



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Written Summary of Oral Submissions from Issue Specific
Hearing 4: Surface Transport

Book 10

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: MARCH 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.8.5

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Agenda Items 1 and 2: Welcome, introductions and arrangements for the Hearing; Purpose of the Hearing	2
3	Agenda Item 3 - Strategic Transport Modelling	2
3.1.	Future baseline	2
3.2.	Assessment period	5
3.3.	Vissim modelling – extent	6
4	Agenda Item 4 - Rail Modelling	7
4.1.	Station modelling	7
4.2.	Passenger modelling	8
5	Agenda Item 5 - Car parking assessment	10
6	Agenda Item 6 - Modal targets and controls	12
7	Agenda Item 7 - Pedestrians and cyclists – movement frameworks	14
8	Agenda Item 8 - Action points arising from the Hearing	15
9	Agenda Item 9 - Any other business	16

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document contains a written summary of Gatwick Airport Limited's (the Applicant) oral submissions and post hearing comments on submissions made at the Issue Specific Hearing 4 ("ISH4") on Surface Transport held on Tuesday 5 March 2024. Where the comment is a post-hearing comment submitted by the Applicant, this is indicated. The Applicant has separately submitted at Deadline 1 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5) its response to the Examining Authority's ("ExA") action points arising from ISH4, which were published on 8 March 2024 [[EV8-005](#)].
- 1.1.2 This document uses the relevant headings for each item in the agenda published for ISH4 by the ExA on 30 January 2024 [[EV2-001](#)].
- 1.1.3 The Applicant, which is promoting the Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project (the "**Project**") was represented at ISH4 by Heather Sargent, and the following persons:
- 1.1.3.1. Richard Higgins, Surface Access Lead, Development, Gatwick Airport Limited;
 - 1.1.3.2. Dave Ellis, Director, Arup
 - 1.1.3.3. Chris Bruce, Associate Director, Arup
 - 1.1.3.4. Stuart Jenkins, Associate Director, Arup
 - 1.1.3.5. Darren Atkins, Principal Highways Engineer, Arup.

2 Agenda Items 1 and 2: Welcome, introductions and arrangements for the Hearing; Purpose of the Hearing

- 2.1.1 The Applicant did not make any submissions under these agenda items.

3 Agenda Item 3 - Strategic Transport Modelling

3.1. Future baseline

- 3.1.1 In response to the Examining Authority's ("ExA") series of queries on the treatment of the future baseline in the **Environmental Statement ("ES") Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport** [[AS-076](#)], the Applicant confirmed that the growth figures and passenger numbers in ES Chapter 12 were correct. The Applicant confirmed that ES Chapter 12 assesses the impacts and effects of the Gatwick Northern Runway Project (the "Project") against the future baseline and

explained that, as a consequence of the way in which the future baseline has been developed for the ES assessment, any committed changes or improvements to the transport network are included.

- 3.1.2 In response to the ExA's query for clarity on the level of passenger growth above today's baseline considered in the assessment, and whether a realistic worst case scenario has been assessed, the Applicant confirmed that airport growth without the Project has been included in the future baseline and the impacts of the Project over and above the future baseline have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport** [[AS-076](#)]. The Applicant explained that references to "background traffic growth" in paragraph 12.6.3 of the **Transport Assessment** [[AS-079](#)] are intended to refer to both airport and non-airport related growth, because and the airport-related future growth without the Project is included in the future baseline.
- 3.1.3 In response to the ExA's query about why the uncertainty log (contained as part of the **Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [[APP-260](#)]) does not mention the level of passenger growth assumed in the Future Baseline (i.e. that which would occur in the absence of the Project), the Applicant explained that the assessment included the baseline forecasts in the baseline cases. The Applicant explained that the passenger throughput figure does not sit in the uncertainty log because it relates directly to the forecast in **ES Appendix 4.3.1: Forecast Data Book** [[APP-075](#)].
- 3.1.4 In response to the ExA's query on whether there was any double counting when applying background growth factors, The Applicant confirmed that there has been no double counting because increases in airport and non-airport demand in the future baseline have been treated separately. The uplift in airport demand has been based on growth in passenger, employee and cargo demand between 2016 and future years as set out in **ES Appendix 4.3.1: Forecast Data Book** [[APP-075](#)]. Incremental growth in non-airport traffic has been factored separately using appropriate DfT growth factors.
- 3.1.5 In response to the ExA's query about the Capital Investment Plan (CIP) improvements set out at paragraph 13.2.8 of the **Transport Assessment** [[AS-079](#)] and how confident the Applicant is that the operation of the network without the Project would not compromise the future baseline projections or act as a constraint on airport growth, the Applicant confirmed that the Applicant has confidence in the transport modelling and the CIP highway improvements at the North and South Terminal roundabouts will deliver additional capacity that assists the airport to deliver the growth assumed, in the absence of the Project. The Applicant explained that the network modelling indicates the immediate area

around the airport would operate within, although close to, capacity by 2047 in the absence of the Project and that the Applicant would have interventions and measures in place, including the signalisation works and surface access strategies, that would help control airport-related trips such that there would not be a constraint on reaching the level of demand (67.2mppa) assumed at the Airport by 2047 without the Project.

- 3.1.6 In response to the ExA's query about traffic effects on local roads and whether **ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport** [\[AS-076\]](#) represents a realistic worst case on traffic movement and demand, The Applicant explained that the baseline and future baseline assumptions include future growth at the airport without the Project, which represents a 'business as usual' condition for the airport that could realistically occur.
- 3.1.7 In response to the ExA's comments on the expectation that the ES should consider the Project against background growth on the network in absence of the Project, the Applicant explained that the background traffic growth model assumes airport growth without the Project because there is no cap on airport growth.
- 3.1.8 The Applicant, confirmed that it would provide a written note at Deadline 1 to clarify the EIA methodology used and the position with respect to the future baseline used in the **Transport Assessment** [\[AS-079\]](#) and in **ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport** [\[AS-076\]](#).

[Post-Hearing Note: the Applicant has provided further information in relation to this matter in its separate responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5), in response to **Action Point 1**].

- 3.1.9 In response to concerns raised by Mustafa Latif-Aramesh (BDB Pitmans) on behalf of National Highways (**NH**) about the transport and traffic modelling, HS confirmed that the Applicant is engaging in further discussions with NH to seek to resolve these concerns. The Applicant confirmed that it was preparing sensitivity tests using the VISSIM models and assuming post-Covid conditions, building on the work examining post-Covid conditions in the strategic model (reported in **Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling** [\[AS-121\]](#)). The Applicant also confirmed that it would provide further information to NH about the performance of the network in 2029 and 2032, in relation to the timing of delivery of the Project highway works, as part of the post-Covid sensitivity testing in the VISSIM models. The Applicant confirmed that it could supply NH with a summary of the outcomes of the 2023 staff survey.

- 3.1.10 In response to NH's concerns about the securing mechanism for the highway improvement works considered as part of the future baseline (namely the CIP signalisation works), the Applicant confirmed that it has no in-principle issue with including measures in the Draft Development Consent Order ("draft DCO") and is engaging with NH to agree appropriate drafting.
- 3.1.11 **[Post-Hearing Note:** the Applicant anticipates that drafting to secure these works will be included in the updated Draft DCO due to be submitted at Deadline 3].
- 3.1.12 HS also confirmed that the Applicant will address the car parking issues raised by Michael Bedford KC (MBKC) for the Joint Local Authorities in written responses.
- 3.1.13 **[Post-Hearing Note:** the Applicant anticipates that a response to these matters will be included in the Applicant's responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5) due at Deadline 2].
- 3.1.14 In response to matters raised by Daisy Noble, Counsel for Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP (Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP) with interests in the Holiday Inn hotel, HS confirmed that meetings have taken place with the Applicant and Holiday Inn to discuss their concerns about access and the Applicant is continuing engagement with a view to resolving these concerns.

3.2. Assessment period

- 3.2.1 In response to the ExA's query about using the June period in the **Transport Assessment** [\[AS-079\]](#) (at paragraph 8.1.13), the Applicant explained that the June average has been selected considering a number of factors in terms of the seasonal profile of background demand (non-airport), the profile of demand for the Airport itself, and a combination of those two (which is a greater impact). From analysis of traffic count data, the commuting periods during June show higher traffic flows than in August. Therefore in combination with June, airport demand (which will become increasingly similar to the August period in future years based on the aviation forecasts) it is a reasonable scenario to assess.
- 3.2.2 In response to the ExA's query about whether June traffic levels are higher than August, the Applicant explained that across the local network, traffic volumes in the study area were generally higher in June than in August; on the Strategic Road Network ("SRN") flows are marginally higher in August in some places and time periods. In a wider context, it is most appropriate to look at average June network conditions coupled with a busy June day at the airport. The Applicant

explained that vehicle flows were looked at for the morning and evening peak hours as well as throughout the day.

- 3.2.3 In response to the ExA's query about whether August sensitivity testing is required, the Applicant explained that it has considered, in discussions with NH, an uplift on June demand to understand resilience to August conditions. The Applicant explained that the variation between August and June is around 8% based on existing profiles, and future projections in the aviation forecasts reduce the difference to 2-3%. From an assessment perspective, the Applicant confirmed that using the June conditions was appropriate.
- 3.2.4 In response to the ExA's query on whether the ES considers August traffic flows in the off-peak period, The Applicant explained that the model covers both morning and evening peak periods as well as a daytime interpeak. The Applicant explained that the June period was considered to be the preferable case in order to be consistent within the assessment. In response to the ExA's query on whether this indicates there are pros and cons of using the June date in the assessment in terms of the local roads and strategic roads, the Applicant confirmed it would respond to this point in writing.
- 3.2.5 **[Post-Hearing Note:** the Applicant proposes to submit a clarification note on the assessment period and the use of June in the modelling in the Applicant's responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5) due at Deadline 2 in response to **Action Point 3**].
- 3.2.6 In response to concerns raised by Cllr Essex about whether the holiday period being more car dependent had been factored into the model, the Applicant confirmed that CAA mode share data shows higher car mode share in June in comparison to the average annual car mode share, and that the model uses that higher car share.
- 3.3. **Vissim modelling – extent**
- 3.3.1 In response to the ExA's reference to Surrey CC's concerns about coverage of the VISSIM model in relation to the road network in Horley, the Applicant confirmed the VISSIM model was developed to verify the operational performance of the road network local to the airport. The Applicant explained that the main traffic route is the route from M23 which carries 70-75% of Airport traffic. The focus of the VISSIM model has been to assist in the discussions with NH and local authorities; to understand the local operation of the existing road network and CIP signalisation scheme without the Project; to support the development of the design of the highway works proposals for the Project and help to verify that the capacity they add is appropriate. It is designed to work

directly with the strategic highway model (developed in SATURN) and uses flows from that as an input in generating forecasts, and so is also aligned with the results of the magnitude of impact study in Section 12 of the **Transport Assessment** [[AS-079](#)]. This approach has been scoped and agreed with all the relevant stakeholders.

- 3.3.2 In response to concerns raised by Mr Bedford KC for the Joint Local Authorities about the Longbridge roundabout modelling approach, the Applicant explained that the strategic model covers a much wider area and it is the purpose of that model to look at journey times and network performance across the wider modelled area. The Applicant confirmed that it is not the case that those areas feeding into Longbridge roundabout have not been considered; they have been considered in the strategic model, just not in the VISSIM model for the reasons already discussed. For clarity, the Applicant confirmed that the VISSIM model includes the operation of Longbridge roundabout itself.
- 3.3.3 In response to comments made by Lisa Scott concerning the modelling as a result of the diverted path to access the South Terminal and the implications of an increase in vehicles on the road, the Applicant confirmed that the model deals with interactions between road traffic and pedestrian facilities. The Applicant explained that an action of the Project is to implement additional segregated and wider connections for active travel routes to increase walking and cycling to the airport. There is not an interactive model that deals with switching between road-based and active travel modes but separate surveys and work have been done to understand the numbers of active travel users.
- 3.3.4 In response to points raised by Chris Hyde (for Surrey Climate Commission) about whether the VISSIM model can assess the displacement of traffic to local roads as a result of congestion on the SRN, the Applicant confirmed that the strategic model includes a highway routing model and reflects capacity constraints in future which influence traffic feeding into the M23 spur and which use the local road network. That will consequently feed into the VISSIM model in terms of the proportions of Airport traffic using different routes in the different scenarios in the different conditions.

4 Agenda Item 4 - Rail Modelling

4.1. Station modelling

- 4.1.1 In response to the ExA's query on whether the modelling included the improvements to Gatwick Airport station that are now complete, the Applicant confirmed that it does.

- 4.1.2 In response to the ExA's query about whether any additional model validation had been undertaken now the station is complete, the Applicant confirmed the new station opened pre-Christmas and explained that it has taken the station model validated by Network Rail ("NR") in terms of ensuring the model reflects the as-built station. The Applicant explained that station activity is currently different to what is included in the NR model for the station project in terms of the current service pattern and the demand at the railway station, which is below that expected in the NR model. To assess the effects of the Project, the Applicant would therefore rather use the validated model which considers a larger volume of passengers to reflect the 'with Project' scenario based on projections, instead of basing the assessment on current conditions.
- 4.1.3 In response to the ExA's query about whether the Applicant has any concerns about the station accommodating the projected demand, the Applicant confirmed it is meeting with NR on 14 March 2024 to discuss these matters and will report back to the Examination on the outcome of these discussions in due course.
- 4.2. **Passenger modelling**
- 4.2.1 In response to the ExA's question about whether the passenger modelling assumes a future baseline of 67.2 mppa in 2047, in the same way as has been done for the traffic modelling, the Applicant confirmed that it does.
- 4.2.2 In response to the ExA's query about 2023 surveys to review the passenger modelling, the Applicant explained this was addressed in the post-Covid modelling note (**Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling** [[AS-121](#)]).
- 4.2.3 In response to the ExA's request for clarification about the model being based on timetable data or actual performance, the Applicant confirmed the model is based on timetable data and is converted to a level of frequency per hour which is derived from the timetable.
- 4.2.4 In response to matters raised by Govia Thameslink Railway ("GTR") and NR on passenger modelling, the Applicant confirmed it is engaged in ongoing dialogue with NR and GTR. The Applicant explained there is a Memorandum of Understanding in place with GTR for both parties to support an increase in rail mode share at the Airport and promote more journeys using rail and it continues to work closely with them. In response to the points raised, the Applicant explained the importance of looking at the impacts of the Project rather than the wider challenges the rail network is experiencing at present.
- 4.2.5 The Applicant explained the assessments are based on the expectation that the current network can return to the pre-Covid service provision and this has been

agreed by NR. The Applicant explained that its analysis is based on this expectation of future provision of services with both GTR and Great Western Railway (“GWR”) who operate additional services between Gatwick and Reading. In specific terms to return to pre-Covid demand, the Gatwick Express service is targeted at Airport demand and currently operates at two trains per hour and previously operated at four trains per hour. These services would be supported by Airport-related passengers as they provide direct services to London Victoria. In response to the GTR point regarding combined impacts of Airport-related and non-airport related demand, the Applicant explained that because of its location on the Brighton Main Line, all services stopping at Gatwick Airport station attract both airport and non-airport passengers, which all affect the timetabling of services, meaning that capacity is a complex picture for the operator and network provider.

4.2.6 The Applicant explained that in respect of funding, it has provided considerable funding into the redevelopment of Gatwick Airport station and those projects have helped reduce delays to trains accessing the platforms which has had wider benefits to the Brighton Main Line and has enabled upgrades to be undertaken early. Also, GTR and NR are party to the Transport Forum Steering Group which considers applications for grants of the Sustainable Transport Fund. It is a fund from various airport levies and is applied to sustainable access. The Applicant explained that there is an opportunity for rail improvements to be funded through this fund with an example being the direct train service to Reading which has been supported through this fund to enhance it from an hourly service to a half hourly service direct to Gatwick Airport and there would be opportunities for other such investment in future. The Applicant explained that in respect of investment in connections to Kent, an opportunity could exist for that to be brought forward subject to additional work by NR and GTR to ensure that wider integration with the Brighton Main Line does not preclude that. With respect to the funding, the Applicant confirmed that further detail will come through in the draft section 106 agreement (which will be submitted at Deadline 2) including with respect to the Transport Mitigation Fund which is mode-neutral and will be available for rail interventions. The Transport Mitigation Fund is intended to fund measures that respond to unknown or unintended impacts of the Project in future.

4.2.7 The Applicant made reference to the original core modelling which has been discussed with GTR and utilises GTR data to validate the model. The Applicant explained that it is working with Network Rail on the points that they have raised. The Applicant explained that the station improvements have been included within the assessment because they were always planned to be complete ahead of the 2029 and 2032 assessment periods. It explained that in terms of seated and

standing capacities used in the modelling, these are taken from the DfT's Green Book which provides the standing and seated capacity for each train type included within the model. The Applicant asked NR to provide details of the assumptions they are looking to confirm so that the Applicant can provide the necessary information.

4.2.8 **[Post-Hearing Note:** the Applicant is meeting with NR on 14 March 2024 to discuss these matters relating to the Project.]

4.2.9 **[Post-Hearing Note:** the Applicant will provide further information at Deadline 2 in relation to issues raised by Interested Parties in its separate responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5), in response to **Action Point 5**].

5 Agenda Item 5 - Car parking assessment

5.1.1 In response to the ExA's query on whether the car parking numbers are justified, the Applicant confirmed that it is intending to submit a Car Parking Strategy note at Deadline 1 (Doc Ref. 10.5) which include details of occupancy levels and efficiency of operation of different parking elements and references off-airport capacity .

5.1.2 In response to the ExA's query about whether the DCO should include parking controls, the Applicant explained that the **Surface Access Commitments ("SACs")** [[APP-090](#)] comprise the necessary controls and the Applicant's commitment to mode shares. That commitment has links to parking capacity and how the Applicant operates car parking in tandem with other surface access measures. The Applicant explained that up until Covid, airport demand grew and the Applicant delivered an increase in public transport mode share which demonstrates that the SACs can be achieved all in balance. The Applicant noted that it is currently occupying at about 75-85% capacity which varies seasonally. The Applicant explained that it cannot operate at 100% capacity because some capacity needs to be left open to allow flexibility around arrival and departure times, passengers to arrive on the day of travel and park without pre-booking, and to deal with variability in demand from a number of factors.

5.1.3 The Applicant confirmed it has included in **ES Chapter 5: Project Description** [[AS-133](#)] the additional amount of parking which the Applicant considers appropriate in accordance with the SAC's and the detailed modelling in terms of how mode shares can be achieved. The SACs require the Applicant to implement measures to meet the committed mode shares and one of the methods it may use is to vary parking and forecourt charges. The Applicant

explained that the SAC commitments around mode share have the effect of providing a limit on the amount of car parking needed and that drives the achievement of mode shares. The Applicant's approach is to ensure there is sufficient car parking to ensure enough for the peak levels of activity in summer but that might be masked by annual mode shares because there will be times in the year with less demand for parking when some on-airport car parks will not be open for use.

- 5.1.4 In response to the ExA's query about robotic parking, the Applicant explained that the term robotic parking refers to a level of automation for undertaking parking in a similar manner to that which the Applicant already operates and which is commonly referred to as valet or block parking.
- 5.1.5 **[Post-Hearing Note:** the Applicant will provide further information at Deadline 2 in relation to robotic parking spaces in its separate responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5), in response to **Action Point 7**].
- 5.1.6 The Applicant explained that the impact of robotic parking is the same as using existing car parks as block parking using "jockey" drivers. It is primarily the technology and customer experience that is different. The Applicant confirmed that there is a net increase of 2500 car parking spaces as a result of the conversion from self-park to block-park.
- 5.1.7 **[Post-Hearing Note:** The Applicant has provided further information in relation to Table 45 of the **Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [[APP-260](#)] in its separate responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5), in response to **Action Point 8**].
- 5.1.8 In response to concerns about parking matters raised by various Interested Parties, HS confirmed that the Applicant is due to submit a paper at Deadline 1 which addresses many of these points.
- 5.1.9 **[Post-Hearing Note:** The Applicant has provided further information in relation to these matters in the **Car Parking Strategy** (Doc Ref 10.5) in its separate responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5), in response to **Action Point 6**. In addition, the Applicant anticipates providing further information in relation to matters raised by the Joint Local Authorities in its separate response to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5), in response to **Action Point 7**].
- 5.1.10 In response to the ExA's query about the controls in the **Surface Access Commitments** [[APP-090](#)], the Applicant considers there are many reasons why the more flexible approach in the SACs is more appropriate given there is not a

linear relationship between a decrease in on-airport car parking provision and the achievement of an increase in sustainable transport mode share. The Applicant explained that if there is insufficient parking on-airport it might be displaced to off-airport provision, so it is about striking the right balance. The Applicant explained that there is a clause in the draft section 106 agreement (which is due to be submitted at Deadline 2) to help support local authority enforcement against unauthorised off-airport parking as ultimately this is a matter that is not in the hands of the Applicant to control.

6 Agenda Item 6 - Modal targets and controls

- 6.1.1 In response to the ExA's request for clarification about the SAC process, the Applicant confirmed that the obligation to produce action plans is a continuing process and the Applicant would be required to keep producing action plans if the mode share commitments have not been met, and importantly, would be required to implement the measures in the action plans.
- 6.1.2 In response to the ExA's query on how the action plan would control growth, the Applicant explained that it would be necessary to find a proposal that is more effective in order to meet the mode share commitments and noted that the Applicant has a strong record of shifting modes of travel to a more sustainable direction.
- 6.1.3 The Applicant explained that it has a lot of monitoring data to support the SAC approach, including data on car parking, passenger activities and mode share and road traffic. The Applicant explained that the intention is not to develop action plans on failure to achieve targets, but to develop them in advance and ensure there is mitigation in order to avoid failing to meet the targets. It is a proactive response to ensure there is opportunity to develop lasting mitigation. The process by which the Applicant manages that monitoring and reporting is through the Transport Forum Steering Group which currently exists to review applications for Sustainable Transport Fund monies and to monitor elements of the Airport Surface Access Strategy, its targets and action plans and the Applicant's success and progress on those actions. The Applicant has been successful in meeting the targets to date under this approach and intends to continue to do so.
- 6.1.4 The Applicant confirmed that it will consider the comments NH and Crawley Borough Council have stated they will provide in respect of the **Surface Access Commitments** [APP-090]. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant explained that it considers the proposed measures are robust and will be effective. It remains the Applicant's position that there is no need for an alternative such as a passenger or emissions cap where there is general policy support for airport growth and in

view of the mitigation proposed as part of the Application. There is no evidence that there needs to be a growth constraint in order to ensure mode share commitments are complied with. In contrast, there is evidence of the Applicant having a track record of meeting its targets. Any failure to meet the targets would result in the need to identify specific mitigation and would enable the Applicant to engage with the Transport Forum Steering Group to identify a tailored remedy to deal with any issue rather than a less effective response which is to impose a cap of growth which won't necessarily facilitate achievement of mode share targets. The Applicant is proposing continuation of the existing approach which has been shown to be successful. In response to the point that there have been previous higher targets, the Applicant explained that aspirational targets remain and they have not been set aside and indeed are expressly referenced as remaining the Applicant's ambition in Section 7 of the SACs. The Applicant has given careful consideration to realistic targets in light of its experience and it is those targets that are reflected in the SACs and which have informed the assessment.

6.1.5 **[Post-Hearing Note:** in response to queries raised by Chris Hyde (for Surrey Climate Commission) about whether the Applicant considered a scenario which assumed no car traffic growth at all (similar to the pledge put forward by Heathrow in the context of their 3rd runway proposal), the Applicant makes the following submission:

- 6.1.5.1. The Applicant's **Surface Access Commitments** [\[APP-090\]](#) focus on increasing the proportion of passengers and staff travelling to the airport by sustainable transport means as the airport grows with the Project. These commitments will reduce the number of additional journeys that would otherwise be made by private car and taxi.
- 6.1.5.2. The Applicant already achieves a very high mode share by rail where passengers and staff have access to rail services, in particular for journeys to and from London. However, there are areas to the east and west of the airport that are currently less well served by public transport and the Applicant is committing to significant investment in public transport to provide an alternative, sustainable mode of access for journeys to and from those areas, aiming to reduce car and taxi mode shares.
- 6.1.5.3. In the process of developing these commitments, the analysis based on the transport models showed that it would be unrealistic to assume that no additional journeys would be made by road. Detailed modelling, shared with stakeholders through the DCO Application and

wider engagement, highlights the measures required to achieve our mode share commitments and indicates that it would not be possible to achieve high levels of public transport mode share across the whole passenger catchment area.

- 6.1.5.4. Rather than pursue outcomes which would be unachievable in practice, the Applicant's mode share commitments reinforce the continued shift towards travel by non-car modes by passengers and staff. In addition, the Applicant has also identified aspirational mode share targets, beyond those commitments in the **Surface Access Commitments** [APP-090], which will frame the development of future Airport Surface Access Strategy action plans.
- 6.1.5.5. The Applicant notes that it currently achieves a higher public transport mode share than Heathrow and the **Surface Access Commitments** [APP-090] go further than the public transport mode shares which were “expected” for Heathrow in the Airports National Policy Statement (paragraph 3.51).]

7 Agenda Item 7 - Pedestrians and cyclists – movement frameworks

- 7.1.1 In response to the ExA's query on the diagrams (Diagrams 14.3.1 and 14.3.5 in the **Transport Assessment** [AS-079]) which show the movement framework and connections, RH confirmed those diagrams are maps intended to help staff and new starters to understand cycling and walking routes around the Airport. They are not intended to provide a comprehensive guide or movement strategy. The continuation of existing paths or additional active travel provisions is included in the highway plans (works plans) in the DCO Application.
- 7.1.2 The Applicant confirmed that in relation to footway on the eastern side of A23 London Road, the proposed width is a 2m wide footway with a 0.5m separation buffer to the road carriageway and it would meet the latest design standards taking into account road speed limits.
- 7.1.3 **[Post-Hearing Note:** The Applicant has provided the **Active Travel Provision Details Technical Note** in its separate responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5), in response to **Action Points 10 and 11** which includes the following information:
 - A new set of labelled drawings, referred to as ‘Surface Access Highways Plans – Active Travel’ are included in **Appendix A** of the Technical Note

(Doc Ref. 10.9.5). These plans illustrate the extent and types of active travel provision included as part of Work Nos. 35, 36 & 37.

- Table 1 provides a summary comparison of the existing proposed and types of active travel link and crossing provision with reference to the relevant sections of active travel provision labelled in the Surface Access Highways Plans – Active Travel.
- Table 2 provides a summary of the widths of each active travel link with reference to the relevant sections of active travel provision labelled in the Surface Access Highways Plans – Active Travel.
- Section 3 of the Technical Note provides a summary of the design standards and guidance applicable to the scheme along with a summary of the compliance of the widths of active travel provision with respect to the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) for National Highways assets.]

7.1.4 In response to matters raised by Interested Parties in respect of active travel route provision, the Applicant explained that after the summer 2022 engagement, substantial changes were implemented to the detail of design. The details of this process are set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered** [[APP-028](#), see page 3-40]. The Applicant confirmed that commentary with respect to compliance with design standards for National Highways assets could be provided.

7.1.5 **[Post-Hearing Note:** This is included in Section 3 of the **Active Travel Provision Details Technical Note** (Doc Ref. 10.9.5) submitted at Deadline 1 as set out above.]

7.1.6 The Applicant confirmed that inclusive design principles have been taken into account in the development of the preliminary design with respect to key design criteria such as gradients and this will be further developed in detailed design stage and will be subject to approval by relevant highways authorities.

8 **Agenda Item 8 - Action points arising from the Hearing**

8.1.1 The Applicant confirmed it would provide further clarification with respect to the future baseline position and EIA methodology.

8.1.2 **[Post-Hearing Note:** the Applicant has provided further information in relation to this matter in its separate responses to the ExA's action points arising from ISH 4 (Doc Ref. 10.9.5), in response to **Action Point 1**].

9 Agenda Item 9 - Any other business

- 9.1.1 In response to matters raised by Daisy Noble, Counsel for Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP (Marathon Asset Management MCAP Global Finance (UK) LLP) with interests in the Holiday Inn hotel, the Applicant confirmed that the Hoppa Bus is one of a number of approved operators and the Applicant intends to maintain access to both terminals during the construction period and will be working with partners to ensure access is maintained.