



Horsham  
District  
Council



# **GATWICK AIRPORT NORTHERN RUNWAY PROJECT**

Planning Inspectorate's Reference: TR020005

## **Legal Partnership Authorities**

### **Comments on The Applicant's Response To The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1)**

#### **Response to [[REP3-091](#)] | General and Cross Topic**

**DEADLINE 4: 15 May 2024**

Crawley Borough Council (GATW-AFP107)

Horsham District Council (20044739)

Mid Sussex District Council (20044737)

West Sussex County Council (20044715)

Reigate and Banstead Borough Council (20044474)

Surrey County Council (20044665)

East Sussex County Council (20044514)

Tandridge District Council (GATW-S57419)

## Legal Partnership Authorities' Comments on the Applicant's Responses To The ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1)

### Response to [\[REP3-091\]](#) | General and Cross Topic

The Legal Partnership Authorities are comprised of the following host and neighbouring Authorities who are jointly represented by Michael Bedford KC and Sharpe Pritchard LLP for the purposes of the Examination:

- Crawley Borough Council
- Horsham District Council
- Mid Sussex District Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- Surrey County Council
- East Sussex County Council; and
- Tandridge District Council.

In these submissions, the Legal Partnership Authorities may be referred to as the “*Legal Partnership Authorities*”, the “*Authorities*”, the “*Joint Local Authorities (“JLAs”)*” or the “*Councils*”. Please note that Mole Valley District Council are also part of the Legal Partnership Authorities for some parts of the Examination (namely, those aspects relating to legal agreements entered into between the Applicant and any of the Legal Partnership Authorities).

#### Introduction

1. The Legal Partnership Authorities have now had the opportunity to review the Applicant's responses to ExQ1 in conjunction with their specialist consultants and legal advisors.
2. The Applicant provided their response to ExQ1 in the form of 19 separate written submissions to the examination together with annexes. For the ExA's ease of review, the Legal Partnership Authorities set out their comments on the Applicants responses in the final column of the table below.
3. Where the Legal Partnership Authorities have decided not to comment on one of the Applicant's responses, this question has been deleted from the table below.
4. For the avoidance of doubt, where the Legal Partnership Authorities have decided not to comment on one of the Applicant's responses this should not be taken to indicate that the Legal Partnership Authorities agree with the response.
5. At deadline 4, the Legal Partnership Authorities have submitted a paper authored by their specialist aviation consultants at York Aviation LLP entitled “Response to Additional Documents Submitted at Deadline 3 – Case for the Scheme and Related Matters” (the “**York Aviation Deadline 4 Paper**”).
6. **The York Aviation Deadline 4 Paper addresses issues relating to the case for the scheme thematically and includes further commentary on the Applicant's responses to the ExQ1 questions relating to this topic.**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant’s Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities’ Response
<b>GENERAL AND CROSS-TOPIC</b>			
GEN.1.4	The Applicant	<p><b>Alternatives</b></p> <p>In ES Chapter 3 [APP-028] three scenarios are considered – Do Minimum (Scenario 1), making best use of its existing runways (Scenario 2) and a second runway (Scenario 3).</p> <p>Are these realistic alternatives to the Proposed Development?</p> <hr/> <p>The three scenarios mentioned in <b>ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered</b> [APP-028] were developed, presented and consulted on as part of the Applicant’s draft <b>2019 Master Plan</b> for the Airport’s longer term future in view of increasing demand. They represented alternative approaches, considering Gatwick remaining as a single-runway operation (Scenario 1), dual runway operations through the routine use of the existing northern runway (Scenario 2) and the continued safeguarding for a future, new southern runway (Scenario 3). Scenario 2 was ultimately taken forward as the preferred option for the reasons set out in the concluding paragraphs 3.4.12 to 3.4.17 of <b>ES Chapter 3: Alternatives Considered</b> [APP-028]; however, Scenarios 1 and 3 were valid and realistic alternatives to the question of how Gatwick could</p>	<p>The Gatwick Masterplan 2019 makes clear that the three scenarios it sets out are not exclusive choices; Gatwick could transition from one to another within the timeframes of the master plan (para 7 in the Executive Summary) and para 1.2.8 “There are three broad ways that – used either together or in combination – might enable Gatwick to grow to meet increasing demand for air travel”.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		develop to accommodate increased demand.	
GEN.1.5	The Applicant	<p><b>Second Runway to the South</b></p> <p>Paragraph 3.7.2 of ES Chapter 3 [APP-028] states that Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) is not actively pursuing the option of a second runway to the south of the existing runway:</p> <p>a) Clarify this statement.</p> <p>How is this land reflected in local planning policy and can the safeguarded land be released? If not, why not?</p> <hr/> <p>a) The current Gatwick Airport Master Plan was published in July 2019 and confirmed that Gatwick is no longer actively pursuing plans for an additional runway to the south, but nevertheless also confirmed that there remains a possibility of building and operating one in the future. Following an extensive amount of work undertaken during the Airports Commission process in 2015 to develop a detailed master plan for the additional runway, no further work has been undertaken by the Applicant on developing the scheme or carrying out environmental surveys to the level necessary for the preparation of a planning application.</p>	<p>CBC's adopted, and Modifications Draft Local Plan, (Policy GAT2 in both), safeguard land to the south of Gatwick for a potential future southern runway, as required by the Aviation Policy Framework 2013. The Government's consultation on the policy proposals for its Aviation Strategy, Aviation 2050, published in December 2018, after the Airports National Policy Statement, states in paragraph 3.66 that it is "prudent to continue with a safeguarding policy to maintain a supply of land for future national requirements..." Aviation 2050 also states that the Government is not at the point of making a decision on long term (beyond 2030) need and that it proposed to ask the National Infrastructure Commission to include airport capacity in future national infrastructure assessments to determine if there is a needs case for further runways beyond 2030 (paragraph 3.13). The second National Infrastructure Assessment Baseline report (November 2021) states that the future demand for air travel, and the approach to expanding runway capacity in the South East is currently unclear. Therefore, the Second Assessment will not further consider airport capacity (page 63). The Second Assessment was published in October 2023 and does not include any reference to airport capacity. Therefore, CBC reluctantly concluded that, as there is no certainty in Government policy that land at Gatwick is no longer required to be safeguarded, the emerging Local Plan needed to retain the safeguarding policy.</p> <p>Following conclusion of the Local Plan examination hearings, the Local Plan Inspectors issued a post-hearing letter dated 31 January. This endorses the</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land to the south of the existing runway at Gatwick has been safeguarded through local planning policy for a new full length additional runway after it was first required to be safeguarded in the Government's 2003 Aviation White Paper - The Future of Air Transport (Dec 2003), DFT, para 11.11. This requirement was adopted into local planning policy through the Crawley Borough Council Core Strategy in 2007 and reaffirmed again in the adopted Crawley Borough Local Plan (2015 – 2030) published in December 2015 (see Chapter 9 and policy GAT2). The Draft Crawley Borough Local Plan (2024 – 2040) Submission Publication Consultation May – June 2023, (which is currently being independently examined by the Secretary of State) also confirms that land at Gatwick is still required to be safeguarded for a potential additional runway (see para 10.17 and 10.18) and, as such, draft policy GAT2 continues to identify a significant amount of land that is safeguarded from development which would be incompatible with the expansion of the airport to accommodate the construction of an additional wide spaced runway. Following public hearings in November 2023 and January 2024, the Inspectors set out their initial preliminary findings including on the Draft Local Plan's general approach to Gatwick Airport being sound albeit matters of detail need to be addressed. The Draft Local Plan is currently under-going further consultation on the Main Modifications, but with the principle of continued safeguarding having been established. Releasing safeguarded land would also be contrary to government policy as set out in the Aviation</li> </ul>	<p>Local Plan's approach to the safeguarding of land critical for an expanded Gatwick Airport.</p> <p>However, given the significant constraints that safeguarding imposes on the ability of the borough to meet its housing and other development needs, the adopted Local Plan at paragraph 1.33 and the Modifications Draft Local Plan consultation draft at para 1.36 confirm that a review of the Local Plan will be triggered should national aviation policy clarify that safeguarding can be removed at Gatwick. CBC would seek this certainty from the Secretary of State should consent be granted for the Project, given the significant impacts of safeguarding on development in the borough and the very limited prospect then that a southern runway would be constructed before 2050. Gatwick would be continually growing its capacity, and the Project air transport movements would use all those included for Gatwick in the Jet Zero modelling.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>Policy Framework 2013 (para 5.8 and 5.9), Aviation 2050 Dec 2018 (para 3.66) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (para 110).</p>	
<p>GEN.1.12</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p><b>Securing Air Quality Monitoring</b></p> <p>Paragraph 8.5.18 of the Planning Statement [APP-245] states that air quality monitoring commitments are intended to be secured under the s106 agreement.</p> <p>Why is such monitoring not to be secured under the DCO?</p> <hr/> <p>In the context of the conclusions of the <b>Air Quality Environmental Assessment</b> [APP-038], and the absence of any significant effects identified as a result of the Project, it was not considered necessary or appropriate for this monitoring to be secured as a requirement to the DCO. However, in acknowledgment of the monitoring arrangements under the existing 2022 s106 Agreement, the Applicant is happy to continue to support the understanding of air pollution effects more generally in the local area, and accordingly GAL is proposing to commit to continued monitoring obligations under the new DCO s106 Agreement. <b>Appendix A of The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5</b> [REP2-005] contains a table showing the commitments in the existing s106 Agreement and how those are proposed to be treated in</p>	<p>The section 106 agreement, as currently drafted, expires 9 years after opening (2038), yet the emissions inventory shows pollution from the airport increasing between 2038 and 2047 (with the applicant refusing to model 2047), indicating an ongoing need for monitoring around the airport.</p> <p>Therefore the Joint Authorities view is that if monitoring cannot be secured via the s106 agreement to 2047 or 389,000 movements i.e. the airport at full capacity (with the opportunity to extend monitoring beyond 2047 if needed at that time) then securing monitoring under the DCO would provide a more secure mechanism for the monitoring commitments.</p> <p>The Applicant's response does not give a clear explanation of why air quality monitoring is not secured under the DCO, other than the Applicant does not consider it necessary because their assessment finds no significant effects in line with current air quality standards.</p> <p>Although limits are not currently being exceeded, scientific and medical evidence is evolving resulting in WHO target values for nitrogen dioxide being lowered to 10 µg/m<sup>3</sup> from 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, and EU nitrogen dioxide standards reduced from 40 µg/m<sup>3</sup> to 20 µg/m<sup>3</sup>. Monitoring to ensure mitigations remain effective in safeguarding local air quality in the long term (i.e. over the lifetime of the project) is therefore still needed.</p> <p>In addition the local authorities have pointed out in the response to AQ1.1 that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- air pollution such as nitrogen dioxide is a 'no threshold' pollutant and thus has a health impact on the communities surrounding the airport effectively down to zero exposure hence monitoring is important.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>the DCO s106 Agreement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is also important to ensure that pollution levels around the airport are falling and not rising regardless of the standard, as while the applicant makes much of no UK standards being breached it appears to miss the fact that UK policy in relation to air pollution has moved on from a simple pass / fail approach, to ensuring that levels of pollution exposure are reduced over time and that any new developments should help in this process - as outlined at the start of the AQ sections for the Surrey LIR [REP1-097] and West Sussex LIR [REP1-068].</li> </ul> <p>It is also worth noting that that while the headline level of pollution is falling, on the Horley Gardens Estate at some sites this headline fall masks a significant change in the nature of the pollution exposure, with the falls in airport related road traffic NOx pollution at the RG1 site for example more than offset by the rise in aircraft related NOx pollution Surrey LIR (chapter 11 para 11.88 and table 11.5) [REP1-097].</p> <p>The joint authorities also note that the applicant expresses a wish to support the understanding of air pollution effects more generally in the local area by continuing its current funding for monitoring for RBBC. However, the support is not extended wider. A request from Crawley borough council for funding for its air quality monitoring station on the airport's eastern border was turned down by the applicant.</p>
<p>GEN.1.21</p>	<p>The Applicant  Relevant Planning Authorities</p>	<p><b>Good Design</b></p> <p>Comment on the desirability of implementing the following measures to ensure that good quality sustainable design and integration of the Proposed Development into the landscape is achieved in the detailed design, construction and operation of the project. How might they be</p>	<p>Please refer to the detailed response to this provided by the Authorities at Deadline 3 [REP3-135]. The Authorities are disappointed to that the Applicant's design approach does not involve engagement with the wider community and only limited engagement with the discharging Authorities, it is not considered this approach will secure high quality design outcomes.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
	(RPA)	<p>secured? Are any further measures appropriate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) A 'design champion' at board level to advise on the quality of sustainable design and the spatial integration of the proposed structures, buildings, new landscape features, and visual amenity.</li> <li>b) A 'design review panel' to provide informed 'critical-friend' comment on the developing sustainable design proposals;</li> <li>c) An approved 'design code' or 'design approach document' to set out the approach to delivering the detailed design specifications to achieve good quality sustainable design;</li> <li>d) An outline, including timeline, of the proposed design process, including consultation with stakeholders and a list of proposed consultees.</li> </ul> <p>In the opinion of CBC and other local authorities where relevant, would the implementation of any or all of the above measures assist in determining post-consent approvals (including the discharge of requirements) in relation to achieving good design?</p> <p>By way of introduction the Applicant is grateful for this question and wants the ExA to be aware that it has sparked a conversation within</p>	



ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>GAL about the approach to take; recognising the importance of good design to the airport and its community. As set out below, design issues are already taken very seriously and consulted on widely but the Applicant would like the opportunity to explore further the ideas prompted by the question and to develop its response through the examination.</p> <p>a) GAL's Chief Technical Officer is responsible for overseeing design matters and sits on GAL's Executive Management Board. The Chief Technical Officer has overall responsibility for the Airport's development programme and construction as well as sustainability. The Applicant is exploring whether that approach could be supplemented by additional advice.</p> <p>b) Securing good design is an important feature of GAL's procurement process and the Applicant carefully considers the appointment of its contractors / designers, including those who have a track record and examples of airport developments. In addition, the Applicant can call on the expertise of its major shareholders Vinci Airports, who own / manage / operate nearly 70 different airports world-wide, and who have a particular interest and specialism in airport design. The Applicant will consider the desirability of a design review panel for certain key buildings in light of comments received by the local authorities.</p> <p>c) The <b>Design Principles</b> (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3), secured under</p>	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>Requirement 4 of the <b>dDCO</b> (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6) contain detailed built-form design principles (DBF1 to DBF36) which describe matters to be reflected in the detailed design, including building finishes, external materials and the appearance of new buildings. The detailed design of each Project component will be controlled through the approval and consultation processes with the relevant Local Authorities set out in Requirement 4 and 5 of the <b>Draft DCO</b> (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6). As specified in Requirements 4 and 5, the detailed design must be in accordance with the design principles contained in the <b>DAS Appendix 1</b>.</p> <p>d) The detailed design process will take place in accordance with Requirement 4 of the dDCO. Design details (layout, siting, scale and external appearance) for all parts of the authorised development except for highway works and excepted development (as defined) must be submitted to and approved by Crawley Borough Council (in consultation with the other borough councils to the extent relevant). The timing of this process will depend on the particular work in question (within the bounds of the timescales specified in Schedule 11 of the dDCO), and will take into account the indicative construction sequencing. For highway works, design details are subject to approval by the relevant highway authority under Requirement 5 or, for national highway works, National Highways under Requirement 6 and the provisions for the protection of National Highways in Part 3 of Schedule 9 to the dDCO. Crawley Borough Council must be consulted on the detailed design for</p>	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>excepted development in the same manner as it would be consulted for such development (being that which the Applicant as airport operator can bring forward under permitted development rights) currently, under Requirement 4(4). Excepted development must be carried out in accordance with the Design Principles (Doc Ref. 7.3 v3) by virtue of Requirement 4(5).</p> <p>In addition to the approval process described above, the Applicant also has existing processes in place to engage with and consult key stakeholders on design matters on an on-going basis, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Passenger Advisory Group (a sub group of GATCOM) on matters such as way finding, design, passenger ambience, etc.</li> <li>• more specialist input may be sought from the Independent Gatwick Accessibility Panel on accessibility issues;</li> <li>• Airlines – through the Airline Consultative Committee (ACC) in relation to developments identified in the Capital Investment Plan;</li> <li>• GAL's Aerodrome Safeguarding Team in relation to aerodrome safety and navigational aid safeguarding requirements, including building design, use of materials and landscaping considerations.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant is internally considering whether additional processes</p>	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>would be beneficial and would like the opportunity to develop this response.</p>	
<p>GEN.1.22</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p><b>Sustainable Design</b></p> <p>a) Explain the steps that have been undertaken to ensure that the Proposed Development achieves a good quality of sustainable design and integrated into the landscape. How are these measures secured?</p> <p>Explain the measures to be taken to ensure the standards of sustainable design. Will (building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) Excellent (or higher) certification be incorporated into the scheme design? How would this be secured?</p> <hr/> <p>For the proposed approach to sustainable design please refer to the response to GEN 1.18 above.</p> <p>With respect to integration into the landscape, the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) forms <b>ES Appendix 8.8.1 [REP2-021, REP2-023, REP2-025, REP2-027]</b> and is secured through Requirement 8 of the draft DCO. The report defines the distinctive landscape and ecological zones within the site. The report describes how the Project will be developed and the outline mitigation and enhancement measures which have been prepared based on a set of environmental objectives including landscape integration, landscape</p>	<p>The Authorities wish to see the Applicant address in full the local sustainability policies set out in the Crawley Borough Local Plan, these policies are evidenced and justified through the local plan examination process and reflect the local situation within the borough.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>amenity, public access and biodiversity. Outline landscape proposals at Figures 1.2.1 to 1.2.18 have been developed to illustrate the broad concept of soft and hard landscape proposals within the Project. Landscape elements have been defined which describe the range of soft landscape treatments that will be implemented to enhance the landscape zones.</p> <p>Our approach to BREEAM standards is contained in Volume 5, Section 6 of the <b>DAS [REP2-036]</b> Sustainability accreditation schemes are one way of achieving sustainable outcomes. Different schemes are available for different types of assets and covering different sustainability issues. GAL will consider whether the use of sustainability accreditation schemes will result in sustainability outcomes that may otherwise not be achieved and this would be explained at the time details are submitted in relation to dDCO requirement 4 (Version 6.0 of the dDCO submitted at Deadline 3 (Doc Ref. 2.1 v6).</p>	
GEN.1.28	The Applicant	<p><b>Future Baseline - 2500 Net Increase in Robotic Parking.</b></p> <p>The Airport Surface Access Strategy 2022-2030 is a reference document in ES Appendix 5.4 [APP-090] Surface Access Commitments in which it is stated on page 40 “<i>2,500 incremental spaces from robotic parking – the trial phase of this project is anticipated to re-start in 2023, with full incremental capacity coming on stream in phases over subsequent years subject to an Environmental Screening Assessment and planning approval.</i>”. Given no submission has yet been made date to CBC concerning these additional spaces,</p>	<p>As set out in the West Sussex LIR [REP1-068] paragraphs 17.68 and 17.69, and the West Sussex Authorities 'D3 submission [REP3-117] para 2.5.9, the Authorities still question whether it is appropriate for the Future Baseline to simply assume that these spaces can come forward through Permitted Development. This 2500 space increase should be considered as part of the Project and, if further development, which is not authorised by the DCO, is to take place at the airport, it should be subject to control by the local planning authority. The Applicant's potential ability to greatly increase the amount of on-airport parking in this way highlights the need for control over future parking provision which would</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>explain:</p> <p>a) If the trial phase of 100 spaces been completed?: and</p> <p>Why the additional 2500 spaces yet to be implemented should not be included in the Project parking allocation.</p> <p>The Applicant launched a 100-space trial of the robotic parking equipment on site in the South Terminal Long Stay car park, but this was paused in 2020 due to the Covid pandemic. The results of the trial were positive and provided proof of concept for operation at Gatwick Airport. Progress towards delivering the full 2,500 spaces has been delayed due to the pandemic and required changes to car park operations during the airport's recovery, noting the South Terminal itself reopened only two years ago. The Applicant provided information in relation to the proposed additional 2,500 robotic parking spaces and its status as part of the Future Baseline in respect to Action Point 7 of ISH4 in paragraphs 4.6.42 and 4.6.3 of the <b>Applicant's Response to Actions from ISHs 2 to 5 [REP2-005]</b>, which is considered to address the ExA's query under part (b) of this question</p>	<p>otherwise not be controlled.</p>
GEN.1.30	The Applicant	<p><b>Future Baseline – ES Chapter 12 Transport</b></p> <p>Has any assessment in the ES been done of the future baseline transport</p>	<p>The Applicant's response to the ExA's question about the assessment of the Future Baseline in ES Chapter 12 Transport [APP-037] is noted. Based on</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>effects of either the increase of movement from the 2023 40.9 mppa or the 2019 baseline 46.6 mppa to the future baseline levels of 57.3 mppa in 2029, 59.4 mppa in 2032 and 67.2 mppa in 2047?</p> <p>As set out in Sections 2.2 and 2.3 of <b>The Applicant's Response to Actions from Issue Specific Hearing 4: Surface Transport [REP1-065]</b>, the approach to trassessing the Project in ES Chapter 12 is in keeping with the ES Scoping Request submitted to and the Scoping Opinion subsequently issued by the Planning Inspectorate in October 2019. The ES does not require separate assessments of the transport effects of increased air passenger numbers that could occur in scenarios without the Project.</p> <p>The <b>Transport Assessment [AS-079]</b> and <b>ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport [AS-076]</b> considers the performance of the transport networks under the combined demand from 'business as usual' Airport growth, background growth resulting from increased population, employment and economic activity, and the additional demand that would result from dual runway operations as part of the Project. This performance is compared to performance without the additional demand from the Project and therefore the modelling used for the assessment does test the future baseline scenarios as well as the with Project scenarios.</p> <p>The <b>Transport Assessment Annex B Strategic Transport Modelling</b></p>	<p>discussions that took place at Issue Specific Hearing 7, and the Applicant's statement at the start of Compulsory Acquisition Hearing, the Joint Authorities await further information from the Applicant in relation to the sensitivity tests of the Future Baseline. The Applicant has stated that they will continue to engage with York Aviation until Deadline 4. Should agreement not be reached between the Applicant and York Aviation, a sensitivity test of a revised, lower than the currently assessed, future baseline will be undertaken and submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 5. The Joint Local Authorities will assess this information and the impacts it has on ES Chapter 12 Transport [APP-037] once this information is submitted.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p><b>Report</b> [APP-260] provides a more detailed assessment of the performance of future transport networks in the absence of the Project. This takes account of the projected 'business as usual' growth at the Airport, together with background growth, but excludes additional Airport growth associated with the Project. The <b>Transport Assessment Annex B Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> [APP-260] covers the following points:</p> <p><b>Mode share:</b></p> <p>In the future baseline scenarios, air passenger mode shares are forecast to continue to move away from car and towards public transport, with public transport mode share for passengers forecast to increase from 43% in 2016 to 52% in 2047. This is a response to increasing congestion and journey times on the highway network, increased parking and forecourt access charges over time and improvements to bus and rail provision, all in the absence of the Project. Future baseline employee mode shares are forecast to increase from 29% in 2016 to 35% in 2047.</p> <p><b>Highway network performance in the future baseline:</b></p> <p>Section 11.8 of <b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> [APP-260] discusses the changes in highway performance from a 2016 base year to each of the future baseline years. The information is presented in terms of changes in</p>	



ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>vehicle flows, journey times, volume to capacity ratios for highway links and the magnitude of impact at junctions. These are reported in more detail by performance area in Section 11.9 of <b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260]</b>. In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road traffic flows are expected to increase as a result of background growth and 'business as usual' growth at the Airport through all the future baseline assessment years. The most significant increase in road traffic would be on the strategic road network, resulting in increased congestion and journey times over the modelled period. Additionally, the majority of the M25 within the Area of Detailed Modelling (AoDM) would operate with a Volume over Capacity (V/C) ratios of over 90% from the 2032 future baseline onwards and there would also be sections of both the M23 and A27 with V/C ratios above 90%.</li> <li>• In Performance Area A (Gatwick, Crawley and Horley) the model shows a number of increases in V/C ratios and/or journey times in the vicinity of the Airport as a consequence of 'business as usual' Airport-related and background growth. The future baseline scheme at South Terminal and North Terminal plays a role in helping to mitigate these impacts.</li> <li>• In performance area B (M25 to A272) the model shows that the majority of locations affected by future baseline growth would be on</li> </ul>	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>the M25 in both directions between J6 and J8. There would also be some impacts in the Redhill area and on the A264 at Cophorne and East Grinstead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Performance Area C (Inter-London) the model shows a number of impacts in the Croydon and Sutton areas resulting from future baseline growth, with a small number also on the M25. However, much of this is due to 'model noise' in this area that results from additional growth in an area that is already congested. This growth would also contribute to increased journey times on routes through the area over the modelled period.</li> <li>• In Performance Area D (A272 to A27) the model highlights potential impacts of future baseline growth at junctions in the Burgess Hill area alongside increases in the number of links at or over capacity in this area.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>Rail network performance in the future baseline:</i></b></p> <p>Tables 110 to 115 and 117 to 122 of <b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260]</b> provide information on the rail crowding factors for the base year (2016) and the future baseline years for the morning and evening peak periods. Overall rail growth between 2016 and 2047 is forecast to be 48%, an annual average growth rate of just over 1% per year. On the Brighton Main Line, there would be standing in all future years in increasing</p>	

ExQ1	Question to:	Question and Applicant's Answer	Legal Partnership Authorities' Response
		<p>numbers in the peak periods between east Croydon and London Bridge and between Clapham Junction and East Croydon. Between East Croydon and Gatwick no standing is forecast in the early years but by the 2047 future baseline there would be some passengers over this journey sector.</p> <p><b><i>Bus and coach demand in the future baseline:</i></b></p> <p>Tables 128 and 129 of <b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260]</b> provide the bus / coach air passenger and employee trip numbers for the base and future baseline years. It is assumed that bus and coach service frequencies would increase as the industry responds to growth in demand. Additional local bus services part-funded by the Applicant would provide extra capacity for employees and other airport users.</p>	