

File Name: ISH4 5th March 2024 Part 2.mp3

File Length: 01:39:49

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:10 - 00:00:10:18

And this issue specific issue specific hearing on surface transport is resumed.

00:00:12:08 - 00:00:37:25

Um, so we're on agenda item 4.2, which is passenger modeling. Rail passenger modeling. I have a few fairly straightforward questions, and then I want to hear the views of the train operating company and Network Rail. But my questions are does the passenger modeling consider a future baseline of 67.2 million passengers per annum in the same way as a traffic modeling?

00:00:44:18 - 00:00:46:09

Anything else for the applicant? Yes. That's correct.

00:00:49:02 - 00:00:57:12

And are the 2023 rail passenger service. It could be used to review the modelling or not.

00:01:12:03 - 00:01:22:21

Priest. Priest will have the applicant. So we have available gate line data at Gatwick Airport station for 2023. Um, it was included as part of the post-Covid modelling note.

00:01:24:24 - 00:01:37:11

Thank you. And do them. Do some modeling. Is it based on timetable train times or is it a consideration of actual levels of performance?

00:01:45:12 - 00:02:09:24

Mr. Bruce on behalf of the applicant. The modeling is done using a timetable data, um, and convert it to slightly technical point in terms of the way the uh demand is applied into the public transport model, it uses a frequency, a level of frequency per hour, but this is derived from timetables and actual, uh, running the running schedule that's on the network.

00:02:10:18 - 00:02:20:00

Thank you. Um, those are my fairly straightforward questions I'd like to hear from, especially the train operator, which is Govia Thameslink. I think.

00:02:21:21 - 00:02:36:05

Nigel sell go for your Thameslink railway which I will use the acronym GTR uh, going forward. Um, right. In terms of, uh, the timetable 2023, um.

00:02:38:02 - 00:03:28:08

Over, over the whole of 2023. The demand has been suppressed due to a number of things. First of all, the recovery from Covid is still recovering. And then we also have the, um, we've had the issue of considerable disruption due to strikes and, uh, due to, um, action short of a strike. However, on days when trains have been running to the proper timetable, we have been having, uh, very good loadings, which, um, has been on weekdays, around about 10% below, uh, what it was pre-COVID and on weekends, well above, uh, 13% above over the whole weekend, 23% above on Saturdays, according to the autumn 2023 uh passenger census.

00:03:28:27 - 00:03:29:12

Um.

00:03:30:23 - 00:04:10:22

To go to this. What? What I was sort of thinking was we need to look at the, at the bright and main line holistically, and we need to learn from history of how it is, how it is, um, developed because it was um, the Gatwick Airport expansion is a great opportunity, but also a challenge. It's a huge opportunity because of the economic benefits it brings business growth, high quality jobs, improved income, tourism and so on. Social benefits. Um, but as a surface transport challenge, um, in that surface transport network, including the railway is already severely congested.

00:04:10:24 - 00:04:38:24

And we've also got the environmental challenge. So if we look at the at a bit of the history of the Brighton mainline, how we got to where we are, um, and how it has, um, coped with the increased number of passengers. That has far exceeded the increase of capacity because it was built 180 years ago, when Sussex population was about 300,000. Um.

00:04:40:17 - 00:05:17:07

By. After six years. After that, the population had doubled, but the number of trains running had far more than doubled, and it was forever getting a train to forever getting the light. And and it was simply was not coping. So they doubled the capacity, made it four tracks instead of instead of two. Um, going forward from that, there has been no further major, uh, increase of capacity since then. And so the increased number of passengers has been achieved by moving from steam to electric traction, by improvements in signalling and so on.

00:05:17:17 - 00:05:56:12

And while other railways were in decline in the, uh, the Brighton line continued to grow, um, and the population grew a further 80% by the 1960s, for example. And of course, Gatwick Airport opened in that time. Then if we fast forward to today, there was another 58% increase in the population. Um, but let's just take the 20 years from 2000 to 2020, um, and we see that the amount of passenger journeys on the railway just north of Gatwick between Gatwick and Horley, um, has increased by 93% in just those 20 years.

00:05:56:14 - 00:06:35:20

That's far greater than the increase of the of the population. And it's making the Brighton mainline the most congested railway in the UK and probably in in the world, because if you take one relatively, uh, one relatively modest station, uh, East Croydon, six platforms, it has more trains and passengers passing through it than all of the intercity trains from London Euston, Saint Pancras and Kings Cross

combined to the Midlands and North and Scotland, and the junctions north of Croydon handles more trains than the busiest part of any other UK mainline and.

00:06:36:14 - 00:07:10:03

This creates unacceptable standing both in the peak. And there's also standing in the off peak from from Gatwick. And there was pre-COVID and there is post Covid as well. There's there's already standing on trains passing through Gatwick in the off peak as well as well as the peak. So. The the baseline for for Gatwick modelling that was used was was 2016. And then they got their future um future baselines and.

00:07:11:03 - 00:07:48:22

Uh, looking through, through through the reports. It's suggesting that that standing is not, um, not an issue, is it? Recognizes some standing between, uh, from East Croydon northwards, um, in the peak and doesn't seem to uh, and it's and they say and the report says that because that's less than 20 minutes, that's um, that's acceptable standing. Um. And it's not recognizing the standing that there is from Gatwick Airport, or indeed their standing from south of Gatwick in the peak and sometimes in the off peak as well.

00:07:49:17 - 00:07:50:02

Um.

00:07:51:21 - 00:08:28:08

And the um, so the the Gatwick modelling future baseline states there is genuinely generally standing on services in both directions between East Croydon, London Bridge and Victoria in 2029 and 2032. In the future baseline and with project scenarios, the travel time for this section of route is within 20 minute threshold that DFT use as a guidance for acceptable standing, as long standing capacity is not exceeded, and concludes that the rail crowding assessment indicates that no additional mitigation is required because of the project that's on page 103 of the Transport Assessment.

00:08:29:08 - 00:09:02:11

So. My response to the consultation. We demonstrated pre-COVID that the morning peak had 4.2% passengers in excess of seats departing Gatwick Airport on fast trains, that's 30 to 40 minutes standing, and the levels of passengers in excess of seats increases to 10.9%. Arrive in Clapham Junction and 22.5% arriving London Bridge. Um, and we also demonstrated that there was significant off peak crowding as well.

00:09:03:17 - 00:09:34:16

Autumn 2023 morning peak. We've during Covid, we lost some of our resources, some so we haven't got so many trains to to run. Um, and so the crowding is actually worse now that 16.3% passengers in excess of seats departing Gatwick Airport on fast trains, and it's 20.2% on arrival at Clapham Junction, 49.4% arriving London Bridge and the off peak passes in excess of seats is 1.6%.

00:09:34:26 - 00:09:53:05

Uh, departing uh Gatwick Airport on uh on a typical, um busy hour, uh increasing to 5.6% arriving Clapham Junction. Now the experience that people have. Is worse than the cold statistics suggests because.

00:09:55:09 - 00:10:26:21

Those passages and excess of seat numbers is is the average. But it's the demand is very variable. So if, for example, you've got a load factor of 100%, every seat on average on 50% of the days, that will be passengers in excess of seats and on 50% of the days it will be there will be some spare seats. And the other thing is that trains don't load evenly. And so therefore, uh. And and with airport passengers in particular.

00:10:26:24 - 00:10:58:00

They have lots of luggage with them and so on, and that takes up more space and makes trains more uncomfortable. And. This is going against what people's expectations are as as time goes on, people constantly expect to have better service, more comfort, and so on. But that's not what's happening. It's people expect the quality to improve. They expect to get a seat on a journey, especially a journey that's, uh, over the finish. Uh, um, 20 minutes off, off peak.

00:10:58:14 - 00:11:31:10

Uh, the standard is for everyone to have a seat, no matter how how long the journey is. So with the track so congested over complex junctions, we also have a problem with performance because. Uh, every train with the track used capacity. Every train, every slot is used. So if a train is just just a tiny bit late, a few seconds late, and it's a pass over a junction, just just that little bit late, it then delays the next train and then you start getting the dominoes going over so you can't actually fit.

00:11:31:19 - 00:11:32:14

Although.

00:11:34:19 - 00:12:05:27

Although in theory, you might be able to fit in extra training in practice by taking out any margin for delays, that just makes the risk much greater that that that dominoes will start going over and and spread and making the delays much, much worse. Um. But what we can say is. But I have to, you know, praise the staff of GTR and Network Rail. For a truly amazing achievement to fulfill.

00:12:05:29 - 00:12:39:00

Running so many trains in such limited infrastructure that has not been significantly expanded since it was for 120 years ago. To run so many trains as reliably as we do is is really phenomenal work from from all the staff of of of Earth train operator GTR and Network Rail. So to the future population is expected to continue to grow. Relic rail use is expected to continue to grow faster than population. Although Covid reduced revenues it is.

00:12:39:02 - 00:13:13:24

The demand is growing back very fast, especially leisure travel. And as I mentioned, the autumn 2020. Well, the autumn 2023 passenger census. The loading of the trains. Is it a level that we weren't actually expecting when we when when we responded to the consultation, we, uh, in the middle of Covid, we put our predictions of of how it's going to how the changes were going to increase. And we and we're now at the level that in in our response to the consultation we were expecting in 2029.

00:13:13:26 - 00:13:16:03

So that's six years earlier. Um.

00:13:19:02 - 00:13:54:29

And that that was based on a typical day with no disruption during the autumn 2023 passenger sensors. So the midweek has bounced back from very tiny during Covid to 9% down on what it was on pre-COVID with weekends. As I said, 13% higher. So what can we do? Well, subject to funding. Um, because we are a management contract. Uh, as opposed to a train operator with free freedom to act. So we get paid by the Department for transport to operate the train service that is agreed with them, um, with the resources that are provided.

00:13:55:01 - 00:14:27:11

So with funding, it would be possible to, uh, we've got off-peak trains that are still eight cars that we could extend to 12 car with, with additional funding. Um, and off peak. There are still two parts per hour south of Purley, but could be reinstated if funded. Um, they're the further theoretical path because people often say, why don't you run the same level of train services in the peak? Well, that's not possible because, um.

00:14:28:28 - 00:14:32:17

They well in on the route to Victoria? Um.

00:14:34:07 - 00:15:07:05

There are no additional peak paths because it's the same level of service both south US, south of Purdy. It's the same number of of services peak and off peak on the Victoria route. But we've also got a. Capacity. Hungry freight paths. Um, and there's and as I've previously mentioned, there is no opportunity to recover from minor delays. So the level of service you run at the height of the peak, which pre-COVID in 2020, 1920 and the beginning of 2020.

00:15:07:24 - 00:15:43:19

That was the maximum possible that you could achieve. There was just a theoretical one path that you could have put in that we could have put in. But. That for that busiest peak hour, if there was any delay whatsoever, it was going to. It wouldn't just be one train that was delayed. It would be, uh, the dominoes would go, go over and would delay the whole lot because there was no room for recovery at all. Um, and in the high peak hour, we are, um, five we're five paths below what we were in the, um, uh, what we were pre-COVID.

00:15:45:04 - 00:16:05:19

So. With expected growth. It is very clear that by the mid 2030s, every train path will be required in the peak and the off peak. Any attempt to squeeze more trains in will result in small delays, quickly escalating into major network wide delays, with the risk of collapsing the service. Airport passengers.

00:16:07:06 - 00:16:37:26

Have to think from, you know, when, when particularly foreign visitors, when they come to, to the UK, they might have a brilliant experience going through the, uh, new Gatwick Airport. But then that would be all for nothing. If when they get on a train, they're having to ram into crowded trains, struggling to get on with their their luggage and don't get the same level of service at the that a new airport that an improved airport could provide.

00:16:38:06 - 00:17:13:17

Um, and is that really the experience that we want visitors to the UK to, to have when they arrive in the country? And the other thing is, air passengers who get that poor experience are likely to choose a different way to make their journey in the future. Uh, travel by car or taxi or use another airport. And is that really what is wanted for for a Gatwick airport? Customers. So one of the things that we've noticed is that the put funding additional funding into the road network, but not the rail network.

00:17:14:26 - 00:17:50:27

And yet they've got targets for sustainable surface access. And I don't understand how they could be attainable if road capacity is increased, while trains are severely crowded and unreliable, and rail capacity is not increased. Um, Gatwick Airport pledged to achieve carbon net zero for direct emissions is undermined, uh, if road capacity increase and rail access is unpleasant, unreliable. So, you know what good is a world class airport with an integral railway station if passengers are crushed in overcrowded, unpleasant trains?

00:17:54:03 - 00:18:35:12

So what's needed? Increased rail capacity to accommodate additional air passengers on top of domestic passengers as a minimum. A reasonable, proportionate contribution as Network Rail is going to suggest towards increasing rail capacity. And Gatwick Airport should not treat this as a cost to get their development consent order approved, but consider it an investment to enable their customers to access air travel in a reliable, in reliable comfort. Failure to invest, we feel, will undermine the viability of airport expansion and condemn the traveling public to uncomfortable, unreliable travelling conditions.

00:18:36:09 - 00:18:42:03

Do we feel that it is vital that the rail capacity is increased in order to achieve this?

00:18:43:20 - 00:19:00:12

And we think that Gatwick Airport should be visionary about accessing the airport, as they should be as visionary about accessing the airport as they are about expansion and improving the airport. Um, if we go back to GT's contribution to the London and South Coast Corridor Study.

00:19:02:02 - 00:19:14:15

There, we demonstrated that even the proposed improvements for the Brighton Main Line, the Brighton Main Line upgrade plan and the the Core, the Croydon area remodelling.

00:19:16:04 - 00:20:00:18

Although that's sufficient to get us to mid-century, it's not sufficient to get us beyond mid-century. And when you're building real infrastructure, you have it's long term. You have to plan it well in advance. And so we presented a visionary transformation of the bright and main line and access to Gatwick Airport with a very strong business case, which would have got Gatwick Airport within 15 minutes of central London every five minutes. And so Gatwick Airport should look at this contribution. New London Gatwick Sussex Railway that GTR made to that study and work with other stakeholders to make this transfer transformational service access to Gatwick Airport become a reality in order to support the expansion of the airport.

00:20:02:03 - 00:20:19:04

Thank you. I mean, if I could just ask you briefly that. Are you saying that you don't think the applicant's passenger modeling adequately describes the available capacity of the train service?

00:20:19:27 - 00:20:49:01

Um, but their baseline, uh, their future baseline suggests that, uh, that standing will not be a problem yet, uh, in 2019. Uh, 2020. We had passengers in excess of seats, and with the demand bouncing back, we got passengers in excess of seats. Uh, which we can do, which by getting the trains that are not 12 car, up to 12 car can solve for now, but will not solve in the future.

00:20:49:29 - 00:20:54:22

Thank you. Bob Seger, Network Rail debut of the passenger. Modeling.

00:20:57:03 - 00:21:36:03

Thank you. Stuart. Historic network rail. So that work really is not yet in a position where we could endorse the airport's conclusion that there will be no significant impact in crowding on rail services as a result of the project, and that no additional mitigation is required. That said, we have been having good technical meetings with the applicant around the detail of the model. Um, we have some particular concerns that it might smooth demand between individual services averaged over an hour, which is not representative of how the rail service will operate. Um, and we also have some concerns that our forecasts or industry rail industry forecasts of background growth might not align with those in the model.

00:21:36:05 - 00:22:12:05

And we might be understating, uh, the level of demand. So again, we're working through those. Uh, what we can say is that the railway has the capacity to return to the, um, available space, to return to the capacity that the railway provided pre-COVID in 2019. Um, and to go beyond that would require major service reconfiguration or infrastructure investment. Um, the positives within that. So making use of underutilized capacity in the off peak areas is clearly a positive thing for the rail industry, generating additional revenue.

00:22:12:07 - 00:22:50:07

Very supportive of that. We have some concerns around the impact on the peak and how that might impact performance across the wider network, much as my colleague from GCI was implying that if you get delay loading people onto a tight schedule, then that will then mitigate across the railway. Um, probably worth pointing out that that is potentially linked to the DCO for Luton rising, with Thameslink connecting from Gatwick through to Luton to end of that, it's just an area to explore. Uh, we are currently reviewing our background forecasts as part of the work to work with the applicant around what the demand forecast looks like.

00:22:50:14 - 00:22:59:26

At the moment, we expect that the base case would be returning to 2019 levels of demand. Some time in the 2030s, and we need to do more to understand that.

00:23:00:16 - 00:23:04:10

Yeah. Thank you. Are there any other comments at this stage?

00:23:06:21 - 00:23:38:16

Uh. Uh, yeah. Lee White for Cagney. Um, I think I echo the comments from GTR and indeed from Network Rail, sir. I think the other point I'd make is that there is origin and destination data available from the Office of Rail and Road for 20 2223. Um, that does show us that, um, around 75% of the trips from or to Gatwick, whichever way you look at it, are on the Brighton mainline, um, of which, um, about 10% of those are then drawn to other destinations such as Clapham and so on.

00:23:38:18 - 00:24:09:05

So the concentration on the Brighton mainline is quite important for us, I think. Um, I just, um, really think, sir, that the, the rail, um, impact, you know, there's some real challenges, particularly towards the end of the development period in terms of capacity accommodating these people. Where does that go? It goes on to road. It then causes the local impacts that my clients are very concerned about. So I think that's the key thing there. So we will be um, exploring this more in our written representation.

00:24:09:07 - 00:24:44:28

But just to concur that at the moment we're not, um, convinced by the, by the analysis. And I think two final points, uh, again, we'll canvass these in our written rep. Um, firstly, um, you know, the applicant is seeking to rely on a third party that they've got no control over in terms of the DFT who fund that rail and the train operator. Obviously, we know there's going to be some fluidity in the rail industry in the next year or so whilst it restructures. But the reality is, is that the paymasters will be at the Department of Transport throughout the Treasury, so capacity is not within the gift of the applicant.

00:24:45:00 - 00:24:53:19

I think that's the key point we make there, sir. So I think I'll, I'll say, but um, we will be canvassing this more in the written rep. Thank you, Mr. Hyde.

00:24:54:26 - 00:25:38:16

And thank you, Chris. Hide. Sorry. Climate commission. I should also say I used to run a transport modelling team in transport for London. So have some experience of looking at these kind of issues. A few questions. What criteria did the applicant use to conclude that the existing passengers standing on the future network would not be an issue? Why did they conclude that? Um. Secondly, does the rail modelling include the assumption that rail passengers going to and from Gatwick will have will have luggage with them and presumably significant amounts? Um, thirdly, what sensitivity testing has been done to test, uh, in effect, the resilience of the railway to a whole range of, of scenarios.

00:25:38:24 - 00:26:11:21

Um, so, so for example, how sure are they that they've tested, um, say the busiest day? I mean, what about, for example, within summer, um, a sunny day when lots of people are travelling to and from Brighton and the airport is busy, so people are travelling away to, to fly to various destinations. Have they looked at, you know, various potential, uh, peak situations? Also, um, we, you know, we should be planning for a sustainable, uh, surface transport strategy.

00:26:12:01 - 00:26:47:21



Uh, well, come on to this. Probably when we talk about mode shares. In my view, a sustainable transport strategy would assume no growth in car traffic. So has the applicant looked at a scenario which assumes there's no growth in car traffic to and from the airport, and that demand would then shift to the rail system. So therefore, what extra capacity would you need on the rail system to accommodate that kind of that kind of scenario? Um, and then my last point is, uh, there was an interesting point made earlier, um, about the, um, the changes to Gatwick station.

00:26:47:25 - 00:27:21:09

And I was quite struck that the station has been designed to accommodate demand for 20, 30 and 36. I think the time was which does not assume, um, expansion of Gatwick Airport. Now, from my experience in, in London, um, there is actually interaction in the operation of train services and crowding in stations to the extent and when a station is very crowded, it's difficult for passengers to actually clear the station. So you then end up with a with a backup. Uh, in terms of the, um, in terms of the platforms and so on.

00:27:21:14 - 00:27:59:01

So has the applicant looked at a circumstance where, um, trains are unable to clear their passengers alighting passengers away from the platforms, um, or even make space for passengers to be alighting to, to join the trains while other passengers are leaving. So I just interested in this, this kind of dynamic between a very crowded station which appears, you know, which could be under capacity and very busy trains. So has that been looked at? Thank you. Yeah, I think that last point perhaps more relates to Bayesian modelling than passenger, but it's fine.

00:28:01:05 - 00:28:35:29

Yes, Mr. Rolf. Thank you very much. Stephen Rolf and Sid Lowe, parish Council, three queries, if I may. If GR was able to extend all its trains to 12 car units, if the DFT found some money for them to get them, what delays could we expect of 12 car trains or more 12 car trains going through the Selhurst Triangle? There are delays there now. When a 12 car train comes to a red and the rear four coaches overhang a flat junction, impeding other stuff from moving on.

00:28:37:04 - 00:28:37:28

Point number.

00:28:38:00 - 00:29:19:22

Two. There is currently no direct rail service from Kent into Gatwick. Network rail have done some modelling on this. If track paths are as scarce as they say they are, how they gain to accommodate it and it would be good if it could pair up with the North Downs Line service to use the current two paths. An hour that Great Western have into Gatwick, and going back to an earlier thing. I'd like to know why the airport the applicant are not considering using rail freight to keep their heavy goods vehicles with construction materials off the local road network, and to take the waste away again with large lorries on our local roads.

00:29:19:24 - 00:29:20:09

Thank you.

00:29:20:14 - 00:29:21:24

Thank you Bedford.

00:29:23:04 - 00:29:55:09

Thank you, sir Mike Bedford for the joint local authorities, just briefly similar point to the point that we did raise in relation to the station modelling. Obviously the passenger modelling is a critical part of the jigsaw, um, because of the interaction with other forms of surface transport access and therefore it's of some concern to hear the strength of issues being raised both by the train operating company and by Network Rail, about the robustness of the modelling that you're presented with. But obviously we sort of defer to them as being the operators or the regulators.

00:29:56:02 - 00:29:58:15

Q Mr. North online.

00:30:02:20 - 00:30:38:23

Yes. Thank you sir. Uh, Tim North, I'm representing the Holiday Extras Limited. My clients. And my question on this particular aspect is, is concerned with the station and passenger capacity. My my query is this, uh, sir, that, um, the current station design certainly is anticipating growth to 48 MPA. The DCO predicts 82 MPA by 2047. That in itself is 32 MPA more than the station that was currently originally designed to handle.

00:30:39:12 - 00:31:26:23

My query is this if you look at the, uh, fluid level of service, which I anticipate and understand relates to queuing rather than passenger movements on platforms, um, the proposed, uh, sustainable transport mode in the latest version of the ISIS is for 60% of I, um, sustainable transport modes, the majority of which will be by rail, has the fluid level of service carried out by the applicant considered future improvements to public transport provision by rail? Well, has it just considered the capacity on the station as currently or as was the case in 2021? Thank you.

00:31:27:09 - 00:31:30:18

Thank you. Yes, Mr. Latif.

00:31:31:20 - 00:32:13:10

Thank you sir. Mr. Ramesh, for National highways. Um, just a brief point which echoes what Mr. Bedford has told you, that the interrelationship between the rail modelling and the in the road modelling clearly has a significant impact on our views, uh, of the sensitivity analysis that's been provided by the applicant. Now, you made a procedural decision about post-Covid, um, modelling and assessments. Um, we've reviewed that. And I think our position is that we can't be assured that what's been produced is, um, sufficiently robust in the absence of, uh, Network Rail and others being content with the assumptions that are being made.

00:32:13:12 - 00:32:23:12

And I would just make one specific request in this context, which is we need to see the underlying assumptions that have been fed into that modelling, which are not available in what's been published.

00:32:25:06 - 00:32:30:19

Thank you. You know, the comments all, uh, go back to the applicant and.

00:32:33:18 - 00:32:34:18

But at least there.

00:32:37:05 - 00:33:10:03

Uh, thank you, Richard Higgins, for the applicant. Um, it's rather a lot of points there, and rather a lot of detail, including data. Um, so I'd like to address, um, certainly my comments initially to some of the points that were made, especially by Network Rail and GTR. Uh, and then perhaps on, um, a few more of the other details. Um, refer to colleagues if there's something further. Uh, we would, however, note that we have, um, ongoing dialogue with Network Rail and GTR, um, together.

00:33:10:06 - 00:33:51:28

So all those discussions are held jointly, um, and uh, and are already, uh, you know, we're already very, um, pleased to see those valuable discussions continuing. Um, and we've already made reference to a point on, um, station modelling. I appreciate we're talking passenger modelling here, um, on station modelling specifically on the 14th of March, and that's on the record. Um, we have a memorandum of understanding with GTR, uh, for both parties to support um, and act to increase the number of passengers at the airport using rail and to increase rail mode share.

00:33:52:01 - 00:34:32:05

We work very, very closely with them and have an excellent relationship with them. Um, I think. In response to a number of the points that have been made. Um, I would just sort of like us to sort of draw back to the impacts of the project themselves, rather than more general points in respect to the rail industry at the moment. Um, it is clearly in a, uh, an unusual position in respect to post-Covid, um, both demand and supply. Uh, and uh, it's, uh, I suppose an open question, particularly given, uh, I think the response, uh, from Mr.

00:34:32:07 - 00:34:54:22

Keystroke at Network Rail that there would be an expectation that the current network, um, can both accommodate and would expect to return to, uh, post, sorry, pre-COVID service provision, which it currently doesn't have an apology because I'm, I'm putting words in Mr. Mouse, but I, I can see him nodding across the way from me.

00:34:54:25 - 00:34:56:27

I can agree with that statement. Thanks.

00:34:58:01 - 00:35:24:10

Um. So our analysis has been, uh, undertaken based on, uh, previous consultation with Network Rail and GTR in terms of the expectation for future, um, uh, future provision of services and therefore capacity on both the bright and main line. And there is a second operator which operates direct services to and from uh Gatwick Airport, which is Great Western Railway. I do apologise, sir.

00:35:27:07 - 00:36:06:05

Do apologise. Sorry. Um. That we do have, um, a second the second operator that has additional capacity, um, provided. Um. I think, as well as the return or in specific terms, in terms of the return to pre-COVID demand, we would also point to the fact that the Gatwick Express service, which is

particularly tuned to airport related passengers, is currently operating at two trains an hour, whereas pre pre-COVID was operating at four trains an hour.

00:36:06:20 - 00:36:38:22

Um, and those would um although extending to Brighton. Um they would be uh sort of specifically um uh taken up if you like, or um, supported by airport related passengers as they provide a direct service, non-stop service to London, Victoria. Um, we have a considerable amount of overall capacity on the rail services coming through Gatwick and stopping at Gatwick.

00:36:39:07 - 00:37:42:13

Um, uh, the points I think that, uh, um, that was so made from GTR was that there is a combined impact of airport related and non airport rated passengers on all of those services, and therefore the casting of those services, um, is a um, uh, is a sort of complex picture for the operator and indeed for the network provider. Um, I would just like to touch on the point regarding funding. Um, and, uh, those present will know that Gatwick provided considerable funding into the redevelopment of Gatwick station, which did include some, uh, capacity improvements for the Brighton Main Line, and that they helped to reduce waiting times in and out of, um, the platforms at Gatwick, so had wider benefits and indeed were originally considered as part of the BML upgrade, but were undertaken early as part of the Gatwick station project.

00:37:42:15 - 00:38:18:26

Uh, in order to gather those benefits, um, at as early as possible, uh, position as possible. Um, I would also point in terms of funding that, um, GTR and Network Rail are party to the Transport Forum Steering group, which considers applications for the Sustainable Transport Fund. And I this we may come on to in um in other items as well, sir, but it's a fund that we take as a levy on our on airport car parking forecourt charges and apply it to improvements to sustainable access.

00:38:19:01 - 00:38:51:09

There is opportunity for rail improvements, um, to be funded through the SDF and indeed um some rail elements, including the recent conversion from a single direct train on the Great Western, uh, service on what's called the North Downs Line, uh, to Redding. Uh, we've, uh, supported GWR with some financial contribution through the SDF. Uh, to bring that forward from an hourly service direct Gatwick to a half hourly service direct to Gatwick.

00:38:51:11 - 00:39:29:17

So there is clearly opportunity to continue to invest in opportunities in the future. Um, uh, certainly I'm aware and um, I know in comments there was a reference to some work that Network Rail had done for Kent to Gatwick, uh, as a service. Um, and. An opportunity could exist for that to be brought forward, subject to what would be considerable additional work on behalf of Network Rail and GTR to ensure that the wider impacts on the VML, um, uh, didn't preclude that that coming forward.

00:39:29:27 - 00:40:14:28

Um, and finally, on the funding side, we have also included, uh, within the application and there is more detail on this, and, sir, that will come through in respect to the section 106 agreement, um, in the Transport Mitigation Fund, which is part of our surface access commitments, um, that is mode neutral in that access to that transport mitigation fund would also be available for rail interventions in the

future. Um, and it's specifically to identify measures that may come forward to respond to either unknown um or an assessed um impacts of the project were they to come forward in the future.

00:40:15:18 - 00:40:23:00

Um, I probably don't want to go much further than that stage because there was so much on that on that subject, but I don't know.

00:40:25:05 - 00:40:25:20

Throughout.

00:40:37:08 - 00:41:07:15

Okay, David, I can, uh, I just probably cover off a couple of the, uh, quicker ones from there. Um. The. It's probably worth going back to the original core modeling where we it's probably just worth saying we have we have a good engagement with GTR on that in that regard. And we did use GTR data to validate model at that time. So that was that was can be received. Um, we're working with Network Rail on the comments which they've provided today.

00:41:07:19 - 00:41:09:17

Acknowledge those. Um we will.

00:41:10:19 - 00:41:11:04

Um.

00:41:11:20 - 00:41:50:06

Um, in terms of the level of service points, just picking up that, that if I've understood the question correctly, the station. At the station improvements being included within that work. The station improvements are included within the assessment because there were a station always planned to sit ahead of the 29 and 32, etc. assessments, so that's included. Um, in terms of, uh, standing capacity, seating capacities, um, the seated and standing capacities which are used within the modelling are taken from DFT Green Book, uh, which varies the amount of standing and seating capacity for each of the train types.

00:41:50:20 - 00:41:54:13

Uh, that's been included within the modelling. Um.

00:41:56:02 - 00:41:58:01

That was probably the key.

00:41:58:17 - 00:42:08:27

Key parts A lot of other detail in there are network National highways on data. Details around the assumptions. I think if you could you could provide us the assumptions you're looking for. We can provide that data to you.

00:42:10:08 - 00:42:13:26

Thank you. Thank you. Man. There were a number.

00:42:13:28 - 00:42:15:11

Of other points, but.

00:42:15:13 - 00:42:24:04

Given it's a hearing and you can respond a deadline one in writing to them, perhaps that would be a good way of dealing with the other points raised.

00:42:24:25 - 00:42:33:13

Yes. Which is yes, we'd like to like to do that, and also to reflect on the continued discussions that we'll have with Network Rail, GTR and the.

00:42:34:10 - 00:43:06:13

Thank you. And with that, then, um, I think we'll move on to item five. Could I just say, you know, I am aware of the time, and I would like to try and cover the last three agenda items. Um, but. The purpose of the hearing is so I can ask some questions, and if I can't get to ask those questions in the hearing. So this is some of its points. And so with I don't want to curtail anyone's comments, but please bear that in mind.

00:43:07:25 - 00:43:08:10

Um.

00:43:10:19 - 00:43:21:01

In terms of car parking, I'd like to understand whether the increases in parking numbers can be justified in relation to occupancy of existing car parking provision, both on and off site.

00:43:22:26 - 00:43:53:28

As I read the, um, transport assessment that there is very little or perhaps you can point to where it is about occupancy of car parking. And so it's, it's difficult to understand car parking supply and demand because it just basically says we've got this many spaces and we want this many more and that's it. It doesn't say it doesn't justify why you would want that many more. So there is no occupancy. Could that be done?

00:43:55:11 - 00:44:27:13

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Uh, yes. Uh, you'll be aware that, uh, we have produced a, uh, a car parking strategy note. Uh, which are we are preparing to submit at deadline one, uh, that includes information on, uh, occupancy levels. Uh, essentially, it's a level of efficiency at which, uh, Gatwick Airport operates its wide variety of parking, uh, uh, components. Uh, and also makes reference, I think, to off airport capacity. Uh, so all that detail will be in there.

00:44:27:27 - 00:44:34:18

Um, I'll for the purposes of brevity, I shall perhaps sort of leave it there, but I'm happy to take any further questions if you have them.

00:44:34:21 - 00:44:55:25

Well, I mean, I mean, Mr. Rhodes did say it is true that the provision of car parking is one of the many tools available which I agree with. And so supply and demand of car parking is a very important issue.

And what I was wondering whether is whether or not you think the DCO should include controls over parking levels.

00:44:58:09 - 00:45:35:06

Uh, Sir Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, the way we see the controls working are in the surface access commitments and our commitment to mode shares. Um, that mode share commitment does have a link to car parking capacity. And indeed, the way we operate car parking in concert with our other surface access strategy measures. Um, to give an example, um, over the decade leading up to, uh, to the Covid lockdown and the airport grew significantly in terms of passenger demand.

00:45:35:11 - 00:46:08:28

It also delivered a considerable increase in public transport mode share, alongside an increase in on airport parking. So all those things can, uh, can be achieved in balance. And that's how we operate. Um, internally. Um, we currently operate our car parks, um, somewhere in the region of 75 to 85%, um, occupied, uh, which varies according to the particular parking products, um, seasonality factors, etc..

00:46:09:10 - 00:46:26:22

Um, the reason that we can't reach 100% is that we have to leave a certain amount of flexibility around arrival and departure times, uh, perturbation and change, both in terms of wider transport networks and indeed the airport, um, passenger mix.

00:46:28:01 - 00:46:59:08

Thank you for that. I understand that, but not wanting to go into another agenda item, but let's say. The merger commitments, as I understand it, are based on. You will monitor them, report on them, and if that fails, there will be an action plan to deal with it. Suppose let's run a scenario that the action plan growth continues and the action plan isn't delivering the budget year. Traffic will go up. The demand for parking will go up. The airport has permitted development rights for additional parking.

00:47:00:01 - 00:47:02:06

Why can't you just simply provide more parking?

00:47:04:06 - 00:47:43:06

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Uh, we've included in the, uh, in the project description and the application for an additional amount of parking, uh, which we consider to be appropriate in line with, um, the surface access commitments that we've made and indeed, the detailed modeling that we've done to show how we can achieve those mode shares. As you say, the surface access commitments require us to take measures in order to meet those mode shares moving forward. And one of the ways we might meet those are indeed, um, through, uh, our ability to flex car parking charges and indeed, forecourt forecourt charges.

00:47:43:26 - 00:47:56:25

Charges wasn't the issue. It's supply and demand, because that's a separate discussion. But I think what I'm saying is, if you're so confident about that, when what's wrong with the control of level of car parking.

00:47:59:08 - 00:48:20:18

Uh, we're chickens for that. We believe that the surface access commitments around mode share against the, um, passenger numbers that we have, um, have the effect of providing a limit on the amount of car parking that is needed, because that is what's, um, what's driving the mode. Achieving the mode shares, uh, under our control mechanism.

00:48:21:07 - 00:48:38:18

But so is the amount of parking. I mean, if the action plan, it ultimately cannot deliver the mode share. It's failing. Just. I'm not saying it will. I'm just saying let's run a scenario. It is failing. Traffic and parking demand will go up.

00:48:40:05 - 00:48:51:19

So an effective control in a DCO might be, well, actually, if you can control all parking events in parking, you can control the level of traffic.

00:48:55:20 - 00:49:28:26

Rich things for the applicant. Um. I'm not sure. There is quite so direct a relationship between the amount of traffic and the amount of car parking that we provide. Um, particularly in terms of the variation in car share through the year. So, for example, our mowed shares between the summer and the winter periods. Um, an apology. I should probably more correctly use the CIA quarters rather than half years.

00:49:29:06 - 00:50:04:00

Um, can vary quite significantly. Um, our approach is to make sure that we have sufficient parking, um, both in accordance with our section 106 agreements and more generally, in terms of efficient operation. We have enough car parking capacity for the, um, the peak activity in the summer, uh, which is associated, uh, also with the modelling that's been undertaken with the project, but that might be masked by changes in mode share at an annual level. Uh, because we may have considerable amounts of the year when we are not using all of those car parks.

00:50:04:27 - 00:50:33:07

But I don't think I haven't seen this car parking supply. Nope. But, I mean, I may well have follow up questions when I've read that. But just on one more point for me about parking goes back to Mr. Bedford's point about this robotic parking, which I understand you have made no submission to Crawley Borough Council on yet, so it's theoretically you could do under permitted development. Given that. And suppose the DCO was granted, why isn't it in with project amount?

00:50:35:12 - 00:51:03:21

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, the term robotic parking really just applies to a, uh, a level of automation, um, and, uh, in some respects, uh, uh, customer experience for undertaking the, uh, kind of parking that we already operate at Gatwick, uh, which is generally referred to as valet parking or block parking. Um, as opposed to South Park. Um.

00:51:05:07 - 00:51:38:19

I think that's, um, probably well understood, but I'll happily defer to deadline one in terms of the difference there, because it's it reduces the amount of space that you need in order to park a car. Um,



the impact of robotic parking would be the same as us using the existing car parks and operating them to block park, using, um, existing, uh, what we call jockey drivers. So valet drivers who would then park in the same.

00:51:38:21 - 00:51:54:06

So it's not of itself, um, making any any difference to the approach to to parking. It's the it's the, the technology. It's the that the customer experience that is contained within the robotic parking. Well, the way I raised the issue.

00:51:54:27 - 00:52:00:07

Thank you. But the way I read the to it reads like 2500 more parking spaces.

00:52:01:26 - 00:52:15:03

I have in the cities a specific product which would take existing South Park spaces and convert them to an equivalent block park, hence the uplift in declared spaces.

00:52:15:26 - 00:52:18:07

Well, I read it as a net increase.

00:52:20:08 - 00:52:28:03

Um. It's sorry. It is a net increase of 2500 across an area of South Park that is converted to two Block Park. Yeah.

00:52:29:10 - 00:52:40:20

That's correct. Okay. One more question for me and then I'll take some comments. But this is where I might. Could you display table 45 strategic transport modelling report up to 60.

00:52:49:02 - 00:52:52:18

I'm sorry, Richard. I do beg your pardon, sir. Would you mind repeating the point?

00:52:52:20 - 00:52:56:26

It's table 45 of the Strategic Transport modelling report.

00:53:05:09 - 00:53:06:27

It is up to 60.

00:53:12:07 - 00:53:14:16

Thanks be to the transport assessment.

00:53:21:11 - 00:53:42:13

Thank you. Somebody perhaps if you look at the, um, 2040 future baseline number total and a 2047 with project total. Explain how that table shows an increase of 1100 spaces, which you. Say there will be with the project.

00:53:43:25 - 00:54:08:11

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, it's really simply, uh, explained. I'm afraid that table does contain wrong information, which is incorrect. That's table. Uh, the information that's in the project description, which provides the existing, um, car parking supply and the with project parking supplies. Correct. Which gives you the 1100 spaces.

00:54:08:23 - 00:54:13:00

But my understanding of this table is this is what the modelling was based on.

00:54:15:01 - 00:54:23:27

But sorry. It's an it's an earlier table which has been incorrectly included within the document. It's not what the modelling has been based on. Corrected.

00:54:24:06 - 00:54:25:13

It will be corrected somewhere.

00:54:25:15 - 00:54:26:01

Yes.

00:54:26:03 - 00:54:26:28

Okay. Thank you.

00:54:27:04 - 00:54:28:14

Apologies. Um.

00:54:28:22 - 00:54:33:29

So I'll take comments from other people. National highways comment.

00:54:35:19 - 00:55:14:26

Thank you sir. Uh, very briefly noting your comments on time. Um, I think the key thing here is that, um. You'll note the Surface Access Commitments document, which we said that we would be providing a markup of, uh, commitment eight is the is the is the key one which relates to the car park, car parking assessment, uh, and what the applicant proposes to do in terms of parking spaces. There's two simple comments. One is the way that that's drafted is is too loose at the moment. And the second is and it relates to the question you've just asked around the assumptions on increased spaces is it commits to the provision of six and a half ball.

00:55:14:28 - 00:55:29:28

It says that 6500 additional spaces will be available, but that's not how the commitment itself has been drafted in what it delivers. So from our perspective, the assessment, um, is making assumptions that are not secured. Thank you.

00:55:30:28 - 00:55:31:18

Mr. Bedford.

00:55:33:28 - 00:56:09:15

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford, for the joint local authorities. So we have, uh, some concerns about, um, the degree of control we note. Um, what we'd understood was the position that there is proposed to be a net increase of 1100 parking spaces, and at the moment, we don't understand the rationale for that. Tables that we've assumed are correct, uh, in app 260 are table 70 and table one, three, three.

00:56:10:04 - 00:56:41:04

And they appear to show the proportion of passengers at 2047 who would be, um, park and fly passengers, i.e. the ones that would generate a need for a parking space themselves, as opposed to the other ways of arriving at the airport. And as we read that information in the baseline, it's suggested that there will be 36,500 park and fly passengers.

00:56:41:19 - 00:57:20:23

And in the with development scenario, it suggested there would be 36,003 hundred passengers, which appears to be a slight reduction, but it's effectively the same. But if that is the case, we don't understand, therefore why the with development scenario has a 1100 increase in parking spaces. So that brings us back to where we were slightly on the discussion last week on Friday about the sack and the need for stepped controls so as to ensure that if there is a justified case for an increase, then that may be so.

00:57:20:25 - 00:57:55:22

But there shouldn't be provision without there being a justified case for an increase. So that's that's the main point. Then I won't say anything more about the queries we've got about those baseline quantities of parking, including the robotic parking as one of those. And then we've also got a separate concern which relates to how off airport parking is to be monitored, which is to ensure that demand is diverted to the on airport carparks rather than to, as it were, the problems of fly parking and so on.

00:57:56:02 - 00:58:31:09

And obviously that relates also to discussions that we are having about levels of funding for enforcement of that which will be related matters. Um, so, so I think those are our concerns about the parking assessment. And effectively we see a need for greater control, and we don't see why in particular, it would not be appropriate to take up your suggestion that bringing controls on the quantum of parking into the DCO via a requirement, as opposed to simply relying on the Sachs MOT commitments, would not be an effective way of dealing with that.

00:58:31:16 - 00:58:35:10

Thank you. Um, Mr. North, online, please.

00:58:37:14 - 00:59:07:00

That's right. Thank you. Sir. Um. My question really is I don't want to repeat what you have indicated is purely this. This seems to be, as far as I can read it in the documentation to do your application. No real, um, no real commitments or or comment to those relating to either transport network companies like Uber, who are fast becoming an increasing.

00:59:07:11 - 00:59:07:26

Uh.

00:59:07:29 - 00:59:50:22

Access vehicle to London Heathrow Airport, if not London Gatwick Airport as is being shown through their own assays, and also the fact that people do park their cars in people's driveways using these ongoing technological platforms such as Uber and Lyft and the rest of it. Um, there seems to be nothing mentioned about the increase, and there is colossal increase around Gatwick Airport of people parking in private driveways, paying for, uh, paying private individuals for the privilege of doing so, and often being transported to the airport either by taxi or by the household of concerned and back.

00:59:51:09 - 01:00:00:17

These seem to be issues which don't seem to have been addressed in the, uh, to or in any documentation which I've read. Thank you.

01:00:01:01 - 01:00:03:14

Thank you. Anyone else in the room?

01:00:05:03 - 01:00:38:23

Yes. I think the point is, Chris. Sorry, climate Commission, I think these points have already been made. But just to reiterate, I, I remain confused how parking fits in with a coherent transport strategy. So I'll look at this recording again and just clarify. But, um, it doesn't seem it seems to be an add on rather than the implicit implicit part of the of the strategy. And the second question is, is simply how well off off airport parking be controlled and over potentially quite a wide area. Um, you know, what controls have been placed to prevent that? Thank you, thank you.

01:00:39:27 - 01:00:42:09

Any other. Yes.

01:00:46:24 - 01:01:19:02

Lisa Scott Parish Council, and we're surrounding the airport on two sides. So we see an awful lot of this fly parking and issues with taxi drivers and um residents being accused, um, taxi drivers actually phoning the police and accusing a resident of threatening to put their windows in when they're just asking them to move out of the driveway. This is a really serious concern for us. We know the local authorities. Um, some of them have got policies where they will not approve further off street, um, airport parking.

01:01:19:04 - 01:01:33:14

And I'm concerned about, um, Gatwick, um, potential um, management of parking by charging, which will just push more people to looking for legitimate parking locations. Thank you. Thank you.

01:01:35:19 - 01:01:37:27

Okay. We'll hear from the applicant now.

01:01:40:20 - 01:02:14:16

Um, so I have a sergeant counsel for the applicant. As you've, um, understood, we are due to submit a paper on this by deadline one. So we will pick up in that, um, some of the points that have been raised today. But just in terms of an overview, um, there are many reasons why at this stage, um, the applicant considers that the sort of more flexible approach in the um service access commitments

document is appropriate. Um, not least because there isn't a sort of very entirely linear, um, relationship between, um.

01:02:15:22 - 01:03:00:29

Decreased. So I mean, it's right around. Yeah. A decreased provision of parking on airport and then a better position in terms of sustainable transport mode share because as has just been adverted to obviously if there's insufficient parking on airport, then that parking doesn't necessarily displace itself to more sustainable modes of transport. It might displace itself off airport. So it's about striking the balance between managing all of these considerations. And just on a sort of technical legal point, um, there is a clause in the section 106 agreement that deals with the parking support that the applicant is proposing to pay, um, to Crawley to deal with off site, off airport parking, because obviously that isn't something that ultimately is in the hands of the applicant to control.

01:03:02:00 - 01:03:33:07

Thank you. But. In my own defense, on the point about parking. I didn't mean all on airport parking. I meant in the to say that Off-Site parking will be controlled to A level A capacity of 87.5%, and you're going to make a contribution to Crawley to deal with offsite parking. It's the trip and parking is all the parking available. So it's that level of control I was talking about. It's it's what the what the airport said in the application.

01:03:33:10 - 01:03:48:12

It, it has control over offsite parking to a city of 87.5% from memory. So it wasn't just about the airport parking, it was about the all the parking around the airport. All the trip ends if you're like.

01:03:50:22 - 01:03:52:28

But I know your comment.

01:03:54:24 - 01:04:07:15

Um. So moving on to. I think we probably I think realistically I think it's a panel. We think we've got another half an hour, maybe about quarter past, if that's all right with everyone.

01:04:11:18 - 01:04:37:05

Uh, movement framework. Uh, no. Sorry to myself. Item six is modal targets and controls. I mean, I think I've already rehearsed probably what I was going to say about this, inasmuch as what happens. In the event. That the action plan. Does not control growth and does traffic and parking at the airport.

01:04:41:24 - 01:04:42:21

What would happen.

01:04:45:01 - 01:05:01:03

Um, have a sergeant counsel for the applicant. So it's a it's a continuing process. So essentially there's a there's a continued obligation to produce action plans that do address the, the need to achieve the Mod share requirements.

01:05:01:15 - 01:05:05:17

So in practical terms, we just keep writing apps and plans.

01:05:06:26 - 01:05:15:07

About notes. Well, writing them then also implementing them. So there is an it's not simply an obligation to produce the plan.

01:05:15:16 - 01:05:37:27

I do that, but I understand that. But but what I'm saying is I don't know what's in the plan. None of us know what would be in that plan. Those aren't planned. Whatever's in that plan ceases to does not control the growth. They might say. Just for instance, more money on cycle parking. And suppose that has no effect.

01:05:41:00 - 01:06:03:28

Then it would be necessary to find an alternative proposal that is more effective. That's the that's the obligation. I mean, the context of this series, you'll have understood, is that, um, the applicant has a very strong track record of successfully shifting modes of travel, um, in a more sustainable direction. That compares very well with what other airports have been, um, undertaking.

01:06:06:02 - 01:06:16:15

Yeah. My. My concern if you like is, is I know the applicant's view is this is the best way of controlling it through most commitments.

01:06:18:05 - 01:06:31:14

I am yet to be persuaded. I think that in my view, that's the best way of controlling it. And it's what we talked about before about parking numbers is is part of a package of ways of controlling it.

01:06:36:12 - 01:07:10:11

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, I just in sort of support and, um, and further. Explanation really in terms of how the service access commitments would work. Um, we have a lot of monitoring data, both gateway related data. We continually monitor our car parking. Um, we have monitors, obviously, of, um, passenger activities, uh, various things, various bits of data in terms of mod share and road traffic.

01:07:10:15 - 01:07:49:29

The intention is not to develop action plans, uh, to respond to a failure to hit our targets, but to develop action plans in advance of that condition coming forward, and therefore to ensure that there is mitigation that can be achieved in order to avoid. Um, failing to hit the mod share targets. So it's not a proactive, it's not a post response. It's a proactive response in order to make sure that there is, uh, there is opportunity to develop, um, lasting and effective mitigation.

01:07:50:09 - 01:08:25:13

Uh, the other point I would make is that the process by which we, um, uh, we manage that, uh, that monitoring and reporting will be through the Transport Forum Steering group, um, who currently exist to review our proposals for sustainable transport fund allocations and also review of what our what elements of the surface access strategy action plan, uh, we are undertaking at any time and our success and progress on all those actions.

01:08:25:20 - 01:08:38:23

Um, and as uh, Sergeant mentioned, we have been successful in meeting um and progressing our surface access targets under that approach, uh, for, for many years. And we will continue to do so.

01:08:39:05 - 01:08:42:08

Thank you. Um, I'll ask Mr. Bedford.

01:08:44:11 - 01:09:27:12

Thank you, Sir Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. So you're already obviously alive to our concerns about the, um, the lack of, um, robustness in the surface access commitments and their enforceability and what we suggest needs to be done about that. But it's I don't want to repeat that. So looking at it in a slightly wider concept, we obviously acknowledge that, not least because Gatwick, unlike some other airports, has, um, the rail station embedded uh, within it that it is achieving, uh, what may be a better modal share than some of the other, uh, London airports.

01:09:27:16 - 01:09:59:10

But we consider that when one's dealing with the human behaviours and all the variables, there may be a suggestion of, as it were, not necessarily a ceiling, but that the further up as it were, the gradient you go, the harder and harder it gets to get to the, the last element. And that's why we are concerned that the, the reference to achieving the 55% will be a challenge and we don't see it as being regulated. We also note that from the applicant's perspective.

01:10:00:04 - 01:10:46:08

At the time that it produced the Preliminary Transport Assessment Report in September 2021. It had an ambition for a 60% load share, both for sustainable travel for passengers and for staff journeys by 2030. Whereas in the application that has been, as it were, downgraded to a 55% by 2032, which would seem to imply that the applicant itself has entered, as it were, a note of caution about its ability to achieve those higher mo shares.

01:10:46:10 - 01:11:16:27

And that, again, tells us that there really need to be some, as it were, teeth or checks or, um, mechanisms to ensure that the Mo shares are achieved. And if they're not achieved, there are effectively sanctions rather than the preparation of action plans, and then the review and subsequent preparation of further action plans and so on, which we don't regard to be, um, sufficient to be effective.

01:11:17:00 - 01:11:31:27

And again, I don't repeat it because we talked about it last week. But that brings us back to the idea of a controlled growth approach, a stepped approach, rather than simply relying on the SAC commitments.

01:11:32:00 - 01:11:34:04

Thank you, Mr. Latif. Ramesh.

01:11:36:05 - 01:12:06:18

Thank you, sir. Mr. chief, for, uh, National Highways. I think everything that we were going to say under this agenda item, we've covered either issue specific hearing to or under agenda item three. Um, it's only to signpost that the surface access commitments is obviously a key document. Will mark it up to show you exactly what we'd like to see. I would also just flag that that document contains a number of references to agreements or arrangements with third parties to deliver some of the interventions in that document.

01:12:06:20 - 01:12:18:09

And it's not clear, um, at least from what's been published, the status of, of, of those, um, arrangements, because clearly they will need to be in place if they are deliverable. Thank you.

01:12:19:08 - 01:12:53:02

Any other comments? It's Mr. Hyde. Um, the 55 Crusade. Uh, sorry. Climate Commission. Uh, the 55% sustainable mode share target is not truly sustainable because it allows some car traffic growth to and from the airport. Did the applicant consider a scenario which assumed no car traffic growth at all? Um, and, uh, they test that scenario. I mean, that scenario, of course, presumably would therefore relieve them of the need to introduce the quite expensive, um, highway improvements.

01:12:53:04 - 01:13:04:12

And that funding could have been used to, um, to contribute to, to uh, improvements in, um, in rail, uh services and infrastructure. Thank you. Thank you. Any other comment?

01:13:06:00 - 01:13:08:12

Yes. Councillor. Essex.

01:13:10:16 - 01:13:11:14

Thank you. I think.

01:13:11:16 - 01:13:12:05

Um, councillor.

01:13:12:07 - 01:13:30:01

Essex Gal noted that they're, they're good at delivering on surface transport improvements, but it's been watered down from 60% to 55% to 2032. Um, why is there no ambition to increase it beyond 2032, when the airport is expected to continue to grow all the way to 2047?

01:13:36:13 - 01:13:36:28

Yeah. This.

01:13:39:12 - 01:13:40:24

Guess there's a hand at the back there.

01:13:46:00 - 01:14:18:03

Thank you sir. Hello. My name is Nola Cooper. I'm a principal transport planner at Kent County Council, and I'm mindful of time, so I'll be very short today. Um, so Kent County Council is a neighboring highway authority, but it is worth noting that Gatwick Airport is the closest international



airport for approximately the 1.7 million people that live in Kent. Currently, the main mode of transport to the airport for many of our residents is by car, and KCC has long made the case for better public transport services between Kent and the airport.

01:14:18:22 - 01:14:51:24

We note that Gatwick Airport Limited's application includes ambitious public transport modal share targets, which are of course welcomed. And in addition to that, we would support the discussions today around the potential for a direct rail service from Kent. However, we are concerned that the 55% public transport mode share target set by the applicant is unachievable by the interventions that they propose and in particular, this relates to the 15 fold increase in air passenger coach services proposed to Kent.

01:14:53:03 - 01:15:36:22

In order to fully understand the extent of the impacts on the wider road network. If these ambitious targets are not met, we would request that a model sensitivity test is undertaken on the implications of a continuity of current mode share levels. Furthermore, the applicant states in commitment five of applicant sorry application document app 090. Sorry. Excuse me. Um. That gal will provide reasonable financial support to enable the coach services detailed in table one or others, which result in an equivalent level of improved public transport accessibility to sustain their operation and promote their use for a minimum of five years.

01:15:36:26 - 01:16:10:08

But the terminology used here is incredibly vague, as is the detail around how the airport plans to work with local authorities and commercial coach operators to encourage the uptake of these services. Therefore, we would ask for further information on what constitutes as reasonable financial support and for the applicant to work with KCC to develop the proposals for coach services to and from Kent to ensure that they are successful. Um, we will also be making these requests in writing as part of our local Impact report and written representation at deadline one.

01:16:10:14 - 01:16:16:27

Um, but we did just want them to bring them to the attention of the examining authority at the earliest opportunity. Thank you.

01:16:16:29 - 01:16:21:15

Thank you. And Mr. North online.

01:16:23:14 - 01:16:23:29

Are.

01:16:26:11 - 01:17:24:04

Thank you, sir. Uh, again, Tim North, representing Holiday Access Limited. Um, so my point is very brief, and that is that, um. Monitoring or enforcing the appropriateness or effectiveness of environmental impacts, such as road share targets, is leaving the matter up to the applicant to decide, in other words, marking his own homework or her own homework. The only way any sort of exceedances in terms of modes share targets, when I mean exceedance is not meeting those targets can be controlled is so a system whereby there is a mitigation measure put in place by a an

independent form of operator, such as the Environment Scrutiny Forum, who will control effectively the growth of the airport through perhaps slot allocations or something of that nature.

01:17:24:09 - 01:17:25:13

That's the only way to do it.

01:17:26:14 - 01:17:32:10

Thank you. Thank you. The applicant wanted to respond on those points, please.

01:17:34:10 - 01:18:09:25

And thank you, sir. Sergeant. Counsel for the applicant. Um, I mean, I think. Some of this will. We'll have to come back to you once you've had the section 106 agreement, which provides the detail of the proposed measures. But the applicant's position is that the measures proposed are potent and are strong, and the applicant is firmly of the view that they will be effective. And I won't, um, repeat the point I've already made about the applicant's track record in terms of, um, successfully achieving a shift, um, in mode share.

01:18:09:27 - 01:18:42:18

I would just note that the surface access commitments are not purely retrospective either. Um, that document is app zero 90 and it's paragraph 6.2.5 and 6.2.6. And for your notes, sir, um, it remains the applicant's position that there isn't a need for an alternative, such as a passenger cap or an emissions cap, because, um, that would be disproportionate in circumstances where there is, um, general policy support for airport growth.

01:18:42:20 - 01:19:06:02

And, um, given that the applicant is an experienced airport operator with a very good track record, there is no evidence to suggest that there needs to be, um, a growth constraint or the threat of a growth constraint in order to ensure that the applicant complies with the Mod share commitments that it's putting forward. And the other point that I'd like to make is that, um.

01:19:08:22 - 01:20:06:07

We consider the appropriate response to any failure to meet the. The mode share target is to identify specific mitigation to address that failure, which is why we're proposing the action plan route, because it enables, for example, additional sustainable transport measures or an increased contribution to the Sustainable Transport Fund, or adjustments in the parking and the forecourt pricing. So it would enable the applicant to engage with the Transport Forum Steering Group in the same effective and collaborative manner that it has been doing for a long time now, and to successfully identify a tailored, specific remedy to the failure if, as and when were to emerge, um, rather than a less tailored um, we would say potentially less effective response, which is simply to impose, um, a cap on growth when, you know, that's a way of dealing with the issue, but it won't.

01:20:07:05 - 01:20:41:18

Necessarily facilitate both growth plus achievement of the mode share targets. So that's why we've taken this more tailored approach. And that's set out in the CAC document. Um, because for example, there might well be cases where actually having sufficient demand to sustain particular initiatives means that growth, um, and continued growth can facilitate achievement of the Mod share

commitments. Um, so yeah, it's what we're proposing is a continuation, essentially of the existing approach, which has been successful.

01:20:41:20 - 01:21:15:18

And it's not, as you'll know, sir, unusual as an approach to airport expansion. And just to pick up finally on, um, Mr. Bedford's point about the previous hire, um, identified potential mode share targets. I mean, in the decade of change, those remain aspirational mode share targets. Um, and they're not disregarded and they haven't been set aside by the applicant. But what the applicant has done is to think very carefully, with the benefit of its experience and its success, um, in this area, about what mode share targets are achievable.

01:21:15:20 - 01:21:19:08

And it's those that have gone into the surface access commitments document.

01:21:20:17 - 01:21:56:12

Thank you. Um, right. So we move briefly on to item seven, which is about movement frameworks. Um. The information provided in the documents submitted seemed to be mostly relate to the airport's own website maps of pedestrian and cycle routes. And that's in the TOS 079 diagrams 14.31 and 14.35. Not clear from these diagrams how the cycle routes connect to the cycle parking locations, or how pedestrian routes connect to pedestrian entrances and exits.

01:21:57:04 - 01:22:14:15

Would it be possible to produce a clearer movement framework indicating pedestrian and cycle routes where these and where these are shared? Indicating locations like cycle parking and entrances. And could it also include an indication of the width of the various pedestrian cycle and shared routes?

01:22:18:03 - 01:22:50:02

Basically a more detailed movement framework so we can understand better, because one particular area just on the width is that I can't quite understand from the documents submitted and the plans, is the footpath that run along the A23 into the Riverside Park currently is a very narrow, overgrown path. I'm not clear what it is intended to be or what width is intended to be, and a proper movement framework would be able to understand that.

01:22:53:29 - 01:23:02:18

I'm Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, the maps you refer to in terms of on airport facilities, um.

01:23:03:20 - 01:23:04:08

Uh.

01:23:05:06 - 01:23:46:03

Really sort of maps intended to, um, help staff who have other, um, mechanisms for finding out um, information relating to cycling and walking. Um, so they're not intended, um, to provide a comprehensive guide to the movement strategy, as you describe. Um, the information relating to the both the existing, the continuation of existing paths and indeed the changes to those paths, um, or additional um, uh, rights of way and active travel provision are included more generally within our, um, our highway plans.

01:23:46:05 - 01:24:00:27

So in the works plans associated with the, uh, with the application, um, probably just also, uh, sort of introduce a colleague, um, to to provide a bit more detail on some of the comments you've made with respect to widths, etc..

01:24:02:17 - 01:24:49:22

Thank you. Darren Atkins for the applicant. Uh, so just in relation to the A23 London Road footway that you mentioned, the proposed width, there is a two metre wide footway with a 9.5m separation buffer to the to the highway. And that proposal would meet the latest uh design standard requirements for footway provision, taking into account the speed limits, etc., on that road. Uh, we I have the information here for the typical widths for all the active travel provision. Um, I, in the interest of this, probably proposed that we could share that information at a future deadline in a table format, providing you typical and minimum widths for all of the assets proposed, uh, with reference to the relevant um labels and the rights away and access plans to give you the clarity as to which routes that they're covering.

01:24:50:04 - 01:25:01:26

Yeah, that would be very useful. Thank you. I mean, that was my basically my point there is, is more clarity on the movement framework. Um, does anyone have a point I want to raise on this issue? Mr. Bedford?

01:25:02:27 - 01:25:34:03

Thank you sir. Um, there has been sorry Michael Bedford for the joint local authorities. There has been discussion with the applicant through the, um, working groups on the movement framework, and concerns have been expressed by the authorities about particular locations, which I'm not sure it's helpful to you at the moment to go into the detail of precise locations and precise deficiencies. But in very, um, headline terms, there are concerns in relation to the Longbridge roundabout.

01:25:34:05 - 01:26:10:16

There are concerns in relation to active travel between Horley and Gatwick, and there are concerns in relation to the ability to cross the Brighton main line. There are also issues in relation to the um permissive and public rights of way network. We'll set those out. We have discussed those with the applicant, and we're hoping to see progress made on those discussions and dialogue to get a better position, not least because obviously, whilst it's probably more relevant to the employees than it is to the passengers, active travel as a mode is an important part of the overall strategy.

01:26:11:09 - 01:26:13:13

Thank you. National Highways.

01:26:14:19 - 01:26:45:04

Thank you, sir. Um, Mr. Latif Ramesh, for, uh, National Highways, we were going to raise exactly the point that you've raised. And if we could just make a request through you that when that information is prepared on the widths, that the key interest of National Highways is ensuring compliance with the design? Uh, manual for Roads and Bridges and specifically KD 143. So if the applicant could

comment and confirm that there are no departures from that standard when producing those documents, that would be particularly helpful.

01:26:45:15 - 01:26:46:00

Thank you.

01:26:46:24 - 01:26:47:27

Yes. Mr. Rolf.

01:26:48:28 - 01:27:20:18

Thank you very much, Steve. And South Parish Council. Could I ask through you, sir, the of the applicants whether the measures for pedestrians and cyclists are taking into account the needs of the physically impaired in wheelchairs, manual or electric, or any kind of mobility scooters? Often the problem is that kerb drops where it crosses a highway are too steep, and there is a risk of wheelchairs toppling and expelling the rider into the path of oncoming traffic.

01:27:20:20 - 01:27:21:24

Thank you. Thank you.

01:27:22:07 - 01:27:26:20

Any others? Yes. This baby. Sorry.

01:27:28:03 - 01:27:55:21

Thank you very much, sir. Sally Paver for Cagney. Um, a major concern that that we have raised previously with the applicant is actually the cycle routes that actually go into Gatwick itself are dangerous. Um, and the access to the terminals is, is in totally inappropriate for people with cycle or with bikes. And North Terminal is almost. Well, you can't access it with a bike. So if you were to look at those perhaps on your visits, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

01:27:58:02 - 01:28:00:13

It's Mr. Hyde. Oh.

01:28:02:01 - 01:28:11:14

Okay. Um, on that point, Miss Pavey, we have actually, we did actually look at that on our unaccompanied site inspection back to the applicant responding.

01:28:15:00 - 01:28:53:12

And Darren Atkins for the applicant. So just with respect to some of the, um, details of the design options that we've looked at in relation to active travel provision, uh, during the design development, in particular, after the summer 22 consultation, there was, uh, extensive engagement with local authorities on potential active travel measures to be introduced as part of the scheme. Um, following those discussions that took place through the likes of the active travel topic working groups, substantial changes were implemented in the design proposals. Uh, details on that are set out in the uh, US chapter three alternatives considered document reference 028.

01:28:54:01 - 01:29:14:03

Uh, specifically uh, from page 3.40, just for reference. Um, then, um, in relation to, uh, the compliance with um DMR b and the, the widths and the details to be provided in the future deadline, we're happy to have details in relation to compliance with TMB and.

01:29:16:03 - 01:29:51:09

I also in relation to the inclusive design principles. So at this preliminary design stage, inclusive design principles have been taken to account, looking at features such as gradients of the roots, etc. at this stage there is some aspects of the design such as drop, kerb, design, proposals etc. some of that will be developed at the detailed design stage as will be the norm for schemes of this nature. The. So those proposals will be continue to be developed and refined in accordance with inclusive design principles. And it's worth noting that ultimately as well, those design proposals at that stage will be subject to approval by the relevant highway authorities as well, would also have similar concerns.

01:29:52:03 - 01:30:19:10

Thank you. Thank you. They will take us on to. Item nine, which is going to be the action points. But what I was going to suggest was there's quite a lot of action points here. We will publish them as soon as we can. The one exception to that would be the very first point I started with about. Are you clear about the future baseline position?

01:30:25:17 - 01:30:45:08

So I have a sergeant counsel for the applicant. I apologize from our side of the room for this, but when we were discussing this in the break, I don't think we had between us necessarily got an identical understanding of what you wish to understand. So if you wouldn't mind just articulating that and then we can assist you hopefully as, as much as possible on that. Thank you. Okay.

01:30:45:10 - 01:31:23:25

What I was hoping was. I think the future baseline, as you have put in chapter 12. Is in effect a fallback position if the DCO isn't granted. That's the way it's described. Um, the future baseline I would like to examine the project against is one that contained all the airport growth. In one place, i.e. the project. So the background, the future baseline was indeed the background of future term, future traffic growth and other non airport developments.

01:31:24:16 - 01:31:39:14

And that's the future baseline for which the With project is looked at. I don't know what that will show but I would like to understand that. I think that's a relevant consideration as a robust worst case scenario if you like.

01:31:42:24 - 01:32:08:09

Sir Richard Higgins for the applicant, um, and apologised once again. Just trying to make sure that this is absolutely clear. Yeah. Uh, when you refer to that, um, that future baseline that you would like to see. Are you describing a condition where we have the, um, dual runway operation under that level of demand, but without some of the mitigation works associated with the project? No, it's.

01:32:09:27 - 01:32:14:26

Thanks. Isn't that the same? Isn't that the same thing? That. That without.

01:32:16:13 - 01:32:30:19

It's a baseline as it is, has all the things like the reason why you can increase to 67 million passengers are all the same things that are in. Already in the project case.

01:32:32:09 - 01:32:46:19

They're not. All of the. You're accepted right at the beginning that all of the growth. In airport passengers, as described in the With project, the 88.2 is the total amount of growth.

01:32:48:22 - 01:32:52:12

Baseline at 2019 is 46.6 million.

01:32:55:25 - 01:32:57:16

Which you're not at, but.

01:32:59:26 - 01:33:01:23

Um, what I'm hoping to see is.

01:33:03:12 - 01:33:10:13

All of the growth wants the DCO is granted, becomes the project case, is the project case. All of those things like.

01:33:12:03 - 01:33:22:08

Um or occupancy of planes. Uh, bigger planes, all of that in the with project case that the without project case doesn't exist at that point.

01:33:24:27 - 01:33:29:00

And if you if you're looking at it as an environmental issue on the streets

01:33:30:21 - 01:33:37:00

or around the airport. That case doesn't exist. It's only. What's it like now? And what will it do with the.

01:33:39:23 - 01:33:40:29

Don't think it can be any.

01:33:42:21 - 01:33:51:16

I have a sergeant counsel for the applicant. No, sir. Thank you. That has clarified for us what you're seeking to understand, and we'll come back to you on that with a hopefully a helpful answer. Thank you.

01:33:51:21 - 01:34:05:01

Thank you. All right. Well, that's the that's the one action point I think that probably needed clarity. Um. Move on to item ten, which is any other business. Only. Yes.

01:34:08:23 - 01:34:13:21

Um, could I just say it should be related to what we've been discussing in the agenda rather than.

01:34:14:22 - 01:35:00:23

Um. Thank you. Thank you. Sir. Uh, Daisy noble, Marathon Asset Management and the Holiday Inn. There's just one point I wanted to raise, sir. It is related to surface transport, and therefore, we wanted to raise it today. Uh, it didn't seem to fit clearly under any other agenda item. Um, in order to address you on this brief point, I will hand over to Mr. Tom Allsopp on my left, who is a senior transport planner at Stantec. Um, just by way of context, with the point we're about to make. Um, I don't know if the Xa is aware that at present, there's a 24 hour shuttle bus service that's operated by BM coaches, and that connects various hotels around Gatwick Airport with the airport terminals, and that service is called the Hopper Bus.

01:35:00:25 - 01:35:23:09

And a significant part of my client's business relies on customers being able to park at the airport, stay in the hotel and then access the airport, um, using the hopper bus. Um, and therefore we have some concerns about the way in which, um, the project construction might impact upon this service and therefore, um, my client's business. I'm going to just hand over briefly to Mr. Althorp on this.

01:35:24:25 - 01:35:25:10

Uh.

01:35:25:12 - 01:35:25:27

Thank you.

01:35:25:29 - 01:35:28:10

Um, we just want to make two brief points in.

01:35:28:12 - 01:35:29:16

Respect to the Harper bus.

01:35:29:18 - 01:35:30:23

Uh, firstly, we've.

01:35:30:25 - 01:35:32:03

Reviewed all the technical.

01:35:32:05 - 01:35:33:01

Uh, service access.

01:35:33:03 - 01:35:33:18

Information.

01:35:33:20 - 01:36:13:01

Within the environmental statement. Chapter 12. Um, submitted as part of the application. Uh, and it's apparent that the applicant has not assessed the impact of the project on the Hopper bus service, including the impact arising during the construction period of the highway works along the 823 and



along bridge roundabout. We also understand that there has been no active engagement between BM coaches and the applicant. Um, and we consider this to be an omission in the assessment. Uh, secondly, we understand from engagement with the applicant that notwithstanding the lack of any assessment in the transport assessment, it will be necessary to divert the hopper bus during the construction period.

01:36:13:03 - 01:36:43:21

We do not yet have any certainty as to the duration of any diversion or alternative route. However, we would like to highlight this at this stage that any delays, disruption or impact on the reliability of the Hopper bus service would have a significant impact on my client's business, and potentially also of that of other third party hotel operators. We will look to develop these points further in our written representations, but wanted to raise them now so that the examiner and authority are aware of them. And as they prepare their written questions to the applicant. Thank you.

01:36:47:08 - 01:36:49:19

Any other points. Yes.

01:36:51:02 - 01:37:03:17

I can feel my passion. The quick point. Just a quick point. There don't appear to be any particular reference to bus services in this transport. Is that to be dealt with elsewhere?

01:37:04:14 - 01:37:16:09

I mean, I think I said right at the start. This hearing is about the things I needed to examine at the start of the examination. Both services were obviously one of the things that will be considered during the examination, but not at this hearing.

01:37:18:24 - 01:37:19:14

Yes.

01:37:22:18 - 01:37:46:26

This is Scott Charles Parish Council. With regard to the additional map showing walking and cycling infrastructure that would be delivered for some time point one and I'd like to understand how, um, other interested parties will be able to view that and put comments in, um, being aware that will be shortening on time. And I think there's a huge amount of comments on that aspect. Thank you.

01:37:49:10 - 01:37:55:00

I'm hoping the applicant will say it will be a submitted document and you'll be able to see on the website, but I'll leave it to the applicant.

01:38:00:15 - 01:38:05:13

Thanks. Richard Hagans for the applicant. Yes. We will be providing submitted documents in relation to the active travel provision.

01:38:06:17 - 01:38:07:27

And the other points raised.

01:38:08:26 - 01:38:09:11

Um.

01:38:11:24 - 01:38:13:25

Perhaps pick those up. Um.

01:38:15:23 - 01:38:34:08

More, I'll say more widely. Um, I would just sort of like to, to to note in respect of the Holiday Inn and the Hopper bus, um, provision for the Hopper bus. Um, and gaining access to the terminals is one of a number of um, uh, approved operators. Um, uh.

01:38:35:09 - 01:38:36:08

Others will be aware.

01:38:36:10 - 01:38:54:26

That, um, during the construction period, we plan to maintain access to and operation of both terminals and all those facilities that currently enjoy access. Um, we will be working with partners to ensure that that access is maintained. Thank you.

01:38:56:12 - 01:39:01:17

Well, if there are no other matters, I will pass back to Mr. Hockley to close this meeting.

01:39:04:12 - 01:39:34:19

Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. Um, if I could just remind you that timetable for this examination requires that parties provide any post hiring documents, either deadline one or alternative deadlines as identified in the hearing today or in the action point list to be published as soon as possible. And if I can also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the Inspectorate's website as soon as possible after this meeting. And thank you very much for attending today and for your participation. Um, we found it very useful.

01:39:35:03 - 01:39:40:26

The time is now 1719 and this issue specific hearing for is now closed. Thank you.