



# Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

Statement of Common Ground Between Gatwick Airport Limited and Network Rail

**Book 10**

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: JUNE 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.1.16

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Current Position	5
2.1.	Agricultural Land Use and Recreation	5
2.2.	Air Quality	6
2.3.	Capacity and Operations	7
2.4.	Climate Change	8
2.5.	Construction	9
2.6.	Cumulative Effects and Interrelationships	10
2.7.	Draft DCO and Explanatory Memorandum	11
2.8.	Ecology and Nature Conservation	12
2.9.	Forecasting and Need	13
2.10.	Geology and Ground Conditions	14
2.11.	Greenhouse Gases	15
2.12.	Health and Wellbeing	16
2.13.	Historic Environment	17
2.14.	Landscape, Townscape and Visual	18
2.15.	Major Accidents and Disasters	19
2.16.	Noise and Vibration	20
2.17.	Planning and Policy	21
2.18.	Project Elements and Approach to Mitigation	22
2.19.	Socio-Economics and Economics	23
2.20.	Traffic and Transport	24
2.21.	Waste and Materials	31
2.22.	Water Environment	32
3	Signatures	33

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared in support of the examination phase for the proposed Gatwick Northern Runway Project (NRP). The Application was made by Gatwick Airport Limited (the Applicant) to the Secretary of State for the Department for Transport (the Secretary of State) pursuant to Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008).
- 1.1.2 The Application comprises alterations to the existing northern runway which, together with the lifting of the current restrictions on its use, would enable dual runway operations. It also includes the development of a range of infrastructure and facilities which, with the alterations to the northern runway, would enable an increase in the airport's passenger throughput capacity. This includes substantial upgrade works to certain surface access routes which lead to the airport. A full description of the Proposed Development is included in ES Chapter 5: Project Description (Doc Ref. 5.1).
- 1.1.3 SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and focus on specific issues that may need to be considered during the Examination. The purpose and possible content of SoCG is detailed in the Department for Communities and Local Government's guidance entitled 'Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent' (2015), stating:
- "A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence."*
- 1.1.4 The Statement of Commonality provides details of the structure and status of the SoCG between all the relevant Interested Parties, including the local authorities. Naturally, the level of detail across the suite of SoCG varies to reflect the nature and complexity of the matter, as well as the position between the parties.
- 1.1.5 This document solely relates to matters between the Applicant and Network Rail. A summary of the meetings and correspondence that has taken place between the parties is detailed in **Appendix 1** of this document.
- 1.1.6 The engagement between the parties across the breadth of matters is ongoing. Therefore, the SoCG is an evolving document and the detailed wording within it is still being discussed in detail between the parties. Future iterations will be submitted at each deadline; and both parties reserve the right to supplement the matters identified as discussions progress, to ensure it is comprehensive and up to date.
- 1.1.7 This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties, and where agreement has not (yet) been reached, and is presented in a tabular form. This SoCG does not seek to replicate information that is available elsewhere, either within the Application and/or Examination documents, but referring to these where appropriate. The terminology used within the SoCG to reflect the status between the parties is either:

- “Agreed” to indicate where a matter has been resolved to the satisfaction of the parties.
- “Not Agreed” to indicate a final position where parties cannot agree.
- “Under discussion” to indicate where matters are subject of on-going discussion with the aim to either resolve or refine the extent of disagreement between the parties.

1.1.8 It can be assumed that any matters not specifically referred to in Section 2 of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to Network Rail; and therefore, have not been the subject of any discussions between the parties. As such, those matters should be assumed to be agreed, unless otherwise raised in due course by any of the parties.

## 2 Current Position

### 2.1. Agricultural Land Use and Recreation

2.1.1 **Table 2.1** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.1 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Agricultural Land Use and Recreation within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.2. Air Quality

2.2.1 **Table 2.1** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.2 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Air Quality within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.3. Capacity and Operations

2.3.1 **Table 2.3** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.3 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Capacity and Operations within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.4. Climate Change

2.4.1 **Table 2.4** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.4 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Climate Change within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					



2.5. Construction

2.5.1 **Table 2.5** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.5 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
2.5.1.1	Access to Operational Railway during Construction	Network Rail requires access to the operational railway to be maintained throughout the period of construction unless with prior agreement with Network Rail. Where works are proposed on or in close proximity to the railway appropriate asset protection agreements must be entered into prior to the commencement of such works - at present no such agreements are in place.	<p>GAL has provided outline construction methodologies for work to widen Airport Way over the railway, just north of Gatwick Airport Station, which would impact access to Network Rail assets. These can be found in the Buildability Report Part B – Part 1, paras 7.3.76 to 7.3.88 and in Appendix F - Method Visual: Airport Way Railway Bridge. Access to lineside equipment will be maintained whenever possible and Network Rail will be permitted access for operational safety reasons during the construction period, with specific arrangements made with Network Rail where a full railway possession is in place to install the new bridge deck. The Applicant is engaged with Network Rail in relation to its Asset Protection requirements and has registered the project with the corresponding Network Rail team.</p> <p>Protective provisions for inclusion in the DCO and a Framework Agreement are currently under negotiation between the Applicant and Network Rail and the current draft versions of these documents contain protections against DCO powers being used to prevent Network Rail's access to railway property without their consent. The Applicant is optimistic that these documents will be agreed during the examination.</p>	<p><b>ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report Part B – Part 1</b> [<a href="#">APP-080</a>]</p> <p><b>ES Appendix 5.3.1 Buildability Report Part B – Part 2</b> [<a href="#">APP-081</a>]</p>	Under discussion

2.6. Cumulative Effects and Interrelationships

2.6.1 Table 2.6 sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.6 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Cumulative Effects and Interrelationships within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.7. Draft DCO and Explanatory Memorandum

2.7.1 Table 2.7 sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.7 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
2.7.1.1	Protective Provisions	The draft DCO proposes the use of compulsory acquisition powers in relation to operational land of Network Rail and this poses significant issues for the safe operation of the railway. We also note that the DCO currently does not include any protective provisions for the protection of the railway which will be necessary given the proximate location of the works to the railway.	Discussions continue between the Applicant and Network Rail regarding appropriate protective provisions to be included in the draft DCO and the Applicant remains confident that these will be agreed before the end of the examination. These protective provisions will, inter alia, require Network Rail's consent to the exercise by the undertaker of any of the compulsory acquisition powers in the DCO as regards land or interests owned by Network Rail for the purpose of the railway. It is anticipated that these provisions will address the concerns flagged here.		Under discussion
2.7.1.2	Compulsory Acquisition	The draft DCO also propose to permanently acquire a vast number of plots of which Network Rail have rights over, such as access rights, right to culvert, channel or cables. Network Rail will require these rights to be retained, as well any existing rights yet to be determined.	The Applicant is content that, under the protective provisions to be agreed, Network Rail's consent will be required for the acquisition by the undertaker of any interests or rights of Network Rail forming part of the rail network. In respect of wider rights of way of Network Rail over other parts of the airport, the Applicant is content for the protective provisions to secure that appropriate replacement rights must be provided for any rights that are necessarily interfered with pursuant to the Order powers.		Under discussion
2.7.1.3	Framework Agreement	Network Rail proposes a Framework Agreement to be put in place in respect of land subject to the proposed Gatwick Airport Northern Runway DCO. This Agreement should be used to regulate certain aspects of the relationship between Network Rail and the Undertaker in relation to the Works, the Draft Order and the implementation of the powers proposed to be conferred by the Draft Order and to make provision regarding Related Agreements. The Agreement must ensure that Network Rail's interests as operator of the national rail network are properly protected and that Network Rail's ability to carry out its obligations as a statutory rail undertaker are not affected by the Draft Order.	Discussions continue between the Applicant and Network Rail regarding the Framework Agreement and the Applicant remains confident that this will be agreed before the end of the examination.		Under discussion

2.8. Ecology and Nature Conservation

2.8.1 **Table 2.8** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.8 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Ecology and Nature Conservation within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.9. Forecasting and Need

2.9.1 **Table 2.9** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.9 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Forecasting and Need within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.10. Geology and Ground Conditions

2.10.1 **Table 2.10** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.10 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Geology and Ground Conditions within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.11. Greenhouse Gases

2.11.1 **Table 2.11** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.11 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Greenhouse Gases within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.12. Health and Wellbeing

2.12.1 **Table 2.12** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.12 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Health and Wellbeing within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					



2.13. Historic Environment

2.13.1 **Table 2.13** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.13 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Historic Environment in this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.14. Landscape, Townscape and Visual

2.14.1 **Table 2.14** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.14 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Landscape, Townscape and Visual in this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.15. Major Accidents and Disasters

2.15.1 Table 2.15 sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.15 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Major Accidents and Disasters within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.16. Noise and Vibration

2.16.1 **Table 2.16** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.16 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Noise and Vibration within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.17. Planning and Policy

2.17.1 **Table 2.17** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.17 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Planning and Policy within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.18. Project Elements and Approach to Mitigation

2.18.1 **Table 2.18** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.18 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Project Elements and Approach to Mitigation within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.19. Socio-Economics and Economics

2.19.1 **Table 2.19** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.19 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Socio-Economics and Economics within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.20. Traffic and Transport

2.20.1 Table 2.20 sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.20 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<b>Baseline</b>					
<i>There are no issues relating to the baseline for traffic and transport</i>					
<b>Assessment Methodology</b>					
2.20.2.1	Unfunded model assumptions	<p>Gatwick’s transport modelling assumes that the rail industry will deliver the following schemes in time for the opening of Gatwick’s Northern Runway:</p> <p>a) 24 tph Thameslink services (also as per table 9.2.1). 9.4.16 of the Transport Assessment incorrectly states that 24 tph has been delivered – this requires Traffic Management which has not yet been delivered;</p> <p>b) North Downs 3 tph service pattern;</p> <p>c) Restoration of 4 tph Gatwick Express peak and off peak;</p> <p>d) Reinstatement of peak hour services (as per the December 2019 timetable);</p> <p>e) Additional off peak fast services between Thameslink / London Bridge and Gatwick (Table 9.2.1) – these cannot be accommodated without a major change to service specification or increased infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>For points a-d, these model input assumptions are uncommitted and unfunded, but nonetheless credible. Point e is not compatible with the capacity available on the current infrastructure.</p> <p>For 3.1a, confirmation of the materiality of the 24tph Thameslink service assumption to the overall analysis.</p> <p>For 3.1b-d, clarification from Gatwick Airport on the materiality of these outcomes to the overall Transport Assessment if they are not in place. For 3.1b-d, proposals for mechanisms for Gatwick to fund/ part-fund the implementation of these services, should the industry not have implemented them by the timescales required by the NRP.</p> <p>For 3.1e, Network Rail have received supplemental advice from Gatwick and are reviewing the implications alongside observed capacity data.</p>	<p>In relation to points a) to e) we have undertaken further sensitivity tests both to account for Covid and changes in infrastructure and assumptions which are detailed in <b>Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling [AS-121]</b>. These tests assume the 2019 timetable with adjustments for known upgrades such as the Battersea Line extension, opening of the Elizabeth Line and service increase on the North Downs Line.</p> <p>In relation to point e note that when Table 9.2.1 refers to off-peak it is referring to 10:00-16:00, rather than the off-peak model time period which represents the overnight.</p> <p>For additional information please see Deadline 2 submission on rail, following discussions at ISH4 - ref to <b>Appendix C of The Applicant’s Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005]</b>. The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.</p>	<p><b>Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling [AS-121]</b></p> <p><b>Appendix C of The Applicant’s Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5 [REP2-005]</b></p>	Under discussion
<b>Assessment</b>					
2.20.3.1	Technical model clarification and alignment	At this stage, Network Rail cannot endorse the Airport’s conclusion that “no significant increase in crowding on rail services is expected as a result of the Project” and that therefore “no additional mitigation is required” (Transport Assessment, page 73).	It is noted that Network Rail are reviewing the data and undertaking further analysis and the Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.		Under discussion



		<p>It is noted that Network Rail are in live discussions with Gatwick Airport Ltd to explore these issues. Ongoing liaison between Network Rail and Gatwick Airport Ltd is required to come to an agreement on factors such as these.</p> <p>It is possible that initiatives or investments in services and infrastructure could be required to satisfy these concerns – Gatwick Airport Ltd should propose mechanisms for this to be implemented if required.</p> <p>In summary, Network Rail’s concerns relate to the following areas:</p> <p>i. The aggregation of passenger demand by hour and service group does not reflect the significant variation that results in uneven passenger loads across each of the Brighton Main Line service groups. Network Rail are reviewing observed loading data provided by GTR to understand the materiality of this concern as there is a risk the modelled outputs artificially smoothen out demand.</p>			
<b>2.20.3.2</b>	Technical model clarification and alignment	<p>ii. The assumptions relating to assumed train capacities, including train lengths, formation and seated and standing densities. The requirements for airport passengers, particularly those with luggage, have a material impact on passenger experience and reduce effective available capacity. Network Rail are reviewing the provided data to understand the materiality of this concern.</p>	It is noted that Network Rail are reviewing the data provided and the Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.		Under discussion
<b>2.20.3.3</b>	Technical model clarification and alignment	<p>iii. The modelling of the Gatwick Express and the impact of fare differentials on the overall distribution of capacity may smoothen out demand.</p>	<p>TAG Unit M2.1 on Variable Demand Modelling recommends the use of fares to aid in the assessment of demand responses such as modal choice. The approach to deriving fares for the variable demand models is set out in section 7.2.1 of Appendix A of the Strategic Modelling Report [APP-260]. Fares from a range of services were considered in the demand model although no distinction was made for Gatwick Express services. During the development of the public transport assignment model, no evidence was found that additional adjustments were needed for Gatwick Express services to help the model to validate between service groups. This suggested that the frequencies and journey times from Victoria were a reasonable determinant of choice of service and it was not necessary to model fares as demand assigned to service groups reasonably closely. The impact of using a fare differential to model the “premium” Gatwick Express would have been to weaken the validation and over-assign demand to other services in a way that is different to observed data. Meetings were held with Network Rail’s Strategic Planning team on 12 February 2024 and 11 April 2024 at which these</p>		Under discussion

			points were discussed along with other matters. We have continued to engage with Network Rail on this matter as part of further crowding analysis and these productive discussions are ongoing.		
<b>2.20.3.4</b>	Technical model clarification and alignment	iv. The impact of Covid-19 on the overall modelling and conclusions, taking to account the base is 2016.	In relation to Covid, DfT guidance has been used to implement changes to background demand in the transport modelling which is detailed in <b>Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling</b> <a href="#">[AS-121]</a> .	<b>Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling</b> <a href="#">[AS-121]</a>	Agreed
<b>2.20.3.5</b>	Technical model clarification and alignment	v. Confirmation of the level of service modelled across the day (train frequencies) for each of the stated time bands.	The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.		Under discussion
<b>2.20.3.6</b>	Technical model clarification and alignment	vi. Alignment with rail industry forecasts and subsequent conclusions.	The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.		Under discussion
<b>2.20.3.7</b>	Technical model clarification and alignment	vii. Conclusion from Gatwick that future crowding levels are acceptable. We note that it is an industry standard to aim for passengers at peak times to not have to stand for more than 20 minutes, and no standing at off peak times.	Crowding was discussed at ISH4 and considerations related to crowding are set out in <b>Appendix C of The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5</b> <a href="#">[REP2-005]</a> . The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.	<b>Appendix C of The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISHs 2-5</b> <a href="#">[REP2-005]</a>	Under discussion
<b>2.20.3.8</b>	Technical model clarification and alignment	viii. It is unclear how much of the additional demand is allocated to the slow line services via Redhill.	The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.		Under discussion
<b>2.20.3.9</b>	Brighton Main Line freight services unaccounted for in Transport Assessment	We are concerned that Gatwick's Transport Assessment makes no mention of rail freight services. This is an issue because many rail freight services interact with Gatwick passenger services each day. This affects network performance and capacity and means that capacity is not necessarily available in the off peak to accommodate additional passenger services to serve Gatwick demands. Network Rail would like to see the removal of the off-peak service uplift assumed in the modelling in table 9.2.1, and acknowledgement of freight services using the network in the off-peak. Network Rail would also like to see consideration of the opportunities for delivery of materials by rail during construction. Identification of any required mitigative works to Crawley New Yard or in the immediate Gatwick station area and how those would be funded.	The rail frequencies adopted in the assessment of rail crowding are as timetabled and include funded upgrades to service levels at the time the modelling was undertaken for the Application, detailed in <b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-260]</a> . Given the ExA's requirement to look at the impact of Covid 19 this has allowed for some sensitivity tests to be undertaken which include changes to infrastructure assumptions since the core modelling for the Application was undertaken. These are detailed in <b>Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling</b> <a href="#">[AS-121]</a> . Note that when Table 9.2.1 refers to off-peak it is referring to the period between 10:00 and 16:00. The Applicant has considered the options for construction in developing the construction strategy. The Applicant recognises the sustainability benefits of reducing road traffic associated with construction but it is too early to be able to agree specific proposals. At this stage, therefore, the feasibility of using rail for construction is not confirmed and therefore the Applicant has assumed for the purposes of assessment that all construction materials would be transported by road.	<b>Transport Assessment Annex B: Strategic Transport Modelling Report</b> <a href="#">[APP-260]</a>  <b>Accounting for Covid in Transport Modelling</b> <a href="#">[AS-121]</a>	Under discussion
<b>2.20.3.10</b>	Wider network capacity issues that are unacknowledged and/or assessed	There are system-wide considerations that Network Rail must have due regard to as different proposals will interface with one another. Although these are outside the scope of Gatwick's own DCO, the implications could be severe as pressures increase across the route from multiple directions.	Schemes which are committed are included into the strategic transport modelling, and this includes the Elizabeth Line, as set out in paragraph 9.4.2 of the <b>Transport Assessment</b> <a href="#">[REP3-058]</a> . The proposed expansion at Luton Airport was not a submitted planning application at the time the modelling for	<b>Transport Assessment</b> <a href="#">[REP3-058]</a>	Under discussion

		<p>Concerns for the rail industry are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The current application for expansion at Luton Airport, which is served by the same Thameslink services that would be serving Gatwick. Increases in demand at both ends of the route clearly places further pressure on the overall service.</li> <li>- Integration with the Elizabeth Line at Farringdon - with demand increases from Gatwick and Luton as well as general shift towards Farringdon from other London Terminal stations could result in wider system limitations and the need for interventions here.</li> </ul>	<p>Gatwick was undertaken and therefore not considered to be committed in accordance with DfT TAG Unit M4. Luton Airport demand is likely to have a small overlap with Gatwick Airport demand through the Thameslink Core in Central London. For most passengers we would expect them to be travelling from central London and in opposite directions and so we expect the cumulative impact on rail crowding to be minimal. We will continue to discuss this point with NR as part of ongoing discussions.</p>		
<b>Mitigation and Compensation</b>					
<b>2.20.4.1</b>	Lack of mitigative funding for rail	<p>The Gatwick Northern Runway DCO does not include any mitigative funding to manage the impact of the proposed increase in passengers on the railway network. There are also no clear mechanisms for Gatwick to invest in the rail network later, as and when such investment is required to accommodate forecast increases in airport passenger numbers.</p> <p>The DCO inherently assumes the overall railway system will provide the rail capacity required by the Airport, including a return to December 2019 levels of capacity. This does not take account of the unprecedented financial constraints that the rail industry is operating within, which has resulted in recent capacity reduction. This includes reductions in the number of passenger trains leased by GTR. It is important to note that there is no public funding currently allocated or planned for the train service or infrastructure mitigations that Gatwick's expansion might require, and Gatwick have not identified mechanisms to fund any future shortfall. This is also out of alignment with the Aviation Policy Framework.</p> <p>Overall, Network Rail's position is that Gatwick should provide a reasonable and proportionate contribution to the rail network to mitigate the effects of airport-driven growth for which Network Rail and the wider rail industry on behalf of the taxpayer are not currently funded to provide.</p> <p>Gatwick to identify and propose mechanisms which could fund investment in rail Network Rail. Network Rail's view is that the Transport Mitigation Fund is not an appropriate mechanism for securing this investment (see <a href="#">NR's comments on responses to ExQ1</a> at Deadline 4). Network Rail's view is that a separate ringfenced Rail Mitigation Fund would be the most appropriate and streamlined approach. This would enable the introduction of appropriate governance arrangement for these funds and the integration of appropriate rail industry representation.</p>	<p>Gatwick rail passengers pay for use of the railway. GAL neither mandates mode choice nor the fares set to attract revenue, which is assumed to be at a level to attract passengers. The Applicant is acting in accordance with Government guidance promoting the use of sustainable modes.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken the rail modelling in accordance with DfT guidance, including the use of an Uncertainty Log to determine whether future planned schemes are sufficiently certain to be included in the future baseline forecast years. The Assessment presented in the Application indicates that the effects of the Project on rail crowding and station performance would not be significant and therefore would not require mitigation.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Sustainable Transport Fund and Transport Mitigation Fund (TMF), as set out in the <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> <a href="#">[REP3-028]</a> and <b>draft S106 Agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>, could provide funding to contribute to rail interventions if required. Network Rail is proposed as a member of the TMF Decision Group within the arrangements set out in the <b>draft S106 Agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a>. Based on the assessment undertaken and the mechanisms which are proposed to provide funding for transport interventions, a separate ringfenced fund for rail is not considered appropriate as it would limit the flexibility to support the most effective interventions to achieve the sustainable mode share commitments.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.</p>	<p><b>Draft S106 Agreement</b> <a href="#">[REP2-004]</a></p> <p><b>Surface Access Commitments</b> <a href="#">[REP3-028]</a></p>	Under discussion

<p><b>2.20.4.2</b></p>	<p>Rail network performance challenge</p>	<p>Maintaining good train service performance is an ongoing challenge on the Brighton Main Line. The high volume of trains, passengers, and mix of service groups including freight sharing the same infrastructure means small disruptions on the network can cascade and magnify, leading to cancellations and more significant network disruption.</p> <p>Gatwick’s Transport Assessment does not recognise this ongoing challenge to maintain and improve performance across the Brighton Main Line and is instead proposing more trains and passengers on a system which is at or will soon be at its functional capacity. The train service operating in the December 2019 timetable was the most intensive possible on the existing infrastructure, without unacceptably compromising overall system performance. At peak times there were no more paths available, and the off-peak periods were used as a ‘buffer’ time to recover from delays which accumulate in the peak. Effectively, the December 2019 timetable was the ‘cap’ to the service volume which could be accommodated peak and off peak, without infrastructure enhancements.</p> <p>Gatwick should identify and include funding for mitigative works to maintain or enhance overall network performance associated with increased Gatwick Airport passengers. Gatwick should contribute to a ringfenced fund for joint railway reliability / performance initiatives relating to the Brighton Main Line.</p>	<p>The Applicant’s assessment of the Project is based on 2019 levels of railway use and service provision, which is higher than the current situation. It is unreasonable for GAL or any other Applicant to be responsible for reliability on a mixed use railway where it is only one source of demand. The additional demand created by the Project is spread widely over the day, and much of the peak Airport demand occurs in the counter-peak direction in peak periods. The Project therefore does not have a disproportionate impact in the peaks when the railway is at its busiest. Furthermore, the Applicant is not responsible for the maintenance or reliability of the railway.</p> <p>The Applicant has undertaken the rail modelling in accordance with DfT guidance, including the use of an Uncertainty Log to determine whether future planned schemes are sufficiently certain to be included in the future baseline forecast years. The Assessment presented in the Application indicates that the effects of the Project on rail crowding and station performance would not be significant and therefore would not require mitigation.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Sustainable Transport Fund and Transport Mitigation Fund (TMF), as set out in the <b>Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028]</b> and <b>draft S106 [REP2-004]</b>, could provide funding to contribute to rail interventions if required. Network Rail is proposed as a member of the TMF Decision Group within the arrangements set out in the <b>draft S106 Agreement [REP2-004]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.</p>	<p><b>Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028]</b></p> <p><b>Draft S106 [REP2-004]</b></p>	<p>Under discussion</p>
<p><b>2.20.4.3</b></p>	<p>Gatwick Airport station capacity is a concern with future passenger levels</p>	<p>The Gatwick Station Project delivers additional capacity but explicitly did not account for the impact of the Northern Runway Project. The evidence provided in the Transport Assessment indicates a particular issue with congestion at two of the ticket barriers (gate lines) due to the extra passengers arising due to the scheme, which requires further investigation and potential mitigative measures.</p> <p>Network Rail have not formally quality assured Gatwick’s station modelling analysis. Consequently, we cannot endorse Gatwick’s conclusion that “the Project does not require any additional mitigation works to Gatwick Airport station” (Transport Assessment, p. 83).</p> <p>Gatwick should work with Network Rail to undertake a calibration exercise to compare the model to reality now the station is open.</p>	<p>The Applicant has used the Network Rail Gatwick Station Project Legion model as the basis for its station assessment. The model has been checked by the Network Rail technical team previously and this confirmed that the station modelling was conducted satisfactorily. The Applicant has provided Network Rail with the Legion modelling for the Project for review. This review notes that while there is queueing at the station exit gatelines in the Future Baseline and Proposed Development, this is consistent with some queueing observed in the Network Rail modelling of forecast years associated with the Gatwick Station Project Business Case. The Applicant notes that queueing increases with the Project, as shown and reported in <b>Transport Assessment Annex D – Station and Shuttle Legion modelling Report [APP-262]</b>. The Applicant has agreed with Network Rail to monitor actual behaviour within the station concourse areas following the recent completion of the Gatwick Station Project with the aim of</p>		<p>Under discussion</p>

		<p>Considerations for this validation should include taking account of different nature of airport passengers e.g. luggage and rail system familiarity characteristics.</p> <p>Gatwick should contribute to funding mitigative measures, whether operational or capital investment, to accommodate the additional passengers the Northern Runway will bring to the station and ensure a positive passenger experience is maintained.</p>	<p>identifying minor operational and wayfinding measures that may assist in mitigating the potential queueing. The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail and Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) on this matter.</p>		
2.20.4.4	Mode share target for rail	<p>Currently, Gatwick’s Sustainable Access Commitments (SACs) are stated as a combined ‘public transport’ target, differentiated by staff and air passenger trips.</p> <p>While this reflects the separate trip characteristics/modal choices made by passengers and staff, it makes it ambiguous what the rail industry mode share target is. The lack of a rail specific target means accountability in its achievement could be undermined and a specific target would focus industry partners on a simple goal.</p> <p>Network Rail would like details from Gatwick on how it intends to monitor and manage rail mode shares and details on the opportunities that will exist for the airport to invest in initiatives which could increase rail demand and mode share – particularly for initiatives which would require subsidy. Having a clear rail mode share target that Gatwick is accountable for achieving.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not have a specific mode share target for rail as GAL has limited influence on the choice of mode for passengers or on decisions taken by the DfT, Network Rail and Train operating Companies in relation to service provision and infrastructure development.</p> <p>Rail is already a very attractive mode for accessing Gatwick and makes a significant contribution to public transport mode share, but the Applicant is also committing to promoting regional bus and coach services that would support areas where rail journeys are less feasible. The <b>Surface Access Commitments</b> [REP3-028] document is secured through Requirement 20 to the <b>Draft DCO</b> [REP3-006] and Schedule 3 of the <b>Draft DCO S106 Agreement</b> [REP2-004] covers surface access.</p>	<p><b>Surface Access Commitments</b> [REP3-028]</p> <p><b>Draft DCO</b> [REP3-006]</p> <p><b>Draft DCO S106 Agreement</b> [REP2-004]</p>	Under discussion
2.20.4.5	Mode share opportunities	<p>Gatwick does not take a proactive approach to increasing rail mode share. As no rail interventions are identified by Gatwick, and the rail mode share uplifts are linked to schemes that have already been delivered, the increase in rail trips appears to be in line with the overall increase in passenger numbers rather than a concerted effort to encourage the use of rail.</p> <p>Furthermore, increasing highway capacity will make achieving public transport mode share commitments more challenging.</p> <p>Network rail would like identification of, and funding for, rail initiatives that would support Gatwick in achieving its public transport modal shift targets, and further discussion on the mode share opportunities for rail.</p>	<p>The Applicant has a history of proactively supporting rail, through station investment, marketing, joint-promotion with GTR, subsidising staff journeys by rail and supporting the rail industry to maintain and drive up rail mode share. This will continue in the future in line with our sustainability objectives and to meet our surface access commitments. The Applicant’s approach to on-airport parking and forecourt charging encourages passengers to choose sustainable modes and the Applicant continues to develop and invest in initiatives to encourage staff journeys by public transport.</p> <p>The Assessment presented in the Application indicates that the effects of the Project on rail crowding and station performance would not be significant and therefore would not require mitigation. Within the <b>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments</b> [REP3-028] there are details of funding allowances that would permit an allocation for rail initiatives, subject to further discussions between the Applicant and Network Rail on the potential mitigation measures that are considered proportionate to the impacts of the Project, in accordance with the</p>		Under discussion

			methodologies set out.  The Applicant will continue to engage with Network Rail on this matter.		
<b>2.20.4.6</b>	Clarity of mode share commitments	<p>The Transport Assessment is not clear as to the actions that Gatwick are proactively taking to drive mode shift, only that the Sustainable Access Commitments and mode shift targets are an output of the model specification. Objective 4 of the Transport Assessment reads “Objective 4: Deliver a new standard in sustainable surface access in support of Gatwick’s Decade of Change” (p.4, para. 50). This objective should be supported by clear initiatives to support monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Network Rail would like a clear list of the push and pull interventions that Gatwick have in place within the model to ensure the mode shift targets are achievable and thus achieved, as well as clarity on how rail mode share increases and due to which assumed interventions.</p>	The push and pull interventions are set out in Section 7.3 of the <b>Transport Assessment [REP3-058]</b> . An updated version of <b>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028]</b> has been submitted at Deadline 3 which adds further detail to the commitments related to the interventions.	<b>Transport Assessment [REP3-058]</b>  <b>ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments [REP3-028]</b>	Agreed  (captured in other issues)
<b>Other</b>					
<b>2.20.5.1</b>	Data format	<p>ES Appendix 12.9.2 Rail Passenger Flows – Please could Network Rail have the raw files of what has been extracted in the .pdf Rail Passenger Flows as an Excel, CSV or similar? In particular the Fast line flows. The purpose is validate that the model outputs align to our models and observed data sets. Hopefully this isn’t too onerous, but happy to discuss with the Applicant how it can be refined.</p>	The Applicant will engage with Network Rail on the exchange of information.		Under discussion

2.21. Waste and Materials

2.21.1 **Table 2.21** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.21 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Waste and Materials in this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					

2.22. Water Environment

2.22.1 **Table 2.22** sets out the position of both parties in relation to matters.

**Table 2.22 Statement of Common Ground Matters**

Reference	Matter	Stakeholder Position	Gatwick Airport Limited Position	Signposting	Status
<i>There are no issues relating to Water Environment within this Statement of Common Ground.</i>					



### 3 Signatures

3.1.1 The above SoCG is agreed between the following:

Duly authorised for and on behalf of Gatwick Airport Limited, The Applicant	Name
	Job Title
	Date
	Signature
Duly authorised for and on behalf of Network Rail	Name
	Job Title
	Date
	Signature