



# Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

The Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's  
Written Questions – Traffic and Transport

**Book 10**

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: APRIL 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.16

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

## Table of Contents

1	Response to the Examining Authority's Written Questions – Traffic and Transport	1
---	---	---

## 1 Response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions – Traffic and Transport

The below table sets out the Applicant’s response to the Examining Authority’s Written Questions relating to traffic and transport.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.1	The Applicant	<p><b>ES Chapter 5 Project Description</b></p> <p>According to paragraph 5.2.115 of <b>ES Chapter 5</b> <a href="#">[APP-030]</a> the forecourts and approaches to both existing terminals are proposed to be reviewed and enhanced within existing boundaries, to maintain effective routes providing access to the terminal frontage, multi-storey and long stay car parks, hotels and pick-up and drop-off areas for different transport modes.</p> <p>How can the Applicant be sure that there is sufficient space to accommodate these works in the absence of submitted proposals? Does the dDCO provide sufficient flexibility?</p> <p>There is flexibility in the manner in which forecourt areas are allocated to different road users, whilst retaining access to specific locations such as car parks and hotels. The design of the highway improvements included in the DCO takes account of potential development of the forecourts within the existing space noting that some changes will arise as a result of other parts of the Project, for example the multi-storey car park at North Terminal adjacent to Jubilee House (MSCP J). Access points and road connections will remain as shown on the DCO drawings <b>Surface Access Plans – General Arrangement</b> <a href="#">[APP-020]</a> with modifications only to internal roads. Access to car parks will</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>take account of the increasing use of ANPR technology to improve access and traffic flow to car parks, as proposed for MSCP 7, currently under construction.</p>
TT.1.2	The Applicant	<p><b>Sustainable Transport Fund</b></p> <p>Paragraph 8.4.22 of the <b>Planning Statement</b> <a href="#">[APP-245]</a> describes several measures to reduce the potential for impacts on traffic and transport. Reference is made to a Sustainable Transport Fund, established under the existing Gatwick s106 agreement and to a new contingent transport fund.</p> <p>Would the Sustainable Transport Fund continue to operate in the future? Explain what the contingent transport fund is, what funding it would have and how it would be secured through the dDCO?</p> <hr/> <p>The Sustainable Transport Fund (“STF”) would continue to operate in the future and is secured under the <b>draft DCO s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a> at paragraph 4 of Schedule 3. The STF is mode neutral and has been used in the past to support active travel improvements, bus services and rail infrastructure in support of our sustainable transport objectives.</p> <p>The contingent fund is the new Transport Mitigation Fund (“TMF”) described in the <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> <a href="#">[APP-090]</a> (<b>Commitment 14</b>) and secured under the <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a> at paragraph 10 of Schedule 3. The TMF is to support any further interventions identified as necessary to mitigate an unforeseen or unintended impact. Further detail in respect of the Transport Mitigation Fund is provided in response to TT.1.29 below.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.3	The Applicant	<p data-bbox="651 339 1749 376"><b>Gatwick Parking Provision – Comparison with Other South East Airports</b></p> <p data-bbox="651 429 2047 560">How does Gatwick compare with other south east airports in terms of car parking provision both on site and authorised off site when looked at ratio for each mppa. Provide a table showing this comparison.</p> <hr data-bbox="645 611 2083 614"/> <p data-bbox="651 630 2078 1091">UK airports do not routinely provide information on authorised off-airport car parks as these are matters for local planning and are generally, though not exclusively, operated by third parties. Publication of information for the capacity of on-airport parking provided by the airport operator is not required under existing Government guidance in relation to an Airport Surface Access Strategy though most airports provide summary information on staff and passenger parking capacity. The following table (<b>Table 1</b>) is drawn from available, published information and provides a ratio for number of spaces per million passengers per annum (spaces/mppa) for London Gatwick, London Luton and London Stansted airports. Data for London Heathrow is not directly available as published information in connection with development proposals is provided for passenger and staff spaces combined.</p>



**Table 1 Car parking figures for London Gatwick, London Luton and London Stansted airports**

<b>Airport</b>	<b>mppa</b>	<b>On-site car pax parking spaces</b>	<b>No. of spaces per mppa</b>
Gatwick (2019)	47	40,600	863
Gatwick (Future Baseline)	67	46,350	692
Gatwick (With Project)	80	47,450	593
Luton Airport (2019)*	18	10,550	586
Luton Airport (With Project)*	32	16,000	500
Stansted Airport (2019)	28	26,800	957

\* Taken from London Luton Airport Expansion Transport Assessment Appendix H (TR020001/APP/7.02)

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>It should be noted that the parking capacity provided is related to car mode share, passenger mix, airline and destination mix (short haul/long haul), location, pricing and other factors meaning a direct comparison is misleading. However, in all cases it would be expected that the ratio of spaces/mppa gradually declines over time as mode share changes and airports succeed in promoting more sustainable travel modes. Further information on London Gatwick’s on-airport car parking is provided in the <b>Car Parking Strategy</b> <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a> document submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
TT.1.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Zero Traffic Growth Option for the Proposed Development</b></p> <p>Numerous RRs have mentioned that growth at Heathrow would be on the basis that there would be no associated traffic growth. Explain why you have not adopted this approach at Gatwick.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.1.5 of <b>Written Summary of ISH4 Oral Submissions from ISH4 Surface Transport</b> <a href="#">[REP1 059]</a> provides a post-hearing note on the response to the queries on no car traffic growth, which is reiterated below.</p> <p>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 other areas within the catchment 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.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Nevertheless, in the process of developing the <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> <a href="#">[APP-090]</a>, 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 the Applicant’s mode share commitments and indicates that it would not be possible to achieve higher levels of public transport mode share across the whole passenger catchment area.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that it currently achieves a higher public transport mode share than Heathrow and the <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> <a href="#">[APP-090]</a> go further than the public transport mode shares which were “expected” for Heathrow in the Airports National Policy Statement (paragraph 3.51).</p> <p>The assessment shows that with the Project (including the associated surface transport interventions and the proposed highway works) there would not be significant adverse environmental effects or operational effects related to congestion, and it is therefore not necessary to achieve a "no more traffic" position in order to mitigate the effects of the Project.</p>
<b>Transport Assessment</b>		
TT.1.5	The Applicant	Table 5.2.1 does not detail any scoping report for the <b>Transport Assessment</b> <a href="#">[AS-079]</a> Was a scoping report prepared and agreed? If so, can a copy of the agreed scoping report be submitted to the Examination alongside the details of the agreements from relevant authorities.



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>A <b>Scoping Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-092]</a> was prepared for the Environmental Statement and submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in September 2019. The Scoping Report included the scope of the Traffic and Transport chapter at Section 7.6. The Planning Inspectorate replied to the Scoping Report in its <b>Scoping Opinion</b> <a href="#">[APP-095]</a> and it was confirmed that the ES chapter be supported by a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Application also includes <b>ES Appendix 12.3.1: Summary of Stakeholder Scoping Responses - Traffic and Transport</b> <a href="#">[APP-152]</a> which sets out responses made by stakeholders and how and where those issues are taken into account in the ES and related documents. Table 5.2.1 of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> <a href="#">[AS-079]</a> details the extensive stakeholder engagement that was undertaken with the transport, highway and planning authorities. The engagement took a step by step approach to the <b>Transport Assessment</b> <a href="#">[AS-079]</a> scoping and preparation, covering topics on the study area, modelling approach, assessments and scenarios, and initial results ahead of the preliminary and DCO submissions, rather than the submission of a singular report.</p>
TT.1.6	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.2.10 addresses passenger mode share. How are remote off airport parking passengers considered in the mode share (authorised off airport parking, park (on street or public car park) and bus, taxi or walk). Is there any data on these passengers?</p> <p>Remote off airport parking passengers are considered in the mode share based on the available information contained with the CAA data. This records up to three sequential mode stages in relation</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>to the journey to the airport with the last mode recorded being generally used as the main mode of access.</p> <p>Within the Private Car mode category, this identifies private parking provided off airport which is considered as authorised off airport parking. There is no distinction in the classification to identify those that may park off site in public car parks or on street and use buses, taxis or walk into the airport. In the 2016 CAA data, where car is listed as mode 1 and followed by a public transport mode or other, this amounts to 4.4% of overall travel which is 3% Car to Rail/Tube, 1% Car to Bus/Coach and less than 0.5% Car to Taxi. In all instances it was assumed that these combinations related to drop off at facilities such as stations or bus stops remote from the Airport and that the final leg represented the majority of the journey. In the transport modelling, the final leg is normally used as the main mode of transport on arrival at the Airport, so trips recorded like this would be considered as rail/tube, bus/coach or taxi accordingly. This is the conventional approach in working with the CAA data used at other airports in the UK. No other data was identified that covered off airport use of public or on street parking, nor to distinguish the length of variable mode journeys to identify whether the final mode was the dominant mode used.</p>
TT.1.7	The Applicant	Diagram 6.2.5 is titled 'Mode Share data for Gatwick passengers by quarter'. As there is no description of which mode share this relates to in the title, please clarify.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The mode shares shown in Diagram 6.2.5 are for public transport (as described in paragraph 6.2.14).
TT.1.8	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.5.4 describes “a cycle track and shared pedestrian/ cycle space on the A23 between the North Terminal and the Longbridge Roundabout”. There is only a narrow and overgrown track in this location which could not be described in such terms. Is this track the mentioned route?</p> <p>The text referred to in paragraph 6.5.4 is referring to separate existing infrastructure provisions for pedestrians and cyclists present at certain locations on the A23 between North Terminal Roundabout and Longbridge Roundabout. These provisions are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The existing section of cycle lane provision (delineated by road markings) on the slip road connection between North Terminal Roundabout and A23 London Road northbound carriageway. The cycle lane commences approx. 100m north of the roundabout exit and terminates at the end of the merge taper onto A23 London Road. This falls within the extents of the black hatched area labelled "A20" in Inset B of Sheet 1 of the <b>Rights of Way and Access Plans</b> <a href="#">[REP1-014]</a>; and</li> <li>(ii) The existing shared use path provision for pedestrian and cyclists around the perimeter of Longbridge Roundabout (including the associated toucan crossings across the roundabout approach arms).</li> </ul> <p>There is currently no dedicated cycle infrastructure provision (on or off carriageway) on A23 London Road Northbound between the merge slip road from North Terminal Roundabout and the Longbridge Roundabout shared use path provision. There is no dedicated cycle infrastructure provision on A23 London Road Southbound between the Longbridge Roundabout shared use path provision and North</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Terminal Roundabout. The western grassed verge of A23 London Road is not considered to act as a suitable provision for use by pedestrians or cyclists.
TT.1.9	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.7.11 states that there are currently approximately 46,700 car parking spaces ‘on-airport’ and a further 21,200 authorised spaces ‘off-airport’.</p> <p>Does off airport parking including on street? If not have any surveys/ analysis been undertaken to ascertain off-site parking including on street and other not specifically authorised parking places (eg, private parking areas such as drives and forecourts managed via web applications). Can any analysis be submitted so the ExA can understand the scale and extent of this parking provision?</p> <p>The authorised off-airport spaces referred to are in dedicated authorised off-street car parking facilities, operated by third parties expressly for the purpose of providing airport-related parking. Users of these sites are transferred by bus to the Airport terminals by the car park operator.</p> <p>On-street parking is not specifically or solely available for airport parking and is controlled only by traffic regulation orders and other planning restrictions. The Applicant engages with local planning and highway authorities, town councils and parish councils on a regular basis with respect to off-airport parking activity and has conducted parking beat surveys in the past to ascertain the locations and extent to which on-street parking associated with the Airport occurs. It is noted that it is not possible to determine with certainty if a car parked on-street has carried airport passengers, airport staff or is there for non-airport reasons. On-street parking and use of private driveways and other premises for informal parking “rental” offered by local residents is not found to be significant in the</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>amount of airport parking activity relative to on-airport and off-airport authorised parking sites or control of unauthorised sites that are subject to planning enforcement activity.</p> <p>Further information is available in the <b>Car Parking Strategy</b> [<a href="#">REP1-051</a>] document submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
TT.1.10	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.10.7 sets out the car parking assumptions in the future baseline. With respect to these assumptions, explain the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How are on airport car parking spaces controlled to these limits?</li> <li>b) How would the Applicant control occupancy of off-site airport parking to 87.5% of capacity?</li> </ul> <p>There is no mention of other offsite parking including on street and other not specifically authorised parking places (eg, private parking areas such as drives and forecourts managed via web applications). What assumptions have been made about this parking supply?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) There is no control/limit on parking spaces imposed on the Applicant under any planning permission or agreement. On-airport car parking capacity is reported each year to Crawley Borough Council, in accordance with the Applicant’s 2022 Section 106 agreement. This provides information on the type of parking being provided (mix of self park and block park) and locations. Surveys of cars parked provide a level of occupancy at the time of survey, noting that this will be very variable over time. Block parking, which allows for more cars to be parked</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>per hectare than self-park, is used more during peak seasons in response to passenger demand and customer preferences for different products.</p> <p>The Applicant uses pricing to ensure car parks are used efficiently and in balance with its surface access strategy and goals for sustainable travel. The Applicant operates several different parking products, retaining some capacity in each for passengers to park on the day (“roll-up”) without booking in advance (“pre-book”). Peak parking capacity, being the maximum amount of capacity that the Applicant is able to release for pre-book and roll-up customers, occurs during the summer peak period. The future baseline sets out the expected peak capacity that could be available for both self-park and block-park spaces based on the parking products available.</p> <p>b) The Applicant monitors the demand for parking capacity to inform pricing and availability, noting the extent to which each parking product is pre-booked over the summer peak period. The Applicant does not “control” occupancy to 87.5% occupancy, this is the level of efficiency that it believes it is reasonable to operate on a regular basis by monitoring bookings and varying pricing. This level of occupancy is considered the practical maximum level that can be reliably achieved whilst still retaining some flexibility for roll-up demand and operational requirements. Through annual monitoring and working closely with local planning authorities this approach has worked successfully as the airport has grown and has not prevented sustained increases in public transport mode share during that time. This has not required any controls or limits for on-airport parking outside of permitted development rights.</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Applicant does not control occupancy of off-airport capacity, nor does the DCO seek to do so. Data indicates that off-airport providers have typically operated up to this level of occupancy so this figure was used to reflect this capacity in the transport models, ensuring those passengers that travel by car were allocated to each available authorised car park according to its practical capacity. Requests for additional capacity would require planning permission.</p> <p>In relation to on-street and on-driveway parking, please refer to the response to question TT.1.10.</p> <p>Further information is available in the <b>Car Parking Strategy</b> <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a> document submitted at Deadline 1.</p>
TT.1.11	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 6.10.8 addresses car parking and forecourt charges. If people are dropping off or picking up at the rail station do these apply? Does this discourage local trips to the rail station?</p> <p>Forecourt and parking charges apply to all non-airport users accessing Gatwick Airport Railway Station with some exemptions and allowances, including the operation of a Local Commuter Scheme for residents living close to the airport that regularly use the airport forecourts for dropping off and picking up at the railway station. Residents in a specified local area (based on postcode) for whom Gatwick Airport Railway Station is their closest station are permitted to use the South Terminal drop off forecourt twice per day.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.12	The Applicant	<p data-bbox="651 341 2047 469">Paragraph 7.3.9 addresses staff parking. Is it correct that staff parking charges will only be used if modal targets are not being met? What incentives are proposed for staff using public transport and active travel modes and how would these be secured?</p> <p data-bbox="651 539 2085 863">The Applicant already charges on-airport businesses for access to staff parking (to cover maintenance and other costs). However, these charges are not necessarily passed on to individual staff members so may not drive a change in behaviour. Direct charging is one of a number of measures that may be used to help drive the change in behaviour required to meet mode share targets but other measures will and are being used as well. Measures such as discounted travel by public transport, car share schemes, incentives for active travel including “Ride to Work” schemes are all supported under the current Airport Surface Access Strategy and accompanying Action Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="651 916 2085 1385">The Applicant has a commitment to promoting sustainable modes and invests through the Sustainable Transport Fund to improve public transport services and provide incentives (such as discounted bus, coach and rail travel). This will continue as part of the Project, secured through the s106 Agreement (see response to question TT.1.2 above). In addition, the SACs (secured through Requirement 20 to the draft DCO) provide the sustainable outcomes against which the combination of measures for staff travel is secured in the DCO ensuring the Applicant, in consultation with stakeholders, can be flexible on the most appropriate blend of measures to use to meet the mode share targets. Placing constraints now on which measures are used in the future would be counterproductive as the approach should be adaptable to the cohort of staff and travel choices available at the time the DCO requirements are triggered.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.13	The Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 8.1.12 and 8.1.13 outline the assessments supporting the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and those contained in the TA. The PEIR assessment was based on more robust modelling and the scenario in the TA reflects “a more reasonable and likely scenario.” Have any other sensitivity tests been undertaken to ensure the scenario presented in the TA is robust?</p> <p>The paragraphs identified acknowledge a small change in approach relating to the treatment of seasonality. As set out in paragraph 8.1.12 of <b>Transport Assessment</b> [<a href="#">AS-079</a>] the modelling for PEIR was "unrealistically onerous". The move to using June as the basis for the assessment creates a more reasonable and likely scenario. This was discussed at ISH4 and considerations related to this seasonality point are set out in Appendix B of <b>The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5</b> [<a href="#">REP2-005</a>].</p> <p>During the development of model forecasts, and through discussions with key stakeholders including National Highways and SCC and WSCC, some sensitivity analysis was undertaken to help understand specific topics in more detail and to help build confidence in the forecasting process, assumptions and outputs. As an example, through discussions with National Highways, a test which explored a 10% increase in airport traffic was undertaken to understand the sensitivity of the model in terms of performance of the network, particularly at M23 Junction 9, and the resilience of the proposed highway works to traffic flows greater than those forecast through the core modelling process.</p> <p>The Applicant has also undertaken sensitivity testing for post-Covid travel behaviour, following guidance issued by the DfT in an updated version of TAG Unit M4. These sensitivity tests for the</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>strategic model are reported in <b>Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling</b> <a href="#">[AS-121]</a>. Post-Covid sensitivity tests have also been undertaken using the VISSIM model, to address requests from National Highways, which are reported in <b>Post-Covid VISSIM Sensitivity Tests for 2032 and 2047</b> (Doc Ref. 10.19) which is being submitted at Deadline 3</p>
TT.1.14	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 9.1.1 explains that Chapter 9 of the TA provides an assessment of the rail network in terms of crowding in the future baseline and with Project scenarios.</p> <p>Is all the modelling undertaken based on timetabled services? Has any account been taken of cancellations and actual performance against timetabled services?</p> <hr/> <p>All of the rail modelling is based on timetabled services or where new services are proposed and not within the timetable, the anticipated hourly frequency, following TAG Guidance in Unit M3.2 Public Transport Assignment. No account has been taken of cancellations and actual performance against timetabled services on the basis the timetable reflects the operators' anticipated operating plans. We are continuing to discuss rail crowding analysis and assumptions with Network Rail and are seeking engagement with GTR and will update the ExA accordingly within the SoCG due at Deadline 5.</p>
TT.1.15	The Applicant	<p>Chapters 9 and 10 of the TA address Rail and Station modelling. Given the concerns about the rail and station capacity modelling detailed in the <b>WR from Network Rail</b> <a href="#">[REP1-090]</a> and <b>Govia Thameslink Railway</b> <a href="#">[REP1-185]</a>, provide a timeline for response/ resolution to these concerns to be submitted into the Examination.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Applicant is continuing to engage with NR and GTR to discuss matters relating to the rail crowding assessment and station capacity modelling. A meeting was held on 11th April between all parties to discuss the station modelling and rail crowding assessment. Network Rail is undertaking additional technical work and the parties will continue to have a series of engagement sessions around station capacity and rail crowding during April and May. This ongoing dialogue and active engagement from all parties is working towards the update of the SoCG for Deadline 5.</p>
TT.1.16	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 11.3.14 states that the future baseline scenarios in the model reflect measures GAL is proposing to take together with the expected commercial response of the bus and coach industry to increased demand. How are the improvements listed being secured?</p> <p>The measures assumed in the future baseline scenarios in the model are not 'secured' under the Project in that they relate to future baseline assumptions, and so would be delivered in the absence of the Project through the Airport's Surface Access Strategy. The Applicant has provided further clarification on how the future baseline has been considered in the Transport Assessment and Chapter 12 of the ES in <b>The Applicant's Response to Actions – ISH4 Surface Transport</b> [<a href="#">REP1-065</a>].</p> <p>The Applicant has submitted a revised <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) at Deadline 3. The Surface Access Commitments (secured in Requirement 20 of the draft Development Consent Order) sets out the Applicant's commitments in relation to surface access as part of the Project. The interaction between the Airport Surface Access Strategy and the Surface Access Commitments is set</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:						
		<p>out in section 2 of the Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref. 5.3v2) and paragraphs 8.4.34 and 8.4.35 of the <b>Planning Statement</b> [APP-245].</p> <p>The <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> include a number of commitments in relation to mode share (Commitments 1-4) and support for bus and coach services (Commitments 5-7), a number of which reflect the improvements listed at paragraph 11.3.16 of the <b>Transport Assessment</b>. Funding for these improvements is secured in Schedule 3 of the <b>draft s106 agreement</b> [<a href="#">REP2-004</a>].</p> <p>The table below (<b>Table 2</b>) sets out the summary position of how each of the improvements listed at paragraph 11.3.16 of the Transport Assessment are expected to be delivered:</p> <p><b>Table 2 Delivery mechanism for improvements</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 890 1370 986">Improvements</th> <th data-bbox="1375 890 2087 986">Delivery mechanism</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 989 1370 1321">Further increases to coach frequencies in proportion to the additional growth in air passengers resulting from the Project, representing the expected commercial response of operators even without additional support from GAL. These are shown in Table 11.3.1;</td> <td data-bbox="1375 989 2087 1321">These improvements represent the expected commercial response of operators as noted in paragraph 11.3.16 of the Transport Assessment and are expected to be delivered as a result of the Applicant's regular engagement with operators which help to anticipate potential changes in demand and manage service improvements.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 1324 1370 1417">Increased frequency (half-hourly daytime, hourly early/late) on regional bus or coach route Chatham –</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1324 2087 1417">Commitment 5 of the SAC</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Improvements	Delivery mechanism	Further increases to coach frequencies in proportion to the additional growth in air passengers resulting from the Project, representing the expected commercial response of operators even without additional support from GAL. These are shown in Table 11.3.1;	These improvements represent the expected commercial response of operators as noted in paragraph 11.3.16 of the Transport Assessment and are expected to be delivered as a result of the Applicant's regular engagement with operators which help to anticipate potential changes in demand and manage service improvements.	Increased frequency (half-hourly daytime, hourly early/late) on regional bus or coach route Chatham –	Commitment 5 of the SAC
Improvements	Delivery mechanism							
Further increases to coach frequencies in proportion to the additional growth in air passengers resulting from the Project, representing the expected commercial response of operators even without additional support from GAL. These are shown in Table 11.3.1;	These improvements represent the expected commercial response of operators as noted in paragraph 11.3.16 of the Transport Assessment and are expected to be delivered as a result of the Applicant's regular engagement with operators which help to anticipate potential changes in demand and manage service improvements.							
Increased frequency (half-hourly daytime, hourly early/late) on regional bus or coach route Chatham –	Commitment 5 of the SAC							



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:								
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="649 331 1370 491">Maidstone – Sevenoaks – Gatwick. This and the following regional bus or coach enhancements are shown in Table 11.3.2;</td> <td data-bbox="1370 331 2074 491">Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="649 491 1370 707">New regional bus or route (hourly) Bexley – Footscray – Gatwick;</td> <td data-bbox="1370 491 2074 707">Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="649 707 1370 922">New regional bus or route (half-hourly) Tunbridge Wells – East Grinstead – Gatwick; and</td> <td data-bbox="1370 707 2074 922">Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="649 922 1370 1134">New regional bus or route (hourly) Worthing – Horsham – Gatwick.</td> <td data-bbox="1370 922 2074 1134">Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a></td> </tr> </table>	Maidstone – Sevenoaks – Gatwick. This and the following regional bus or coach enhancements are shown in Table 11.3.2;	Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>	New regional bus or route (hourly) Bexley – Footscray – Gatwick;	Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>	New regional bus or route (half-hourly) Tunbridge Wells – East Grinstead – Gatwick; and	Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>	New regional bus or route (hourly) Worthing – Horsham – Gatwick.	Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>
Maidstone – Sevenoaks – Gatwick. This and the following regional bus or coach enhancements are shown in Table 11.3.2;	Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>									
New regional bus or route (hourly) Bexley – Footscray – Gatwick;	Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>									
New regional bus or route (half-hourly) Tunbridge Wells – East Grinstead – Gatwick; and	Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>									
New regional bus or route (hourly) Worthing – Horsham – Gatwick.	Commitment 5 of the SAC  Paragraph 5 of Schedule 3 <b>draft s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>									
TT.1.17	NH CBC WSCC	<p>Table 12.2.1 lists the major highway schemes included in the future baseline scenarios. Is this a definitive list of schemes? Provide a status update of the schemes listed.</p> <hr/> <p>N/A – this question is not directed to the Applicant.</p>								

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.18	The Applicant	<p>Paragraphs 12.4.7 and 12.4.8 relate to Diagram 12.4.1: Change in AADT (2047) – with Project compared to future baseline. Is the traffic attributed to model noise disregarded or is it reassigned in the model so that all traffic is accounted for?</p> <p>Diagram 12.4.1 shows the change in AADT including model noise as forecast in the traffic models. No attempt has been made to reassign demand related to model noise onto other routes. By definition, model noise occurs where high levels of congestion are predicted within strategic highway models. It results in traffic switching between routes with very similar journey times, in ways that do not appear logical in the context of the test or the actual highway network. In the instances identified in the model forecasts for both south Croydon and Steyning, the extent of Airport related traffic is less than 1% of overall traffic and therefore is not considered to be a material concern. This is discussed in the Application assessment on a site by site basis for all junctions meeting the Magnitude of Impacts criteria set out in Table 12.3.1 of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> [<a href="#">AS-079</a>].</p> <p>The Transport Assessment outlines the distribution of airport demand in Diagram 12.3.2 which shows 5-6% of baseline airport demand reaches the Croydon area. Figures 131/132 of the <b>Transport Assessment Annex B - Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> [<a href="#">APP-260</a>] shows that the absolute volume and proportion of total traffic that airport demand represents is low in the Steyning and Croydon areas. Most roads in the Steyning area see less than 50 airport trips per day. In Croydon most roads are within the 50 - 100 trips per day. Figure 133 shows how the daily trips changes between the Baseline and With Project and this shows that, with the exception of the most strategic</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>roads, daily airport trip increases are under 100. These are low volumes of traffic overall, and the assessment approach to consider node based impacts is therefore proportionate.</p> <p>The change in AADT is a product of the changes at an hourly level and these flows are considered in detail in the magnitude of impact assessment (set out in <b>Transport Assessment Annex E - Highway Junction Review</b> <a href="#">[APP-263]</a>) to determine if the changes observed are real impacts. It is clear that where model noise is occurring, some nodes are flagged through assessment that would not otherwise be flagged. A number of nodes here show either the absolute change resulting from the Project is negligible and/or where the proportion of airport traffic is low. For instance, in 2047 at Lower Coombe Street / Southbridge Road (Node 54708) <b>Transport Assessment Annex E - Highway Junction Review</b> <a href="#">[APP-263]</a> shows the absolute increase in airport flows per hour is up to 10 vehicles (in the AM2), or one vehicle every six minutes. In the 2047 Baseline AM2 there are 7 airport vehicles representing 0.4% of demand, and with Project this becomes 17 airport vehicles representing 0.6% of demand (and would likely be a lower % if it was not for the additional model noise assigned traffic). For model noise in Steyning Figure 152-155 of the <b>Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-260]</a> show that the model noise primarily impacts 2038 in this area.</p>
TT.1.19	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 13.2.8 describes the Capital Investment Plan improvements. Are these the only highway improvement that would be required in the future baseline scenario in the assessment?</p> <p>The Capital Investment Plan improvements to the North Terminal Roundabout and South Terminal Roundabout are proposed as improvements to the safe and efficient operation of the main access</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>points to Gatwick Airport’s terminals and forecourts. Whilst they are not a requirement for future baseline growth they are proposed to reduce future congestion and improve traffic flow. No other highway improvement measures are proposed or required for future baseline airport growth.</p>
TT.1.20	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 13.2.11 states that the Capital Investment Plan works will be completed by 2029. However, they do not appear in the dDCO. Explain why these works are not included in the dDCO.</p> <p>As noted in response to the question above, the Future Baseline assumptions of the growth which would occur at the Airport in the absence of the Project include improvement works (including signalisation) of both the North Terminal and South Terminal roundabouts (as explained in section 4.4.9 of <b>ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operations</b> [APP-029]). These are the same works as those described as “Capital Investment Plan (CIP) improvements” at paragraphs 13.2.8-13.2.11 in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> [AS-079]. As per that section, it is anticipated that these works will be completed by 2029.</p> <p>Following discussions with National Highways, the Applicant has agreed to secure the delivery of these works in the draft DCO. The Applicant has responded to National Highways’ request for a new Requirement seeking to secure these works in response to National Highways' written representation in <b>The Applicant’s Response to the Written Representations</b> (Doc Ref 10.14). As noted in that response the Applicant proposes to deliver the works prior to commencement of dual runway operations.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The Applicant is engaging with National Highways to seek to agree appropriate drafting to secure these works with a view to including this in the draft DCO in due course.
TT.1.21	RHAs	<p>Paragraph 13.5.7 states that the model outputs confirm that in the 2032 future baseline the level of congestion is becoming more extensive, increasing the potential for wider impacts on the highway network, indicating insufficient capacity to accommodate Project demand without the highway works.</p> <p>In 2032 the future baseline traffic levels are expected to be 59.2 mppa and the terminal roundabout works have been done and no more mitigation is planned in this future baseline scenario. This is compounded by the findings set out in paragraphs 13.5.13 to 13.5.15 concerning the 2047 period. Also, in paragraph 13.6.3 it is stated that “the Project prevents unacceptable highway conditions arising”. Given “the significant congestion highlighted at key locations, both within the Airport network and on the strategic and local network” relating to the future baseline. Does this suggest that the 67.2 mppa would be a realistic and robust future scenario in the event the dDCO would not be granted?</p>
		N/A – this question is not directed to the Applicant.
TT.1.22	The Applicant	Explain why section 14.1 has been reduced from the submission TA [APP-258]?
		The formatting in the first part of Section 14 in the submission version of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> [APP-258] was corrupted. Version 2 of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> [AS-079] contains all of the text of Section 14.1 that was present in the submission version. However, the final paragraph of Section 14.2

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>of the submission version [<a href="#">APP-258</a>] was omitted inadvertently when producing Version 2 [<a href="#">AS-079</a>]. The missing paragraph should follow paragraph 14.2.7 of AS-079, prior to Diagram 14.2.3, and should read "<i>Further analysis has been undertaken on the 2016 and 2047 staff numbers by catchment area. Diagram 14.2.3 shows the active travel mode trips from the local area in 2016 and those expected in 2047 with the Project.</i>" This has been included in the updated version of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3) submitted at Deadline 3</p>
TT.1.23	The Applicant	<p>Diagram 14.2.3 shows active travel mode trips for the 2016 baseline and 2047 with Project. What do the green/ blue and yellow lines represent?</p> <p>In Diagram 14.2.3 of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> [<a href="#">AS-079</a>] the green/blue and yellow lines are intended to assist with spatially summarising the employee active travel trip numbers. The green/blue line encompasses zones with daily active travel mode trips, which are wholly or predominantly within 5km of the Airport and to the north and east of it. The number in the green/blue box is the number of active travel trips within the area enclosed by the green/blue line. The number in the yellow box is the number of active trips within the area enclosed by the yellow line, which encompasses zones to the south and southeast of the Airport with daily active travel mode trips, that are wholly or predominantly within 5km of the Airport.</p>
TT.1.24	The Applicant	<p>Diagram 14.3.1 shows the existing active travel network around Gatwick Airport. The public footpath on the northeast side of the A23 is not a PRow.</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Should this be shown differently?</p> <p>Diagram 14.3.2 shows the existing Public Rights of Way network in the vicinity of the airport and does not include the pedestrian route northeast of A23 London Road. The pedestrian route northeast of A23 London Road in Diagram 14.3.1 is a path within Riverside Garden Park which can be utilised by pedestrians.</p>
TT.1.25	The Applicant	<p>Diagram 14.3.5 shows Gatwick Airport cycling facilities. Part of the key is missing but should this be the same as Diagram 14.3.? Are the yellow walking routes usable by cyclists as in some cases the only connection is to cycle parking?</p> <p>The key to Diagram 14.3.5 should be the same as that for Diagram 14.3.1. This will be corrected in the updated version of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> (Doc Ref. 7.4 v3) being submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>The yellow walking routes are not usable by cyclists and are only for pedestrians.</p> <p>Cyclists are currently expected to travel around the airport using the existing road network, with NCR21 being the only existing designated infrastructure for cyclists.</p> <p>One of the key benefits brought about by the proposed Project is the proposed off carriageway active travel improvements for cyclists in and around Gatwick Airport from Longbridge Roundabout to South Terminal via North Terminal which will provide significant safety benefits for cyclists.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
TT.1.26	The Applicant	Diagram 14.4.1 shows key walking routes. The pink shaded lines do not appear in the key. Clarify their designation.
		The key found in Diagram 14.4.1 which is found in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> [ <a href="#">AS-079</a> ] is incorrect, the diagram with the correct key can be found in the <b>Transport Assessment Annex A - Figures</b> [ <a href="#">APP-259</a> ]. Diagram 14.4.1 has been corrected in the updated version of the Transport Assessment submitted at Deadline 3.
TT.1.27	The Applicant	<b>Riverside Park – Pedestrian Link</b>
		<p>Explain why a new pedestrian/ cycle link has not been considered from the pedestrian crossing in the new North Terminal signalised junction directly towards the small car park and Riverside and Crescent Way beyond which would seem to provide a much more direct link to central Crawley.</p> <p>The design proposals at this location seek to minimise environmental impacts to Riverside Garden Park. Active travel user access between the signalised junction and the small existing car park accessed from Riverside would be via the existing paths through the middle of Riverside Garden Park. These existing paths would be accessed via the existing connection onto the A23 London Road footway which is to be widened as part of the scheme proposals. Refer to label c14 on Sheet 1 of the 'Surface Access Highways Plans - Active Travel' in Appendix A of The <b>Applicant's Response to</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><b>Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport</b> <a href="#">[REP1-065]</a> for the location of the access point.</p> <p>Retaining the existing paths within the park minimises further tree loss and/or loss of green space. The proposed footway improvements on the eastern side of A23 London Road would benefit pedestrian users travelling between Horley and the new signal controlled crossing via Longbridge Roundabout. This route would benefit from improved lighting provision and passive surveillance from the A23 London Road. The proposed Replacement Public Open Space at Car Park B and the new pedestrian link between Car Park B and the A23 London Road Eastern footway, labelled as c12 on Sheet 1 of the 'Surface Access Highways Plans - Active Travel', would provide enhanced connectivity to/from the east / south east of Horley.</p> <p>The design proposals do not preclude potential future provision of an upgraded path through the park, noting that not all park users or other stakeholders may support the principle of additional or widened paths across the middle of the park between the existing car park and the new junction. The primary travel routes for cyclists travelling between Horley and the airport are envisaged to be via NCR 21 on the eastern side of Riverside Garden Park or via the proposed new active travel path connection between Longbridge Roundabout, North Terminal Roundabout and South Terminal on the western side of A23 London Road.</p>
TT.1.28	The Applicant	<b>Ultra-low or Zero Emission Vehicle Mode Share Targets</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Targets from the Airport Surface Access Strategy and the Surface Access Commitments are expressed in a consistent way. The Surface Access Commitments commitment is that by 2030 passenger travel would be 60% by sustainable modes and ultra-low or zero emission vehicles. In the 2021 Decade of Change this 60% target included both staff and passenger travel to the airport.</p> <p>Explain:</p> <p>Why this only relates to passenger travel in the Surface Access Commitments; and</p> <p>How ultra-low or zero emission vehicle use will monitored and controlled.</p> <hr/> <p>The Airport Surface Access Strategy 2022 includes a Target to achieve 52% of passenger journeys to the airport by public transport by 2030 under the scrutiny of the Transport Forum Steering Group, as part of meeting the Decade of Change target of 60% by sustainable modes and ultra-low or zero emission vehicles by 2030. This compares to a public transport mode share of 47% in 2019. (Target 1).</p> <p>To be clear about The <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> <a href="#">[APP-090]</a> these include mode share commitments (Commitments 1-4) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Commitment 1</b> - A minimum of 55% of air passenger journeys to and from the Airport to be made by public transport;</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Commitment 2</b> - A minimum of 55% of airport staff journeys to and from the Airport to be made by public transport, shared travel and active modes;</li> <li>▪ <b>Commitment 3</b> - A reduction of air passenger drop-off and pick-up car journeys at the Airport to a mode share of no more than 12% of surface access journeys; and</li> <li>▪ <b>Commitment 4</b> - At least 15% of airport staff journeys to and from the Airport where those staff journeys originate or conclude within 8km of the Airport (such “staff journey” being a single one-way trip to or from the Airport) to be made by active modes.</li> </ul> <p>There are also aspirational targets (not commitments) at Section 7, including the following in respect of both air passenger and staff journeys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A minimum of 60% of air passenger journeys to and from the Airport to be made by public transport; and</li> <li>▪ A minimum of 60% of airport staff journeys to and from the Airport to be made by public transport, shared transport and active modes.</li> </ul> <p>In relation to the use of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles, noting their positive contribution to emissions reductions by comparison to their petrol/diesel counterparts, the Applicant has included an additional specific commitment in revised Surface Access Commitments (SAC) (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) to develop a strategy for providing charging infrastructure for electric vehicles used to access the Airport.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>This will apply to both passengers and staff, to facilitate the use of ultra-low and zero emission vehicles for those journeys that are made by car.</p> <p>Vehicle usage would be monitored and controlled in the same way as all other car trips by reference to compliance with the mode share commitments.</p>
TT.1.29	The Applicant	<p><b>Transport Mitigation Fund</b></p> <p>How would the Transport Mitigation Fund be secured in the dDCO? Also explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The scope of the Transport Mitigation Fund;</li> <li>b) The level of commitment within the Transport Mitigation Fund;</li> <li>c) The relevant thresholds which would trigger the activation of the Transport Mitigation Fund;</li> <li>d) The parties to be consulted during the development of any Transport Mitigation Fund proposals; and</li> <li>e) The parties and makeup of the decision body that would act as the approval body for the Transport Mitigation Fund.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The Transport Mitigation Fund (TMF) is secured in the <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) and the <b>draft DCO s106 agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>. The following responses address each of the questions in turn:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The general scope of the TMF is described at Commitment 14 of the <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) and paragraph 10 of Schedule 3 of the <b>draft DCO Section 106 Agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>. By way of brief summary, the TMF is a contingency fund available to address potential future unforeseen or unintended impacts of the Project.</li> <li>b) The financial investment in the TMF is defined in the <b>draft DCO Section 106 Agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a> (paragraph 10, Schedule 3) as the sum of £10 million.</li> <li>c) The TMF has been established to address unknown future impacts and so rather than setting thresholds which would trigger the activation of the Transport Mitigation Fund, the Applicant has established a decision making group (further details set out below) together with a set of detailed criteria against which a proposal for funds would be assessed which is included in the <b>draft DCO Section 106 Agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a> (paragraph 10, Schedule 3) to enable the TMF to achieve its intended purpose.</li> <li>d) and e) The <b>draft DCO Section 106 Agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a> (paragraph 9, Schedule 3) establishes a decision group for the TMF (the Transport Mitigation Fund Decision Group</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(“TMFDG”) to assess and determine applications for funding from the TMF. The TMFDG shall comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one representative of GAL;</li> <li>• one representative of CBC;</li> <li>• one representative of WSCC;</li> <li>• one representative of Surrey County Council;</li> <li>• one representative of National Highways; and</li> <li>• one representative of Network Rail</li> <li>• or such alternates as may be nominated by those representatives from time to time.</li> </ul>
<b>ES Chapter 12 Transport</b>		
TT.1.30	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.5.3 of <b>ES Chapter 12</b> <a href="#">[APP-073]</a> states that “Strategic multi-modal modelling has been undertaken which informs mode shares and the resulting traffic flows and rail loadings used in this assessment.” How do these mode shares compare with actual mode shares from the latest travel survey?</p> <p>The response to TT.1.42 sets out the latest mode share data for staff and passengers. The mode shares from the strategic multi-modal model are set out in detail in <b>Transport Assessment Annex B Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-260]</a>. Table 72 shows the annual average passenger</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>mode shares for the 2016 baseline and future baseline years and Table 135 show the mode share information for the with Project scenarios. Table 74 shows the staff mode shares for the 2016 baseline and future baseline years and Table 137 shows the staff mode shares for the with Project scenarios.</p> <p>Because the staff surveys show that the Airport is still in recovery post-pandemic, they are not a suitable direct comparator to the forecast mode shares in the strategic modelling, which takes into account a range of sustainable interventions in the future baseline (paragraphs 12.6.52 to 12.6.76 of <b>ES Chapter 12</b> <a href="#">[AS-076]</a>) and with Project (paragraphs 12.8.6 of 12.8.9 of <b>ES Chapter 12</b> <a href="#">[AS-076]</a>).</p> <p>The future baseline mode shares shown in Tables 72 and 74 of <b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-260]</a> are therefore the most appropriate basis for comparison with the mode shares for the with Project mode scenarios.</p>
TT.1.31	<p>The Applicant Network Rail</p> <p>Train Operating Companies</p>	<p>Paragraph 12.5.15 states that it is assumed that air passengers place their luggage in overhead luggage racks. Is it realistic on trains serving an airport that all luggage will fit in overhead racks or luggage storage areas and not on the floor. Has this assumption been checked against actual surveys?</p> <p>Paragraph 12.5.15 of <b>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> <a href="#">[AS-076]</a> states that <i>"It is assumed that all seats are available for passenger use, and that air passengers place their luggage in overhead luggage racks, under the seats, in the luggage compartments provided throughout the train, or on the</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>floor, but not on the seats."</i> The assumption is therefore not limited to luggage being in overhead racks or storage areas and does include the potential for luggage to be placed on the floor.</p> <p>Further information around the assumptions relating to luggage and its potential implications with regard to the rail crowding analysis has been presented in <b>The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005]</b> in Appendix C. Paragraphs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 of that Appendix reiterate the approach noted above, stating that <i>"The seated and standing train capacities used in the assessments of rail passenger modelling are taken from DfT's Green Book (2019). It is not clear from this source what specific assumptions are made in the calculation of standing capacity. The working assumption relating to luggage in the assessment of rail crowding is that it is placed in overhead racks, under seats, in luggage compartments or placed on the floor."</i></p> <p>No surveys of how luggage is located in trains have been obtained - the assessment has focused on considering the proportion of available standing space (as defined in the DfT Green Book) that would be occupied by the passenger volumes that are forecast. Clearly if the Green Book standing capacities do not assume any luggage placed where passengers might otherwise stand, the presence of such luggage would reduce the available standing capacity although any reduction is likely to represent a small proportion of available standing capacity.</p>
TT.1.32	The Applicant	<p>Table 12.6.1 shows passenger mode share. Clarify:</p> <p>a) Do the Bus/ Coach numbers include shuttle buses from remote parking areas?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) Do the taxi numbers include any people remotely parking in either off street car parks or on street?</p> <hr/> <p>The passenger mode shares shown in Table 12.6.1 are taken from Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) data, which is the industry standard method of reporting mode shares for airports. All airports report their mode share on this basis. The data is from CAA Departing Passenger Surveys and based on the CAA methodology:</p> <p>a) No, passengers using car park courtesy buses are included in the car mode shares. This is because such passengers arrive at the Airport by car and the shuttle buses represent only a short-distance transfer between car parks and terminals, within the Airport estate.</p> <p>b) For all other mode combinations, where more than one mode of transport is used to travel to an airport, the final mode is presented, as set out in the answer to TT.1.6 above.</p>
TT.1.33	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 12.6.45 states that “There is also access to the Airport via Povey Cross Bridge which is convenient for staff living around Charlwood and Hookwood, and from the Balcombe Road for residential areas to the east of the Airport”. These are not shown as either new or existing pedestrian routes in Figure 12.6.2 <a href="#">[APP-059]</a>. Why not?</p> <hr/> <p>While the existing Povey Cross Bridge can be used by active travel users as it is signed by a "No vehicles except bicycles being pushed" sign, there is no formal off carriageway provision in the form</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>of a footway, shared-use or segregated route within the Airport and therefore this has not been highlighted on Figure 12.6.2.</p>
TT.1.34	The Applicant	<p>Can the Applicant provide evidence that the pricing of car parking is effective in managing modal choice at airports?</p> <p>The relationship between parking capacity and pricing in helping to manage mode share is illustrated by the relative change in car parking capacity in the decade from 2010. Over this time capacity increased by 8,000 spaces, a 23% increase and this was accompanied by increases in parking charges. However, air passenger demand increased by approximately 41%, equivalent to a need for 14,200 additional spaces if mode shares had stayed the same. However, as part of a wider Airport Surface Access Strategy, the Applicant promoted the use of public transport, including investment in rail in support of objectives for more sustainable travel. As a result, car mode share (park and fly and kiss and fly) reduced from 48% to 34% over this period. This shows the importance of the Applicant managing changes to on-airport car parking capacity and pricing alongside commitments towards sustainable modes.</p> <p>This relationship between behavioural change and pricing of car parking and forecourt drop off and pick up can be modelled by calibrating choice of mode in the transport models to change in travel cost (money and time).</p> <p>Appendix A of <b>Transport Assessment Annex B - Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-260]</a> sets out the development of the Airport demand model that is used to predict how mode shares for air</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>passengers may change in the future. It sets out the approach to model development, the source data and calibration of the model. A key attribute considered in the model calibration was airport parking cost and various statistics from the calibration and analysis help to demonstrate the importance of parking cost on travel behaviour. Table 7 of this Appendix shows that for the M_Money attribute, representing monetary costs experienced by passengers on their surface access trip, the t-statistic (indicating the strength of significance of the parameter), is high for all passenger segments, indicating it has a significant role in influencing surface access mode choice decision making at Gatwick. Table 15 provides a comparison of the outturn elasticities of the GapSAM model with previous results from the LASAM model (which covers Heathrow). The 'Parking to parking cost line', shows the strength of response predicted at both Heathrow and Gatwick illustrating that pricing of car parking has a significant influence on car park demand. This is further illustrated for Gatwick in Table 16, which outlines the outturn elasticities relating to a range of surface access transport components. It illustrates that for a 20% increase in car parking cost, car park demand could decrease from 24.1% to 21.9%. It should be noted these tests are simple model sensitivities to check the scale of response, but may differ to the Application scenarios as these will combine a range of surface access measures.</p>
TT.1.35	The Applicant	<p>Has the Applicant undertaken any sensitivity analysis of failure to meet the modal targets? If not, why not?</p> <p>As noted in the answer to TT.1.13, during the development of model forecasts, and through discussions with key stakeholders including National Highways and SCC and WSCC, some sensitivity analysis has been undertaken to build confidence in the forecasting process, assumptions and</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>outputs. However, the Applicant has set out the mode shares it is committing to achieve in <b>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments</b> (Doc Ref. 5.3 v2) together with arrangements for monitoring and reporting progress towards achieving them and a process for addressing a situation in which the targets are not, or are not expected to be, met in a particular year.</p>
TT.1.36	The Applicant	<p>The new cycle link, along the A23, into the Riverside Park and crossing to the terminal is likely to become a much used route. The degree of change for users is therefore likely to be great but there is no mention of this route being considered in the latest <b>Technical Note</b> <a href="#">[AS-119]</a> assessment of the effects on the users of this path in terms of Fear and Intimidation. Signpost where this is submitted or provide explanation as to why this has not been done.</p> <p>In keeping with guidance, the emphasis in the <b>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport</b> <a href="#">[AS-076]</a> is to identify and explain significant effects (as set out in paragraph 12.4.11) and this is the same approach undertaken in the <b>Technical Note on the Impact of Latest IEMA Guidance (2023) on the Assessment of Effects Related to Traffic and Transport</b> <a href="#">[AS-119]</a>. As Section 4.2 of the technical note describes, the assessment of fear and intimidation experienced by pedestrians and cyclists is based on determining a 'degree of hazard' (with reference to traffic flows and speeds) and an overall score for the level of fear and intimidation in a particular location. The magnitude of impact arising from the Project is determined by considering the change in the overall score. The magnitude of impact is then considered alongside the sensitivity of relevant receptors in that location to determine the significance of effect resulting from the Project.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Table 12 of <b>Technical Note on the Impact of Latest IEMA Guidance (2023) on the Assessment of Effects Related to Traffic and Transport</b> <a href="#">[AS-119]</a> lists the locations where low and medium magnitudes of impact were identified using the criteria set out in the 2023 IEMA guidance. The section of A23 London Road between Longbridge Roundabout and the new signal junction for North Terminal (link 003) is identified in Table 12 as experiencing a medium magnitude impact in the initial construction period (2024-2029). At this time the new shared use cycle track between Longbridge Roundabout and the ramp into Riverside Garden Park, and the continuation of the new pedestrian footway southeastwards to the new signal junction, would not yet be complete.</p> <p>In other assessment years, the analysis indicated that the Project would cause a negligible magnitude of impact in these locations using the 2023 IEMA methodology. It is not therefore identified in Table 12 of the technical note as there would be no significant effect related to fear and intimidation at this location in those other years.</p>
TT.1.37	The Applicant WSCC	<p><b>Sussex Border Path</b></p> <p>Sheet 1 of the <b>Rights of Way and Access Plans</b> <a href="#">[APP-018]</a> shows the existing route of the Sussex Border Path (PRoW 346-2sy). Explain why when the proposed dDCO realignment does not include formal realignment of the elements of the path not coincident with the existing footpaths within the airport site.</p> <p>The existing alignment shown on the plans seems to follow an alignment in part along carriageways which is unlikely to be the practical route for those using the PRoW. Given the formal diversions being</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>asked for within the dDCO this would seem to be an opportunity to formally divert the path within the airport to follow established pedestrian routes on the site. Should this form part of the PRow diversion within the dDCO?</p> <p>The relevant section of Public Right of Way Footpath 346_2sy is labelled as B2 on Sheet 1 of the <b>Rights of Way and Access Plans</b> [REP1-014]. This section of footpath is currently coincident with various Rights of Way with a highway designation (including Longbridge Way, North Terminal Roundabout, Gatwick Way and Perimeter Road North and the associated footways which form part of the highway). To address this existing issue of overlapping Rights of Way, the footpath is to be stopped up where it is coincident with highways (as is the case elsewhere along the footpaths associated with Sussex Border Path). The Sussex Border Path long distance trail would follow the proposed predominantly shared use path provision that reflects a rationalised version of the current route as stated in Table 4.1.1 of <b>ES Appendix 19.8.1: Public Rights of Way Management Strategy</b> [REP2-009]. The relevant labelled sections of the replacement route on Sheet 1 of the Rights of Way and Access Plans are as follows: c11 (southwestern section), c8 (eastern section), c40, c6, c5, c4, c3 and c2. Waymarking signage would be updated to reflect the revised Sussex Border Path trail route.</p>
TT.1.38	The Applicant	<p><b>Car Parking Strategy</b></p> <p>Table 2 of the <b>Car Parking Strategy</b> [REP1-051] does not provide an estimated total peak parking accumulation, 2047 (equivalent to line H) for the 2047 future baseline. Provide that estimation and also the comparison with the future baseline parking provision.</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:								
		<p>Using the same methodology as was used to derive the passenger parking requirement shown in Table 2 of the <b>Car Parking Strategy</b> <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a> with the Project, which is explained in the answer to TT.1.39 below, the estimated total peak passenger parking accumulation for the future baseline in 2047 would be 59,650. For completeness we have reproduced <b>Table 3</b> below to include the 2047 future baseline requirement below.</p> <p>As acknowledged in paragraph 4.6.5 of <b>The Applicant’s Responses to Actions - ISHs 2-5</b> <a href="#">[REP2-005]</a>, planning permission for the 820 parking spaces at the Hilton hotel has lapsed and those spaces no longer form part of the future baseline or with Project scenarios. The 820 spaces have therefore been removed from the future baseline projects in row M.</p> <p>Row N in the revised <b>Table 3</b> below shows the parking supply that would be required assuming a maximum occupancy of 87.5% of capacity. However, despite removing the Hilton hotel spaces from the calculation, the Applicant is not seeking to increase the number of spaces required for the Project. Rows P and Q have therefore been added to Table 2. Row P shows the proposed additional provision for the future baseline and with Project scenarios (other than the known future baseline parking projects in row M). Row Q shows the overall total passenger parking provision in the future baseline and with Project scenarios.</p> <p><b>Table 3 2047 Car Parking Requirements</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="651 1286 2040 1417"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="651 1286 721 1417"></th> <th data-bbox="725 1286 1570 1417"></th> <th data-bbox="1574 1286 1796 1417">2047 future baseline</th> <th data-bbox="1800 1286 2040 1417">2047 with Project</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="651 1286 721 1417"></td> <td data-bbox="725 1286 1570 1417"></td> <td data-bbox="1574 1286 1796 1417"></td> <td data-bbox="1800 1286 2040 1417"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			2047 future baseline	2047 with Project				
		2047 future baseline	2047 with Project							

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:			
		A	Current on-airport passenger parking provision (2019)	40,600	40,600
		B	Current authorised off-airport passenger parking provision (2019)	21,200	21,200
		C	Total passenger parking provision (2019) (A+B)	<b>61,800</b>	<b>61,800</b>
		D	Peak on-airport passenger parking accumulation (August 2019)	32,000	32,000
		E	Assumed peak off-airport passenger parking accumulation (August 2019)  (87.5% of off-airport provision)	18,550	18,550
		F	Current peak passenger parking accumulation on and off-airport (August 2019) (D+E)	50,550	50,550
		G	Estimated increase factor in number of Park & Fly trips with Project (2019 to 2047)	1.18	1.2
		H	Estimated total peak passenger parking accumulation, 2047 (F x G)	59,650	60,810
		I	Estimated peak passenger parking accumulation accommodated off-airport (87.5% of off-airport provision)	18,550	18,550

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:																												
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>J</td> <td>Estimated on-airport peak passenger parking accumulation to be accommodated, 2047 (H – I)</td> <td>41,100</td> <td>42,260</td> </tr> <tr> <td>K</td> <td>Estimated on-airport passenger parking provision required (allowing for max occupancy of 87.5% of provision) (J / 0.875)</td> <td><b>46,970</b></td> <td><b>48,300</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>L</td> <td>Additional on-airport passenger parking provision required (over and above current) (K – A)</td> <td>6,370</td> <td>7,700</td> </tr> <tr> <td>M</td> <td>Less future baseline projects</td> <td>5,750</td> <td>5,750</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N</td> <td>Additional requirement for the future baseline / Project assuming 87.5% peak occupancy (L – M)</td> <td><b>620</b></td> <td><b>1,950</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>P</td> <td>Expected additional passenger parking provision (in addition to row M)</td> <td><b>0</b></td> <td><b>1,100</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Q</td> <td>Expected total passenger parking provision for the future baseline / Project (A + M + P)</td> <td><b>46,350</b></td> <td><b>47,450</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>The revised <b>Table 3</b> shows that the estimated peak passenger parking accumulation in the 2047 future baseline would be approximately 59,650 vehicles of which 41,100 would be on the airport (row J), assuming 87.5% occupancy of authorised off-airport parking and no change to the capacity of that</p>	J	Estimated on-airport peak passenger parking accumulation to be accommodated, 2047 (H – I)	41,100	42,260	K	Estimated on-airport passenger parking provision required (allowing for max occupancy of 87.5% of provision) (J / 0.875)	<b>46,970</b>	<b>48,300</b>	L	Additional on-airport passenger parking provision required (over and above current) (K – A)	6,370	7,700	M	Less future baseline projects	5,750	5,750	N	Additional requirement for the future baseline / Project assuming 87.5% peak occupancy (L – M)	<b>620</b>	<b>1,950</b>	P	Expected additional passenger parking provision (in addition to row M)	<b>0</b>	<b>1,100</b>	Q	Expected total passenger parking provision for the future baseline / Project (A + M + P)	<b>46,350</b>	<b>47,450</b>
J	Estimated on-airport peak passenger parking accumulation to be accommodated, 2047 (H – I)	41,100	42,260																											
K	Estimated on-airport passenger parking provision required (allowing for max occupancy of 87.5% of provision) (J / 0.875)	<b>46,970</b>	<b>48,300</b>																											
L	Additional on-airport passenger parking provision required (over and above current) (K – A)	6,370	7,700																											
M	Less future baseline projects	5,750	5,750																											
N	Additional requirement for the future baseline / Project assuming 87.5% peak occupancy (L – M)	<b>620</b>	<b>1,950</b>																											
P	Expected additional passenger parking provision (in addition to row M)	<b>0</b>	<b>1,100</b>																											
Q	Expected total passenger parking provision for the future baseline / Project (A + M + P)	<b>46,350</b>	<b>47,450</b>																											

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>parking stock. Applying an 87.5% occupancy rate to the on-airport passenger parking accumulation gives an on-airport capacity required of 46,970 spaces (row K). The airport had 40,600 passenger parking spaces in 2019 and the planned future baseline projects (row M, now excluding the Hilton hotel parking) would increase this to 46,350 spaces (row Q). This would result in peak passenger car park occupancy levels of 89%. Although this is slightly above the target operational maximum of 87.5% occupancy, peak parking demand occurs for a relatively short period during the summer months and the Applicant is confident that it will have the flexibility to manage this additional level of demand.</p> <p>The removal of the 820 Hilton hotel car park spaces from the future baseline parking projects means that in the with Project scenario, the total parking requirement would amount to 48,300 spaces at 87.5% occupancy (row K). The Applicant continues to seek 1,100 additional parking spaces as part of the Project (row P) which would provide a total of 47,450 spaces (row Q). This would result in peak occupancy levels of 89%, which the Applicant considers is manageable for the reasons noted above.</p> <p>The Applicant is aware that the ExA has requested further information about car parking provision and accumulation for each year between 2024 and 2035, through its Rule 17 request issued on 8 April 2024 (item R17a.3 of <a href="#">PD-013</a>). The Applicant will provide a full response to that request at Deadline 4.</p>
TT.1.39	The Applicant	<p><b>Car Parking Strategy</b></p> <p>With reference to Table 2 of the <b>Car Parking Strategy</b> <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a> explain the derivation of the increase factor in Park and Fly trips with the Project. Also provide and explain any similar increase</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>factor for the future baseline projections along with an explanation of any difference between these two factors.</p> <p>The estimate of passenger car parking requirement was made at an early stage in the transport modelling process, because parking provision and location is an input to the strategic model and therefore needed to be defined before the full model runs could be undertaken. The Applicant is keen to ensure that there is sufficient parking capacity available to accommodate park and fly trips and avoid any shortage of capacity leading increased parking in surrounding streets or unauthorised locations, or transferring to kiss-and-fly trips instead.</p> <p>The factor was derived from initial estimates of the change in the number of Park &amp; Fly trips between 2019 and 2032 with the Project, which were available at that time from the mode choice model, together with the anticipated growth in passenger throughput between 2032 and 2047. The factor therefore combines a factor of 1.08 for Park &amp; Fly trips between 2019 and 2032 (drawing on information in Table 133 of <b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-260]</a>) and a factor of 1.11 for growth in passenger throughput between 2032 and 2047 (from 72.3mppa to 80.2mppa), giving an overall factor of 1.2.</p> <p>Using the same methodology for the 2047 future baseline would produce a factor of 1.04 for Park &amp; Fly trips between 2019 and 2032 drawing on information in Table 70 of <b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-260]</a>) and a factor of 1.13 for growth in passenger throughput between 2032 and 2047 (from 59.4mppa to 67.2mppa), giving an overall factor of 1.18.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The differences between the future baseline and with Project factors arise because the rate of passenger growth at the Airport with the Project would be faster between 2019 and 2032 than would be the case in the future baseline. This leads to a greater increase in the number of Park &amp; Fly trips in this period with the Project than without it, although the subsequent rate of growth in passenger throughput would actually be slightly lower (in percentage terms) with the Project than in the future baseline.</p>
TT.1.40	<p>The Applicant RHAs  RPAs</p>	<p><b>Car Parking Strategy</b></p> <p>Paragraph 3.5.5 states that authorised parking demand is calculated to a maximum practical occupancy of 87.5%. Could the approval for future increases in parking not be done on an as and when required basis, linked to mode share targets, to ensure the parking supply is managed on actual demand and not long term forecasting? We note that in paragraph 3.1.1 that this approach is already used to identify, plan consult on and implement any additional car parking.</p> <p>As a commercial operator, the Applicant only provides as much on-airport parking capacity as is needed, with due reference to mode shares and demand. As noted in its response to question TT.1.34 above, this has been effective in accommodating passenger growth at the Airport, whilst simultaneously reducing car mode share. This will remain the Applicant's approach in the future, including in delivery of the Project and having regard to the Surface Access Commitments (Doc Ref.5.3 v2), which are a binding requirement under the DCO.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Due to the variable nature of peak demand, passenger mix and seasonal mode shares, the lead time for implementing any additional capacity (in the form of decking, multi-storey car parks or even surface parking) and the corresponding impact on existing parking during construction, some element of forecasting is necessary in order to avoid either over-supply or under-supply. The DCO is providing for an increase of 1,100 spaces over the assessment period and GAL would not anticipate the additional spaces to be required until after 2032. However, this will depend on the above variables and an increase in the operational efficiency to ensure capacity is used most effectively. Delivering insufficient capacity would risk an increase in demand for off-airport unauthorised parking, which the Surface Access Commitments seeks to avoid. The mode share commitments mean that any concern that harm may arise from an over provision of parking is protected against by the need for the Applicant to meet the mode share commitments and that there is no need to control parking numbers as well.</p>
TT.1.41	The Applicant	<p><b>Parking Levels and Mode Share Comparison Table</b></p> <p>Provide a table showing the Proposed Development comparison with the Future Baseline for the years 2019, 2029, 2032 and 2047 of target (or actual) mode shares, estimated parking accumulations and parking provision.</p> <p>The following table (<b>Table 4</b>) sets out the information requested.</p> <p>For the purposes of the calculation the table assumes that the existing (2019) number of authorised off-airport passenger parking spaces (21,200 spaces) remains constant over the period to 2047. The</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:																								
		<p>Applicant has no control over this figure since these off-airport sites are authorised through planning permission from the relevant local planning authority.</p> <p>As acknowledged in paragraph 4.6.5 of <b>The Applicant’s Responses to Actions - ISHs 2-5</b> [<a href="#">REP2-005</a>], planning permission for the 820 parking spaces at the Hilton hotel has lapsed and those spaces no longer form part of the future baseline or with Project scenarios. The 820 spaces have therefore been removed from the expected passenger parking provision in the years 2029, 2032 and 2047 in the table. The figures for 2047 correspond with those shown in the revised Table 2 contained in the answer to TT.1.38.</p> <p><b>Table 4 Comparison of car parking figures between the future baseline and with the Project</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th></th> <th>2019</th> <th>2029</th> <th>2032</th> <th>2047</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Future baseline</td> <td>Estimated (actual) peak passenger parking accumulation on-airport</td> <td>32,000</td> <td>33,520</td> <td>34,020</td> <td>41,100</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Passenger parking capacity required (at 87.5% maximum occupancy)</td> <td>36,571</td> <td>38,310</td> <td>38,880</td> <td>46,970</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Expected (actual) passenger parking provision available on-airport</td> <td>40,600</td> <td>46,350</td> <td>46,350</td> <td>46,350</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			2019	2029	2032	2047	Future baseline	Estimated (actual) peak passenger parking accumulation on-airport	32,000	33,520	34,020	41,100		Passenger parking capacity required (at 87.5% maximum occupancy)	36,571	38,310	38,880	46,970		Expected (actual) passenger parking provision available on-airport	40,600	46,350	46,350	46,350
		2019	2029	2032	2047																					
Future baseline	Estimated (actual) peak passenger parking accumulation on-airport	32,000	33,520	34,020	41,100																					
	Passenger parking capacity required (at 87.5% maximum occupancy)	36,571	38,310	38,880	46,970																					
	Expected (actual) passenger parking provision available on-airport	40,600	46,350	46,350	46,350																					



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:					
			Target (actual) PT mode share	45.7%	51.5%	52.2%	52%
		With Project	Estimated peak parking accumulation		30,480	36,550	42,260
			Passenger parking capacity required (at 87.5% maximum occupancy)		34,830	41,770	48,300
			Expected parking provision available*		46,350	46,350	47,450
			Target PT mode share		54.2%	55.2%	55.9%

\* not allowing for any spaces temporarily lost as a result of construction activity

The table assumes that the additional 5,750 passenger parking spaces which would be provided in the future baseline situation (paragraph 3.4.2 of the **Car Parking Strategy** [[REP1-051](#)]), but excluding the 820 spaces at the Hilton hotel) would all be in place before 2029.

The revised figures show that in the 2047 future baseline, the expected peak passenger parking accumulation would be some 41,400 vehicles. Having removed the 820 Hilton hotel spaces from the provision, it is expected that 46,350 on-airport passenger parking spaces would be provided, and the peak parking accumulation would therefore equate to around 89% occupancy.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In the 2047 with Project scenario, the expected peak passenger parking accumulation would be 42,460 vehicles and the expected provision would be 47,450 spaces, having excluded the 820 Hilton hotel spaces. Peak accumulation would therefore equate to around 89% occupancy.</p> <p>Although a peak of 89% occupancy in each case is slightly above the target operational maximum of 87.5% occupancy, the Applicant is confident that it will have the flexibility to manage this peak parking demand bearing in mind that it would occur for a relatively short period during the summer.</p>
TT.1.42	The Applicant	<p><b>ES Appendix 5.4.1 Surface Access Commitments</b></p> <p>With respect to the <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> <a href="#">[APP-088]</a>, in order to inform the ExA's consideration of progress being made in meeting mode share targets provide an update of when the following information will be available:</p> <p>a) 2023 staff travel survey information; and</p> <p>b) Latest passenger mode share information.</p> <hr/> <p>a) 2023 staff travel survey information has been submitted at Deadline 2 as part of <b>The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5</b> <a href="#">[REP2-005]</a> - see Section 4.2 and Appendix D.</p> <p>b) <b>The Transport Assessment</b> <a href="#">[AS-079]</a> referenced latest CAA 2022 passenger mode share information. 2023 CAA data is now available and this shows a slight increase in public transport mode</p>

**ExQ1**
**Question to:**
**Question:**

share to 44.1%, compared to private car 37.9% and taxi/minicab/uber at 16.7%. The table below (**Table 5**) provides both the 2022 and 2023 CAA data for comparison.

**Table 5 2022 and 2023 CAA data**

Mode	2022 (as in Transport Assessment)	2023
Rail	40.6%	38.9%
Coach / bus	3.2%	5.2%
Private car	37.7%	37.9%
Taxi	17.0%	16.7%
Car rental	1.1%	1.1%
Other	0.4%	0.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%