



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Environmental Statement

Appendix 12.3.1 Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses Traffic and Transport

Book 5

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: JULY 2023

Application Document Ref: 5.3

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses for Traffic and Transport	1
3	Glossary	31

1 Introduction

1.1 General

- 1.1.1 This document forms Appendix 12.3.1 of the Environmental Statement (ES) prepared on behalf of Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL). The ES presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposal to make best use of Gatwick Airport’s existing runways and infrastructure (referred to within this report as ‘the Project’). The Project proposes alterations to the existing northern runway which, together with the lifting of the current restrictions on its use, would enable dual runway operations. The Project includes the development of a range of infrastructure and facilities which, with the alterations to the northern runway, would enable the airport passenger and aircraft operations to increase. Further details regarding the components of the Project can be found in Chapter 5: Project Description.
- 1.1.2 This document provides the summary of stakeholder scoping responses for traffic and transport for the Project.

2 Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses for Traffic and Transport

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
Burstow Parish Council	28 September 2019	The general surface transport infrastructure gives cause for alarm as both the rail and road links are already over-crowded. The M23 Smart motorway is being constructed for today’s traffic because so much congestion already occurs so will be inadequate for the proposed expansion despite the protestations to the contrary that there will only be a 1% increase per year over the next 10 years.	National Highways’ M23 Smart Motorway Project has added additional running lane capacity to the strategic network serving Gatwick at peak times and has been constructed to provide capacity for future growth. In addition, Gatwick enjoys a very high level of rail connectivity, with up to 20 trains to and from central London in the morning peak hour (10 to London Bridge and 10 to London Victoria, of which four are Gatwick Express services). The proposed mitigation and enhancement measures, including the proposed highway improvements, are described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport. Section 12.8. Section 12.9 of the same Chapter explains that strategic transport modelling shows these enhancements provide capacity for background traffic as well as growth related to the Project out to 2047. Chapters 12 and 13 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) provide further details.
Burstow Parish Council	28 September 2019	Network Rail have tried to squeeze every drop of timetable utilization out of the main London-Brighton line that has included losing most of the dedicated ‘premium’ services of the Gatwick Express since extending many of the train services to Brighton. This service must be allowed to return to a dedicated service in any expansion.	Whilst two peak hour Gatwick Express services will continue to run to Brighton to provide the maximum benefit of these valuable train paths, Gatwick Express will continue to provide a dedicated four trains per hour service between the Airport and London Victoria, departing every 15 minutes and taking around 30 minutes.
Burstow Parish Council	28 September 2019	Collaboration will be necessary with government departments in order to improve the surface access infrastructure. Both the A22 and A23 roads need upgrading to dual carriageways in many places in order to help avoid the massively increased use of country lanes that is already being experienced.	As demonstrated by strategic transport modelling, there is appropriate capacity on the A22 and A23 to provide for background traffic as well as growth related to the Project out to 2047. These results are described in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Charlwood Parish Council	30 September 2019	The forecast 34% increase in traffic and freight will mean more cars, white vans and more HGVs. An increasing proportion of Gatwick road traffic passes through Charlwood as result of Satnavs or smart phones indicating that this is the shortest route to and from the north west. The community also suffers an increase in traffic when Satnavs automatically divert traffic when the M23 or M25 are blocked, or when there is a traffic jam on the A217	As demonstrated by strategic transport modelling, any redistribution of traffic on roads through Hookwood or Charlwood as a result of growth to 2047 with the Project would be very limited and the assessment examines whether any significant adverse effects would

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		through Reigate. This could get much worse. The Assessment should include an impact of increased traffic on the villages of Hookwood and Charlwood.	occur (see ES Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport, section 12.9). During highway construction, some traffic redistribution is likely to occur with works on the M23 Spur, Airport Way and A23 London Road. GAL explored options to mitigate these effects through the way in which construction would be managed and phased. The assessment of effects during construction is contained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9. Strategic modelling results for highway construction are described in Chapter 15 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	There is concern about the level of uncertainty around proposed surface access improvements as set out in para 5.2.44. It would appear that a road traffic assessment has not been undertaken and there is an acknowledgement that potential solutions may need to be designed. The extent of the EIASR scoping boundary is very limited which falsely implies that there would be limited impacts outside of the airport development area. The impacts on surface access must therefore be extended from the limited boundaries drawn by the EIASR.	The road traffic assessment considers an area which is broadly bounded by Epsom, Sutton, Croydon to the north, including the M25 as far west as Chertsey and east as Sevenoaks, and extending west of the A24, south of the A27 and east of the A22. The detailed models include the road network within this area, which is described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.4. Strategic highway modelling results are described in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	CBC question the assumption in para 5.2.45 that the increase in traffic volumes is likely to be greatest at the South and North Terminal junctions which appear to necessitate the scoping option of an 8m tall flyover at both junctions. Both these junctions are fed from the M23 Junction 9 spur which is not identified as being impacted and it not even wholly with the Project scoping boundary (see figure 5.2.1d). The impacts on this junction as a minimum must be fully scoped in.	The effects of Gatwick's growth related to the Project, and growth in background traffic, on the M23 and M23 Spur including Junction 9 are demonstrated by strategic highway modelling. The detailed models cover a wide area (as noted above and in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.4) but mitigation is only identified where required as shown by the assessment.
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	CBC is also concerned that the only other road capacity issue identified is at the Longbridge Roundabout (para 5.2.50) and there is little consideration of the impacts upon the wider road network. With the transport modelling not finalised the scope of impact on the highway network cannot be defined and the report is therefore incomplete.	Strategic highway modelling covers a much wider area which is broadly bounded by Epsom, Sutton, Croydon to the north, including the M25 as far west as Chertsey and east as Sevenoaks and extending west of the A24, south of the A27 and east of the A22, as described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.4 and Chapter 5 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). This assessment includes roads in Crawley with the strategic transport model built using the network coding from West Sussex's Crawley SATURN model.
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	Increased impacts will be experienced on Crawley's local roads such as the A2011/A2004 Hazelwick Roundabout which is an AQMA, and routes such as the A23 to the airport which will experience increased traffic from new employees and passengers. Until initial highway modelling has been undertaken, following consultation with all local authorities, an accurate scope of impact on the highway network, and additional mitigation which may be required as part of the Project cannot be established.	As above.
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	The area of detailed modelling for highways, shown in Figure 7.6.1, excludes significant centres of population yet paragraph 7.10.5 describes a wide area for the Labour Market assessments. Paragraph 7.10.24 asserts that "Future labour demand will be distributed across a wide labour catchment area so no significant impacts on population levels or housing and community infrastructure needs are expected". CBC consider that surface	Strategic highway modelling results for the study area are described in Chapter 12 of Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the assessment of highway-related effects is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9. The urban areas of Guildford and

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		transport modelling for all modes must include this full area, including the major urban areas along the south coast, Tunbridge Wells and Guildford, and detailed assessment of the impact on in-commuting needs to take place.	Royal Tunbridge Wells are included in the model and traffic on roads through these urban areas has been simulated.
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	In respect to the rail network the report para 5.2.52 assumes that no further rail improvements are required. It is considered that this assumption is incorrect as the report also states that “studies will be undertaken to explore the need for further improvement to the rail station”. In addition, assessment should be made of the capacity of the rail network itself. The option to further improve rail capacity and encourage this sustainable form of travel must be included as part of the ES.	Modelling results for rail and railway station capacity are described in Chapters 9 and 10 of Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the assessment of rail-related effects is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.12 asserts that improvements to train capacity provides “sufficient overall capacity for Gatwick to continue to grow its rail mode share over the next decade”. For the ES, full assessment of the capacity of the rail network to accommodate growth in passengers and staff, as well as increasing rail mode share for access to the airport, should be undertaken. This should include the Arun Valley line as well as the Brighton Mainline, and Southern and GWR services as well as Thameslink and the Gatwick Express. Cumulative impacts of planned and anticipated growth in the area should also be taken into account in determining the need for enhancements to capacity.	Modelling results for rail capacity including the Arun Valley and Brighton Mainline as well as specific services are described in Chapter 9 of Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the assessment of rail-related effects is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9. The assessment includes forecasts of expected growth in rail trips in the future baseline as a result of general population and employment growth from new development and is therefore inherently cumulative as far as the effects on the rail network are concerned. ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.11 discusses cumulative effects with reference to major potential developments in the area immediately surrounding the Airport.
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	Effects to be assessed in the ES, as set out in para 7.6.47, should take account of any cumulative impacts should there be cross over between the Gatwick Station works and early works on the Project.	There will not be an overlap between Gatwick station works and the Project. The Gatwick station works are anticipated to complete by 2023 and are considered in the future baseline scheme.
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	There is no reference at all in part 5 of the EIASR to improvements to bus services and facilities or other sustainable travel modes such as cycles. This is a major omission that must be included as an integral part of the project and part of the ES.	These modes have been considered in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport. ES Chapter 5: Project Description, section 5.2 includes a description of the active travel infrastructure improvements that form part of the Project and would be delivered alongside the proposed highway works. The ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) contains proposals for enhanced bus and coach connections to and from the Airport, which are also summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport section 12.8 and in Chapters 7 and 11 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	The Transport Assessment which, as stated in para 7.6.61 will include Gatwick’s Surface Access Strategy, should prioritise sustainable access to the airport and include challenging modal shift targets which will then inform the identification of transport mitigations which may not be highway schemes. It should include a Car Parking strategy as a key part of the mode share target, with the aim of reducing the amount of access to the airport by private car.	Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) provides a summary of the transport interventions proposed. The ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) sets out GAL’s commitments to mode shares and transport interventions.
Crawley Borough Council	30 September 2019	The reference in paragraph 7.6.63 to “ <i>Reviewing the extent to which the Sustainable Transport Fund....provides benefits.....</i> ” is welcomed but should also consider other possible options and measures to significantly improve public and active transport modes, using the profitability of on-airport parking to help provide funding.	GAL uses its Sustainable Transport Fund to support such measures. The Sustainable Transport Fund is amongst the measures that GAL is committing to in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3).

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
London Borough of Croydon	1 October 2019	<p>The key rail interchange at Croydon (presumably East Croydon) is mentioned. The data collection and scope of the transport assessment should therefore analyse the impact of the proposed development and increased airport capacity on this recognised key interchange which is beyond the airport.</p> <p>The scoping report should indicate how, as part of the Transport Assessment, the impact of airport growth on passenger numbers and interchange trips at East Croydon Station and other rail stations within Croydon is understood and adequately addressed.</p>	Strategic rail modelling has been undertaken and additional passenger demand associated with the Project is described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 and Chapters 9 and 10 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). Most air passengers remain on rail services through East Croydon into central London.
London Borough of Croydon	1 October 2019	The effects of freight being moved to and from the airport appears to be missing from the scoping, but must be included within the assessment.	The strategic modelling used to inform the ES includes freight and logistics movements related to the Airport. These have been increased in line with the projected increase in freight tonnage through the Airport in the future baseline and With Project scenarios.
London Borough of Croydon	1 October 2019	The focus on introducing incentives to reduce the number of staff travelling by car and mitigating the impacts of parking at the airport is acknowledged. However, there still appear to be plans to increase overall car parking numbers at the airport (7.6.63). It is considered that the airport needs to make a full commitment to traffic demand management measures in order to enable ongoing reductions in the number of car journeys.	Car parking proposals are outlined in the ES in Chapter 5: Project Description and Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8. They are also described in Chapter 2 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). The ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) includes challenging mode share commitments and associated transport interventions to deliver them, which are summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8 and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 4.4.25: When looking at existing baseline conditions, staff travel data will be just as important as passenger travel figures. While existing staff numbers have been set out, no forecast of staff numbers has been provided. It is impossible, therefore, to quantify the potential for significant impact of employment on local populations or the road network and other infrastructure in East Sussex.	Growth in staff travel has been included in strategic modelling as described in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.5: Traffic data has also been provided by East Sussex County Council (Transport Monitoring team) and should be reflected as such.	This data has been referenced in the technical reports dealing with the development and validation of the strategic models.
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	<p>In paragraph 7.6.6 reference is made to the proportion of Gatwick passengers (27%) travelling to or from the nearby counties of Kent, Surrey and Sussex. It will be important to provide a breakdown by County and to also examine the commuting patterns of Gatwick employees.</p> <p>The transport mode figures for staff and passengers vary significantly between counties and it is important to recognise that for the many parts of East Sussex there is an absence of non-car alternatives – due to the extremely limited options for rail travel and bus/coach travel to Gatwick, particularly from the central parts of the county.</p>	The strategic model suite has been used to determine the likely mode shares of passengers and staff, which can be identified by local authority area and this has informed the development of public transport measures and interventions. GAL is making commitments to these in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3).
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.12 states that “Train capacity serving Gatwick has more than doubled since 2014, with new rolling stock on most of the services calling at the airport. This provides sufficient overall capacity for Gatwick to continue to grow its rail mode share over the next decade.” However, the increase in capacity has not been shared equally across all routes. It is occurred due to the increase in capacity of Gatwick Express and Thameslink services, whereas the capacity of Southern services into East Sussex has remained fairly static, and there continues to be no direct rail services to/from Kent. The study will need to establish if the capacity of different routes is sufficient to at least the design year of 2038, or if maintaining Gatwick’s sustainable mode share to the level indicated beyond 2029 is dependent on further investment in rail capacity such as Network	Modelling of rail capacity is described in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the assessment of rail-related effects is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9. The Croydon Area Remodelling Scheme (CARS) is not included in the future baseline nor With Project scenarios. Therefore the assessment does not rely upon the delivery of the CARS.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		Rail's "Croydon Area Remodelling scheme", which is not currently a committed scheme, so cannot be relied upon.	
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	<p>Paragraph 7.6.18: the focus is on the M23/A23 corridor with some reference to the A27 and A272 as east – west routes linking into this arterial corridor. However, for south coast towns in East Sussex such as Eastbourne and Hastings, and also towns within the centre of the county (eg Uckfield, Heathfield, Crowborough), other north – south and east – west routes are more important for access to the Airport and the connection into the A23/M23 corridor.</p> <p>Therefore GAL need to recognise the role that routes such as the A21, A22, A267 and A264 perform in providing access between the south coast, as well as central East Sussex, and the Airport.</p>	The strategic highway model includes these roads and modelling results are described in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the assessment of highway-related effects is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	<p>Paragraph 7.6.19:</p> <p>The text alludes to a 1 hour 20 minute journey time between Folkestone and Gatwick via the A23/A27/A259 corridors however these journey times can only be achieved via alternative routes (via the M20/M25). This needs to be clarified within the body of the text to avoid any mis-interpretation of the situation.</p>	Text modified.
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.25: GAL should review the sustainable transport mode share for employees, which is currently shown as 42%. Whilst progress has been made in increasing the sustainable transport mode share for air passengers, this has been more challenging for staff. Therefore, consideration should be given to different mode share scenarios for employee trips with an assessment of the worst case scenario (continuation of current staff travel patterns).	Strategic modelling has been undertaken including both passenger and employee journeys, with mode choice interventions tested, as described in Chapters 5, 7 and 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	<p>Paragraph 7.6.33 – 34:</p> <p>As the Gatwick Airport version of the South East Regional Transport Model (SERTM) has not yet been developed and finalised, it cannot yet be used to determine the area over which significant changes to travel demand flows are likely. This means that the assessment of the extent of network over which mitigation has to be considered will be less accurate. GAL should complete their assessment and identify what mitigation measures are required before the scoping area is finalised. In addition, from an East Sussex perspective, additional network detail and coding is available from the A22/A26 Corridors model which has also been derive from SERTM, which can be made available at request.</p>	Strategic modelling has been undertaken and is described in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). The highway assessment considers an area which is broadly bounded by Epsom, Sutton, Croydon to the north, the M25 as far west as Chertsey and east as Sevenoaks and extending west of the A24, south of the A27 and east of the A22.
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	<p>Paragraph 7.6.41:</p> <p>It is not clear if the A27 corridor is outside the area of detailed modelling. There is a prevalence of long-standing congestion issues on the corridor that could be exacerbated by the Project. Planned housing development will not be equally distributed across the south coast and there is a choice of competing routes between A22, A21 and A23 so travel patterns can be expected to change as a result of the Project. The A27 corridor is located within the wider area of simulation modelling for which it is proposed to keep the SERTM level of detail.</p> <p>To ensure that the Model will accurately route traffic to/from Gatwick based on a realistic simulation of main junctions along the coastal corridor between Eastbourne, Wealden and Lewes (and potentially Bexhill/Hastings) the most affected parts of the A27/A259 corridor (such as A27 Lewes – Polegate and Bexhill) extending to Hastings should be included in the area of detailed modelling.</p>	The strategic highway model has simulated the A27 which is now inside the boundary of the Area of Detailed Modelling. Modelling results are described in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the assessment of effects related to traffic is presented in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	As shown in Diagram 7.6.1, the proposed structure of the demand model splits airport related highway demand into passenger and employee trips. It should be clarified that the model will also handle demand made by trips by suppliers to airport businesses and airlines –goods delivery trips - and visitors to the airport, such as people using the airport hotels without being air passengers or staff, whether being guests or attendees of the hotel conferencing facilities or visitors to on-airport businesses.	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.5 describes the assumptions and limitations of the assessment. Airport supplier, cargo and logistics, ie delivery trips, as well as non-airport users including visitors and commuters are included in the modelling.
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.42: It is noted that rail modelling will extend down to and along the Sussex Coast, which is welcomed. To ensure consistency to assessing mode share, it is desirable that both the rail and highway modelling should be undertaken over a similar geographical area.	Noted. GAL's strategic multimodal transport model (comprising highway and public transport – rail and bus/coach) covers the same area for all modes between South London and the South Coast in its Area of Detailed Modelling, and a wider area is contained within the model simulation area.
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.61 (Wider Assessment of Traffic and Transport) makes reference to the Transport Assessment which will be produced, and which will include mitigation proposals. It also makes reference to the existing Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS). The increase in staff and passengers travelling to and from East Sussex will need to be mitigated effectively. Careful consideration will need to be made of how bus/coach and rail services to and from Gatwick can be improved to encourage non-car travel to the airport.	A Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) is provided with the DCO application and Chapter 7 of the TA summarises the surface access commitments and actions, which are also set out in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3).
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Taxis are often utilised by East Sussex residents who have no public transport alternative, for whom taking a car not a viable option, or those who have limited mobility. Such commuters also rely on lifts to / from the airport from family or friends. Whilst we recognise that restricting the use of drop-off / pick-up areas reduces congestion outside the front of the airport entrance and improves safety, it increases overall journey time for passengers who require a lift to/from the airport, and disrupts the end-to-end journey, therefore impacting on the overall journey experience. It is therefore important that these drop-off / pick-up facilities are retained and potentially enhanced if no additional public transport provision is made available. Integration of all modes needs to be a key consideration, with options available which cater for all needs.	Since 2019, GAL has introduced forecourt charging. However, free pick-up and drop-off is provided at both terminal long-stay car parks, with shuttle buses operating to both terminals.
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	It is likely that the details of the mitigation required will need to go beyond the details included within the ASAS. Therefore we would expect an updated ASAS to be developed as part of the DCO process.	The ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) has been developed and submitted as part of the DCO application. Commitments in the SACs, together with associated measures, are summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8 and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.63: The proposed approaches to mitigation should additionally include provision to increase physical highway capacity to address residual issues. It may also be necessary to consider additional bus/coach services which are likely to see significant employee commuter and passenger demand to Gatwick.	The measures in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) include additional bus and coach services, alongside the proposed highway works.
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	The Gatwick Area Transport Forum only meets annually and is not constituted as a consultative body. The Gatwick Area Transport Forum Steering Group - which includes the local transport authorities, local planning authorities, the train operation company, Highways England, the local bus operator and other stakeholders - provides a more suitable forum for consultation and coordination of approach to delivering transport objectives and initiatives.	Noted. It is expected that the Gatwick Area Transport Forum Steering Group would be the body to which GAL will regularly report progress on the SACs.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
East Sussex County Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.65 - 66: The Construction Traffic Management Strategy should include appropriate routes for the movement of construction materials to site by road; proposals for how construction workers will travel to and from the site – including how this will be achieved by sustainable modes – and if construction workers do travel by car, where they will park.	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan has been developed and is contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3 - Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3).
Elmbridge Borough Council	30 September 2019	In regard to the Area of Detailed Modelling it is felt that this should be extended to include the A3 heading north from the M25 Junction 10 up to New Malden. Whilst paragraph 7.6.18 acknowledges the A23 as a key route connecting south London and Croydon to Gatwick Airport, there is no reference to the similar role that the A3 plays in connecting central and other areas of south London to the M25 and Gatwick Airport.	The A3 from M25 Junction 10 up to New Malden is included in the model with a fixed speed assumption on this link. Whilst not in the Area of Detailed Modelling, the effects of the Project on traffic on this road have been modelled and analysed.
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council	27 September 2019	Proposed scope of traffic and transport assessment is agreed. Epsom and Ewell is interested in the impacts to the strategic highway network that serves the Borough, and ensuring that the modelling covers the Borough where appropriate.	Strategic modelling is described in Chapters 5, 6 and 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the assessment of highway-related effects is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
National Highways (formerly Highways England)	1 October 2019	Highways England's principal concern with any development proposal is the impact generated on the SRN. The Applicant has commenced traffic modelling which will be used to support their proposals and is sharing information on the early development of these models with Highways England. Prior to DCO submission, Highways England will need to be satisfied that the impact of the development on the SRN has been modelled robustly and, if necessary, all works to provide capacity on the network to accommodate the development will achieve their objectives. This should include microsimulation modelling of the area.	Strategic and microsimulation modelling is described in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). Extensive engagement has taken place between GAL and National Highways on modelling and mitigation prior to submission of the DCO application. Engagement with National Highways and other stakeholders is set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3.
National Highways (formerly Highways England)	1 October 2019	An assessment of transport related impacts of the proposal should be carried out and reported as described in the Department for Transport 'Guidance on Transport Assessment (GTA)'. It is noted that this guidance has been archived, however it still provides a good practice guide in preparing a Transport Assessment. In addition, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) also provide guidance on preparing Transport Assessments. Highways England would appreciate early sight of the scheme's Transport Assessment and should be consulted on the scope of this assessment to ensure all relevant tests have been included.	Noted. The assessment has had regard to the National Planning Practice Guidance published by MHCLG (now DLUHC) which superseded the DfT guidance. GAL has engaged with National Highways during the preparation of the assessment. A Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) has been prepared and submitted with the DCO application.
National Highways (formerly Highways England)	1 October 2019	The Applicant will need to demonstrate that all proposals for changes to the SRN to mitigate the impact of the development are in line with the various tests described in the Circular.	Noted. ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport presents the assessment of environmental effects of the Project. Chapter 12 of Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) which provides further technical detail of the anticipated future operation of the SRN without and with the Project. Extensive technical engagement has been undertaken with National Highways in relation to the design of the highway proposals, as summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3.
National Highways (formerly Highways England)	1 October 2019	The Applicant shall identify the distribution of traffic on the SRN as a result of the expansion proposals and will complete capacity assessments of relevant SRN links and junctions to ensure that the SRN is able to continue to fulfil its strategic function. This assessment should include impacts of both construction traffic and the reduction in capacity as a result of the construction work itself.	The assessment is provided in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the assessment of highway-related effects is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 has included consideration of the effects on the highway network during the construction period.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
National Highways (formerly Highways England)	1 October 2019	The Applicant shall confirm locations to be assessed in the Transport Assessment through engagement with Highways England via Topic Working Groups. This shall include all locations where there is a material change to traffic flows as a result of the application, including those distant from the boundary of the Proposed Development.	Engagement with National Highways has been ongoing since 2019 and is summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3.
National Highways (formerly Highways England)	1 October 2019	Traffic and environmental impact arising from changes to the SRN, the increase/re-routing of traffic post-opening (including phased opening) of the Proposed Development, during construction, traffic volume (including cumulative effects), composition or routing change and transport infrastructure modification should be fully assessed and reported. Adverse changes to noise and air quality should be particularly considered, including in relation to compliance with the European air quality limit values and/or in local authority designated Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs).	The assessment of highway-related effects during construction and operation is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9, and is also addressed in Chapter 15 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). Effects on air quality and noise are addressed in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality and ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration respectively.
Horsham District Council	27 September 2019	The Council is very concerned that the extent of the transport model should be wider, particularly to include impacts on major urban areas (in particular along the south coast) and the impact on more localized transport infrastructure. The proposed restrictive area of the study is not acceptable, especially if, as GAL claims, the housing requirements arising from this proposal are not being considered as part of this application and is instead relying on the delivery of supporting housing to come through Local Plans that are being prepared. Not enough consideration is given to the impacts on major links including A roads within Horsham District. The assessment should also include impacts on these roads, together with highway links, not just junctions.	'A' roads through Horsham district are included in the Area of Detailed Modelling in the strategic transport model. Urban areas along the South Coast are also included in the model and have been modelled and analysed. The assessment of highway-related effects during construction and operation is reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
Horsham District Council	27 September 2019	We would urge GAL to consider more challenging modal shift targets, particularly in relation to parking. The impact of transport construction traffic is also omitted and needs to be considered as part of the assessment. Changing the location of the development will change the impacts and this needs to be better considered with an appropriate supporting evidence base. In any EIA the worst-case scenario should be considered.	GAL has developed mode share commitments for the proportion of passenger and employee journeys made by sustainable modes. These are described in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) and in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8. Construction traffic scenarios have been assessed and the effects are reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 and in Chapter 15 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Horsham District Council	27 September 2019	The Council considers that there is too much reliance on the planned improvements across the transport network, such as the M23 Smart Motorway Project and the improvements to Gatwick Railway Station. These upgrades are required to create additional capacity in the transport network to accommodate existing requirements and do not take account of the additional burden that will be placed on the network even with these upgrades as a result of airport expansion. It is therefore imperative that sufficient studies are undertaken to understand these impacts and to enable the provision of suitable mitigation.	Modelling has been undertaken to test the capacity and performance of the highway and railway networks (including the railway station in its form following the improvements currently being implemented) for the With Project scenarios to 2047 as described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 and in Chapters 9 to 13 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Horsham District Council	27 September 2019	We would also like to request that Horsham District Council's Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2014 & 2016), or any updates which emerge through our Local Plan preparation process, are added to the list of relevant Policy, Legislation and Guidance documents to consider, particularly given that we think the scope of the transport assessment should incorporate the traffic impacts in Horsham district. We are also updating our infrastructure Delivery Plan as part of the Council's Local Plan Review and we strongly suggest GAL takes this document into consideration as it emerges.	This Plan has been taken into account and is included in the list of related plans and policies in Chapter 4 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
Horsham District Council	27 September 2019	There has already been an increase in road traffic 'spillage' from the main highways to the side roads and country lanes. Even though the total noise will not be comparable to the main roads, the increase in noise can be large and proportionally more disturbing due its close proximity to residents and due to the fact it is made up of multiple 'events' rather than a general hum. Therefore, an assessment should be made of traffic flows on local roads and how this traffic is associated with Gatwick and how it can be mitigated.	The assessment set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport uses the results from strategic highway modelling to determine whether and where adverse effects would be experienced by pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and highway users as a result of the Project. Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) provides additional information about expected traffic flow changes on the network. Strategic transport modelling output has been provided to environmental consultants to undertake noise modelling on the highway network around the Airport.
Kent County Council	1 October 2019	Consideration should also be given to proposed significant development sites in Tunbridge Wells and again in Tonbridge and Malling. The Tonbridge and Malling Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State and the Tunbridge Wells Local Plan Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan is currently out for consultation. A Saturn transport model has recently been completed for Tunbridge Wells.	Local Plan development growth is included in the strategic transport model in accordance with the approach set out in the DfT's Transport Appraisal Guidance (TAG), originally published in 2013 and updated regularly.
Kent County Council	1 October 2019	Sensitivity testing should consider the impact on other routes when strategic routes are disrupted by congestion and incidents. This is particularly an issue for communities on the A25, which is significantly impacted when there are issues on the M25. Areas in West Kent are impacted by rat running on the rural highway network.	The strategic highway model includes the M25 and A25 and has tested peak period operations to 2047 without and with the Project. The resilience of the M25 is important to the whole of the south of England and goes beyond the scope of just the Project.
Kent County Council	1 October 2019	Objectives, targets and measures to support and encourage trips by sustainable modes, as well as to mitigate highways impacts, will need updating. Measures for sustainable staff travel should also be an important part of the Travel Plan, as a reasonable proportion of the 24,000 employees working at Gatwick live in Kent.	GAL has developed mode share commitments for the proportion of passenger and employee journeys made by sustainable modes. These and the associated interventions are described in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) and in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8. The interventions have been tested and the outcomes are described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 and in Chapters 9 to 14 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Kent County Council	1 October 2019	A Construction Management Plan (CMP) is to be provided. The County Council requests involvement in the preparation of the CMP as the proposals are refined, including an investigation of likely construction impact on Kent roads and mitigation of any resulting impact.	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CMP) is contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3 -Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3). A draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) is also contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3 -Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3) which draws together the proposed mitigation measures during the construction period. The assessment in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 covers both the airfield and highway works construction periods. Highway modelling outputs for these periods have been presented at Topic Working Groups.
Kent County Council	1 October 2019	It is noted that GAL aims to increase public transport mode share for passengers from 44% to 48% by 2022. Impact on and consideration of options to improve rail services within Kent to accommodate Gatwick bound passengers, such as an enhanced service between Tonbridge and Redhill in order to connect to Gatwick, should be considered. This service currently operates at two trains per hour (tph) in the peaks and could be enhanced to a two tph service all day Monday to Saturday.	GAL has included rail upgrades in the strategic modelling for the assessment. In line with TAG, only those interventions which are near certain or more than likely to occur have been included in the modelling. Gatwick is supportive of other interventions which will improve access by sustainable modes. The ES Appendix 5.4.1:

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
			Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) set out GAL's commitments to future mode shares with the Project.
Kent County Council	1 October 2019	GAL is encouraged to undertake further research into the destinations that passengers are travelling to and from. Gatwick is the closest airport to Kent, and yet poor public transport connections mean the majority of those travelling to the airport from Kent travel by car. Therefore, KCC requests that the traffic model be extended further to include the whole of Kent. This will allow for the consideration of mitigation measures which may be required on the Strategic Road Network across the region.	Strategic transport modelling includes highway and public transport networks in Kent as described in Chapter 5 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Kent County Council	1 October 2019	Paragraph 7.6.63: Public transport connections (in particular rail) to the east of the airport are particularly poor. If GAL is to appropriately mitigate the impact of increased traffic volumes on the highway network and increase public mode share to the airport, it is encouraged to work with Network Rail to improve rail connectivity from the airport into Kent. Currently, most rail journeys to Gatwick from Kent are reliant on interchanging in London which results in journey times more than double that of driving.	Rail upgrades are included in the strategic modelling. In line with TAG, only those interventions which are near certain or more than likely to occur have been included in the modelling. GAL is supportive of other interventions which will improve access by sustainable modes.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Having prematurely scoped out housing implications there is concern about the robust nature of the transport modelling. The parameters of the transport modelling work need to include population centres, including along the south coast. The local labour market covers a much more extensive area than the area subject to detailed transport modelling. This is significant as the impact of the Project on the transport network will not be fully assessed without understanding relationship between where people live and work. It is also important that existing and consented highway and rail improvement schemes (such as the M23 Smart Motorway and Gatwick Airport Station improvements) are not seen as a solution to mitigate the impact of future growth at Gatwick beyond that already consented. These schemes are required, even without the additional demand that the Northern Runway will bring.	The assessment is based on strategic modelling which includes urban areas along the South Coast. Trips to and from these locations have been modelled and analysed. The need for any additional mitigation beyond M23 Smart Motorways and the Gatwick station improvements has been considered as described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and in Chapters 7 to 14 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	It should be clarified as to which works will clarify as a highways NSIP, and for GAL to consult with MSDC (and other stakeholders) when the package of improvements has been finalised.	The highway works constitute an NSIP and have been included in the DCO application with the airfield works. Full detail is contained in ES Chapter 5: Project Description.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Provide information indicating where the new parking stands for aircrafts will be located and how many there will be to accommodate the increase in departing aircraft capacity.	See ES Chapter 5: Project Description
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Provide evidence and justification for the car parking and increased cargo throughput.	The proposed car parking strategy is indicative of where car parking capacity could be provided as opposed to a commitment to build all of this car parking. The SACs note the range of potential interventions available to GAL in order to achieve its commitments and further detail is provided in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). Interventions including increasing the cost of parking have been tested to increase sustainable mode share. Cargo growth has been forecasted and included in the assessment.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Enter into dialogue with MSDC to identify residential and employment allocations and proposals already with planning permission in Mid Sussex (or allocated in the Local Plan), to devise a list of known and planned developments for highways purposes and to identify further where there are likely to be an increase in traffic as a result of the Project.	GAL has engaged with Local Authorities to inform the list of developments and schemes included in the strategic modelling work.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	To confirm the capacity assumptions made when the planning consent for Gatwick Railway Station improvements, and then to identify if there is any further need for rail improvements and to properly identify the uplift in the number of passengers.	Crowding in Gatwick station has been modelled in Legion using the calibrated and validated model developed by Network Rail for AM and PM peak periods. This is described in Chapter 10 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Given the proximity of Gatwick Airport to the Strategic Road Network (SRN) the assessment should have cognisance to Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 02/13 'The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development'.	Noted and references added.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The assessment should also consider the guidance contained within Manual for Streets (MfS) and Manual for Streets 2 (MfS2) where applicable.	Guidance in Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2 is not considered directly applicable to the nature of the road network in and round the Airport. Consideration has been given to the need for walking and cycling infrastructure enhancements as part of the Project.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The guidance contained within the IEMA Guidelines is dated and its application should be treated with due prudence.	This is noted and Chapters 9 to 15 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) contain further assessment.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Reference should also be made to DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Part 8 'Pedestrians, Cyclists, Equestrians and Community Effects', Part 9 'Vehicle Travelers', and Interim Advice Note (IAN) 125/15 'Environmental Assessment Update'.	DMRB Volume 11 Section 3 Parts 8 and 9 have been superseded by LA 112 Population and Human Health, which do not contain the same assessments. Assessments under LA 112 are included in ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	It is noted that some of the identified data sources relate to data collected in 2016, consistent with the baseline of the modelling tools being used. This raises a concern that the baseline data, when utilised by the assessment, will be more than three years old and potentially unreliable. The validity of this data to inform the current assessment should be demonstrated. Should validity of baseline data not be demonstrated, additional data sources should be explored, comprising additional data collection and/or utilising existing local authority traffic models.	Surveys were undertaken in 2016 to capture a representative data set prior to the construction of M23 Smart Motorways from 2018 to 2020. The Covid-19 pandemic has meant that it has not been possible to update these data sources. Further comparisons have been undertaken between 2016 data and post-pandemic conditions (2021/22) where possible, which are described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.4 and in Chapters 5 and 6 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4), indicating that 2016 remains an appropriate base for the assessment.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The scope and methodology for each assessment model should be agreed with the relevant authorities and stakeholders. The applicant should explore the availability of more recently modelled information available from local authority transport models, eg the MSDC transport model.	See ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3 on consultation and engagement.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The proposed assessment criteria should be established at this scoping stage and agreed with the relevant authorities and stakeholders.	See ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3 on consultation and engagement.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The study area comprising the AoDM should be reviewed and agreed with the relevant authorities and stakeholders as there is justification to extend the catchment area of the AoDM.	See ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3 on consultation and engagement. Chapters 5, 6 and 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) set out further information on the strategic modelling work.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	In order to fully understand the impacts on the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPAC, transport modelling needs to extend beyond the SAC/SPAC boundary to ensure an Appropriate Assessment is properly evidenced.	Noted and included.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	It is considered that a baseline of 2019 would be more appropriate, the validity of 2016 base data to inform the assessment should be demonstrated. Additionally, a 'worst case' scenario should be considered where a third runway at Heathrow is not delivered at all within the period of assessment to 2038.	The assessments undertaken do not include a third runway at Heathrow. ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.11 provides a qualitative commentary on the potential cumulative effects

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
			that might arise should a third runway at Heathrow come forward. See comment above regarding 2016 base data.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The scope and methodology for supporting technical studies should be agreed with the relevant authorities and stakeholders. Technical studies relating to traffic and transport should be appended to the ES where applicable.	See ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3. Detailed modelling technical reports form annexes to the TA (Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) and Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle: Legion Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4)).
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Current staff origin/destination and mode share patterns should be identified.	Staff origin/destination and mode share patterns are included based on GAL's 2016 Staff Travel Survey.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Various improvements to rail and bus infrastructure are referenced, however the assessment will need to establish the extent to which these schemes are committed and whether the existing and/or committed capacity of each service (ie each rail and bus route) is sufficient to accommodate passenger demand in the design year 2038.	Chapters 7, 9, 10 and 11 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) provide information on the rail and bus proposals.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Mitigation in respect of Highway England's M23 Smart Motorway project (due to be completed in Spring 2020), enhancements to the M25 South-West Quadrant, and allocated funding in the GAL Capital Investment Programme to improve South and North Terminal roundabouts are referenced and the assessment will need to establish the extent to which these schemes increase capacity on an already congested network.	Chapters 6 and 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) provide information on the schemes included in the future network.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The assessment should also acknowledge alternative routes to the M23/A23 corridor such as the A24/A264 to the west and the A22/A264 to the east in providing north-south access between the Airport and the south coast.	These are included in the strategic model and acknowledged in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The applicant should have cognisance to the emerging Crawley Borough Council 'Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan' (LCWIP).	Noted and referenced in the list of related plans and policies in Chapter 4 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	Future staff mode share patterns should be identified, and projections provided for the assessment years 2026 (first full year of operation), 2029 (interim assessment year) and 2038 (design year).	Future mode share commitments have been identified and are set out in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) and summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8 and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	No reference is made to collision data on the surrounding highway network. It is considered that a review of baseline collision data for a minimum of the most recently available three-year period within the study area should be reviewed and assessed.	Collision data is included in the assessment in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and in Chapter 6 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	No evidence appears to have been presented in the EIA Scoping Report to demonstrate how the content of consultation discussions has been incorporated into the assessment methodology. Whilst it is recognised that the consultation process is ongoing, further consultation is required with relevant authorities and stakeholders to adequately determine the scope of the assessment and the geographical study area with respect to transport and traffic.	See ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3 on consultation and engagement.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The proposed approaches to mitigation are considered appropriate, however they should additionally include provision for physical highway improvements where such measures are demonstrated to be required by the assessment after these approaches have been evaluated.	A description of the proposed highway improvements is provided in ES Chapter 5: Project Description.
Mid Sussex District Council	1 October 2019	The identified effects and sensitive receptors are considered broadly appropriate and reasonable; however, the effects should also consider the absolute change in traffic generation where the local road network is already observed and/or forecast to be operating at or close to capacity in the baseline and/or future baseline scenarios.	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.5 explains the assumptions and limitations of the assessment, including that of construction and operational traffic. The assessment includes consideration of highway construction impacts. The potential effects

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		The assessment of driver delay and effects on other public transport services and users (ie bus and coach) should include journey times and journey reliability on key routes to/from the airport.	of any redistribution of traffic are also considered as part of examining the outputs from the strategic modelling which informs the assessment of effects reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
Mole Valley District Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.1: For the avoidance of doubt, the Council would like to make clear that not all of the Mole Valley Local Plan 2000 policies listed as relevant to Traffic and Transport were saved following review of the 2000 Local Plan in 2007. Policy MOV1 was not saved and is therefore not applicable.	Noted.
Mole Valley District Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.12: The Council questions the Applicant's assertion that there is sufficient overall capacity in the rail network for Gatwick to continue to grow its rail mode share over the next decade. We would suggest that through the EIA, a full assessment of the rail network's capacity is undertaken to ensure that the growth in passenger throughput can be accommodated, as well as increasing rail mode share for access to the airport.	An assessment of effects related to rail capacity has been undertaken and is contained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 and in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Mole Valley District Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.18: The Applicant should also recognise the various other local highway network routes that provide access to the airport.	Strategic modelling work has informed the assessment and further VISSIM microsimulation model work has been included in Chapter 13 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Mole Valley District Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.20: The Council is concerned by the Applicant's apparent assumption that Highways England's M23 Smart Motorway improvement scheme will add spare capacity to the strategic network serving Gatwick. We are aware of Highways England's apparent concerns with the impacts on the strategic road network associated with the allocation of Horley Business Park and growth at Gatwick will only exacerbate this problem.	This is noted and strategic modelling work has been undertaken to inform the assessment (Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4), Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) and Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle: Legion Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4)). This shows the results of the assessment, which are also used to inform the assessment of highway-related effects reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
Mole Valley District Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.34: The Council believes that all highway modelling and assessment should be undertaken prior to finalising the scoping area, as otherwise it is impossible to know which parts of the local highway network might require mitigation	This is the approach that has been undertaken for the ES as described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.4.
Mole Valley District Council	30 September 2019	Paragraph 7.6.41: The Council is concerned that the Area of Detailed Modelling (as shown in Figure 7.6.1) does not encompass a wide enough area. The boundary does not include large urban conurbations such as Brighton and Hove, Tunbridge Wells, Guildford and some areas of South London that should be included to fully understand the potential impacts on the highways network. To miss out these areas negates to include a significant proportion of the regional population that use the highways network.	These areas are included in the strategic model albeit not all of them are in the Area of Detailed Modelling. The effects of the Project on traffic in these locations have been considered. Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) discusses the approach to the strategic modelling.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
Public Health England	30 September 2019	<p>The overall risk to NMU and impact on active travel should be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking into account, the number and type of users and the effect that the temporary traffic management system will have on their journey and safety. Any traffic counts and traffic assessment should, as far as reasonably practicable, identify informal routes used by NMU or potential routes used due to displacement, as well as established or formal routes.</p> <p>The final ES should identify the temporary traffic management system design principles or standards that will be maintained with specific reference to NMU. This may be incorporated within the Code of Construction Practice.</p> <p>The scheme should continue to identify any additional opportunities to contribute to improved infrastructure provision for active travel and physical activity.</p>	<p>This is noted. The temporary traffic management system has been developed into a set of principles and indicative arrangements, which has informed the assessment in the ES.</p> <p>Access to public open space and footpaths is considered within ES Chapter 19: Agricultural Land Use and Recreation. The resultant effects on participation in physical activity and recreation are communicated within the health and wellbeing chapter. Furthermore, ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport assesses the potential effects on pedestrians and cyclists from changes in traffic flow and composition.</p>
Public Health England	30 September 2019	The ES should consider the impact of the development on community severance from changes to the transport infrastructure and usage within both the construction and operational phases.	The impact on community severance is covered in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	<p>Also following the adoption of the DMP references to the following saved Borough Local Plan Policies should be removed from Paragraph 7.6.1 of the EIA Scoping Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M04 “Development Related Funding for Highways Schemes” • M05 “Design of Roads” • M06 “Servicing Provision” • M07 “Car Park Strategy & Standards” 	Noted.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We note GAL is proposing to use SATURN software and the SERTM strategic highway model to assess the strategic highways impacts and three VISSIM traffic simulation models and a Corridor Model to assess the local highways impact. Given that Surrey County Council are the transport authority responsible for roads within Reigate & Banstead and given that a number of the key transport routes to the airport more generally pass through Surrey, the models need to take into consideration Surrey County Council’s SINTRAM 7 using OMNITRANS model.	Strategic modelling has been undertaken and is described in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	In relation to the SERTM model, we note that as the Gatwick Airport version of SERTM has not yet been developed and finalised it cannot yet be used to determine the area over which significant changes to travel demand flows are likely. This means that the assessment of the extent of the network over which mitigation has to be considered will be less accurate. This means, for example, that the local highway network such as the A23 London Road (in Reigate & Banstead) close to the Airport is not included within the scoping area. Given that it is likely to be affected by the Project, we expect GAL to complete their assessment and identify what mitigation measures are required before the scoping area is finalised.	Strategic modelling has been undertaken and is described in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We also note that Paragraph 7.6.37 which discusses the Corridor Model states that “in 2016, the Corridor Model was recalibrated based on an extensive data collection exercise. Calibration of the 2016 Corridor Model shows that the model satisfies WebTAG requirements ...” and that Paragraph 7.6.38 states that “given this high degree of calibration and validation, the updated 2016 Corridor Model is considered a robust base to take forward and uplift for future analysis of impacts”. Given the potential for transport impacts associated with the Project, the Council seeks confirmation that the transport authorities responsible for the strategic and local highways (namely, Highways England, West Sussex County Council and Surrey County Council) are satisfied with the use of this model and the assumptions made.	Strategic modelling has been undertaken and is described in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council considers that the information provided in Table 5.4.1. of the EIA Scoping Report provides a useful summary of the key parameters of the proposed Project. This will be useful in assisting in modelling of future impacts if current generations and impacts on the existing levels are known. Where data does not exist on current impacts/ generations, the Council considers that this needs to be gathered as soon as possible in order for the transport impacts of the surface access strategy to be properly understood/ assessed and then mitigated.	Noted.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	In relation to data collected so far, we would welcome clarity regarding the dates on which traffic counts have been collected. We are concerned that the M23 Smart Motorway Works may have impacted upon the traffic counts. We also consider that the scope of the baseline information should be extended to include contribution from housing sites (planning permissions and allocations) of less than 100 units as in a constrained area like Reigate & Banstead, housing completions from smaller sites represent a major component of housing supply and any modelling which does not factor in the contribution from small sites therefore risks significantly underestimating cumulative impacts.	Surveys were undertaken in 2016 in order to capture a representative data set prior to the construction of M23 Smart Motorways from 2018 to 2020. The strategic modelling work which informs the ES includes local development assumptions (latest local plans and committed development as confirmed with Local Authorities) and TEMPro growth factors which have been adjusted to align with cumulative developments in the scheme area in line with TAG guidelines. Future year networks have been updated in consultation with National Highways and Local Authorities to reflect the degree of certainty associated with future upgrade proposals, in line with the approach set out in TAG.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	With regards to the proposed information to be included within the future baseline conditions, the Council notes that Paragraph 6.2.5 states that “a number of improvements are proposed at Gatwick Airport to accommodate the predicted increase in passenger numbers in the absence of the Project” and that “the likely timing of these improvements will be taken into account through the use of future baseline scenarios and assessment years”. The Council would welcome clarity as to the nature of the proposed improvements and their planning status (ie whether they are consented or are ambitions). If they are not consented, we consider that they should not be included within the Future baseline Conditions.	A description of the future baseline for development is provided in ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation and specifically for transport in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.6 and in Chapter 6 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We note that Paragraph 5.2.5 of the EIA Scoping Report states that robotics will be used to increase capacity of long stay carparks by 2,500 spaces. We seek clarity regarding whether this constitutes ‘development’ which requires consent. If so, we do not consider that this additional capacity should be considered within the baseline.	This measure is one of the future baseline car parking projects listed in Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	In relation to Paragraph 7.6.6 of the EIA Scoping Report we consider that current employee travel patterns should also be considered.	This is included in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council notes that the proposed assessment years (relating to transport impacts) do not correspond with the proposed construction period. Given that Paragraph 5.3.20 states that “it is anticipated that construction would require an average workforce of approximately 700 personnel, with up to approximately 2,000 personnel during the peak construction period”, the Council considers that the scope of the assessment should include at least one additional assessment year to take into consideration the peak impact of construction.	Chapter 15 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) discusses the indicative programme for construction. The construction programme shows peak construction activity occurring in mid-2026 with around 1,350 construction workers on site. The airfield construction scenario modelled reflects this peak construction activity and is tested in conjunction with 2029 future baseline conditions, which means background traffic in the assessment has been assumed to be slightly higher than it might actually be in 2026.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We also consider that the scope of the assessment should include at least one additional assessment year to take into consideration the proposed early growth at Heathrow airport (25,000ATMs from 2022), especially considering that this timeframe corresponds with the beginning of construction works for the proposed routine use of the northern runway, no surface access improvements are being proposed by Heathrow to facilitate this proposed early growth and that a number of the key transport links around Heathrow and Gatwick are the same	Modelling assumes growth at Heathrow with two runways from Heathrow’s future baseline as published during its DCO consultation on its third runway. The ES does not consider the Heathrow Third Runway because of the uncertainty about its consenting and delivery

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		roads/ link (and that these roads pass through our borough). We consider that this should be 2023 to take into consideration a full year of proposed early growth and construction at Gatwick.	processes. A qualitative assessment is provided in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12..
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We also question whether there is a need for an additional assessment year later in the 2030s to assess what would happen if Heathrow R-3 didn't open. Whilst the Council recognises the planning policy context behind the proposed expansion of Heathrow, the Council question whether there is a need for such an assessment given recent comments by government and given that the information provided as part of the EIA Scoping Report suggests that if Heathrow was delayed there would be additional growth at Gatwick.	As noted above, the assessments undertaken do not include a third runway at Heathrow.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	With regards to the proposed study area, we note that Paragraph 7.6.36 of the EIA Scoping Report states that the assessment of the impact of traffic from the proposed Project on local roads will be taken into consideration on "the A23 London Road into North Crawley ... roads connecting to the Manor Royal estate and the A2011 Crawley Avenue to Hazelwick Roundabout". We consider that the study area should also take into consideration the impact on the local roads within Reigate & Banstead (and Surrey more generally) including the impact on the A217, A23, B2036 and A264/A22 given that these are key local transport routes (including key local transport routes to the airport) and that past experience suggests that disturbance on the strategic network severely impacts these routes as people use re-route onto local roads to access the airport.	The ES is based on strategic modelling work which includes the A217, A23, B2036 and A264/A22. The extent of the strategic modelling work is explained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and Chapters 5 and 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We would expect any assessment to consider the interaction between the North Downs line and the road network in Reigate, specifically in respect of Reigate level crossing.	The strategic modelling includes rail and road links through Reigate and considers the changes in patronage on rail services and the effects on rail users, but is not used for a capacity assessment of level crossing impacts in this location.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council considers that the scope of the effects proposed to be assessed for 'use of the airport including upgraded highway junctions' should be expanded to include changes in vehicular kilometres driven given the significant additional carparking proposed.	The proposed car parking for the Project is set out in ES Chapter 5: Project Description and is reflected in the transport modelling which informs the assessment in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport. The SACs and interventions including increasing the cost of parking have been tested as part of the assessment and are described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport section 12.8 and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	With regards to Paragraph 7.6.47 of the EIA Scoping Report which details the effects to be assessed within the PEIR/ES, the Council notes that whilst the IEA Guidelines are appropriate for the environmental assessment of the impacts of additional traffic on network, that they are not necessarily transferable to the assessment of other impacts on the network in terms of performance. The scope of the assessment therefore also needs to take into consideration the consequential need to mitigate these.	Chapters 12 and 13 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) set out additional information about the performance of the highway network.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council considers that given the substantial increase in parking provision planned, that the scope of the wider assessment of traffic and transport detailed within Paragraph 7.6.61 of the EIA Scoping Report should also include an assessment of the potential increases in kilometres travelled as a result of the end state scenario when compared with the base.	The proposed car parking for the Project is set out in ES Chapter 5: Project Description and is reflected in the transport modelling which informs the assessment in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport. The SACs and interventions including increasing the cost of parking have been tested as part of the assessment and are described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport section 12.8 and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). Cargo growth has been forecasted and included in the assessment.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council notes that GAL is proposing a number of mitigation measures in order offset the potential impact of the proposed Project. The Council is however disappointed that much of these measures are soft/ management type measures and that there is an absence of hard infrastructure and service provision measures referred to.	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8 describes the mitigation and enhancement measures. A description of the proposed highway works is included in ES Chapter 5: Project Description.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	With regards to the mitigation methods proposed, the Council notes that the majority are from the Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS). The Council would welcome clarity regarding the status of the ASAS given that the Council understands that the ASAS referred to in the EIA Scoping Report, available on GAL's website and referred to in the masterplan is the draft ASAS which was produced in May 2018 and circulated to local authorities for comment. We subsequently provided comments on this document, but our understanding is that they have not been taken into consideration/incorporated into a final ASAS. Our understanding is also that comments provided by residents, town and parish councils, business representatives etc. who made comments on the draft ASAS as part of the masterplan consultation have not been taken into consideration and note that Paragraph 4.20 of the National Aviation Strategy (2013) states that "local people, town and parish councils which have qualifying airports within their boundaries, business representatives, health and education providers, environmental and community groups should be involved in the development of airport surface access strategies" and the Aviation 2050: The Future of UK Aviation Consultation Document highlights the importance of ASAS and their role in setting targets for modal share and environmental targets.	The ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) has been developed and submitted as part of the DCO application. The SACs also explain the relationship between the current ASAS and the commitments being made for the Project, and how those commitments might inform a future ASAS. Commitments within the SACs are included in the assessment reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and in Chapters 9 to 14 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	With regards to the mitigation methods proposed in the ASAS, the Council notes that bullet point 8 of Paragraph 7.6.63 of the EIA Scoping Report which discusses mitigating the impacts of increased carparking on the airport states that "GAL is committed to providing all of the carparking required for the Project on Gatwick land whilst working with local planning authorities such as Crawley Borough Council to reduce unauthorised off-airport parking and to re-provide this on-airport in line with GAT3 [of Crawley Borough Council's Local Plan] commitments". The Council would welcome clarity as to how this would work in practice, for example whether GAL is proposing a mechanism by which additional on-site parking is only permitted following the closure of off-site spaces (both authorised and unauthorised).	ES Chapter 5: Project Description describes the proposed car parking. Adequate parking would be provided for the forecasted passenger numbers. This would reduce the need for offsite parking. The ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) also contains funding to support local authorities in enforcing against unauthorised off-airport parking or providing additional parking controls in the surrounding area.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council would also welcome clarity regarding the practicality of how GAL is proposing to bring construction materials to and from the site by rail. Whilst we note – and welcome - GAL's commitment to "delivering as much of the construction associated with the Project as is practicable by sustainable modes", we are concerned that opportunities to bring construction materials to and from the site by rail would require a rail head. We therefore question the practicality of this (for example where a railhead would be located/ whether the deliverability of a railhead is feasible etc.) and consider that the scope of the assessment should consider the likely scenario of a railhead not being delivered and the majority of construction materials being delivered by road.	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.5 provides information on assumptions and limitations. Further work has been undertaken by GAL's construction team and the assessment for the ES is based on the developed proposals for construction materials and staff movements and phasing. Those proposals are summarised in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan which is contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3 -Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3).
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council also notes that the Gatwick Area Transport Forum only meets annually and is not a consultative body. Instead we consider that the Gatwick Area Transport Forum Steering Group which meets quarterly provides a more suitable forum for consultation and coordination of approach to delivering transport objectives and initiatives.	Noted. It is expected that the Gatwick Area Transport Forum Steering Group would be the body to which GAL will regularly report progress on the SACs.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We note that Gatwick's ongoing sustainability objective with regards to surface access is to "increase sustainable access options for passengers and staff" but that GAL only intends to increase their passenger modal shift by 4% (from a current 44% to 48% by 2022). We question how ambitious this is given that the already consented	GAL is committed to sustainable growth. The headline mode share commitments are set out in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) and summarised in ES Chapter 12:

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		<p>capacity growth on the railway station will be delivered by 2022 and that 2022 is before the proposed commencement of the routine use of the northern runway.</p> <p>We also question how likely it is to be achieved once the proposed Project is completed given the scale of carparking proposed (an additional 17,500 parking spaces on site on top of an already committed 6,750 additional parking spaces proposed/consented for continued one runway operation); that the ASAS commits GAL to reducing staff parking²⁰ which will lead to further passenger parking as current staff parking is made available for passenger parking; and that Paragraph 5.2.52 of the EIA Scoping Report suggests that GAL are not planning for additional rail capacity to accommodate the proposed passenger growth associated with the routine use of the northern runway.</p>	<p>Traffic and Transport, section 12.8 and Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). Modelling for rail capacity has been undertaken and is contained in the assessment in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and in Chapter 9 of the TA.</p>
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	<p>Following on from concerns in the previous section regarding the scale of parking proposed, the Council would welcome more clarity as to the location of the proposed additional carparking given that this will impact upon traffic movements and therefore needs to be accounted for in the traffic modelling. We also note that Paragraph 5.2.43 of the EIA Scoping Report states that some of the existing carparking provision will need to be demolished to make way for other development and reprovided elsewhere on the site; we would therefore also welcome clarity as to which carparks are proposed to be demolished and reprovided elsewhere given that this will also impact upon traffic movements.</p>	<p>A description of the proposed highway works and car parking is included in ES Chapter 5: Project Description. The proposed car parking provision is included in the strategic modelling.</p>
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	<p>We would also request additional clarity regarding the proposed scope of junction improvements and potential road widening given that land in our borough including the Riverside Garden Park and the Horley Business Park site allocation is identified in the for-junction improvements. The Council notes that Paragraphs 5.2.48 and 5.2.49 of the EIA Scoping Report suggests that at-grade junctions may be required at both the northern and southern roundabouts. The Council considers that the scope of the assessment should include the potential for 0-2 at-grade junctions.</p>	<p>A description of the proposed highway works and car parking is included in ES Chapter 5: Project Description. The highway proposals are included in the strategic modelling for the With Project scenarios and in the assessment of effects reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport.</p>
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	<p>We also note that Paragraphs 7.6.12-7.6.15 and 7.6.20-7.6.21 of the EIA Scoping Report describe a number of transport improvements which have already been committed to/ planned, including the railway expansion, new rolling train stock on services calling at the airport, new waiting areas for rail passengers, M23 Smart Motorway and Highways England's proposals to improve traffic flow on the M25. The Council notes that these projects are proposed to mitigate current problems and not facilitate additional capacity from any future growth at Gatwick Airport. This should be taken into consideration in the scope of the assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. The strategic modelling work which informs the ES includes consideration of local development and infrastructure schemes. Future year networks have been updated in consultation with National Highways and Local Authorities to reflect the degree of certainty associated with future upgrade proposals, in line with the approach set out in TAG.</p>
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	<p>The Council notes that there is considerable uncertainty within the location regarding the scale and location of future growth in the region beyond current local plans which end in the early-2030s. In the absence of a long-term strategic land use plan, we consider that there is a need for GAL to consider a range of potential future growth scenarios and at the very least undertake a cumulative assessment of the worst case.</p>	<p>The strategic modelling work which informs the ES includes TEMPro growth factors which have been adjusted to align with cumulative developments in the scheme area in line with TAG guidelines. Future year networks have been updated in consultation with National Highways and Local Authorities to reflect the degree of certainty associated with future upgrade proposals, in line with the approach set out in TAG.</p>
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	<p>The Council notes that Paragraph 5.3.14 of the EIA Scoping Report states that "a temporary logistics facility may be required in order to allow scheduling of deliveries to the appropriate work sites" and that Paragraph 5.3.15 states that "the use of a logistics facility would allow HGV deliveries to the airport to be consolidated, reducing the overall number of deliveries on the local road network". The Council would welcome clarity as to whether a construction logistics consolidation centre will be required, and if so where it will be located as if it does not have</p>	<p>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.5 provides information on assumptions and limitations.</p>

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		internal access to the airfield and the main construction locations then it will not reduce the overall number of deliveries on the local road network but cause additional secondary journeys on the local road network around the airfield.	
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council considers that it is encouraging that Paragraph 5.2.48 of the EIA Scoping Report recognises that any improvement scheme should take into consideration the allocated Horley Strategic Employment Site to the north of the southern roundabout, but considers that consideration of this planned development should also be taken into consideration in the assessment stage.	The Horley Strategic Employment site has been considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment presented in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.11.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	With regards to traffic and transport assessments, the Council would welcome some clarity regarding what assumptions have been made regarding the Horley Strategic Business Park, namely assumptions regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Access to the strategic road network ii. Timeframes for the construction and operation of the business park iii. Proposed operational uses (uses, quantities of floorspace, job numbers)23 iv. Proposed construction phasing v. Proposed road improvements vi. Modal shift during both construction and operation vii. The requirement for the land for road improvements and construction works 	The Horley Strategic Employment site has been considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment presented in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.11. The assumptions made about this site are explained in the modelling technical reports in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and derived from information provided by Surrey County Council.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The site allocation in the DMP requires “a new dedicated, direct access onto the strategic road network (M23 spur)”. As part of the proposed Project, GAL includes the southern part of the site (which would deliver the access onto the strategic road network) in their Project site area. Given this, the Council would welcome clarity regarding whether the proposed inclusion of this land in the site boundary will prevent the business park from being developed. We would also question what other sites have been looked at for temporary construction use and expect strong justification to be provided as to why this site has been chosen given its existing site allocation.	An optioneering process has been undertaken as described in Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered. The southern part of the allocated land is only to be used for a temporary construction compound.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	If the inclusion of this land within the Project site boundary doesn’t prevent the business park from being developed, the Council would welcome clarity as to whether it will impact upon the timeframe for the construction and operation of the business park. The site is being developed by Horley Business Park Ltd. which is a joint venture in which Reigate & Banstead Borough Council is a partner, the developers are currently in the process of preparing for the submission of a planning application, however we note that in Figure 5.2.1f of the EIA Scoping Report the southern part of the site is proposed to be used for construction and that Paragraph 6.2.9 of the EIA Scoping Report states that construction will last from 2022 to 2034.	This development has been included and considered within ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.11.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council would also welcome clarity regarding what assumptions are being taken into consideration with regards to proposed uses of the site. The local plan site allocation is for predominantly B1a accommodation with limited B1b, B8 and non-B Class uses including appropriate airport-related Sui Generis uses and ancillary retail, hotel and conference facilities, gym, crèche and medical services and that there is no definitive floorspace within the site allocation (although work undertaken for the DMP Examination suggested 200,000sqm). Instead the policy allocation requires that a masterplan to be submitted at the outline planning application stage and for this to detail the proposed quantum of development and uses. We query what assumptions are being made given that the Business Park masterplan has not yet been agreed and that the Council (as part of the joint venture) has not been approached by GAL to discuss proposed uses/ floorspace.	The assumptions made about this site are explained in the modelling technical reports in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and derived from information provided by Surrey County Council. It is considered in the cumulative assessment as a Tier 3 development and appropriate weighting has been allocated to this development.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We would also welcome clarity regarding what assumptions are being made regarding construction phasing given that this will be informed by the proposed uses/ scale of development and given that Policy HOR9 requires the Business Park masterplan to provide a detailed programme of infrastructure. Work undertaken by the Council's Planning Policy Team suggested that construction would most likely take place over a twenty-year period and therefore there is a need to give proper consideration to construction phasing.	As noted, Policy HOR9 requires the Business Park masterplan and the developer to provide a detailed programme of infrastructure in due course. For the ES, the assumptions made about this site are explained in the modelling technical reports in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and derived from information provided by Surrey County Council.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	We consider that there is a need for GAL to provide strong justification for the inclusion of the business park land for road improvement and construction storage within the Project site boundary. We also question what other sites have been looked at for road improvement and construction storage and expect to see strong justification for the selection of this site given its existing site allocation.	An optioneering process has been undertaken as described in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council has concern with the statement that "for the purpose of this scoping report, it is assumed that schemes up to and including grade separation of the roundabout may be considered" as during the DMP Examination there was extensive debate between the Council, the promoters of the Horley Business Park and GAL regarding the design of the junction for the southern roundabout irrespective of the growth associated with this Project. GAL insisted throughout the DMP examination that there was a requirement for a grade separated junction to accommodate the business park growth irrespective of any additional growth proposed at the airport therefore we consider that there is a likelihood that will be a need for a grade separated junction to accommodate the proposed growth as a result of this Project.	The Project is proposing grade-separation of South Terminal Roundabout to accommodate growth associated with the Project. This has been modelled as part of the strategic and microsimulation modelling work, reported in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). The highway proposals are described in ES Chapter 5: Project Description.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	<p>The Council notes that in addition to the highway junction improvements planned at the North and South terminal roundabouts that it is likely that further highways and transport improvements (not constrained to junctions) will be required off-site to meet the NPPF requirement of resolving severe residual cumulative impacts. We therefore do not consider that at this time the potentially significant impacts of the development on the transport network (and the subsequent required scope of mitigation measures required) have been fully assessed.</p> <p>We consider that GAL should complete the Transport Model and undertake a transport assessment before the scope of development is finalised. To ensure that the highway impacts of the proposed development are properly mitigated, we consider that there is a need to ensure that in designing highway improvements that this does not lead to traffic redistribution and create new congestion hotspots or exacerbate existing ones.</p>	This is noted and the strategic modelling work which informs the ES (described in the technical modelling reports: Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) and Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle: Legion Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4)) shows the results of the assessment. Highway-related effects on receptors are reported in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	<p>The Council notes that planning permission has recently been granted to facilitate additional rail capacity and that Paragraph 5.2.52 states that "studies will be undertaken to explore the need for further improvement to the rail station, but taking into account the improvements that are currently planned, it is not currently considered that any further improvements will be required to the rail station platforms or concourse".</p> <p>The Council notes that the current consented permission is to accommodate current use/ planned growth and not growth associated with the Project. We consider that this paragraph seems to pre-judge the outcome of the study work and consider that GAL should await the outcome of the study before confirming whether or not further improvements are needed and finalising the scope of the development.</p>	Crowding in Gatwick station has been modelled in Legion using the calibrated and validated model developed by Network Rail for AM and PM peak periods. This is described in Chapter 10 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council notes that Paragraph 7.6.12 of the EIA Scoping Report states that "train capacity serving Gatwick has more than doubled since 2014, with new rolling stock on most of the services calling at the airport. This provides sufficient overall capacity for Gatwick to continue to grow its rail mode share over the next decade".	The assessment of rail patronage and capacity has been undertaken by line. This is explained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, sections 12.4 and 12.9 and in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		We note that this increase in capacity has not been shared equally across all routes as it occurred due to the increase in the capacity of the Gatwick Express and Thameslink services, whereas the capacity of Southern and GWR have remained fairly static. We note for example that there are no direct rail services to/from Kent even though this is an area which is assessed as part of the employment effects. We consider that there is a need for the study to establish if the capacity of the different routes (rather than just 'overall') is sufficient to at least the design year of 2038 or whether this is dependent on further investment in rail capacity.	
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council	27 September 2019	The Council notes that Paragraph 7.6.14 of the EIA Scoping Report states that "Gatwick also has an extensive, 24-hour, local bus network provided by Metrobus". We however note that this is subsidised by GAL through the Sustainable Transport Fund. We consider that this should be acknowledged as it is not necessarily guaranteed to continue. More generally we consider that there is a need to clarify which local bus services are subsidised and set out whether there are plans to change levels of subsidy which could result in changes to bus service patterns.	The baseline environment has been characterised by the existing public transport network for the baseline year assessed. The SACs contain proposals for further enhancements to the bus and coach network serving the Airport and the continued use of the Sustainable Transport Fund to support measures that help to achieve the mode share commitments GAL is making.
Surrey County Council	1 October 2019	Southern terminal roundabout (paragraphs 5.2.46 to 5.2.48, p.37): The County Council welcomes the recognition of the need for any improvement scheme for the roundabout to take account of the business park that is proposed for development on the land to the north of the junction (identified under Policy HOR09 of the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan, 2019). The assessment should take account of the traffic that would be expected to arise from that Reigate & Banstead Local Plan designation, and from extant urban extensions to the settlement of Horley.	The Horley Strategic Employment site has been considered as part of the cumulative effects assessment presented in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport.
Surrey County Council	1 October 2019	Construction Logistics Consolidation Centre (paragraphs 5.3.14 to 5.3.16, p.44): The County Council notes that a decision has yet to be made in respect of the provision of a construction logistics consolidation centre as part of the development, but wishes to highlight the potential for such a facility to affect traffic on the network around the airport. The location of the potential centre will determine whether there will be a net decrease in total traffic movements at the site access points. A key determinant will be whether it has an internal access to the airfield and main construction locations within the campus which thus avoids secondary journeys on the local road networks around the airfield. The assessment should adopt a worst-case approach, and modelling of traffic impacts should include the likely effects of a construction logistics consolidation centre, and of all the construction staff required to deliver the project.	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.5 explains the assumptions and limitations for the assessment
Surrey County Council	1 October 2019	Strategic Highways Modelling (paragraphs 7.6.33 to 7.6.34, p.116): The County Council recommends the use of its model for the county of Surrey as an input to the proposed strategic highways model, alongside input from the West Sussex and Transport for London models.	GAL has engaged with Surrey County Council's officers in developing the strategic model development and its outputs.
Surrey County Council	1 October 2019	Local Highways Modelling (paragraphs 7.6.35 to 7.6.38, p.116): The County Council is concerned that the extent of the model into Surrey is too limited. The County Council would recommend that the local highways model be extended to take account of the A217, A23, B2036 and A264/A22.	The ES assessment is based on strategic modelling work which includes the A217, A23, B2036 and A264/A22. The extent of the strategic modelling work is explained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 5.2.43: The effect of increasing car parking spaces by 17,500 net on mode share will need to be taken into account in forecasting. Should provision of additional spaces run at a faster rate than demand for additional travel capacity and employee numbers, this could affect pricing policy for parking which could, in turn, attract car travel and	The strategic modelling work which informs the ES includes the increase in car parking spaces as currently proposed. Surface access monitoring is proposed as part of The ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) include the use of parking charges to influence air passenger travel choices and GAL will keep

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		change the impacts of the Project. GAL should ensure the Transport Assessment methodology identifies trigger points that can be linked to mode share targets and traffic flow monitoring to inform the design and phasing of the development and the Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS).	charges under regular review and adjust them to respond to assumed demand at different times of the year. GAL will also monitor the outcomes that results from deploying the range of surface access interventions and initiatives, in order to provide periodic review of whether the committed mode shares are being achieved.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 5.2.45 - 5.2.50: The Scoping Report notes that the increase in traffic volumes is likely to be greatest at the North and South terminal junctions, so highway junction improvements are planned at these roundabouts. However, this is not necessarily the case, and it is likely that further highways and transport improvements (not constrained to junctions) will be required off-site to be identified through the Transport Assessment process to meet the NPPF criterion of resolving severe residual cumulative impacts on the road network. These may include increased segregation of sustainable modes of transport whilst maintaining capacity for general traffic or in some locations could require additional capacity for all vehicles. Care needs to be taken to ensure in designing highway improvements that they do not lead to traffic redistribution and create new congestion hotspots or exacerbate existing ones, particularly if new journey opportunities are created – for example the North Terminal Roundabout providing access to the A23 London Rd southbound. As well as Highways England, GAL should involve Local Highway Authorities in the development of junction improvements, given the close proximity of the respective jurisdictions, notably the North Terminal roundabout. At this stage, therefore, the potentially significant impacts of the development on the transport network, and the scope of mitigation measures have not been fully established. The scope of the development cannot be confirmed until GAL has completed the Transport Model and undertaken a Transport Assessment, including developing a new ASAS in liaison with relevant stakeholders.	This is noted and the strategic modelling work which accompanies the ES (see the technical modelling reports Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) and Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle: Legion Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4)) shows the results of the assessment. The modelling has been reviewed as part of identifying the highway-related effects of the Project which are explained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 mitigation identified for any significant effects if necessary. A description of the highway works is provided in ES Chapter 5: Project Description.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 5.2.52: The conclusion that further works to the rail station are unnecessary is premature, given that studies to confirm rail station capacity are still being undertaken. It is unclear what the conclusion is based on: what rail share mode has been assumed, and how this relates to maximum passenger throughput.	Rail mode shares are contained in Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and an assessment on rail station crowding has been undertaken and contained in Chapter 10 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.2: In addition to the guidance listed, the following should be included: - WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments; - WSCC Transport Assessment Methodology; - West Sussex Cycling Design Guide; - Manual for Streets; - Manual for Streets 2.	These additional guidance documents have been added, as listed in Chapter 4 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.5: Traffic count data has also been collected from WSCC's traffic count database.	Noted, reference added in Chapter 5 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.6:	Information on staff travel and mode shares has been provided in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and Chapters 7 and 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		This relates solely to passenger transport patterns. It should also include employees, particularly given the significant numbers (as per paragraph 4.2.25 - 24,000 staff currently work at the airport).	
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.12:</p> <p>The paragraph states that: <i>“Train capacity serving Gatwick has more than doubled since 2014, with new rolling stock on most of the services calling at the airport. This provides sufficient overall capacity for Gatwick to continue to grow its rail mode share over the next decade.”</i></p> <p>However, the increase in capacity has not been shared equally across all routes. It is occurred due to the increase in capacity of Gatwick Express and Thameslink services, whereas the capacity of Southern and GWR services have remained fairly static, and there continue to be no direct rail services to/from Kent. The study will need to establish if the capacity of different routes is sufficient to at least the design year of 2038, or if maintaining Gatwick’s sustainable mode share to the level indicated beyond 2029 is dependent on further investment in rail capacity (such as Network Rail’s “Croydon Triangle” scheme, which is not currently a committed scheme so cannot be relied upon). GAL should assess the impacts of the Project and identify infrastructure and service enhancements for different routes that will be needed to facilitate the development and delivery of the ASAS to at least the design year of 2038.</p>	The assessment of rail patronage and capacity has been undertaken by line. This is explained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, sections 12.4 and 12.9 and in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.14:</p> <p>The 24 hour, local bus service (Metrobus) is in part subsidised by GAL through the Sustainable Transport Fund. Clarity should be provided over whether this will be secured through legal agreement attached to the DCO (if granted), and to what degree – whether there would be an increase or decrease in subsidy, which may affect the level of service provided.</p>	The baseline environment has been characterised by the existing public transport network for the baseline year assessed. GAL would still use the Sustainable Transport Fund to support measures that help to achieve the mode share commitments it is making in the SACs, and therefore it is expected that support from the Sustainable Transport Fund would remain an option as part of the wider range of interventions available to GAL.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.15:</p> <p>The proposal should include provision to investigate ways to improve bus services to/from the airport, to minimise the impact of the increase passenger and staff numbers on people, the road network, and the environment.</p>	See Chapter 11 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.18:</p> <p>The focus here is on the M23/A23, but for south coast towns such as Worthing west to Southampton, other north-south routes are more important for access to the Airport. GAL should recognise the role that other local highway network routes such as the A22, A264, A24 and A29 perform in providing access between the Airport and the south coast.</p>	Noted and these routes are included in the strategic model. The M23/A23 carries the highest proportion of airport traffic.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.25:</p> <p>GAL should not assume that sustainable transport mode share for employees will be 42%. Increasing sustainable transport mode share for employees has been challenging and progress has not proved as successful as it has been with air passengers. Therefore, GAL should consider different mode share scenarios</p>	The mode share commitments have been tested through the strategic modelling process, described in Chapters 5 and 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). Proposed mode share commitments, drawing on the strategic modelling work, are set out in

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		for employee West Sussex County Council: Response to Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Scoping Request Page 12 trips and assess the worst case, which is likely to be the continuation of current staff travel patterns. GAL should also include mechanisms to improve the uptake of sustainable travel initiatives for staff to help achieve more ambitious targets.	the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.28: The bulleted list includes “West Sussex model data, including the network for the Crawley Local Transport Model, traffic counts, signal timings and details on future infrastructure and development assumptions.” However, this data has already been supplied. The exception is any further committed highways schemes which were not already included in the Crawley Model future year networks supplied, largely those in locations beyond the study area for that model. These will be supplied to GAL’s transport consultant, Arup.	Noted. This data and the model network have been included in the assessment.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraphs 7.6.33-34: As the Gatwick Airport version of SERTM has not yet been developed and finalised, it cannot yet be used to determine the area over which significant changes to travel demand flows are likely. This means that the assessment of the extent of network over which mitigation has to be considered will be less accurate. It means, for example, that the local highway network such as A23 London Road close to the Airport is not included in the scoping area but is likely to be affected by the Project. GAL should complete their assessment and identify what mitigation measures are required before the scoping area is finalised.	Strategic modelling work which informs the assessment is set out in the technical modelling reports (Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) and Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle: Legion Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4)) contained as annexes to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). A summary is also provided in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraphs 7.6.34 - 7.6.38: The VISSIM Models referenced have a limited study area with inclusion of West Sussex County Council roads largely limited to the A23 between the airport and the A2011 Tushmore Junction, plus a single section of A2011 eastwards to the Hazelwick Roundabout. This means that the consideration of other WSCC managed roads which may experience changes to demand patterns due to the Project will need to be assessed through the Gatwick Strategic Model - including Gatwick Road, the remainder of Crawley Borough, and roads in Mid Sussex and Horsham districts and further afield. The impacts on these roads may require mitigation to ensure the residual cumulative impacts of development are not severe in line with NPPF. Therefore, GAL should add local detail to the Gatwick Strategic Model in these areas and the County Council should be consulted on its calibration and validation on County Council roads.	See above comment.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.41 and Diagram 7.6.1: The proposed structure of the demand model splits airport-related highway demand into passenger and employee trips. It should be clarified that the model will also handle demand made by trips by suppliers to airport businesses and airlines –goods delivery trips - and visitors to the airport, such as people using the airport hotels without being air passengers or staff, whether being guests or attendees of the hotel conferencing facilities or visitors to on airport businesses.	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.5 provides information on the assumptions and limitations of the assessment. Airport supplier, cargo and logistics, ie delivery trips, as well as non-airport users including visitors and commuters are included in the modelling.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.41: The extent of the model coverage is proposed to be assessed using “confirmed assessment criteria” but these are not stated here. The West Sussex County Council: Response to Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Scoping	Strategic modelling work which informs the assessment is set out in the technical modelling reports ((Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) and Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle: Legion

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		Request Page 13 criteria should be established at this scoping stage. WSCC is concerned that the A27 corridor is outside the area of detailed modelling. There is a prevalence of long-standing congestion issues on the corridor that could be exacerbated by the Project. Planned housing development will not be equally distributed across the south coast and there is a choice of competing routes between A29, A24 and A23 so travel patterns can be expected to change as a result of the Project. The A27 corridor is located within the wider area of simulation modelling for which it is proposed to keep the SERTM level of detail. However, to ensure that the Model will accurately route traffic to/from Gatwick based on a realistic simulation of main junctions along the coastal corridor between Arun, Worthing and Brighton and Hove, the most affected parts of the A27, including the section between A27/A29 Fontwell in the west and the county boundary in the east (potentially extending to A22/A27 Polegate in East Sussex) should be included in the area of detailed modelling.	Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) contained as annexes to the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4). A summary is also provided in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.42: WSCC notes that the rail modelling will extend down to and along the Sussex Coast, which is supported. It is desirable that the rail and highway modelling should be kept to a comparable standard over a similar area, so that mode share is assessed consistently, rather than being influenced by the level of modelling of travel costs in certain areas according to mode of travel.	The assessment of rail patronage and capacity is contained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 and in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.43: For both the construction and operational phases it would be helpful to provide information on both the absolute and percentage change in traffic generation and assigned flows.	Absolute and percentage change in traffic flows for the assessment study area and the assessment years are contained in ES Appendix 12.9.1: Highway Flows and Driver Delay Review (Doc Ref. 5.3).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.47: It is noted that the criteria for percentage change in flow for consideration of delay relates to the environmental assessment of the network. However, for the supporting Transport Assessment, tighter figures, such as the West Sussex starting point of 100PCU/hr, may be necessary to assess delays at congested junctions, as a relatively small percentage increase in flow can lead to a much higher increase in delay at peak times for road travel when the network is already congested. GAL should include journey times and reliability on key routes to/from the airport via both the local and strategic road networks.	The driver delay assessment has been undertaken based on changes in Volume to Capacity (V/C) ratios at junctions rather than change in traffic flows. This is described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.4 and section 12.9. Further information is provided in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.53: As well as those listed, local highway authorities also hold information about committed developments and schemes.	Local highway authorities have been consulted on the committed developments included in the strategic modelling work.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.59: The later delivery of Heathrow in 2030 is a highly plausible and worthwhile scenario to include, but it does not seem to be a worst case, that being that Heathrow does not get delivered at all in the period under consideration to 2038. If this occurred, then growth at Gatwick would be likely to occur at a faster rate than currently anticipated, potentially accelerating impacts and the need for improvements that are currently planned for later phases. GAL should also assess the impacts of a 'without Heathrow Runway 3' scenario.	The assessment does not include the Heathrow third runway because of the uncertainty about its consenting and delivery processes. A qualitative assessment is provided in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.11.
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	In reference to Paragraph 7.6.60:	The impact of the Project on direct, indirect and catalytic employment has been assessed and included in the strategic transport modelling.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		<p>TEMPRO does not take Gatwick Expansion into account. Expanding the Airport may generate a greater level of economic growth in the region. A potential way to overcome this could be to develop a scenario where the further development to overall. TEMPRO totals by Local Planning Authority area are distributed according to the sites already considered through the SHELAA process but not yet allocated rather than through TEMPRO's defaults. This would help to ensure that additional background demand in the cumulative impact assessment originates where it is most likely to occur, rather than in proportion to existing population sizes. GAL should also consider other potential future growth scenarios and assess the cumulative impacts of development on the transport network in the worst case to ensure that impacts can be managed in line with NPPF.</p>	
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.61:</p> <p>As stated above, the Transport Assessment will need to use tighter criteria for traffic flow increases than those indicated in paragraph 7.6.47 to consider all relevant locations where a severe impact under NPPF criteria could occur and require mitigation, due to the sensitivity of congested networks. Thresholds of 5% increase or 100pcu/hr, whichever is greater, could be considered reasonable for routes which are already congested at peak times.</p> <p>Also as stated above, the Transport Assessment should take into account the West Sussex Transport Assessment Methodology for the County Council network, as well as the County Council's Guidance on Parking at New Developments and on cycling design.</p>	<p>The driver delay assessment has been undertaken based on changes in Volume to Capacity (V/C) ratios at junctions rather than change in traffic flows. This is described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport section 12.4 and section 12.9. Further information is provided in Chapter 12 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).</p> <p>These additional guidance documents have been added, as listed in Chapter 4 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).</p>
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.63:</p> <p>The proposed approaches to mitigation are appropriate. However, they should additionally include provision to increase physical highway capacity for residual issues after these approaches have been tested, whether this is widening to allow additional segregated facilities for sustainable modes without reduction to general traffic or for increased capacity for all traffic depending on the nature of the location and transport corridor. It may also be necessary to consider additional off-site public transport infrastructure facilities in areas which are likely to see significant employee commuter demand to Gatwick. In practice, the Gatwick Area Transport Forum only meets annually and is not constituted as a consultative body. The Gatwick Area Transport Forum Steering Group provides a more suitable forum for consultation and coordination of approach to delivering transport objectives and initiatives.</p>	<p>The proposed highway works are described in ES Chapter 5: Project Description and have been developed through engagement with National Highways and the Local Highway Authorities. The assessment of the performance of the highway proposals is contained in Chapters 12 and 13 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).</p> <p>It is expected that the Gatwick Area Transport Forum Steering Group would be the body to which GAL will regularly report progress on the SACs.</p>
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.65:</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Strategy needs to include consideration of how construction workers will get to site, how sustainable transportation will be encouraged, and if travelling by car, where they will park.</p>	<p>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.5 provides information on assumptions and limitations. An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan has been prepared and is contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3 -Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3).</p>
West Sussex County Council	11 October 2019	<p>In reference to Paragraph 7.6.66:</p> <p>Consideration must be given to providing buses or other sustainable transport options for construction workers, given that up to 2,000 will be on site at peak times (see paragraph 5.3.20).</p>	<p>Chapter 15 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) contains further information on construction. The construction programme shows peak construction activity occurring in mid-2026, with around 1,350 construction workers on site. For the rest of the duration, there would typically be fewer than 1,000 construction workers on site. An Outline Construction Workforce Travel Plan (CWTP) has been</p>

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
			developed and prepared and is contained in ES Appendix 5.3.2: CoCP Annex 3 -Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Doc Ref. 5.3). It focuses on managing how the construction workforce will travel to and from the Airport, including measures that encourage alternatives to the use of private car, in particular single-occupancy car journeys.
Waverley Borough Council	30 September 2019	In relation to transport matters, the Council would be interested in understanding further how sustainable access to the Airport can be improved for Waverley residents and businesses as part of the development.	Transport links through Waverley are included in the strategic transport model.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	It is noted that that nothing has been scoped out of the traffic and transport assessment for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which is entirely appropriate at this early stage. Although no issues have been de-scoped, TfL is keen to ensure that GAL continues to have sufficient regard for any potential impacts identified on London's transport networks. TfL looks forward to continuing engagement with GAL on these issues.	See ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.4. No effects identified in the scoping and consultation process have been scoped out, other than driver stress and view from the road assessments which no longer form part of DMRB. GAL has continued to engage with TfL as set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	As part of the assessment of transport, GAL should have regard for relevant London policies including the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS). The MTS sets a target for 80% of all Greater London trips to be taken by sustainable modes, including public transport, walking and cycling. It is essential that development proposals outside Greater London, but which are significant generators of trips to and from London have regard for this target and support its delivery.	This is noted and understood. The highest sustainable mode share for airport-related journeys is between the Airport and London, owing to the excellent rail connectivity Gatwick has with the capital.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	In the case of the Gatwick Airport, Greater London is currently its largest market, representing 42% of passengers travelling through the airport. It is the mode share of both passengers and staff travelling between London and the airport which is of most relevance to TfL.	Noted and understood. See above.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	The MTS sets out a transport policy based on Healthy Streets, as part of a wider strategy to improve public health and support good growth. TfL Healthy Streets indicators should be used as a measure of amenity within Greater London, and TfL recommends that the Healthy Streets indicators be applied across the wider study area in order to support sustainable development.	Noted. GAL is keen replicating elements of Healthy Streets through encouraging greater active travel use, particularly by staff, to and from the Airport. The SACs include mode share commitments for active travel, together with commitments to enhance on-site facilities for walking and cycling. Active travel infrastructure improvements form part of the proposed highway works.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	GAL's analysis of the surface access dimension of its proposals is an essential part of its wider assessment of the full range of environmental impacts, which needs to explicitly draw out the impacts on London and associated mitigation required.	Noted and understood.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	In accordance with DfT WebTAG guidance, GAL should agree with stakeholders what surface transport infrastructure and operations will exist in the future baseline without airport expansion. GAL will test the 'with scheme' against the 'without scheme' scenario to determine what impacts will need to be mitigated against. The baseline scenario cannot include uncommitted schemes.	Background traffic in the strategic modelling work is based on the latest TEMPro growth factors which have been adjusted to align with cumulative developments in the scheme area in line with TAG guidelines. Future year networks have been updated in consultation with National Highways and Local Authorities. In line with TAG, only those interventions which are near certain or more than likely to occur have been included in the modelling.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	The Scoping Report highlights that 42% of Gatwick passengers travel to or from Greater London. As this is the largest market for Gatwick passengers and the demographic of greatest relevance to TfL, GAL should provide	Noted. Chapter 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the technical modelling reports accompanying the TA (Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
		the mode share split (main mode), for passengers from Greater London in the baseline conditions. This should be given for the baseline, future baseline and with project scenarios.	(Doc Ref. 7.4) and Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle: Legion Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4)) provide further information about mode share for different locations.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	The baseline staff mode share has not yet been made available and should be included. This is critical for assessing future staff flows and mode share.	Baseline staff mode shares are included in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport and Chapters 5 and 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Transport for London	11 October 2019	As well as the Brighton Main Line (BML) that directly serves the airport, the modelling will need to assess the impact on onward routes and key interchanges in Greater London. Modelling will in general need to assess the impact on bus and coach routes.	The rail modelling includes the London Underground network. Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) provides a full discussion on impacts. Volume changes on the London Underground are very small in comparison to the overall volumes forecasted on these services.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	Public transport connections to Gatwick for locations in southeast and southwest London, ie without easy access to the BML – can be relatively weak relative to private car. Any baseline modelling should seek to understand the flows between these areas on all modes.	Noted. Chapters 5 and 8 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) and its annexes provide further information about mode share for different locations and these considerations have also informed the public transport interventions that are proposed as part of the Project.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	TfL is satisfied that the proposed detailed highways modelling area is appropriate for the proposed project, covering key corridors and town centres in south London. TfL is also satisfied that the strategic highway modelling area is appropriate for the project, which includes all of Greater London.	Noted.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	Should junctions, corridors or wider areas be identified in the strategic modelling as likely to be impacted by the proposed project, detailed modelling should be completed for the affected area.	The strategic highway modelling which informs the assessment includes the potential effects of any redistribution of traffic.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	Modelling will need to assess any direct and indirect impacts from the proposed development, including the potential for induced growth.	Modelling includes the effects of direct, indirect and catalytic employment growth associated with the Project.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	The A23 corridor, which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN), is the corridor of most interest for TfL in relation to the proposed project, with Fiveways Junction and Purley Gyratory of particular concern. For the purposes of modelling, the Fiveways Junction capacity upgrade should be treated as a committed scheme, while the Purley Gyratory upgrade is not committed.	Noted. GAL has consulted with TfL on the development of the highway model.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	TfL is satisfied that the proposed public transport modelling arrangements are generally appropriate for this project.	Noted
Transport for London	11 October 2019	It is noted that the proposed scope of assessment does not explicitly include tram services in South London. GAL should ensure that the trams are included in the public transport study.	The modelling includes Croydon Tramlink which will serve an important role for access to Gatwick via East Croydon from Addiscombe, Mitcham, New Addington.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	TfL requests that any data obtained and used by GAL for the purposes of the EIA, the Transport Assessment (TA) and the Surface Access Strategy is made publicly available.	This is noted, subject to any confidentiality agreements between GAL and the data provider.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	TfL can advise on types of baseline condition survey needed for walking and cycling, such as Healthy Streets assessments.	Noted.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	Issues which have not been identified in Table 7.6.1 include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collisions specifically between cyclists and HGVs ▪ Air, light and noise pollution due to construction traffic ▪ Air quality impact of construction 	The assessment of transport-related effects presented in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport includes considerations of road safety. An assessment of air quality relating to both construction activities and construction traffic movements is provided in ES Chapter 13: Air Quality. An assessment of construction noise is provided in ES Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration.

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
Transport for London	11 October 2019	TfL would like to highlight the potential impact on Tram, Underground, Overground and other national rail services feeding into the BML. These should be adequately modelled in order to determine any potential further crowding on these services.	These services are all included in the strategic transport model.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	TfL recommends GAL works with it to determine the magnitude of any impacts on transport within, to and from Greater London.	Noted and agreed. GAL has already engaged with TfL as an important stakeholder.
Transport for London	11 October 2019	GAL should consider luggage load factor on public transport services as luggage can have a significant impact on crowding, particularly during peak hours.	Noted. The approach to modelling rail patronage and capacity is set out in Chapter 9 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Transport for London	11 October 2019	GAL should make use of TfL's Construction and Logistics Plan (CLP) guidance, as it sets out how TfL expects construction to be assessed in the planning stages. TfL's CLP guidance has been used for other nationally significant infrastructure projects, such as Thames Tideway Tunnel and HS2, as best practice. GAL should forecast construction traffic, both workers and materials, for the entire build programme, and assess lane usage and track possessions during the build programme. GAL should provide modelling for all phases of construction.	ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.5 provides information on assumptions and limitations. Further work has been undertaken in conjunction with GAL's construction team to inform the assessment in relation to the construction period, which is described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 and in Chapter 15 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Transport for London	11 October 2019	Based on the results of the assessment, GAL should implement measures to avoid, minimise and mitigate impacts on the TLRN and the Strategic Road Network (SRN) as part of the Mayor's Vision Zero and air quality targets.	This is noted and the strategic modelling work which informs the assessment (see the technical modelling reports : Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) and Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle: Legion Modelling Report (Doc Ref. 7.4) contained in the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4)) shows the results of the assessment undertaken. Mitigation and enhancement measures are set out in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8 and in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3).
Transport for London	11 October 2019	GAL should seek to set out measures for encouraging mode shift from private vehicles, not only for meeting surface access targets, but for reducing air pollution, noise, carbon emissions and limiting climate change impacts.	This is noted and agreed and is reflected in the proposed mode share commitments in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3).
Transport for London	11 October 2019	GAL has separately indicated that it aims to increase rail mode share for passengers to 50% by 2040 from the present mode share of 39%. This is a sensible approach so long as this increase in rail mode share is not at the expense of other sustainable modes. GAL also needs to set out its plan for staff trips.	This is noted. The proposed mode share commitments are set out in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) and summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8 and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Transport for London	11 October 2019	In the context of the MTS target, and recognising the already strong rail connections between Gatwick and London, TfL has called on GAL to commit to an ambitious mode share target specifically for airport passenger and staff trips to and from Greater London.	GAL is committed to sustainable growth. The headline mode share commitments for the Project are set out in the ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3) and summarised in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.8 and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Transport for London	11 October 2019	GAL's assessment should consider how it will meet its mode shift objectives and how the network is able to support the increase in public transport trips.	Mode share targets have been tested through the strategic modelling process to understand the impact of 'pull' and 'push' measures that are required to deliver these targets. Chapter 7 of Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4) contains further details. Rail and station crowding assessments have also been undertaken to demonstrate

Consultee	Date	Details	How/where taken into account in ES
			how the network is able to support the increase in rail trips. These are contained in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.9 and in Chapters 9 and 10 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Transport for London	11 October 2019	It is noted that GAL proposes to construct approximately 17,500 new car parking spaces to support the project. TfL recognises the spatial context of Gatwick Airport; however, any proposed uplift in car parking needs to be evidence-based. Too much car parking availability risks making driving to the airport an attractive option compared to sustainable modes.	The proposed car parking for the Project is set out in ES Chapter 5: Project Description and is reflected in the transport modelling which informs the assessment in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport. Interventions including increasing the cost of parking have been tested as part of the assessment and are described in ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport section 12.8 and in Chapter 7 of the Transport Assessment (Doc Ref. 7.4).
Tandridge District Council	30 September 2019	Comments from West Sussex County Council (as local highway authority for the Project area) are endorsed. Surrey County Council, as the highway authority covering Tandridge and other host and neighbouring authority Surrey Districts, is best placed to comment in detail in relation to this topic.	See ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport, section 12.3 on consultation and engagement, as well as responses to comments from West Sussex and Surrey County Councils in this Appendix.

3 Glossary

3.1 Glossary of terms

Table 3.1.1: Glossary of Terms

Term	Description
AoDM	Area of Detailed Modelling
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
ASAS	Airport Surface Access Strategy
ATM	Air Traffic Movements
CLP	Construction Logistics Plan
CMP	Construction Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
DMP	Development Management Plan
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EIASR	Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report
ES	Environmental Statement
GAL	Gatwick Airport Limited
GTA	Guidance on Transport Assessment
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
IAN	Interim Advice Notes
LCWIP	Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan
MHCLG	Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government
MTS	Mayor's Transport Strategy
NMU	Non-Motorised User
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
PEIR	Preliminary Environmental Information Report
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SACs	Surface Access Commitments
SERTM	South Eastern Regional Transport Model
SRN	Strategic Road Network
TA	Transport Assessment
TAG	Transport Appraisal Guidance