



## 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.

### Scope

- 1.6 This technical note provides a commentary on the Applicant's Response ("the Response") to the Examining Authority's Written Questions – Traffic and Transport.
- 1.7 At the time of preparing this technical note (25<sup>th</sup> April 2024), the Applicant had not submitted a response to the Examining Authority's Rule 17 request for further information, which was due to be provided by 19<sup>th</sup> April 2024. The comments below therefore do not benefit from this additional information and a further response will be provided following receipt. It is acknowledged that answers to the comments raised below may be provided in response to the Rule 17 request.

## Parking

- 1.8 The provision of sufficient safe and attractive car parking is essential to minimising impacts arising from the Project. Failure to provide safe and suitable car parking will lead to adverse road safety and highway capacity impacts including:
1. Drivers circulating on the local road network looking for somewhere to park. This will lead to increased journey distances locally with drivers unnecessarily travelling through, and increasing the risk at, multiple local junctions – possibly repeatedly whilst looking for somewhere to park.
  2. Nuisance and inappropriate car parking on surrounding roads and streets, blocking or reducing access for local residents and businesses which in turn can lead to increased risk of road safety incidents and loss of amenity.
  3. In particular with regards to drop-off / pick-up, vehicles stopping on street or on / adjacent to private premises causing delay and unacceptable road safety impacts.
- 1.9 The Applicant is questioned regarding the following broad car parking types:
1. On-airport car parking
  2. Authorised off-airport car parking
  3. On-street car parking
  4. Pick-up / drop-off capacity
- 1.10 Given the importance of providing sufficient safe and attractive car parking in order to avoid unnecessary and unacceptable road safety, highway capacity and local amenity impacts, it is surprising that the Applicant appears to know so little about how their staff and guests travel to and from the Airport.
- 1.11 The Applicant is able to provide information regarding on-airport car parking, there is no information provided regarding the extent of authorised off-airport car parking nor regarding on-street car parking.
- 1.12 It is acknowledged that the Applicant does not control authorised off-airport car parking or on-street car parking. However as delivery of the Project can be expected to result in an increase in demand for authorised off-airport car parking and on-street car parking, it is not unreasonable to expect the Applicant to be able to provide a forecast of how this is likely to change. Whether the Applicant is able to control these matters or not is to a large part immaterial. What is material is understanding:
1. how demand for authorised off-airport car parking and on-street car parking will change, and
  2. where these changes are most likely to occur,
- in order to be able to understand the magnitude of impact arising from them and identify suitable mitigation as required.
- 1.13 It is the case that in the absence of the Project, these changes in authorised off-airport car parking and on-street car parking would not arise and hence the associated impacts are directly attributable to the Project and should be assessed and mitigated (where necessary) as part of the DCO. Failure to adequately mitigate these impacts could result in adverse road safety, highway capacity and local amenity impacts to the detriment of local businesses and residents.
- 1.14 Turning to pick-up and drop-off, it is noted that the Applicant refers to “flexibility” in the way space is allocated to different road users. The Project is likely to result in an increased demand for pick-up / drop-off space and it is not unreasonable to expect the Applicant to have an understanding of the future pick-up / drop-off arrival / departure profile and thereby be able to design sufficient space to cater for it. The absence of sufficient space will result in vehicles stopping in inappropriate locations to drop-off / pick-up to the detriment of local businesses and residents.

- 1.15 It is noted that Table 1 of the Response is clear that the car parking space per mppa ratio at the Airport with the Project in place will reduce compared to the existing situation. The Applicant argues that this is reflective of the benefits of the sustainable travel measures that will be delivered, which will see a reduction in the percentage of people travelling to and from the Airport by car.
- 1.16 However as the Applicant states, they do not control authorised off-airport car parking or on-street car parking. Therefore a reduction in the rate of car parking provision could result in an increase in demand for authorised off-airport car parking or on-street car parking. As noted above, the magnitude and associated impacts of this has not been forecast or assessed. Further increases in demand arising from failure to provide sufficient on-airport car parking will lead to increased adverse road safety, highway capacity and local amenity impacts to the further detriment of local businesses and residents.

### Mode Choice

- 1.17 It is noteworthy that rather than clarifying how mode choice has been calculated, the Response appears to make it less clear.
- 1.18 It is understood from the Response that mode choice is measured at the point of entering the Airport curtilage. This would appear to fail to record car journeys made by people parking in authorised off-airport car parking or on-street car parking and subsequently travelling to the Airport by another mode.
- 1.19 As a consequence the number of people travelling by non-car modes could be significantly over-estimated and the traffic modelling failing to appropriately account for car journeys made by people to the Crawley area who subsequently change modes for the final short leg of the journey.
- 1.20 The potential impact of this 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.
- 1.21 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.
- 1.22 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.

### Sustainable Transport Fund

- 1.23 The provision of a sustainable transport fund (STF) is welcomed. The purpose of this should be, inter alia, to ensure that:
1. Through the provision of incentives to travel by non-car modes, that the volume of traffic arising from the Project in operation does not exceed that which is forecast.
  2. As a consequence of the above, demand for car parking and / or pick-up /drop-off does not exceed forecast.
- 1.24 However the STF in itself is insufficient to deliver change. There must be a comprehensive monitoring programme established in order to understand how people are travelling and hence how the STF is best applied.
- 1.25 As outlined above, at this stage the Applicant seems to have little idea regarding the number of people who will utilise authorised off-airport car parking or on-street car parking or indeed on- or off-airport pick-up /drop-off. Moreover the traffic volume forecasts appear to ignore vehicle trips to and from off-airport car parking or on-street car parking and certainly off-airport pick-up /drop-off in the vicinity of the Airport. The baseline on which a monitoring programme can be set up is therefore not yet established.

- 1.26 For the STF to be beneficial, there must be clear mode choice / traffic volume / car park usage targets that the Applicant must meet with equally clear remedial actions to be taken to rectify failures to meet the targets up to and including temporary suspension of flights if needed to meet targets.
- 1.27 Failure to meet mode choice / traffic volume / car park usage targets will result in adverse road safety, highway capacity and local amenity impacts to the detriment of local businesses and residents.