

Date: 12 March 2024
Your Ref: TR020005
Our Ref: GATW-AFP059
Our Internal Ref: 15849

DWD

69 Carter Lane
London
EC4V 5EQ

Airport Industrial Property Unit Trust ('AIPUT') hereby sets out its Written Representation and position on various information requested by the Examining Authority ('ExA') at Deadline 1 of the application made by Gatwick Airport Limited ('GAL') for a development consent order ('the DCO application') for the Gatwick Northern Runway Project ('the Project') under the Planning Act 2008 ('PA 2008').

AIPUT is a limited partner in the Airport Industrial Limited Partnership, the General Partner of which is Airport Industrial GP Limited ('AIGPL'). AIGPL, together with its wholly owned subsidiary Airport Industrial Nominees Limited ('AINL'), own the legal title to certain leasehold land and have rights over a large number of parcels of land to which the DCO application relates (as described further below). AIGPL and AINL are each an 'interested party' and an 'affected person' for the purposes of the examination of the DCO application.

As indicated in their relevant representation submitted on 27 October 2023, AIPUT, AIGPL and AINL have registered to participate in the examination as a group under the name 'AIPUT'.

AIPUT's portfolio across four London international airports extends to 2.5 million sq ft. The portfolio impacted by the Project includes:

- Viking House – Located within the Airport boundary fronting onto the Perimeter Road South. Viking House is located outside the Crawley Local Plan safeguarding area.
- Gatwick Gate Estate – Located to the south of the Airport adjacent to its southern boundary. Gatwick Gate Estate is outside the airport boundary and within Crawley Local Plan safeguarding area.

The remainder of this submission sets out AIPUT's Written Representation (with a summary due to it exceeding 1,500 words). It also addresses certain other Deadline 1 matters, namely Comments on the Applicant's Land Rights Tracker, Requests by Affected Persons to participate in a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing, and Notification of wish to have future correspondence delivered electronically.

Written Representation – Executive Summary

The following written representation outlines the pre and post application engagement of AIPUT with GAL in relation to the Northern Runway project and covers the topic specific issues of Land Interests, Permanent Parking Provision and Transport and Traffic Implications, using a similar structure to that within AIPUT's written representation submitted on 27 October 2023.

AIPUT engaged with GAL's advisors, Dalcour Maclaren in June of 2023 and were in August 2023 promised a draft Heads of Terms relating to their asset 'Viking House' which is subject to powers of compulsory acquisition or temporary possession, as well as powers to override easements and other

rights within the Draft DCO. Following a lack of meaningful engagement from GAL, AIPUT received a draft Heads of Terms this month and are in the process of reviewing them. AIPUT restate their position of objection to the Compulsory Acquisition of rights relating to Viking House as this has not been adequately justified. AIPUT also restates their request for further information on Work no. 42 and the impacts on airside access (if any).

As raised in their relevant representation, AIPUT have concerns regarding the permanent parking provision, particularly, confirmation of the proposed parking figures and the split of staff parking and passenger parking at the proposed Car Park X location. AIPUT also raise significant concern surrounding the lack of sufficient transport modelling within the proposals and the detrimental impact this is likely to have on the transport network and the ability of users to access the operational areas of the airport. As such, a suitable transport consultant has been appointed to provide expert commentary on this technical element of the proposals which is set out below and can be found in Appendix 1.

Written Representation – In Full

Recap of Previous Engagement

AIPUT initially responded to the Gatwick Airport Draft Masterplan 2018 Consultation in January of 2019, supporting the principle of growing Gatwick Airport within its existing boundary by making best use of the existing runways, but raising concerns in relation to GAL's approach to continued safeguarding and the practical restrictions this places on the investment and redevelopment opportunities of properties within this safeguarding zone. AIPUT provided qualified support to the Surface Access Strategy and the proposed free flow of traffic within and around the Airport boundary, particularly in relation to minimising traffic impacts to the south the Airport and the road connections necessary to facilitate tenants' airside access, so as to mitigate impacts on the operation of businesses in this area.

In the Autumn of 2021, GAL ran a 12-week public consultation. AIPUT responded with a six page letter reviewing the proposals, which developed the earlier consultation response from 2019 on the benefits of expansion, safeguarding concerns and the access strategy. AIPUT also commented on the lack of modelling relating to cargo forecasts and impacts arising from construction.

AIPUT again responded to the further consultation carried out by GAL in Summer 2022, reiterating their support of the proposals in principle and endorsing the benefits of expansion and the maximisation of use of existing infrastructure. Further comments were made on the restrictive nature of safeguarding on existing properties within the safeguarded zones. AIPUT also commented on the proposed surface access strategy and requested that the roads and junctions in the vicinity of Perimeter Road South, Lowfield Heath Roundabout, and the south of the Airport are scoped in for traffic analysis in future highways and surface access proposals. AIPUT also sought clarity on the parking proposals referred to as 'Car Park X' and 'Car Park V', particularly the number of spaces to be lost or gained as a result of the proposals. Further consideration of the traffic impacts arising from the relocation of the CARE Facility was also requested.

In both the 2021 and 2022 consultation responses, AIPUT raised concerns about compliance with consultation requirements given that AIGPL and AINL were apparently not identified and consulted as section 42 parties in either consultation. AIPUT also recorded opposition to any proposals for the compulsory acquisition of rights or interests of AIGPL and AINL in affected properties.

The statement in the 2022 response was:

“AIPUT note that the consultation includes PEI updates and potentially represents consultation under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008. AIPUT wish to query the inclusion of one of its assets, Viking House, within the Site Boundary and whether this will translate into inclusion within the draft Order Limits for the DCO Application, given that AIPUT have not received a s42 letter.

We request clarification on whether AIPUT is represented in the draft Order Limits for the DCO Application and whether any powers over this land are sought, as none are apparent from the published materials to date.

AIPUT reserve the right to respond appropriately on land, access or compensation matters if potential impacts come to light in the future. There has been no clarification on this matter since the request we set out in the 29 November 2021 representation.

AIPUT also wishes to reinstate on record, the in-principle objection to any compulsory acquisition of rights or interests.

AIPUT will continue to monitor the progress of the masterplan and will carefully review the plans and strategies herein mentioned during the DCO examination. We intend to review the DCO application carefully, including the management plans and strategies, and the Mitigation Route Map referred to in paragraph 3.10.13, that will form part of the DCO application, and respond if necessary to the acceptance publication under section 56 of the Planning Act 2008.”

On 12 January 2023, AIPUT wrote to GAL again asking for clarification as to what works are proposed at Viking House as part of the Project and what powers would be sought in respect of the property. AIPUT also noted in this letter that AIGPL and AINL were Category 1 persons under section 44 of the PA 2008 but had not been directly consulted by GAL about the proposed application.

Following receipt of a letter from GAL dated 3 March 2023 together with a land interest questionnaire, AIPUT wrote to GAL on 27 March 2023. In this letter AIPUT noted that no substantive response had been received to the matters raised in earlier correspondence and once again sought clarification as to what development is proposed to take place at Viking House and whether GAL intends to seek powers of compulsory acquisition and/or temporary possession in respect of that site. On the assumption that such powers were to be sought, AIPUT asked for details of the specific purpose for which the land is required and the extent of land proposed to be acquired or used. In addition, AIPUT queried why its site at Gatwick Gate was identified in GAL’s 3 March letter as being potentially affected by the Project. It was also noted that the lack of response from GAL to earlier requests for details had impeded AIPUT’s ability to meaningfully comment on and influence the proposals for the Project. A meeting was requested.

On 24 May 2023, AIGPL and AINL received letters from GAL’s land referencing agents, Dalcour Maclaren, indicating that GAL was now seeking to engage with companies with interests within the airport to explain the development proposals. These letters also stated that “[d]ue to the size of the project and the number of interests affected by it, it necessary to include your interest in land within the DCO” and that “GAL will have powers to acquire your rights and interests in land on permanent and or/temporary basis”.

AIPUT responded by letter dated 12 June 2023 in which it repeated its earlier requests for clarification of how the proposals for the Project affect Viking House and Gatwick Gate and what land powers GAL intended to seek through the DCO. If compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers were to be sought, AIPUT again asked for details of the specific purpose for which the land is required and the nature and extent of land proposed to be acquired. AIPUT noted that the 24 May letter from

Dalcour Maclaren appeared to be a generic letter and that it had still not received any response from GAL to its previous letters and requests. AIPUT subsequently provided Dalcour Maclaren with copies of the previous letters sent to GAL (as outlined above).

On 23 June 2023, AIPUT received an email from Dalcour Maclaren responding to its 12 June letter. Dalcour Maclaren provided a plan illustrating the extent of land within Viking House that would be subject to compulsory acquisition powers, being the strip of land at the front of the building. It was said that the decision to include this land in the area subject to compulsory acquisition *“is based on the project’s intention to make road improvements on Perimeter Road South, as well as the potential need for utility diversions”*. The email also confirmed that GAL was not seeking any powers in relation to Gatwick Gate.

AIPUT and GAL subsequently had a meeting (online) on 17 August 2023 to discuss Viking House and Gatwick Gate in the context of the Northern Runway Project. During this meeting, AIPUT were assured that a Heads of Terms for a legal agreement were being prepared, and on 27 September 2023 AIPUT received an email from Dalcour Maclaren confirming that further details on the form of agreement would be provided ‘shortly’. In the event, as outlined below, Heads of Terms were only provided on 1 March 2024 .

On 5 September 2023, AIGPL and AINL received from GAL a notice, under s56 of the PA 2008, following the Secretary of State’s acceptance of the DCO application for examination. The notice was accompanied by a large number of plans, referred to as a “land plan”, to help identify affected land interests. In addition to a plan relating to Viking House, the plans accompanying the s56 notice included multiple parcels of land within and around the airport site, ranging from airport roads to areas within the airfield to land containing buildings at the airport. AIPUT had noted from its own review of the DCO application documents, particularly the Book of Reference, that AIGPL and AINL were identified as having an interest (described variously as rights of access over airport roads and rights of access to use service media) in a very large number of plots (several hundred) within the airport that were subject to proposed compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers.

As it was difficult to ascertain from s56 notice and accompanying plans the precise nature and extent of AIPUT’s affected land interests, AIPUT sent an email to Dalcour Maclaren on 25 October 2023 asking for clarification as to the particular works proposed in relation to all land in which AIPUT has an interest, together with an explanation of the reasons why powers of compulsory acquisition and/or temporary possession are sought in relation to each of those plots. The email highlighted that the Statement of Reasons (‘SoR’) submitted with the application (doc ref 3.2) did not provide that information as it should have done. It is noted that the ‘Justification Table with Status of Negotiation’ in Appendix A to the SoR makes no reference to AIGPL and AINL as Category 1 Landowners or to the plots forming part of Viking House that are subject to compulsory acquisition powers i.e. Plots 6/733, 6/734, 6/737 and 6/740). Table A in Appendix A, which details the works and plot numbers where permanent acquisition is required, identify those Viking House plots next to a reference to “Minor works, including protective works, access or utility diversions”.

On 27 October 2023, AIPUT submitted its relevant representation on the DCO application to the Planning Inspectorate. The detail of the relevant representation is not repeated here but aspects of it are summarised in the topic sections below. AIPUT’s relevant representation was not as fully informed as it might have been had there been adequate pre-application consultation and engagement including a substantive response from GAL to AIPUT’s repeated requests for clarification about its affected land interests and the impacts of the Project on.

On 7 November 2023, AIPUT received an email from Dalcour Maclaren in response to AIPUT's email of 25 October. This response provided a summary of AIPUT's affected land interests and GAL's acquisition requirements, confirming that GAL is seeking powers to compulsorily acquire the strip of land at Viking House as well as permanent acquisition of AIPUT's rights of access and service media across the airport.

AIPUT responded to Dalcour Maclaren by email on 21 November 2023, indicating that it remained unclear as to why compulsory acquisition powers are sought over part of Viking House rather than some lesser right and why the rights of access over airport roads benefitting the Viking House site are proposed to be permanently acquired. AIPUT said that it does not consider that those matters have been adequately explained and justified in the DCO application or in the further information provided through engagement. It also noted that the Heads of Terms / legal agreement (which had been expected shortly after the August 2023 meeting) were still awaited and asked for an update on this.

Following further chasers from AIPUT over the course of January and February, on 27 February 2024, AIPUT were informed that rights sought over part of the Viking House lease are linked to unspecified potential minor works, including protective works, access or utility diversions, and that the extent of these works will be determined as part of the development of the detailed design. Heads of Terms for a legal agreement were provided to AIPUT on 1 March 2023.

For completeness, it is noted that on 18 January 2024 AIPUT submitted their response to the Gatwick Airport Winter 2023 Consultation relating to the Proposed Changes as outlined in GAL's letter to the Planning Inspectorate, dated 27 November 2023. However, as no formal change request has been accepted by the ExA, AIPUT does not comment on those changes within this written representation.

It is clear from the history of engagement set out above that AIPUT has made efforts to engage with GAL and has repeatedly sought clarification and further information as to the justification for GAL's proposals for permanent acquisition of part of Viking House and of the rights of access to airport roads etc. As detailed further below, AIPUT does not consider that these matters have yet been properly justified in accordance with statutory requirements and guidance.

Topic: Land Interests

As described above, AIPUT has for some considerable time sought clarification of the proposals affecting its land interests and justification for GAL's proposals to compulsorily acquire its land and rights in land.

AIPUT's relevant representation submitted in October 2023 identified that AIPUT's asset, 'Viking House' (Book of Reference Plot IDs E/36, 6/733, 6/734, 6/736, 6/737 and 6/740) located on the southern airport boundary was subject to Cat 1 and Cat 2 Land Interests. Plots 6/733, 6/734, 6/736, 6/737 and 6/740 were identified as being subject to powers of compulsory acquisition or temporary possession, as well as powers to override easements and other rights. AIPUT requested more information as to why these parts of Viking House are identified for permanent acquisition, and rationale for the nature and extent of rights sought (as opposed to temporary acquisition or a private easement agreement).

As such, AIPUT objected to the permanent acquisition of part of the Viking House site on the basis that the proposed powers have not been adequately justified in accordance with section 122 of the PA 2008 and relevant guidance. AIPUT remains of the view that the compulsory acquisition proposals affecting Viking House have not been adequately justified and explained in the DCO application or since. Neither AIGPL nor AINL are identified in the Land Rights Tracker submitted by GAL on 9 February

2024 [PDLA-010] nor, as outlined earlier, were they consulted during the pre-application stage as a landowner within s.42(1)(d) of the PA 2008. AIPUT is concerned the lack of clarity during pre-application consultation about what was proposed at the Viking House site and how its land interests were affected, meant that it was not able to respond meaningfully to the consultation and influence the proposals.

AIPUT therefore wish to reiterate their objection to the permanent acquisition of part of the Viking House site on the basis that the proposed powers have not been adequately justified in accordance with section 122 of the PA 2008 and relevant guidance. GAL have still not provided adequate justification as to why temporary possession or a lesser type of right is not sufficient. Furthermore, AIPUT seeks assurance that access from the Viking House site to Perimeter Road South and from off airport locations, will be maintained at all times for the purposes of access to the terminals and cargo areas.

AIPUT also opposes compulsory acquisition of its existing on-airport access rights across several hundred plots, as set out in the Book of Reference. No rationale for this has been advanced. Denying existing and future tenants of its property continued access to both terminal buildings via the internal airport roads will materially impact the ability of that tenant to provide services to the airport and cause further traffic to use the external roads for the wider area. This will compound and worsen the traffic concerns already set out below under the 'Transport and Traffic' subheading. It will also lead to increased costs for AIPUT's tenant and likely higher costs experienced by airlines and other airport users and operators.

In relation to Gatwick Gate, AIPUT also repeats the request for more detail as to the nature and extent of work no. 42, located along Perimeter Road South, including confirmation of any changes to airside access and control posts. Further details on the extent to which existing accesses and transport networks will be affected by the proposed works are requested, as well as confirmation that Old Brighton Road/ Perimeter Road South roundabout and access will be maintained. AIPUT request this information in order to assess any potential impacts on their asset.

AIPUT intend to continue their engagement with GAL. Heads of terms have been received on 1 March 2024 and are still being reviewed by AIPUT.

Topic: Permanent Parking Provision

AIPUT previously commented on the permanent parking provision proposals in the Summer 2022 Consultation and raised further concerns on the amended Proposals in the submitted DCO application as part of their Relevant Representation. AIPUT understands from the figures provided in both the Design and Access Statement and the Planning Statement (Document Ref. 7.1, paragraph 4.5.79) that there will be a net decrease of 425 parking spaces between Purple Parking and Car Park X. AIPUT requests confirmation that this figure is correct.

No detail has been provided on the split of staff parking or passenger parking at the proposed Car Park X location. The application proposes that staff and passengers would use separate accesses, via Perimeter Road South and Charlwood Road, respectively, AIPUT would request forecasts for vehicle movements egressing from Car Park X via these accesses. More specifically, AIPUT would request confirmation that trip generations from the increased size of car park X is not detrimental to operations at Viking House and Gatwick Gate with and/ or without the proposed access from Charlwood Road. Moreover, it is unclear whether 'staff parking' would entail airline employees or airport associated services (or both). AIPUT would request more information on this as well. At this point AIPUT has a concern that operations at Viking House could be detrimentally affected by

increased road traffic from these elements of the Project. These concerns and other overarching traffic implications are further discussed below.

Topic: Transport and Traffic

As explained in the ‘recap’ section AIPUT have commented previously on ensuring the free flow of traffic within and around the Airport boundary particularly in relation to minimising traffic impacts. AIPUT restate the practical requirements for public access to and from Perimeter Road South to be maintained or improved as part of the proposals, for the purpose of efficiently accessing operational areas within the airport.

Following the submission of the DCO, AIPUT commented on the lack of sufficient transport modelling. These are directly relevant to AIPUT who possess access rights around the Gatwick Airport (‘the airport’) relevant to and necessary for maintaining its airline catering and logistics uses which are time critical for airport operations and airline departures.

AIPUT have appointed a transport consultant John Russell CMILT MIHT to provide expert appraisal of this technical element of the proposals. This consultant has initially reported concerns as follows.

1. There is insufficient evidence to allow a conclusion that the traffic modelling is acceptable. The Applicant is relying on “key stakeholders” having accepted the modelling. This is not acceptable; PINS and IPs should be provided with the evidence. This is particularly given the reliance on multiple models and hence a significantly increased risk of significant errors creeping in.
2. The traffic modelling considers a neutral day without having regard to seasonality. At many times of the year, uplifts in traffic travelling to and from the airport can be expected. It has not been possible to identify how seasonality has been included into the production of annualised daily traffic forecasts for EIA disciplines. Likewise it has not been possible to identify how data from one hour traffic models has been manipulated to arrive at daily flows for use by EIA disciplines. These would cause underreporting of volumes.
3. The approach taken to considering the effects of COVID – such as in relation to peak hour commuter patterns - follows general guidance but it is questionable whether this is suited to this relatively unique land use in relation to which traffic patterns are unlikely to have similar post-COVID responses. These would cause underreporting of traffic volumes.
4. The detailed junction modelling outputs show that performance of mitigation schemes is on the margin with very little capacity to absorb any fluctuation in traffic volumes. In addition, the mitigation schemes seem to comprise multiple narrow lanes and tight radii which tend to either be poorly used by motorists or are simply too narrow for.

In light of the above, if the lack of sufficient modelling is left unchecked, there is likely to be detrimental impacts to the road networks surrounding Viking House, Gatwick Gate and Fleming Business Centre, including:

1. Higher traffic volumes at the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts than predicted by the model forecasts;
2. Due to forecast queues and delays, non-airport traffic that is forecast to divert from London Road (including the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts) will fail to do so due to the Scheme in place, thereby increasing the volume of traffic on this route; and
3. Non-airport traffic that would otherwise route via the North and South terminal roundabouts diverting along London Road (including the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts) thereby increasing the volume of traffic on this route.

This is explained further in Appendix 1 (Transport Appraisal) of this submission. Importantly, the points made here are based on the continued ability of Viking House tenants to access the terminal areas using their existing access rights, compulsory acquisition of which AIPUT opposes.

In conclusion, AIPUT has sought to engage with GAL during the pre-application process and the pre-examination phase to discuss its concerns and to gain a better understanding of the proposals for the Project and how they affect AIPUT's land and assets. AIPUT is encouraged that draft Heads of Terms for an agreement with GAL have now been provided and hopes that this will enable more meaningful engagement as the examination proceeds.

We will be happy to answer specific ExA questions on any of the above points.

Comments on the Applicant's Land Rights Tracker

AIPUT notes that neither AIGPL nor AINL are listed as an 'affected person' in the Land Rights Tracker submitted by GAL on 9 February 2024 [PDLA-010]. AIPUT does not understand why they are omitted from the 'Justification Table and Status of Engagement with Landowners', (Appendix A to the Statement of Reasons [AS-008] and similarly from the Land Rights Tracker. As affected landowners, AIPUT should have been consulted during the pre-application stage as section 42 parties (which did not occur, and which we expand in in our Written Representation above) and the status of engagement with AIPUT should be covered in the Statement of Reasons and the Land Rights Tracker.

Requests by Affected Persons to participate in a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing

At this stage, on the basis that there is ongoing dialogue with GAL, AIPUT does not request a compulsory acquisition hearing. We reserve our position should discussions with GAL fail to reach an acceptable agreement.

Notification of wish to have future correspondence delivered electronically

AIPUT wish to have future correspondence delivered electronically to [REDACTED] [@dwd-ltd.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dwd-ltd.co.uk) copying [REDACTED] [dwd-ltd.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dwd-ltd.co.uk) and [REDACTED] [@chappellking.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@chappellking.com).

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Colin Turnbull
Director
DWD

[REDACTED] [@dwd-ltd.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@dwd-ltd.co.uk)

Transport Appraisal

Site: Gatwick Northern Runway DCO
Prepared by: John N Russell
Date: 11 March 2024

motion
Quadrant House
Broad Street Mall
Reading
RG1 7QE
Tel: 0118 467 4498

1.0 Introduction

Representations

- 1.1 This technical note is prepared on behalf of AIPUT and considers the potential transport implications arising from proposals to build a second runway at Gatwick airport ('the Project') which is the subject of a Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
- 1.2 AIPUT manages sites which have the potential to be adversely impacted by the Project as follows:
1. Viking House and Gatwick Gate: which are located immediately to the south of the existing runway and which are accessed from Old Brighton Road South / Perimeter Road South.
 2. Fleming Business Centre: which is located within the Manor Royal business area to the south of Gatwick airport.
- 1.3 Vehicular access to these sites will, in particular, be impacted by changes in traffic volumes at the following locations:
1. Lowfield Heath Roundabout;
 2. Gatwick Road Roundabout; and
 3. Along the London Road between the Tushmore Roundabout and the Longbridge Roundabout.
- 1.4 This technical note considers the transport evidence submitted in support of the Project in general and in particular, the potential access consequences arising from the Project in relation to these sites.

Author

- 1.5 This technical note is authored by Mr John Russell. Mr Russell holds an Honours Degree in Civil Engineering and is a Chartered Transport Planner, being a Chartered Member of the Institute of Logistics and Transport (CMILT) and a Member of the Institution of Highways and Transportation (MIHT). Mr Russell is a Director and owner of Motion Consulting Limited, which specialises in transport planning, traffic engineering and highway design with offices in Guildford and Reading. Mr Russell has worked in the field of traffic engineering and transportation planning for 30 years.

Relevant Documents

- 1.6 The DCO application is supported by a suite of documents of which the following are relevant to transport:
1. Further response to PD-006 - 8.5 Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling - Appendices - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority
 2. Further response to PD-006 - 8.5 Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority
 3. Further response to PD-006 - 8.4 Technical Note: Impact of Latest IEMA Guidance (2023) on the Assessment of Effects Related to Traffic and Transport - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority

4. Response to PD-006 - 5.1 Environmental Statement - Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport (Clean) - Version 2 - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority
 5. Response to PD-006 - 7.4 Transport Assessment (Clean) - Version 2 - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority
 6. Response to PD-006 - 7.4 Transport Assessment (Tracked) - Version 2 - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority
 7. Response to PD-006 - 5.1 Environmental Statement - Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport (Tracked) - Version 2 - Accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority
 8. 7.4 Transport Assessment
 9. 7.4 Transport Assessment Annex D - Station and Shuttle Legion Modelling Report
 10. 7.4 Transport Assessment Annex C - VISSIM Forecasting Report
 11. 5.1 Environmental Statement - Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport
 12. 5.3 Environmental Statement - Appendix 12.3.1 Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses - Traffic and Transport
 13. 5.2 Environmental Statement - Traffic and Transport Figures
 14. 7.4 Transport Assessment Annex A - Figures
 15. 7.4 Transport Assessment Annex E - Highway Junction Review
 16. 7.4 Transport Assessment Annex B - Strategic Transport Modelling Report
- 1.7 This technical note is prepared having regard to the evidence presented in the above documents.

Summary and recommendations

- 1.8 The summary of this technical note is that
1. There is insufficient evidence to allow a conclusion that the traffic modelling is acceptable. The Applicant is relying on “key stakeholders” having accepted the modelling. This is not acceptable; The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) and interested parties should be provided with the evidence. This is particularly given the reliance on multiple models and hence a significantly increased risk of significant errors creeping in.
 2. The traffic modelling considers a neutral day without having regard to seasonality. At many times of the year, uplifts in traffic travelling to and from the airport can be expected. It has not been possible to identify how seasonality has been included into the production of annualised daily traffic forecasts for EIA disciplines. Likewise it has not been possible to identify how data from one hour traffic models has been manipulated to arrive at daily flows for use by EIA disciplines. These would cause underreporting of volumes.
 3. The approach taken to considering the effects of COVID – such as in relation to peak hour commuter patterns - follows general guidance but it is questionable whether this is suited to this relatively unique land use in relation to which traffic patterns are unlikely to have similar post-COVID responses. These would cause underreporting of traffic volumes.
 4. The detailed junction modelling outputs show that performance of mitigation schemes is on the margin with very little capacity to absorb any fluctuation in traffic volumes. In addition the mitigation schemes seem to comprise multiple narrow lanes and tight radii which tend to either be poorly used by motorists or are simply too narrow for larger vehicles which will lose capacity.
- 1.9 The above 4 points are considered in more detail in the sections following the introduction.

1.10 As a consequence of the above, the Applicant has not yet reasonably demonstrated that the Project would not result in severe operational impacts on the highway network to the detriment of other businesses. In particular because:

1. the physical measures proposed in mitigation offer very little margin for anything other than perfect driving and lane discipline;
2. the performance of the junctions is on the margin and relies on every assumption made in the model forecasting to be correct; and
3. the highway impacts forecast by the Applicant are extremely sensitive to small changes in a multitude of factors (such as HGVs encroaching on two lanes on tight radii, increases in seasonal demand for flights, recovery in airport related road traffic forecasts to pre-covid projections etc)

it is extremely likely that the forecast queues and delays will be exceeded.

1.11 With regards to the road network Viking House, Gatwick Gate and Fleming Business Centre, the impacts of this will be:

1. Higher traffic volumes at the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts than predicted by the model forecasts;
2. Non-airport traffic that is forecast to divert from London Road (including the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts) with the Project in place not doing so, thereby increasing the volume of traffic on this route; and
3. Non-airport traffic that would otherwise route via the North and South terminal roundabouts diverting along London Road (including the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts) thereby increasing the volume of traffic on this route.

1.12 Both the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts are forecast to be at or over capacity with the Project in place. Therefore, any further increase in traffic volumes, however small, has the potential to result in severe impacts on the operation of these two junctions. Severe highway impacts would have a significant, detrimental impact on business operations at Viking House, Gatwick Gate and Fleming Business Centre.

1.13 PINS is therefore respectfully requested to seek further information and clarification regarding the points raised above.

2.0 Traffic Modelling

2.1 Traffic modelling undertaken for the Transport Assessment is primarily undertaken using VISSIM. This is a good model for micro-simulation at a local level.

2.2 There is a separate Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) for the VISSIM model does not appear to have been submitted with DCO application.

2.3 There is a statement by the Applicant that validation documents have been shared with key stakeholders and that the base models have been accepted as suitable as a reference for assessing the effects of the project for the DCO application.

2.4 The inference is that "key stakeholders" have accepted the model as suitable however the definition of "key stakeholders" in this context is not provided. Similarly the statement refers passively to "...base models have been accepted..." but does not elucidate by whom.

2.5 It is essential that PINS, interested parties and the wider public has access to the LMVR and any correspondence from "key stakeholders" demonstrating that the models are acceptable to them in order to arrive at a conclusion regarding the veracity of the modelling undertaken.

- 2.6 The VISSIM modelling covers a quite limited network with no route choice. This could result in underestimation of how background traffic on these routes which have no origin or destination at the airport will respond to the uplift in passenger numbers arriving by road. The consequence is that significant volumes of traffic might choose to avoid the Terminal North and South roundabouts in preference to alternative routes such as London Road via Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts. This would cause an adverse impact on the operation of this route and junctions.
- 2.7 It appears that the forecast traffic data used in the VISIM model originates in a SATURN model referred to as "Gatwick's Holistic Overview of Strategic Transport" (GHOST) model. Validation and forecasting reports for this model do not appear to have been provided as part of the DCO application. It is essential that PINS, interested parties and the wider public has access to these in order to arrive at a conclusion regarding the veracity of the modelling undertaken.
- 2.8 It is noted that, seeking to replicate the way humans react through a mathematical model, necessarily relies on the modeller having to make broad assumptions about human characteristics. This can lead to disparities between modelling outputs and "real life" even though many of these disparities in isolation are within acceptable tolerances.
- 2.9 However each separate layer of modelling allows such disparities to arise. In this case, having two models, a disparity in the first model can be amplified in the second model leading to unreliable results, even if each model in isolation is considered to be within acceptable tolerances.
- 2.10 In this context it is even more important that documentation regarding the validation / forecasting processes in all the traffic models relied on is made available to PINS, interested parties and the wider public so that can be clearly seen that the models are fit for purpose in isolation and in combination and that such amplification of discrepancies has not arisen.

Model Scenarios

- 2.11 The traffic modelling accounts for weekday AM peak, PM peak and Interpeak as well as three off-peak scenarios. This is a reasonable approach given the nature of the development. Scenarios are run for the assessment years of 2032 and 2047 with and without the Project.
- 2.12 The model bases are 2016 which seems quite old now given the current year of 2024 not least because of the potential impact of the Covid19 pandemic on medium and long term travel patterns.
- 2.13 Document 8.5 details how a new forecast 2023 base has been developed using DfT guidance on post-covid forecasting. Whilst on the face of it this seems a reasonable approach, the following points are made:
1. Forecasting the base year introduces another layer of estimation in the process (see comments above). It means that none of the modelling undertaken is anchored into observed data: the "base" on which all other models depend is now an estimated base.
 2. It is too early to judge what the medium to long term impact of the Covid19 pandemic will be on travel patterns and road traffic. Document 8.5 appears to rely on a comparison of June 2016 and June 2023 traffic counts at various locations in order to draw conclusions regarding the effects of the Covid19 pandemic on travel. This is a far too simplistic approach which does not appear to relate changes in travel patterns to journey purpose. For example it may be reasonable to assume that, for many office based jobs, people will continue to travel on fewer days in response to homeworking opportunities. However for many journey purposes, home working or delivery for examples are not credible. Specifically having regard to the Project, flight passengers will continue to need to physically travel to and from the airport. Staff involved in physical operation of the airport will continue to need to travel to and from the airport. Surrounding industrial and distribution land uses will continue to need people to travel to and from them.
 3. At a local level, it is instructive to look at the reported 43 million passengers using Gatwick in 2016 and the 32.8 million in 2022. It could be this reduction in passengers that has caused or substantially caused recorded changes in traffic volumes between June 2016 and June 2023. This would mean that rather than

a road traffic reduction being related to people's post Covid19 pandemic work patterns, it could be entirely related to a reduced demand to fly during Covid19 and immediately after. As soon as demand to fly returns to pre-covid levels, road traffic volumes could do also. The potential impact of Covid19 pandemic work / travel patterns nationally may therefore have only a slight, if any, impact at a local level in the vicinity of the Project; and

4. There is an assumption that public transport usage will increase. More than road traffic, public transport has suffered post covid as evidenced in reduced footfall on public transport services, reduced frequencies and services removed.
- 2.14 The model claims to draw on June 2016 data. This is in line with government guidance on building traffic models, which should be based on data collected during a neutral month. However the Project is an airport which experiences seasonal fluctuations. Specifically passenger numbers peak during July, August and September. This means that for at least three months of the year, it can be expected that road traffic volumes will be higher than those predicted by the transport modelling.
- 2.15 Having regard to the above, further details are required to support the model forecasting assumptions in particular:
1. why a 2023 base has been estimated on 2016 data rather than a new model being built on current data;
 2. the impact of Covid19 on specific journey purposes rather than in general especially in relation to journeys to the airport and surrounding land uses;
 3. demonstration that public transport demand will meet expectations; and
 4. how seasonality has been catered for in traffic forecasts.
- 2.16 The potential impact of all the above is that the traffic forecasts on which the impacts of the Project have been based are substantially lower than those that are actually likely to occur. This would lead to higher traffic volumes on surrounding routes such as London Road including the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts.
- 2.17 The transport assessment (document 7.4) and Annex E thereof demonstrate that, even in the mitigated scenario, the surrounding road network, including the London Road and the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts, is already operating at or above capacity.
- 2.18 Given how marginal the performance of the road network is, even after mitigation has been provided, any increase in traffic volume, however slight, would result in disproportionately large, adverse impacts on queues and delays, potentially leading to severe impacts.

3.0 Environmental Impact Assessment

- 3.1 A disadvantage of traffic models is that they assess single hours, whereas many of the EIA disciplines require longer periods of time for assessing impacts for example 16 hours or 24 hours. The traffic model data therefore needs to be converted from the single hours modelled to 24 hour or other periods.
- 3.2 For commonplace developments such as housing or commercial, there is a lot of data available to enable this conversion to be undertaken with a reasonable degree of confidence.
- 3.3 However for less ubiquitous land uses, such as airports, data sources for converting are much reduced. Moreover the data used in EIA assessment is annual averages and hence needs to take seasonal variations in road traffic into consideration.
- 3.4 As noted above, the traffic model on which traffic forecasts are based, comprises several single hour models and is prepared for typical conditions in June. Whilst the work may have been done, it is not apparent how single hour traffic forecasts for a typical June have been converted to annual averages for use in the EIA.

- 3.5 It is essential that this process is clearly detailed so that PINS, interested parties and the wider public can arrive at a conclusion regarding the veracity of the traffic forecasts used in assessing the environmental impacts of road traffic, including noise and air quality impacts.

4.0 Highway mitigation

- 4.1 The proposed mitigation is convoluted and based on “modelling” solutions rather than real life. For example, the mitigation contains lots of narrow lanes provided on tight radii. This type of mitigation works well in mathematical models, which assume that all vehicles are able to fit in the lanes and all drivers have expert knowledge of where they are going and which lane to be in – including queuing evenly across lanes.
- 4.2 In real life, narrow lanes lead to poor usage – especially from HGVs – reducing the capacity available on the ground. Likewise tight radii lead to poor lane discipline, especially from lorries, which require more lane width going round corners. Again this reduces the capacity available on the ground. In short the proposed mitigation appears to have been designed with a local housing estate, rather than a nationally significant infrastructure project, in mind.
- 4.3 The transport assessment (document 7.4) and Annex E thereof show that highway performance is on the margin with little capacity to absorb real-life lane usage. The highway mitigation will therefore simply not be able to deliver the benefits claimed.
- 4.4 In contrast, the importance of suitable and safe design of highway infrastructure for strategically important and nationally significant infrastructure projects is recognised by the DfT, which provides highway design guidance for strategic infrastructure in the form of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).
- 4.5 In the context of a new airport runway, which is considered to be of national significance, the design of supporting highway approaches and accesses should be commensurate and hence should comply with the requirements of DMRB.
- 4.6 Failure to meet the requirements of DMRB will result in a nationally significant infrastructure project being accessed from the equivalent of residential streets, with the adverse impacts on operational capacity identified above. This will result in increased queues and delays in the vicinity of the Project, especially at the North and South Terminal roundabouts. This in turn will result in traffic seeking alternative routes such as the London Road. The transport assessment (document 7.4) and Annex E thereof demonstrate that, even in the mitigated scenario, the surrounding road network, including the London Road and the Lowfield Heath and Gatwick Road roundabouts, is already operating at or above capacity.
- 4.7 Given how marginal the performance of the road network is, even after mitigation has been provided, any increase in traffic volume, however slight, would result in disproportionately large, adverse impacts on queues and delays, potentially leading to severe impacts.