

File Name: ISH4 5th March 2024 Part 1.mp3

File Length: 01:22:23

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:01 - 00:00:13:00

Good afternoon. Can all those present hear me clearly? Okay. Thank you very much. And can I confirm that the live streaming of this event has commenced?

00:00:14:27 - 00:00:46:11

Thank you. Uh, it's now 2 p.m.. Welcome to the tissue specific hearing in relation to the application made by Gatwick Airport Limited, who we will refer to as the applicant for an order granting development consent for the Gatwick Airport and Northern runway project. As described in the application form, the application seeks powers to enable dual runway operations at Gatwick Airport through altering the existing northern runway, lifting restriction on the northern runways, use and delivering the upgrades or additional facilities and infrastructure required to increase the passenger throughput capacity of the airport.

00:00:47:20 - 00:01:04:18

This includes substantial upgrade works to certain surface access routes which lead to the airport. My name is John Hockley. I'm a charter town planner and a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute. I'll be sharing this hearing and making some introductory comments. I'll now ask my colleagues to introduce themselves, please.

00:01:06:19 - 00:01:12:19

My name is Doctor Philip Brewer. I have a PhD in applied acoustics and am a member of the Institute of Acoustics.

00:01:13:28 - 00:01:19:17

Good afternoon. My name is Helen Cassini. I'm a chartered town planner and member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

00:01:21:05 - 00:01:30:06

Good afternoon. My name is Kevin Gleason. I'm a town planner, a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute, and I'm the lead member of the panel appointed to examine this application.

00:01:31:06 - 00:01:39:24

Good afternoon. My name is Neil Humphrey. I'm a chartered civil engineer and a fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers, and I will be asking the majority of the questions this afternoon.

00:01:41:13 - 00:02:14:09

Thank you. We've all been appointed by the Secretary of State to be members of this panel, and we constitute the examining authority or the QA for this application. We will be reporting to the Secretary of State for transport as to whether the development consent Order should be made. For those here in

the venue, you may have met Michele Norris, who is a planning inspector at Case Manager. She is supported by Mrs. Jennifer Savage and Mr. Elliott, both from a case team, and a happy birthday to Mr. Booth as well. If you have any questions about the examination process or the technology we are using, the case team should be your first point of contact.

00:02:15:12 - 00:02:48:11

Before we consider the items on the agenda. There are a few housekeeping matters that I just need to deal with briefly. Firstly, can everyone please set all devices and phones to silent please? There are no fire alarm tests or drill schedule for today. So in the event of a fire alarm, please exit the room and a fire evacuation assembly point is just outside the main entrance on the left hand side. Toilets are located on this and the ground floor. I am informed that um, car parking charges will not apply to those attending this meeting, but any issues either speak to reception or to Miss Norris.

00:02:48:21 - 00:03:22:18

And also, when using the desk based microphones, please speak into the microphone. In addition to this in-person event, the hearing is also taking place on the Microsoft Teams platform and is being both live streamed and recorded. For those persons joining online, you may wish to switch cameras and microphones off. If you're not participating specifically in the discussion. Should you wish to raise a question, please just use the Microsoft Teams hand function and when invited, you can turn your microphone and camera on. Please be advised that the chat function on Microsoft Teams is disabled and cannot be used.

00:03:24:00 - 00:03:33:06

If we have to adjourn proceedings today, including for brakes, we will have to stop the live stream. When we recommence the meeting and restart the live stream, you'll need to refresh your browser page.

00:03:34:28 - 00:04:05:14

Because the digital recordings that we make are retained and published. They form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the General Data Protection regulations GDPR apply. The Inspectorate's practice is to retain and publish recordings per period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. Consequently, if you participate in today's hearing, it's important that you understand that you'll be live streamed and recorded and that the digital recording will be published. If you don't want your image to be recorded, you can switch off your camera.

00:04:06:17 - 00:04:36:13

The only official record of the proceedings is this recording, which will be uploaded onto the Inspectorate's website as soon as possible after the hearing. Tweets, blogs, and similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of this application. Hearing. Today we are structured discussion which the WSA will lead based on the agenda that has already been published. We will be asking questions to ensure that we have all the information we need to make our sorry make our recommendation to the Secretary of State.

00:04:38:02 - 00:05:14:05

We are familiar with the documents already submitted. So when answering a question you do not need to repeat at length something that has already been submitted. When referencing a document, please

give the appropriate pins examination library reference. Additionally, the first time you use an abbreviation or an acronym, could you give it a full title as there will be people participating or observing that may not be as familiar with the documents as you are. The hearing will focus on issues which we wish to address primarily to the applicant. We acknowledge the interested parties have not submitted written representations and local authorities have not submitted their local impact report.

00:05:14:11 - 00:05:27:15

Matters arising from such submissions and residual matters arising from this hearing will be addressed subsequently if necessary. We will look to take a break at around 330 this afternoon and intend to close the hearing no later than 5 p.m..

00:05:29:03 - 00:05:54:07

It's not our intention to do full introductions at this point. However, for the purpose of identification and for the benefit of those who may be watching the digital recordings later, those intended to speak are asked to state your name, who you represent, and any preference on how you wish to be addressed. Please speak clearly into the microphones and additionally, if you could also give your name in any organization you're representing each time you are asked to speak during the hearing, that would be useful. Thank you.

00:05:55:24 - 00:06:26:08

I'd now like to turn to the agenda for this hearing. This was published and placed on the Planning Inspectorate website on the 30th of January, 2024. The ESA has decided to hold this issue specific hearing because we wish to discuss matters relating to the case for the proposed development following the submission of the relevant representations. We consider that the main item for discussion are strategic transport modelling, rail modelling, car parking assessment, movement frameworks and modal targets and controls.

00:06:27:05 - 00:07:11:01

We will seek to allocate sufficient time to each issue to allow proper consideration of it. We'll conclude the hearing as soon as all relevant considerations have been made and all questions asked and responded to. But if the discussions can't be completed or are to take longer than anticipated today, it may be necessary to prioritize matters and defer other matters to written questions. It's important that we get the right answers to the questions that we are going to ask. Therefore, if you cannot answer the questions that are being asked or require time to get the information requested, then rather than giving a restricted or potentially wrong answer for the smooth running of the examination, can you please indicate that you need to respond in writing? And we can then defer the question to the next round of written questions, or a later deadline or hearing.

00:07:12:18 - 00:07:19:04

As noted at the preliminary meeting, the examination is predominantly a written process, supplemented where necessary by hearings.

00:07:20:23 - 00:07:52:16

For the avoidance of doubt. To conclude each agenda item, we will be asking the applicant for any final comments they have on any representations made during the discussions on each item. Finally, this is a hearing and not an inquiry, and therefore there will be no formal presentation of cases or cross

questioning of other parties. As such, any questions that you may have for other parties need to be asked through the Xa. This approach is set out in section 94 of the Planning Act 2008. If there are any questions at this stage about the procedural side of today's hearing or the agenda.

00:07:53:29 - 00:07:54:27

Yes, Mr. Bedford.

00:07:55:15 - 00:08:26:27

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford, um, the joint local authorities. Can I just mention a matter which I don't think has any, um, moment, but I think in the interest of transparency, it just needs to be mentioned. So you will recall that at the preliminary meeting, Mr. Gleason indicated that he'd made a declaration of interest in relation to the firm of Atkins and amongst the Surrey County Council team here today is a member of Atkins, Mr.

00:08:26:29 - 00:08:44:15

Graham Bowen, who sits not immediately to my left, but to my one on from my left. And, uh, simply to note that point and to note that the Mr. Bowen works with, um, somebody who has some connection to a member of the panel. And that's all I was going to say.

00:08:45:22 - 00:08:47:24

Thank you for that, Mr. Bedford. That's noted. Thank you.

00:08:49:16 - 00:08:53:15

Don't you have a question from your house about the procedural side of today's hearing or the agenda?

00:08:55:20 - 00:09:03:09

Okay. Thank you. Oh, we'll now move on to agenda item two on the agenda. And I'll pass to Mr. Humphrey to take us through the next agenda items. Thank you.

00:09:03:16 - 00:09:41:05

Thank you, Mr. Hockley. As previously outlined, the purpose of these hearings is to focus on the issues which the examining authority wishes to address, primarily to the applicant. At this stage of the examination, consideration will focus on the applicant's position. Although interested parties and in particular key transport and highway authorities will be asked for their views where appropriate. I would like to say that I've read all of the relevant representations relating to transport, and will give them full consideration as we go through the examination. At this stage of the examination, the agenda relates to consideration of the principles and methodology used in the applicant's assessment.

00:09:41:28 - 00:10:02:03

You consider this necessary in advance of the detailed considerations of transport impact. So please be assured that this is a starting point of our examination process. With this in mind, the discussions will follow the agenda and any interested party who wishes to comment on an agenda item will be heard before moving on to the next agenda item.

00:10:04:07 - 00:10:06:15

So that is. Anyone got any questions about the.

00:10:08:21 - 00:10:41:28

Oh. Thank you. Well, a move to item 3.1, which is a future baseline development. I would like firstly to look at the forecast baseline and its implications for the transport effects of the project described in chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement at App 037. The future baseline is described as representing the airport, as it would be expected to grow if the proposed development is not granted. However, all of that airport growth is also included in the growth figures for the proposed development.

00:10:42:00 - 00:10:42:28

Is that correct?

00:10:52:15 - 00:10:53:21

It's correct. Uh.

00:10:54:13 - 00:10:57:18

David Ellis, on behalf of the applicant. That's correct. Thank you.

00:11:01:15 - 00:11:10:22

On that basis, then if the DCO was to be granted, the project case scenario would describe all of the airport related growth from the start of the project. Is that correct?

00:11:14:09 - 00:11:14:24

It's correct.

00:11:16:09 - 00:11:47:11

Could I just check the following projected passenger numbers? 2019 baseline is 46.6 million passengers per annum. 2047 future baseline without the development is 67.2 million passengers, parameter being the growth the airport could achieve if the DCO is not granted and 2047 proposed development projection is 80.2 million passengers per annum. Are those figures correct?

00:11:48:28 - 00:11:51:28

David Larson, behalf of the applicant. Can you give us one moment and we'll just check those.

00:12:09:12 - 00:12:12:02

David asking behalf of the applicant. They are correct. Thank you.

00:12:13:06 - 00:12:28:10

In the transport assessment, you have modelled both the impacts of the future baseline and the proposed development. But in chapter 12 of the environmental Statement, you have assessed the impact and effects on the change from the future baseline to the proposed development scenario. Is that correct?

00:12:30:20 - 00:12:33:15

David Ellis on behalf of the applicant. That's correct. Thank you.

00:12:34:18 - 00:13:08:06

I don't want to revisit the discussion on future baseline we had at issue one, but I do want to explore some of the potential consequences of using the future baseline of set out in the assessment. Firstly from the latest CAA data of UK airports. I note that in 2023, Gatwick had return to 40.9 million passengers per annum, which is less than a 2019 baseline figure. From this 2023 figure, the future baseline forecast increase to 2047 is 26.3 million passengers per annum.

00:13:08:14 - 00:13:19:09

That's a 64% increase in 24 years, which is over double the proposed development increase of 13 million passengers who have assessed in chapter 12 of the year. Is that correct?

00:13:27:09 - 00:13:28:13

We're just checking one moment.

00:13:43:07 - 00:13:46:02

I'm David. On behalf of the applicant, the numbers are correct.

00:13:46:08 - 00:14:14:20

Thank you. I just want to read something from paragraph 1.25 for the EMA 2023 guidance that says, in relation to the Rochdale envelope, that the approach should ensure that a project being assessed represents the realistic worst case in terms of traffic and movement demand. Given you only assessed around a third of the potential effects of the airport growth, if the DCO is granted, you think the chapter 12 assessment provides a realistic worst case?

00:14:30:05 - 00:14:32:27

David. Applicant, could you just repeat the last question?

00:14:33:29 - 00:14:58:09

The issue is what what the environmental statements about Rochdale Envelope should ensure that the project being assessed represents a realistic worst case in terms of traffic and movement demand. And if you compare the 26.3 million passengers per annum in your baseline that you haven't assessed.

00:15:00:29 - 00:15:03:20

To the 13 million.

00:15:05:12 - 00:15:07:13

They have assessed in the US.

00:15:09:28 - 00:15:18:27

Is that a realistic worst case that you've not assessed 26.3 million? Passengers per annum growth from now.

00:15:39:28 - 00:15:54:23

So Stuart Jenkins for the applicant, and the 26.3 billion growth is included in the assessment in the sense that it's included in the future baseline. So it's not a case that we've only assessed an uplift of 13 million.

00:15:55:09 - 00:16:27:15

But in the Ta. I accept that point. You've assessed both, you've assessed the future baseline and you've assessed the future project. But in the years you've, in effect, subtracted the future baseline from the future project and said, because, yes, the year chapter 12, if you look at the way it's been derived, is about the change in traffic flows from the future baseline to the project. But what you don't assess is the 26.3 million. I can't see that anywhere in the year where that's been assessed.

00:16:29:15 - 00:16:46:07

To Stuart Jenkins, the applicant I. I understand the point. Um. What we've assessed is the impact of the project over and above what could occur in the future baseline. And that's what we understand as a reasonable worst case for the what ifs.

00:16:46:12 - 00:17:12:23

Potentially would come on to that. But I think the issue is, as we discussed before, it's about a realistic worst case. And the 26.3 million is in the future is in the project case. But what is not being assessed in the year is you haven't assessed the baseline position. Bernoulli says the project case to be 13 million, but the project case isn't 13 million.

00:17:14:21 - 00:17:21:02

Much larger than that because it includes 26, but it should include the 26.3 million. Should it not?

00:17:52:03 - 00:18:07:19

Leave the evidence to the applicant. We believe the assessment is a realistic worst case assessment on top of the future baseline. That's kind of that's our position on it. I think if it needed more detailed response, I think we. Should come back to you.

00:18:08:01 - 00:18:40:13

Maybe at the end of the item, I might sum up what I'd like to see. Yeah, fine. Um, okay. Just just moving on from that then. Um. In paragraph 12 .6.3 of the Transport Assessment as 079 and conclusion of the Strategic Highway modelling is stated that the model provides information on the performance of the highway network in each of the future baseline years, allowing for background traffic growth, committed developments and committed network changes, but does not include the project.

00:18:40:21 - 00:18:46:07

Why is there no mention of that 26.3 million passengers per annum growth there?

00:18:49:00 - 00:18:50:17

Could you provide the paragraph again, please?

00:18:50:19 - 00:18:52:28

It is 12 .6.3.

00:19:09:00 - 00:19:40:19

Says Stuart Jenkins for the applicant. And I think that's just a point of clarity. I think in producing the document. Um, I'm talking about the performance of the network in each of the future baseline years. Um, I think when we wrote it, background traffic growth inherently meant both airport and non airport related growth. It's not an attempt to not mention the growth the the sorry the airport related growth in the future baseline is in our future baseline models.

00:19:41:25 - 00:20:18:10

Okay, well, maybe go on in paragraph 9.1.1 of annex B of the to, which is up to 60. It states in accordance with Tag unit M4 and uncertainty, log was developed for both demand, e.g. new developments and supply e.g. new transport infrastructure, but could impact on the future performance of the transport system. The objective of this was to review the likelihood of specific proposals coming forward, based on their current planning, funding status and the uses as a basis for selecting a set of assumptions for the future baseline.

00:20:19:01 - 00:20:29:24

There is no mention in the uncertainty log of the 26.3 million increase in passengers in the future baseline, or any assessment of the uncertainty attached to this assumption. Why not?

00:20:34:28 - 00:21:07:09

Chris Bruce on behalf of the applicant. So we have included the baseline within the, uh, the baseline forecasts for the airport within the, um, baseline case. It doesn't sit within the uncertainty log, um, within the documentation, but it does sit within, uh, the document, I believe it's sections six. I can clarify that. Um, but it is included and considered as, um, essentially, um, sufficiently certain to be included.

00:21:08:11 - 00:21:29:07

I accept that, I accept your point is included in the Ta assessment, but what I'm. Puzzled by is that there is no uncertainty, given the discussions, that it is one. There is no uncertainty about that level being correct. That's and there is no mention of it here. That's what I was concerned about.

00:21:34:10 - 00:21:34:25

Um.

00:21:37:03 - 00:21:49:05

Okay. Could we move, maybe move on a bit further then? Considering the background traffic growth starting from the 2016 traffic counts, I assume background traffic growth has been applied to all measured traffic flows. Is that correct?

00:21:54:00 - 00:21:56:08

Which person will have the applicant? Yes. That's correct.

00:21:58:07 - 00:22:14:23



Well, I assume that the 2016 traffic counts included airport traffic and thus background traffic growth will also include some element of background growth of the airport traffic. You've also added as part of the future baseline. Is there not some element of double counting in that?

00:22:17:20 - 00:22:50:24

Chris Broussard, applicant. Um, so I believe not. Um, we have, uh, included just the increment in terms of growth from 2016 into the future baseline in terms of, uh, airport uh, growth, which is been added to the 2016 position. So the additional growth occurring between 2016 and 2019, for example, has been added on to the 2016 position. And just the uplift in airport demand, uh, in the baseline has been included.

00:22:52:06 - 00:23:00:01

But I assume in 2016 there will be some element on the network of airport traffic. Surely that would have been approved up to.

00:23:02:19 - 00:23:34:15

Yes, sir. Um, the, uh, base, uh, traffic model includes both, uh, passenger and employee, um, and associated cargo demand that's on the existing uh, network in operation in 2016. Um, and that has then been scaled based on the growth in passengers and employees between, uh, the 2016 operational level and the future baseline level in 2029 and onwards.

00:23:34:22 - 00:23:43:23

So you in effect of extracted the airport traffic then applied not just applied in general growth figure to the airport traffic. It's not what you're saying.

00:23:44:08 - 00:23:44:23

That's correct.

00:23:44:25 - 00:23:46:12

So thank you.

00:23:48:28 - 00:24:13:23

Uh. Um. But moving on again, I know that in paragraph 13.28 of the to the only the future baseline highway works delivered as part of the existing capital improvement plan. But the two terminal roundabouts were modeled at a maximum of 55 million passengers per annum. Were committed to be complete by 2029.

00:24:16:03 - 00:24:47:02

Looking at the operation of the highway network. I note in paragraph 13.5 .15 of the to the museum outputs for 2047 future baseline indicate a network which has very limited capacity to accommodate additional demand by this time, leading to poorer overall performance and significant congestion at key locations both within the airport network and on the strategic and local network. Given the future baseline of 67.2 million passengers per annum.

00:24:48:02 - 00:25:07:06

Do the problems identified and no other highway improvements that that are planned for the future. Baseline traffic increases. How confident are you that. The. The performance and congestion on the highway network would not affect the ability of the airport to meet future baseline projections.

00:25:27:25 - 00:26:16:26

Uh, Sir Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, yes. We are confident in the modelling that's been undertaken. Um, we've got a comprehensive strategic transport model, um, covering all modes. Uh, we have, uh, cluded. Uh, all the committed, uh, both development associated with the uncertainty logs you describe, uh, and the committed, uh, highway and other transport schemes. Um, the scheme that is included to improve the uh, North Terminal and South Terminal roundabouts, which is your identifier is in the future baseline, um, helps deliver additional capacity, um, that will assist the airport to, uh, continue to manage growth and congestion in the vicinity of the airport.

00:26:17:08 - 00:26:36:18

Uh, the other thing that we will have is, of course, is a series of surface access strategies and interventions to promote sustainable modes, which will continue to act in concert with our own airport parking, um, in order to, uh, to balance out growth without a commensurate increase in highway trips.

00:26:37:07 - 00:27:08:15

I, I do understand that, but I think the point I was trying to make, probably not very well, was if that the existing capital improvement plan improvements were modelled up to a maximum of 55 million passengers per annum, and the Ta says that 67.2 million passengers per annum produces a lot of problems on the strategic highway network, the local highway network and performance problems.

00:27:08:17 - 00:27:23:15

It's those problems. Do you not think that that might affect the ability of the airport to meet the 67.2 million passengers per annum, i.e., that the performance of the highway network won't restrain growth?

00:27:25:04 - 00:28:03:20

Uh, we're talking to the applicant. Uh, no, we don't believe it'll constrain growth. Uh, the network modeling that we've undertaken, uh, indicates that the, uh, immediate area around the airport, including M23 junction nine, M23 spur, and Airport Way, um, all operate within, although close to capacity by 2047. Uh, and we have, uh, measures in place, uh, associated with the signalization to essentially sort of allow us to help control, um, the airport related trips coming in and out of the, uh, forecourts and other parts of the.

00:28:05:12 - 00:28:07:06

Gatwick Road network.

00:28:08:09 - 00:28:18:05

What you're saying that what you say in the to about the poorer overall performance and significant congestion at key locations wouldn't be a problem to me at 67.2 million passengers per annum.

00:28:19:03 - 00:28:27:16

Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, it wouldn't be a constraint on a reach on reaching that, um, on that level of demand at the airport.

00:28:28:09 - 00:28:29:06

Okay. Thank you.

00:28:30:21 - 00:28:56:00

I've read the relevant representation representations that express concerns about traffic issues. A large number of these have raised concerns about the traffic effects of the proposed development on local roads through communities located near Gatwick. I mean, my issue is, given what I've read so far and hearing your responses, I was wanting to ensure that chapter 12 represented a realistic worst case in terms of traffic and movement demand.

00:28:57:15 - 00:29:32:27

And the concern I've got now is that from what I've heard you say. Is. I understand you have assessed in the to the future baseline of 20, uh, 67 million, and you've assessed the project at 80.2. But from what I understand and what you've told me, that the IRS considers the difference between the two. It's that missing bit because the project. Once. If if this DCO is granted, then the what would happen without the project falls away and it all just becomes the airport growth with the DCO.

00:29:33:05 - 00:29:58:02

So the 26.3 million should be assessed somewhere. What I'm saying is, have you have you done baseline that considered the baseline, the more traditional baseline that's set out in the uncertainty log which has other developments traffic growth but no airport growth. Have you done the baseline assessment of that? Against the with project in the is.

00:30:02:21 - 00:30:12:14

Oh. Uh, David. On behalf of the applicant, know our our baseline and future years includes growth at the airport, which is which represents a business as usual condition for the airport.

00:30:13:09 - 00:30:31:20

It's not defined as that, though, is it? It's her. What happens if the DCO is not granted? And doesn't provide a realistic worst case of what would happen if the DCO is granted. Because if the DCO is granted. The scenario whereby if it's not granted, doesn't exist.

00:30:33:14 - 00:30:45:14

It's actually what happens from now in traffic terms. So the realistic worst case scenario would be traffic growing in background and other committed developments and the airport growth.

00:30:53:08 - 00:31:22:22

Uh, Richard Higginson, the applicant. Um, manual seeking clarification, sir. Um, are you looking at a or looking for commentary on a future scenario where the airport does not grow but background growth? Does comparing that to the project or a condition where the airport and background, uh, so non airport related to traffic both grow and compare those to the project.

00:31:23:09 - 00:32:00:15

Yeah. Unless unless I'm. Unless I'm misunderstanding the way traditionally I would see this being done is there would be background growth of the network and other committed developments that would be your future baseline. And everything wants if the DCO is granted, becomes the project impact. So it's the eeaS should consider the difference between the project impact and the and the background and other development growth on the network. I don't know what what that would show, but I'm saying right now we can't we can't know what that shows because we haven't got it.

00:32:03:02 - 00:32:32:19

Uh, really talking to the applicant? Um, I think in the condition where the background traffic is that, uh, allowed for within the future baseline. That's also in terms of some airport growth. There is, um, there is no cap on airport growth in its current configuration at Gatwick and therefore the future baseline, which includes airport related growth, um, as you've described, is contained within the future baseline.

00:32:32:28 - 00:32:53:06

Isn't the future baseline a fallback position if the DCO isn't granted? Because unless sitting in the hearing this morning, are you telling me that the socio economics was done with a future baseline in it? That said, without the DCO being granted, the employment numbers would go up to that level.

00:32:59:23 - 00:33:02:11

Why is it different in transport? That's what I want to know.

00:33:04:19 - 00:33:14:08

I understand there's a fallback position and that's a material consideration. But there's also a true position, which is the airport growth is contained within the DCO.

00:33:21:12 - 00:33:37:14

And so I have a sergeant counsel for the applicant. And we'd like to just clarify the EIA methodology for you. And if we can come back to you on that either later this afternoon or in writing, I think it would be helpful for us to just be able to have a quick discussion as a team to straighten this out. Okay. Thank you.

00:33:39:14 - 00:33:51:00

Okay. Well, that's probably on this particular item finished for me. So I'll ask whether. Others are going to start, maybe with National Highways. Do you have any comment to make on this?

00:33:55:07 - 00:34:34:03

Thank you sir. My name is Mustafa Latif Ramesh for National highways. Um, what we're proposing to do is just give you an overview of our concerns, noting that you've read our relevant representation and, um, provide you with the kind of high level concerns that we have. Just by way of update, you'll have noted that issue specific hearing to I mentioned that we were meeting with the applicants team. Um. That that meeting was, uh, broadly positive. And we are cautiously and I emphasize, cautiously optimistic, um, that at least some of the concerns will be addressed in, in due course.

00:34:34:10 - 00:34:42:15

However, we wanted to ensure that you had a snapshot of National Highways views as they currently stand. Um.

00:34:44:18 - 00:35:15:01

So very again, I've got four issues to cover. And again I'll only cover them in in in brief. The first relates to the future baseline. And, um, you've asked the applicants some of those questions already, so we won't repeat them. However, just by way of background, the core model that's, um, uh, has been submitted by the applicant is based on some assumptions that National Highways thinks are misplaced.

00:35:15:15 - 00:35:46:29

Um, just as an example, two brief ones. The lower Thames crossing is assumed to be open in 2029. In the core model, it's proposed to be open in 2032. Um, there are assumptions made about smart motorway projects being delivered, but those have fallen away. Sensitivity analysis that's been provided has sought to address some of these, uh, assumptions that have been made in the core model. However, what we haven't seen is the use of that, uh, corrected, uh, sensitivity analysis put back into the vision model.

00:35:47:01 - 00:36:02:25

We've been told by the applicants team that that will be provided very shortly. But until they provide, um, that updated vision modelling, it's difficult for us to make definitive conclusions as to whether we're satisfied with the impacts on the strategic road network.

00:36:04:15 - 00:36:40:20

It's also worth saying that the strategic model and the future baseline is is is is, uh, as we understand it, uh, utilizes a staff survey report from 2016, but we understand there's an updated version, uh, that was carried out either last year or this year. And there's a question about whether that affects the future baseline. It may be the case that it doesn't, but we haven't seen that, um, sufficient evidence to allow us to conclude that. The second issue is, is something I touched on at issue specific hearing to, and that relates to the timing of the highway works.

00:36:40:28 - 00:37:15:12

Again, one of our concerns is that there is a 2020, uh, sorry, 2029 future baseline, as well as a 2032, um, assessment scenario. What that doesn't do is address the interim growth between those periods. And because the main highway works only have to be delivered by 2032, National highways doesn't currently have sufficient evidence to conclude that that interim period, um, would lead to a situation where the strategic road network is operating efficiently and safely.

00:37:16:21 - 00:37:50:06

The third issue is what you referred to as the Capital Investment Program works, also referred to as the business as usual upgrades on the highway network. Again, there is there is no security, uh, for the timing of those works being delivered. That's partly because the Bor works, those capital investment program works are not within the scope of schedule one, however, because they are assumed in the traffic assessment and are being relied on by the applicant. What we'd like to see is security that they will be in place at the right time.

00:37:50:22 - 00:37:58:21

In the discussion I mentioned. We understand that the applicant is considering that position and might have something to share shortly, but we haven't seen that yet.

00:38:01:02 - 00:38:10:25

And then very finally on the issues before I go to some of the next steps from National highways. Perspectives is a real concern around construction traffic impacts.

00:38:12:20 - 00:38:36:29

It's acknowledged that the, um, construction assessment should be a realistic worst case scenario, and that there is a degree of proportionality that should be applied in determining the scenario that's assessed. National highways is not yet comfortable that, uh, the assessment does, in fact represent a realistic worst case scenario. And.

00:38:38:15 - 00:39:14:16

One of the core issues of this is that. The assessment doesn't consider different measures. It looks at the worst phase of construction as we understand it and then assesses that. But that doesn't necessarily mean that for some junctions and for some links, um, the worst case scenario has been assessed. So what they've done is they've looked at the phases, picked out the phase that is worst overall, but they haven't looked at particular junctions or links. Again, what we're planning to do is to share some of the specific concerns so that the applicant can provide the assurance that's required.

00:39:16:25 - 00:39:49:07

I'll conclude just on what we see as a solution. And I'm doing this as a sign posting, but also just, uh, with your permission, talking about some of the future submissions that we will be making. So on the timing of the highway works, um, what we'd like to see is sufficient modelling to allow us to identify the relevant trigger point at which those highway works have to be in place. That's both. The highway works within the scope of the DCO and also the business as usual upgrades.

00:39:49:09 - 00:40:02:12

The timing of those is key because if they have to be in place in order to mitigate the impacts on the strategic road network, then we should all be clear that they will, in fact, um, be delivered in time.

00:40:06:24 - 00:40:43:02

In relation to the construction traffic concerns that I've highlighted. What we'd like to do, with your permission, is to and we're still considering the logistics on this is to provide a markup of the outline traffic management plan. I think you heard from Mr. Bedford at issues specific hearing to that. The current draft before you is lacking in some detail. And in order to be helpful to the examining authority, we want to provide specifics on where we think that document can be improved. Um, we'd also like to provide a mock up of the Surface Access Commitments document.

00:40:43:04 - 00:41:21:29

As you've heard from the applicant, that's the document which has a number of their modal targets. It also has public transport measures. Um, I won't repeat what I said at issue specific hearing too. But our fundamental concern is that the Transport Mitigation Fund should be robust enough not just to deal with um identified impacts, but unknown impacts arising as a result of the uncertainty of the

modelling carried out. And in that context, the wider impacts of the development on the strategic road network, uh, if they arise in ten, 15, 20 years, should be capable of being addressed through that, uh, transport mitigation fund.

00:41:22:01 - 00:41:34:07

And again, we're hoping that by providing you a markup of the Surface access Commitments document, you can see how we would, um, propose to address those issues. And that's all I had.

00:41:35:27 - 00:41:42:16

Thank you. Um, Mr. Bedford, perhaps on behalf of the local highway authorities.

00:41:47:10 - 00:42:19:11

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, for the joint local authorities. And so we, uh, would share the concerns that have just been expressed on behalf of National Highways. Um, in the sense that we have similar concerns in relation to the local road network, for which obviously the county councils have a responsibility. Um, and I don't, uh, rehearse, uh, the same points because I say we share similar concerns.

00:42:19:28 - 00:42:54:14

Um, we obviously have the wider concern that you've already adverted to that was discussed at issue specific hearing, one about the, um, wider modelling of the future baseline scenario and its realism that obviously, although that was being expressed in the context of, um, aviation need and demand, it necessarily has an inter linkage, uh, with the surface transport consequences of the true level of demand, particularly in the future at baseline.

00:42:55:10 - 00:43:32:05

We will await to see what the applicant says by way of its explanation to your particular, uh, concerns and questions in relation to particular aspects of their modelling approach. And we'll obviously comment on that when we have seen what the applicant has to say. Um, then, um, we um. Are aware of, but are not yet in a position to provide you with detailed comments on the sensitivity test exercise that the applicant has presented through the recent post Covid 19 modelling.

00:43:32:20 - 00:44:05:13

Um, we're still looking at that information. We don't think we'll be in a position to provide a full response to that at deadline one, but we're very hopeful that we'll be able to provide our response to that deadline to so far, in a sense, almost just park that it's a concern, but it's not one that I can develop. Um, and then we also have some specific concerns about some of the assumptions which have featured. Uh, in, uh, the modeling. Um, and in particular in, um.

00:44:06:21 - 00:44:39:13

The modelling of the baseline in chapter four, particularly with regard to some of the assumptions that are made for the baseline scenarios as to the quantum of car parking that would be available. Uh, and there are two particular locations, if I can just mention them where we're not currently persuaded, uh, that what the applicant, uh, proposes ought to be included in a baseline scenario.

00:44:40:03 - 00:45:12:18

Uh, the first of those is the applicant's ability to achieve 2500 spaces via robotic parking, which the applicant is suggesting it could do in the exercise of its permitted development rights under class F of the. The Mets General Development Order 2015. That is something that requires consultation with the local planning authorities to exercise that permitted development.

00:45:12:20 - 00:45:53:00

Right. And in the exercise of that consultation, we would be wanting, uh, if consulted, to understand how such a scale of increase could be, um, consistent with the service access obligations which are currently set out in the current section 106. So so that I think I've probably developed that point enough just to mention it. Um, the second and it's also a related planning point, Hilton hotel, there's a multi-storey car park, which in the future baseline is proposed to some 820 spaces.

00:45:53:02 - 00:46:15:07

We're not persuaded that that's an implemented planning permission. So we don't think that should be part of the future baseline. Uh, if I can just give you a reference, it was section 4.4.6 in app zero 29, where those particular assumptions are identified.

00:46:16:23 - 00:46:24:02

But could I just say on the robotic parking point? I think that forms part of my questioning on item five, agenda item five.

00:46:24:04 - 00:46:43:07

It does indeed, but it also because we were on future baseline assumptions, and it's one of the features that the applicant relies on in the future baseline. That's where I mentioned it. But I absolutely accept your your wider point. Uh, and then um, the um.

00:46:45:27 - 00:46:56:06

Yeah. I think well, there is a concern about the viz in modeling, but that I think relates more perhaps to the future rather than to the baseline situation. So I'll leave that point. Thank you sir. Thank you.

00:46:57:06 - 00:47:01:29

But just before I move on to other parties, does the applicant want to make a response to those two?

00:47:04:17 - 00:47:35:24

Um, I have a sergeant counsel for the applicant. I'll just pick up a couple of points there, and then if anyone else on the team wants to come in, I'll hand over to them. Um, in response to National Highways, as you've heard, we're in discussion with them, and we're looking to see, um, what work we can do to, um, explore the concerns that have been raised. Um, in particular on the point about whether there's any security, um, for the future baseline works. We don't have any difficulty in principle with including, um, measures in the DCO to secure those works.

00:47:35:26 - 00:47:48:13

It's a question of, um, ascertaining what wording would be appropriate. So that's something that we are, um, looking into. And we'll come back to, um, in due course. Um, and then.

00:47:51:01 - 00:48:08:12



I think, um, I'll leave other members to come back on the other points raised by National Highway. But just in response to Mr. Bedford, um, I've noted the points that were raised in particular around the parking capacity, and, um, we'll explore those further and come back in due course on those as well.

00:48:08:14 - 00:48:09:26

So thank you.

00:48:11:26 - 00:48:43:24

Evidence on behalf of the applicant. I'll just pick up on some of the other points from the national highways that are all positively we're doing something along the lines of, uh, so the, the sensitivity testing like, like was raised and that, uh, with the request that it is then run through the vision exercise. Um, that was a discussion we had on Friday. So we're just reviewing the timescales, etc., uh, for that piece of work. And we can come back to you on that, uh, staff survey. We do have a summary of that information which is now complete. So we will supply that along with the commentary with it.

00:48:43:26 - 00:49:09:27

And we can provide that to yourself, sir, if that would assist. Um, the 29 and 32 um situation in terms of the completion of the highway works, um, ties to the earlier point, really in light of the work we're already doing in terms of the, uh, sensitivity testing, we're going to review that piece of work at the same time and just just see what our what our response is and how we take that forward.

00:49:10:05 - 00:49:16:27

Thank you. Okay. So now any of the parties now I've got Cagney down to speak on this one.

00:49:19:00 - 00:49:49:12

Uh, yeah. Good afternoon, sir Lee white, um, instructed by Cagney. Um, transport planner? Um, I think so. Just to, um, signpost our written representation as opposed to anything else. Um, obviously, we've we've listened to your questions, uh, this afternoon, and I think we share a number of those concerns that you've raised in terms of the baseline scenario, the assumptions behind it, um, and indeed the time periods that have been taken into the traffic modeling, um, obviously will detail that in writing for you, sir.

00:49:49:18 - 00:50:21:13

I think the other thing to say is as well, that, um, we obviously have got some concerns to say about the assumptions about the interface between the local and the strategic road network. I think, quite rightly, we would assume that the majority, if not all the traffic, particularly for airport users, would be from the strategic network. But clearly, I think I echo Mr. Latif his concern about the construction traffic analysis that's been conducted to date. Once again, we'll put that in writing to you, sir. And I think, you know, just those great concerns about the traffic modelling.

00:50:21:15 - 00:50:54:08

Unlike National Highways, we've not actually seen the traffic model, I think, just to be aware of that. Um, so we're only going on the information that's been published in the application and the subsequent updates to that. Um, there does appear to be a very limited suite of documentation around the validation of the model. Um, I'm sure there's a more detailed report available. Um, you know, I'm sure colleagues, um, from for the applicant will have undertaken that work, but we've not seen it. I

think that's the I think that's all I'd like to say at the moment. So clearly, um, there will be more, I think, later on.

00:50:54:10 - 00:50:58:08

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. White. Is there anyone else who wants to say something on this? Yes.

00:50:59:07 - 00:50:59:22

Uh.

00:50:59:29 - 00:51:04:25

Thank you very much. My name is Stephen Rolfe, South parish council.

00:51:06:15 - 00:51:39:02

Our area is traversed by the A23 and the A2 one seven, and we know that in the morning and evening rush hour peaks, traffic is at a near standstill. The A23 is also the main feeder road into East Surrey Hospital, and local residents are very aware of the number of emergency ambulances from the north and from the south of the hospital, fighting their way through traffic, either at a standstill and the skill of the ambulance drivers is in.

00:51:39:04 - 00:51:54:29

Getting through is to be marvelled at. Should this application go ahead and reach the growth figures, we're being told. The A23 for local residents will be impossible to use. Make living in Salford's and Sid Lowe unpleasant.

00:51:55:20 - 00:51:56:15

Thank you, Mr. Roff.

00:51:57:05 - 00:51:58:14

Anyone else? Yes.

00:51:59:29 - 00:52:30:06

Uh, Chris? Chris hide for. Sorry. Climate commission. I was listening with great interest. Um, the discussion about the reduction in demand at the airport down to 2023, and that raises all sorts of questions about how growth is then being applied to models which were validated in 2016, as I understand it. Um, so in effect, we've had growth going down from one level then, then you have to then project forwards to forecast years for, for the airport.

00:52:30:08 - 00:52:51:13

So I'll be interested in seeing the reporting that comes out of this. One particular question that emerges from that is not just the absolute, uh, changing volumes at the airport, but also the pattern of demand and whether there were any known changes to patterns of demand, uh, for, for for the airport and how that impacts the, uh, the modelling. Thank you.

00:52:52:05 - 00:52:54:16

Any others? Yes. In the audience.

00:52:57:20 - 00:53:30:12

Thank you. Um, Daisy noble, counsel on behalf of Marathon Asset Management. Um, hi. London Gatwick Limited in high CP limited. Together, the owners and operators of the Holiday Inn Gatwick Airport. Um, the AXA will be aware from what has been said on behalf of the holiday and to date, that contact has been made between my client and the applicant, and the parties are working to resolve, um, issues voluntarily and amicably. Um, with that in mind, I don't intend to go through every issue that, um, we have with the application materials.

00:53:30:19 - 00:54:04:15

Um, the AXA will be aware that my client has various concerns that are relevant to, uh, surface transport, such as the need to maintain access to our client's hotel during the construction process. Um, but that is a matter that the parties are intending to explore through discussions. Um, so for today's purposes, I just wish to make one point in respect of the future baseline. Um, we understand that the applicant's iOS uses traffic data from 2016, um, as the baseline for future projections of traffic numbers in the width scheme and without scheme scenarios.

00:54:04:25 - 00:54:44:03

Um, the applicant's post-Covid traffic assessment, um, and the reference for that document is as 1 to 1, indicates that traffic numbers have fallen significantly between 2016 and 2023, and that means that lower traffic numbers are now expected in the future years without the scheme, i.e. the future baseline scenario. The applicant has not updated the future road traffic baseline position to reflect that decline in traffic numbers. Um, but the reason I highlight this now is simply to flag that whilst that approach may be appropriate in the context of assessing the impact of the project on road traffic, I make no comment on that.

00:54:44:05 - 00:55:14:05

The future baseline does have implications for road traffic noise modelling. Um, which uses a baseline of 2018. Um, in short, unless the future baseline is adjusted, um, the assessment will underestimate the noise effects of the project arising from road traffic, including on my client's hotel, the Holiday Inn. Um, I appreciate we're not discussing noise today, so I won't go any further on that. I just wanted to flag that point and perhaps return to it tomorrow. Um, in the noise ish. Thank you, thank you.

00:55:14:26 - 00:55:15:29

Any other comments?

00:55:18:25 - 00:55:24:10

Baseline. So maybe from the applicant. Doesn't.

00:55:26:19 - 00:55:44:27

Um, so just in response to Miss Noble, I need to, um, confirm that meetings have been taking place and will continue to take place, um, with Holiday Inn and progress is being made, um, hopefully to resolve the concern around their access. I've noted the point raised about noise, and I'm sure we'll pick that up in the session tomorrow, so thank you.

00:55:47:05 - 00:55:52:19

Any other comments on the. Other comments from the interested parties.

00:55:55:09 - 00:55:55:24

So.

00:55:57:29 - 00:55:59:03

Also. Thank you.

00:55:59:11 - 00:56:35:16

Thank you. Well, we'll move on to agenda item 3.2. Then the assessment period. A note in the to paragraph 8.1.13. The use of a June weekday is also in keeping with DFT guidance on using neutral periods as a basis for model development and assessment. The revised approach is considered to be more appropriate and reasonable, robust case for the assessment as it provides a more consistent combination of demand data. Because I read target unit and 1.2, paragraph 3.36.

00:56:36:09 - 00:57:06:12

It says survey should typically be carried out during a neutral or representative month, avoiding main and local holiday periods, local school holidays on half terms and other abnormal traffic periods.

However, it goes on to say there can be instances where particular period e.g. weekends or school holidays is of interest, for example in regions with relatively high levels of seasonal tourism. Period for the survey should be selected with careful consideration of the purpose of the transport model.

00:57:07:20 - 00:57:12:18

Wood. Wood. The area around an airport not be such an instance.

00:57:19:02 - 00:57:21:04

Disappeared somehow. Excuse me. Uh, Chris.

00:57:21:20 - 00:58:05:21

The applicant. Though the selection of June um has been made considering a number of factors, both in terms of the seasonal profile of non airport related traffic background, traffic terms, as well as the airport itself. Um, and the combination of those two. And when we when we consider that they make in combination um, a greater impact on the um local and strategic network. Uh, from analysis of traffic account data, we identified that the, uh, commuting periods during June, uh, was uh, was significantly higher on local roads than through August.

00:58:06:13 - 00:58:46:29

Um, and so we have, uh, identified a, a peak June uh, condition in the context of the airport, um, which in future years is very similar to the peak, uh, August condition. Um, uh, based on the aviation forecasts and in our opinion, the June condition of looking at an average weekday with higher local commuting, um, and, uh, the hi June condition at the airport, um, is a reasonable, um, scenario to take in order to undertake the full assessment.

00:58:47:29 - 00:58:56:23

So then total June traffic levels are higher than August traffic levels. Is that we are saying in effect.

00:58:57:24 - 00:59:29:00

In across the local road network. In terms of traffic count data that we assembled, um, we identified that the, uh, traffic volumes on A-roads and B roads in the study area were higher on uh, during the June condition than during August, and that the strategic road network, whilst in some places and in some time periods, um, was marginally higher than June.

00:59:29:02 - 00:59:47:29

The percentage differences were very small. And in the round, looking at the wider strategic network, it seemed most appropriate to to work with a average June weekday um, coupled with a peak June, uh, busy day at the airport.

00:59:49:07 - 00:59:55:11

So is that was that based on peak hour flows or daily flows?

00:59:56:21 - 01:00:07:13

It was based on a combination of both. Uh. Uh, peak hour, uh, morning and peak, uh, morning and evening peaks. And during the the day also.

01:00:08:27 - 01:00:14:02

Is there any sensitivity test done on whether you used in August? What would what would happen?

01:00:15:14 - 01:00:56:18

In some of the discussions we've had with National Highways, specifically around the operation of the spur, we have considered, um, an uplift on the dune condition to understand the sort of resilience that could come from an August condition. Um, the variation that we've observed within the data is around, um, is around 8% based on existing profiles, but based on the, um, future, um, projections of aviation, uh, behaviour and profiles within the um, application, uh, forecasts.

01:00:56:29 - 01:01:20:00

Um, we believe that reduces in the future to around, uh, 2 to 3% in variability. Um, so from an assessment perspective, we felt that the June condition was fine will be, uh, that some assessment of, um, seasonal variation could be taken on in the visitor model as needed for the, uh, the spur corridor.

01:01:20:25 - 01:01:34:24

But in terms of the ease, because in some instances the development impact can be greater off peak. Is there any consideration given to August traffic flows in local road network and off peak?

01:01:49:21 - 01:02:31:15

I'm Sister Jenkins to the applicant. Um, the the modelling itself covers, uh, both the morning and evening peak periods and a daytime into peak. Um, as you will have seen, uh. I think, although Mr. Gross will confirm if needs be, that when we looked at whether we were going to use a June weekday or an August weekday, um, consideration was made across the peaks as well. And so at an overall level, looking at, um, comparison within seasonal variation across the year, June was still thought to be, uh, the preferable case for us to take so that we could be consistent within the, within the assessment.

01:02:32:24 - 01:02:49:29

Maybe. Maybe it's the preferable case suggests that there are some pros and cons of either one. Maybe it's a greater understanding is what I need. What are the pros and cons of those choices? In terms of the local road strategic road.

01:02:53:21 - 01:02:59:24

Yes, sir. Well, David Foster, the applicant, will take that away and prepare a short, sharp response. Thank you.

01:03:00:13 - 01:03:04:10

So maybe I'd like National Highways. Do you have any comment to make on this?

01:03:07:17 - 01:03:47:04

Thank you, sir. Mr. Latif Ramesh for national highways. I think what I'd just like to signpost, and it's a submission that will be made at deadline. One is the statement of common ground between the applicant and National highways. This specific issue on June versus August is the entry. Uh. 5.170. So we'll be addressing that point in that submission, I think. I think all I have to say at this point is that it's correct to say that we had some discussions and National Highways technical partner is just confirming that they're happy with the explanation that has been provided to National Highways.

01:03:47:07 - 01:03:47:24

Thank you.

01:03:48:18 - 01:03:49:09

Mr. Bedford.

01:03:52:25 - 01:04:30:18

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, joint local authorities. So we did have some concerns about how background traffic had been modeled, particularly in relation to what it was showing on the strategic road network of the M25. And therefore, I think we would want to understand a bit more about the applicant's choice. Um, and um, so I think, Malcolm, seeing that clarification note, um, and obviously our concern is that if there's excess traffic on the SRN that takes it beyond its capacity.

01:04:31:07 - 01:04:36:25

There are potential implications for the local road network of traffic departing therefrom.

01:04:37:19 - 01:04:40:17

Thank you. Any other comments on the assessment period?

01:04:41:18 - 01:05:14:12

Yes. Um, yeah. Lee White representing Cagney, I think very briefly. Um, sir, I think our concern is around the consideration of weekday school holidays and so on, which have really busy times at the airport. I also think although volume over capacity has been reported, clearly the busiest time at the airport from personal knowledge, I actually worked at the airport for some 25 to 30 years ago. Even in that time period, um, the period between sort of 430 and 630 was actually the busiest time on the airport.

01:05:14:14 - 01:05:36:01

And clearly that's totally outside the scope of the modelling. Um, obviously we don't know what that will uncover. It certainly probably will not uncover any volume over capacity issues. But it does raise the question, I think, about what is actually going on in relation to the operation of the network in that very early morning period. That's not within the suite of models that we've seen. Thank you.

01:05:36:03 - 01:05:37:24

Thank you, Mr. White. Anyone else?

01:05:39:10 - 01:05:40:01

Yes.

01:05:44:13 - 01:06:07:18

At Councillor Essex. I wonder if any consideration has been given to how the modal share varies between different transport modes at different times, and maybe the propensity for leisure travel in the holidays to be more road car dependent than those who are travelling more work related during the non-holiday period, and whether that's factored into the choice of the of the modelling time. Thank you.

01:06:07:29 - 01:06:13:22

Thank you. Any other comments? So well that we can respond.

01:06:19:26 - 01:06:58:11

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Just in relation to the last point from Councillor Essex. Uh, the information that's gone into the model is related to a June period, which, as he says, comparing the CAA quarterly statistics for mode share data for Gatwick and for other UK airports, shows a higher car share in comparison to the annual statistics, which are compiled across four quarters. But the data that's gone into the model and the baseline that's included does actually have a higher car mode share baked into the data than would be included at a more aggregate annual level.

01:06:59:21 - 01:07:00:09

Thank you.

01:07:02:29 - 01:07:23:25

Um. Okay. Well, that concludes agenda item 3.2. Uh, moving on to 3.3. This is in response to Surrey County Council's relevant rep, which is for 3.98. Which expressed concern about the wisdom modeling, not extending. Further into the local road network in Horley.

01:07:25:17 - 01:07:30:17

It's really the applicant's views as to why it doesn't do that that I'm interested in hearing.

01:07:37:13 - 01:07:37:28

The moment.

01:07:55:11 - 01:07:58:00

You, sir David Ellison, behalf of the applicant. Um.

01:07:59:28 - 01:08:41:00

We've touched on the strategic model already, and now we're moving to the vision model. Now, the vision model was developed to help verify the operational performance of the road network closer to the airport. The main road traffic route, and which this is pertinent to, um, is the route from the M23 junction line down. The spur carries between 70 and 75% of the airport airport traffic. Um, the focus of the model is being to assist in the discussions with National Highways and the local highway authorities to understand the local operation of the existing road network and the Bayu scheme, which we touched on earlier.

01:08:41:29 - 01:09:12:24

Uh, to support the development of the design of the highway works, which, um, uh, for the main project scheme and to verify the capacity there at is appropriate. It's it is designed to work directly with the strategic highway model, which, which includes most of our network wide highway analysis. And it uses the flows from that model as, uh, the generating forecasts. Uh, so the two, uh, the two are linked and it is aligned with the results of the magnitude of impact study.

01:09:12:26 - 01:09:44:17

So the studies within the transport assessment, which look at the overseas, which we touched on earlier, and the triage process we went through to identify the areas which are, um, local to the airport where we were adding a, a material volume of traffic. It includes those areas as well. So that's that's the reason for the the scope of the visit model. Um, that was something we, we did scope with all the different parties. We had obviously varying comments between those different parties on, on, uh, on the extents. But, um, all of that information was shared.

01:09:45:28 - 01:09:48:04

Thank you. Mr. Bedford.

01:09:54:09 - 01:10:13:26

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. So as I understand, the extent of the Bizim model is shown on diagram 13 .4.1 of the transport assessment and you'll be familiar from your.

01:10:16:06 - 01:10:55:06

Site inspections and knowledge of the area that the Longbridge roundabout sits, as it were. Um, somewhat uh. Towards the edge. Well, it's at the edge of that model network. But what is not modeled are the interactions with the junctions that then feed in traffic to that roundabout. And so we are concerned that because I say that, as it were, the end of the line in terms of the vision modeling, the vision modeling isn't necessarily picking up what is actually happening at that junction, because we've not modeled the interactions with the next junctions along the line.

01:10:55:08 - 01:11:09:09

That's the simple point. Um. We think that's a concern and we think it's capable of being addressed by the applicant. And we would urge that the applicant gives that some further consideration.



01:11:10:15 - 01:11:15:05

Maybe I'll go back to the applicant for your view on that one for taking any other comments.

01:11:20:19 - 01:11:53:27

Please. Thank you, Sir David. On behalf of the applicant, um. Don't really want to repeat what I've been through. Really. It was just to identify that we did look at the performance. We've got a model which covers a much wider area, uh, which is uh, its purpose is to, to look at. Journey times. Junction perform you know, performance across a much wider area. Be able to look at the effects along those routes. So it's not that these areas have not been considered, they just not within the model.

01:11:53:29 - 01:11:59:06

The vision model, which had a different purpose specific to the area around the airport.

01:11:59:15 - 01:12:05:00

But the vision model does consider the the operation of the Longridge roundabout itself.

01:12:05:14 - 01:12:06:03

It does say.

01:12:06:27 - 01:12:11:16

Okay, thank you. Any other comments on this particular period? Yes.

01:12:14:08 - 01:12:49:13

Thank you, Lisa Scott Parish Council. Has any modeling been done around what appears on documents 4.6 and 4.8.1? It looks like the pavement stroke shared use path from Longridge roundabout to South Terminal is going to be moved or diverted. Um, a lot of commuters use that path to get to South Terminal, and a lot of people going to work in the airport will use that path. Um, especially during the nighttime hours when going through the park would be dangerous from a safety.

01:12:49:21 - 01:12:57:04

Uh, personal safety perspective, has modeling been done around the removal of access to that path? Thank you.

01:12:58:17 - 01:13:02:08

Okay. You know. Any other comments? Yes.

01:13:03:08 - 01:13:40:18

Uh, Chris, I'm sorry. Climate commission. The obviously, as the applicant has just explained, the, um. But there is modeling done in the strategic models of the highway network. But obviously the vision models provide more detail, in particular in terms of the relationship between, um demand and supply capacity, as it were, and also the performance of junctions. What assessment has been done of the potential for, in the event of the strategic highway network becoming congested, traffic, then shifting off the strategic highway network and moving on to more local roads, and then causing knock on congestion on those roads.

01:13:40:28 - 01:13:54:22

Um, presumably that's the kind of details of that kind of effect. Um, could then be assessed within the vision model, and if it's limited in extent, we know won't it won't be known for sure what that impact would be. Thank you. Thank you.

01:13:55:13 - 01:13:56:10

Any other comment?

01:13:58:18 - 01:14:00:11

No. Yeah. We can.

01:14:02:12 - 01:14:03:25

Chris Bruce on behalf of the applicant.

01:14:03:27 - 01:14:48:22

Just in reference to the last point there, just to explain the way the models are set up and structured. Um, the strategic model includes a highway routing model, which effectively covers a wide part of the south east of England. That does reflect particular capacity constraints or challenges that occur, um, in the future and will influence the routing of traffic, um, feeding into the spur and the level of traffic that would use the local road network and consequently that will then feed into, um, uh, the, the uh, vision model in terms of the proportion of airport traffic using different routes in different scenarios, under different conditions.

01:14:49:20 - 01:14:52:25

Thank you. Thank you. Any comment on the pedestrian one?

01:14:54:10 - 01:15:22:22

Yes. Richard Higgins for the applicant. And my apologies to the lady from Charnwood parish. I didn't get your name. Um, but may I suggest that we pick up detailed comments about active travel on the later agenda item, and we'll be able to perhaps explore and explain a little more about the wider network of changes that are being made, um, around, uh, around surface access and, and active travel in the Longbridge area, access to and from the park, and indeed access to and from the terminals.

01:15:23:16 - 01:15:24:11

Okay. Thank you.

01:15:25:29 - 01:15:27:09

If this, um.

01:15:30:02 - 01:15:47:20

But if I could come back on that, it's Lisa Scott. And the question was, has any traffic modeling been done around the moving of active transport or into vehicle transport, which will increase the vehicles on the road? Thank you.

01:15:50:00 - 01:15:51:24

You want to respond briefly to that, please?

01:15:53:17 - 01:16:23:27

Yes. What you're taking to the applicant. Um, the models deal with the interaction between pedestrians, cycling facilities and road traffic. And one of the actions that we've taken forward as part of the mitigation for the project is to implement considerable additional segregated, um, and, uh, wider connections for. Active travel routes, with the express purpose of increasing the amount of cycling and walking to and from the airport.

01:16:24:14 - 01:16:50:24

Um, and the additional connections that that, that that provides. Uh, there is not a um. If you like a an interactive model between cycling and walking, switching between vehicle traffic versus active travel modes, we've undertaken surveys on existing active travel, use the area and use those to support the design and proposals for mitigation.

01:16:52:06 - 01:16:53:01

Hopefully that's helpful.

01:16:53:08 - 01:17:00:17

Thank you. Um, right. Well, that concludes the think item. That item. And moving on to.

01:17:02:11 - 01:17:11:18

Real modeling. Um, before we take a break, perhaps they'll do item 4.1, which is decent modelling. Um.

01:17:14:07 - 01:17:20:10

I think the your modelling includes the improvements to Gatwick station that are now complete. Is that correct?

01:17:22:00 - 01:17:26:11

That's correct. David Ellis, on behalf of the applicant. That's correct. Okay. Well.

01:17:27:19 - 01:17:37:18

I mean, rather than. Will there been any assessment undertaken to validate the station model now? It is. The project is complete.

01:17:46:06 - 01:18:23:18

Uh, Richard Higgins, the applicant. Um, most I think perhaps people will be aware. Hopefully the, um, the panel are aware that the station was complete and opened, um, soft open just before Christmas and, uh, and formally opened just after Christmas. Um, we've taken the specific station model, which was prepared on behalf of Network Rail and validated by Network Rail. Uh, in terms of ensuring that the modelling that we've undertaken is based on the, um, what would be referred to as the as built outturn solution.

01:18:23:20 - 01:19:01:03

So the station as it is, um, both designed and and intended to operate, um, we would um, perhaps sort of um, note at the moment that the station activity is, uh, somewhat different to that which is included

in the both the station modelling that Network Rail has done for its for the station project. And indeed that forms part of this project in that both the service pattern and indeed the demand that the railway station, um, has uh, has reduced.

01:19:01:09 - 01:19:35:18

Um in common with some of the comments from, uh, the earlier agenda points. Uh, so we're not proposing to look at the way in which the current cohort of rail station passengers use the station as being indicative of what may happen in the future. Uh, we would rather use the, um, uh, the validated model, um, for what is been produced and what is opened. Uh, and look at the larger volume of passengers that would go through the station in both the future baseline and with project scenarios.

01:19:36:07 - 01:19:39:10

Um, based on those projections. Thank you.

01:19:39:26 - 01:19:53:01

Maybe we could ask Network Rail then about the station and its operation. Do you have any issues about the ability of the remodel station to accommodate the projected demand?

01:19:54:26 - 01:19:56:05

Contract for Network Rail.

01:19:56:08 - 01:19:56:25

Um, so.

01:19:56:27 - 01:20:01:11

The network for the new station has increased capacity and improved, uh, passenger experience.

01:20:01:13 - 01:20:02:04

Immediately.

01:20:02:14 - 01:20:28:00

But it's worth noting that the project was designed to accommodate forecast levels of demand as far as 2036, which at that time did not account for the northern runway plan. Um, we have a slight concern that the transport assessment indicates there will be some instances of crowding, in particular arrival barriers, which may require further intervention to mitigate in the future. Um, and, uh, we are scheduling a technical meeting with the applicant.

01:20:30:24 - 01:20:40:05

I'd echo the comment that we probably should continue to explore whether there is an opportunity to validate the model with real life experience at the station, now that it's open.

01:20:40:18 - 01:20:45:03

Thank you. So I'm back to the applicant and having heard that.

01:20:51:12 - 01:20:59:11

We've, um, we've heard, uh, Network Rail's coming. We've arranged a meeting with them on the 14th of this month to go through and discuss these points in more detail.

01:21:00:08 - 01:21:01:03

Oh. Thank you.

01:21:01:05 - 01:21:01:20

Thank you.

01:21:02:25 - 01:21:05:29

There are any other comments in the room about the station modeling.

01:21:08:26 - 01:21:33:11

No. Sorry. Sorry, sorry. Michael Bedford on the joint local authorities on behalf of the highway authorities. Just because of the interaction between where the station works and then the way they road highway network work, we would share the concerns of Network Rail. And we would. Defer to them, but we would ask that further done on this issue to resolve their concern. Thank you.

01:21:34:25 - 01:21:37:04

Yeah. We don't want to make a response.

01:21:40:02 - 01:21:46:08

Bridget Higgins for the applicant. Um, no further comment. We'll continue to engage with Network Rail on technical points. Thank you.

01:21:46:27 - 01:22:14:03

Um, I think before then, that concludes item 4.1. Uh, before I move on to 4.2, which is passenger modeling at times, I think it might be the right time to take a short break, sort of times 1522. So let's say, um, come back here at 20 to 4. 1540. So I'll adjourn hearing till then.