-026] suggests there is a clear access on the eastern boundary and that further trees are being

removed around the point of access. If this access is not being used then the tree removal is questioned and would appear to conflict directly with Figure 1.2.18 in the OLEMP (extract shown in paragraph 1.3.6 Figure 1) which shows these trees retained. If the direct Balcombe Road access is not being used, then the Authorities would wish to see a solid tree belt created along the eastern boundary to mitigate the impact from views and screen spoil landform from the wider countryside. The comments made in respect of tree impacts for this site remain [REP4-067] LV1.2 c) and e).

- 12.9 The Authorities remain concerned about the impact of the works on nearby rights-of-way. There would need to be safeguards in place in respect of dust management ,noise, drainage and run off and mud on road see paragraph 11.23 [REP1-068].
- 12.10 The Applicant should consider a bespoke solution to managing this site in terms of queries from nearby residents, the impacts from vehicle movements, continual noise from machinery, dust and the general unsightly appearance of the site for a period 7 years which will result in enquiries and complaints.
- 12.11 The Authorities also wish to see within a control document a definite commitment to the comprehensive reinstatement of the land as it would not be visually acceptable for these Works to remain part implemented as a spoil heap in the longer term.
- 12.12 The Authorities have also considered this new document alongside existing detail such as the dDCO description of works [REP5-005] and the Development Principles document [REP5-031]. There are inconsistencies in wording between the document and there could be a perceived misconception that the works are creating an 'ecological area' The field is already identified as Biodiversity Opportunity Area and has ecological value, with the value added being proposed at the end of the Works being implemented with the introduction of species rich planting. Clarification is sought from the Applicant on how this Works site has been factored into the ecological surveys and biodiversity calculations given the areas of new planting described in both documents are unclear.

### **13. REP5-108 Updated PADSSs from Network Rail**

- 13.1 West Sussex County Council (WSCC) as Highway Authority note the updated PADSSs submitted by Network Rail [REP5-108] at Deadline 5. The impacts on the rail network are directly linked to the impacts on the highway network, especially given the significant role that rail plays in delivering the majority of passengers, via sustainable means, to the airport. Gatwick's current Airport Surface Access Strategy highlights that in 2019 Gatwick's annual rail mode share of airport passengers was 43%, but seasonal variations saw this approaching 50% during winter months. Rail clearly plays a key role in offering an



alternative to the use of private car travel at Gatwick and any implications on the rail network could result in increased impacts on the highway network.

- 13.2 Network Rail highlight in their PADSSs [REP5-108] that the project will add additional demand onto already busy rail services. They state that the Applicant is yet to identify and propose appropriate mechanisms which could fund investment in rail, including infrastructure or train service subsidy, to support the provision of sufficient capacity to serve the additional airport passengers anticipated in the future. These concerns, highlighted by Network Rail, are shared by the Highway Authority and rail is seen as a key means to maximise sustainable travel to and from the airport.
- 13.3 The Highway Authority also note Network Rail's comments in relation to a separate ringfenced Rail Mitigation Fund, due to the concerns about the Transport Mitigation Fund not being an appropriate mechanism for securing rail investment. The Highway Authority would be supportive of such a fund but would note that any funding should be in addition to the funding already identified within the Transport Mitigation Fund.
- 13.4 The Highway Authority would look for the Applicant to continue to engage with Network Rail with a view to addressing these concerns and providing appropriate mitigation towards rail infrastructure.