

File Name: ISH8 18th June 2024 Part 2.mp3
File Length: 01:14:42

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:01 - 00:00:13:12

It's 1155, so resume this. Issue specific hearing number eight. Um, Mr. Linus, you were going to respond.

00:00:14:22 - 00:00:46:02

Thank you, sir. Scott Linus for, um, the applicant. Um, I can deal with National Highways, network rail. First of all, can be very brief. Um, as National Highways indicated, um, there have been positive discussions between the parties. And so far as any specific points on drafting matters have been raised this morning. We're content to respond to those as part of those continuing as part of the continuing discussions, rather than spend time here dealing with them.

00:00:46:10 - 00:01:23:18

As for Network Rail, um, we, uh, have noted the points that they've raised at deadline five. The applicant's position thus far is that we don't identify any need for rail specific mitigation as part of the assessment work we have undertaken. However, that discussions are ongoing with Network Rail. We've seen what they have said, and we will continue those discussions with a view to understanding the basis upon which they may be seeking, uh, any specific mitigation, and we can explore the basis for that and whether any mitigation can be can be offered.

00:01:25:08 - 00:01:57:15

Um, as for, um, other representations, um, a couple touched on the issue of offsite parking or deal with those companies. Um, we have committed within the 106 obligations to make a contribution to CBC towards dealing with offsite, um, at parking. Uh, we've done that in recognition of policy within, uh, the local plan. The policy has been mentioned already. Uh, got at three.

00:01:58:03 - 00:02:30:21

Um, we've acknowledged that that says that the provision of additional replacement airport parking will only be permitted within the airport boundary. That policy recognises that off airport sites are not in most sustainable locations, but sites within the bind to provide the most sustainable location for additional long stay parking, which needs to be provided as passenger throughput grows while supporting public transport. Uh, we recognized that and provided for that accordingly within the uh 106 obligations.

00:02:31:03 - 00:03:02:17

The other point we made in relation to that is that. That contribution sits within wider SACs, and it confirms the point we've made earlier on today that it's important to regard this as a package of integrated measures as part of the toolkit, and that's the approach to the contribution needs to be seen alongside a variety of measures that that can help address the risk of unintended consequences, as was raised in some of the submissions.

00:03:02:21 - 00:03:40:03

Best way of dealing with that is to have a toolkit at the disposal of the airport, so that the precise nature of whatever alleged unintended consequences may be considered to arise can be addressed in a nuanced rather than a very blunt way. And it confirms, as far as we're concerned, the utility of the toolkit approach taken in the Sax. As far as the Cagney representations are concerned in relation to the TMF and the adequacy and should circumstances not turn out as assessed.

00:03:40:13 - 00:04:28:13

I think one needs to see the TMF and its proper and its proper context at the TMF, and it needs to be seen in the context of contributions that are being made extensively for bus services as a sustainable transport fund that I mentioned already. And the TMF is there to deal for dealing with unintended consequences. It must be remembered that the CCS will operate. In any event, they're not specific to these funding matters so that if the road share commitments aren't being met, there is a process that's been set in place whereby a plan has to be approved by the SG, and ultimately measures can be imposed by the Secretary of State, which are not necessarily limited to the funding the SACs apply at com what at come what may.

00:04:29:24 - 00:05:01:07

Um, related to that, um, the suggestion that um uh there are effectively is no procedure set down at Gatwick can effectively do anything that it that it wants. It's factually incorrect as, as a suggestion that effectively only minor tweaks could ever be made to matters such as parking charges. I won't repeat the detail, but it's clear that the process that's been set down in the SACs does not allow Gatwick to do whatever it wishes.

00:05:01:09 - 00:05:34:06

It involves the oversight of the Transport Forum Steering Group and the Secretary of State, and the toolkit. Measures provide ample scope for a variety of means, which can't necessarily be categorised as minor, uh, to achieve the objectives. So it's wrong to say there is nothing that we can do. Let Mr. Harris deal with Mr. Scott. As far as the Kent County Council submissions are concerned, we don't see that any further sensitivity analysis is necessary.

00:05:34:27 - 00:06:09:18

We have assessed the effects through the to on the the EIA process, and we have provided, uh, both the means by which any unforeseen effects could be addressed, as well as the process for that to be dealt with, as well as specific measures that could be taken to address impacts that might arise. So, as I've mentioned, there is a process involving the Transport Forum steering Group and the Secretary of State. And ultimately there is a toolkit of measures, including the TMF, to address any further mitigation that is necessary.

00:06:09:20 - 00:06:16:14

So we do not see the value or need for further sensitivity work. Can I ask Mr. Harris to elaborate on other answers, please?

00:06:17:05 - 00:06:28:24

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, I will just pick up on 1 or 2 of the, um, additional specific measures, if I may, from the different, uh, uh, different representatives today. Um.

00:06:30:12 - 00:07:11:00

Just to pick up on Network Rail's point about a specific rail mode share. Um, because of the nature of the catchment for, uh, Gatwick Airport and indeed the nature of the rail network, um, we are, um, reluctant to set a specific mode share for an individual public transport mode, um, because it may detract from providing a more balanced approach across all public transport modes and almost sort of set up a little bit of, um, unintended competition, um, or friction between, um, achieving those across the different geographies.

00:07:11:06 - 00:07:53:20

Um, as you'll be aware, we have specifically set out, uh, substantial mitigation to provide for bus and coach, um, coverage in areas where rail does not currently, um, uh, attract significant, uh, patronage and indeed would not be a feasible mode to get to and from the airport. Um, so our, um, our

preference is very much to keep to a balanced approach, but we will continue to talk with Network Rail on the points that they've made in respect of, uh, of demand and mitigation. Um, I do have, um, sort of one point to respond to, uh, gentleman from Holiday Extras in respect of the Mssp seven figure, um, from the rule 17 response.

00:07:53:27 - 00:08:30:07

Um, and, um, uh, regrettably, I do acknowledge that that 3700 is an error in that table. Um, apologies for that. The number should be 3000 to 250. Uh, I believe, as the gentleman mentioned, um, we will, of course, submit a updated version of the rule 17 response to make all those, um, you know, sort of correlated, um, corrections into that, into that submission. Um. If I may just, um, pick up on the comments from, um, from childhood parish council.

00:08:30:13 - 00:09:09:02

Uh, and apologies if my response is to earlier questions weren't clear when I made reference to NCR 21. Um, I did not wish to suggest that it was connecting North Terminal and South Terminal. Um, I was indicating that it broadly run north to south. So in terms of geography, not not terminals. Um. I would also sort of point out that the method for undertaking the transport assessment, and therefore the understanding of what general background traffic is taking place in future years, corresponds to a level of planned development, including all those in the local area.

00:09:09:14 - 00:09:44:11

So trips associated with new developments, whether they're residential or commercial, will be included in the transport assessment. Um, I also just want to again clarify my reference to a link through Riverside Garden Park, um, which is actually one of the, uh, specific measures that we've been talking with the joint local authorities about. Um, this is in addition to that, to National Cycle Route 21, uh, which does, as the lady from Parish Childhood Parish Council points out, does currently run through Riverside Garden Park.

00:09:44:18 - 00:10:23:18

Um, but along the northern and eastern edges. Um, this is in reference to a um, a direct connection, uh, which has been proposed by the um, joint local authorities, which would connect the car park at Riverside Garden Park directly to the point at which, um, it, uh, you could cross the A23 using the new junction that's being designed as part of our mitigation. Um, and that's something that we do not feel is, um, is appropriate given the existing provision for North, uh, for anchor 21 and also the, um, the additional connectivity that's being provided at the.

00:10:23:24 - 00:11:04:08

You like the western end of Riverside Garden Park via Long Bridge, uh, roundabout and the crossings of the River mole along uh, along London Road. Um, I'd just like to, to, to end on these brief points, um, with response to, um, Miss Cooper from Kent County Council. Um, and, and we've had a number of conversations and we'll continue dialogue with Kent in respect to some of their comments. Um, she is absolutely correct that we have, uh, supported with, um, commercial bus and coach operators, uh, in trying to establish coach links into various places in Kent in the past.

00:11:04:22 - 00:11:37:11

Um, one of the issues that's been experienced with those is that it's actually been, um, perhaps sort of more at the operator's behest as to how long those services are maintained. Um, and when funding for those are withdrawn, you will note from our service access commitments that we specify, um, that services that are introduced to try and improve mode share would be operated and supported, the fine that the funding would be supported for five years.

00:11:37:13 - 00:12:15:05

That is directly to try and make sure that those services can establish that behaviour can change and that the, um, opportunity for demand to grow, um, can, can actually be achieved over a longer period

of time than has been experienced. For some of the examples that that Mr. Cooper is aware of. Um, I'd also like to confirm, as we have confirmed to a number of the authorities, that in, uh, we have provided indicative, um, service provision within the um, bus and coach enhancements, uh, to which the 10 million funding has been applied.

00:12:15:15 - 00:12:50:17

Uh, we would, of course, as is the, uh, sort of normal position on these things, we would be in consultation with the relevant local authorities and indeed the operators to make sure that we optimise those services before we confirm a commercial negotiation with those operators. Uh, it's not possible to, um, define those commercial terms at this stage. It is far too early, um, to, uh, certainly sort of set out what the service provision and therefore what the cost would be for individual routes.

00:12:50:25 - 00:12:59:23

Uh, we would go through a process of discussion and consultation to optimise those, uh, in each case, in order to make sure that we can maximize the, uh, the mode share impact.

00:13:04:29 - 00:13:41:24

Oh, yes. I apologize. Uh, sorry. Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, my colleagues just reminded me I did skip over one other point, which was related to, um, the numbers for off airport parking. Um, uh, raised by the gentleman from Holiday Extras. Um, we have a an annual Gatwick airport, uh, parking count, uh, which is available and published by the local authority, uh, which gives a, um, a reference figure, uh, against which, um, local parking activity, if you like.

00:13:41:26 - 00:14:14:24

And, and the the overall market associated with parking. Um, that could be used for airport passengers. Um, is set. Um, we think that is the right benchmark to use. It is. Um, it is easy to reference and it is easy to monitor changes over time. Um, we certainly would welcome any opportunities to improve any monitoring of both on and off airport parking. Um, as may be opposed, proposed and agreed with the authorities.

00:14:14:26 - 00:15:03:16

But we believe that the um authorities approach to having an annual count, which we have referenced and used in, is the basis for our for our modeling so that we, we capture effectively the whole, um, of the parking market capacity within our assessment. Um, and through the assessment, we have, um, in the absence of any future, um, planning approvals being um, uh, at least sort of acknowledged at this stage, you know, there there are no planning approvals and changes, um, that are, um, within the future, uh, future changes that all of those, whether they be on airport or off airport, non airport operated.

00:15:03:18 - 00:15:38:08

So the ones that aren't, um, operated by Google. Um, all those would remain fixed in the market as, as the currently the local plan would uh would indicate. And that plan development information would indicate. So in that respect, when we come to look at future parking demand, the only thing we have identified to look to flex would be the on airport gala operated car parking. And we've set out our assumptions around how busy all of the park car parks would be.

00:15:38:28 - 00:16:13:00

One of the parameters which we use is to say that off airport, park, car parking, or indeed non-google operated car parking, um, could routinely operate up to, um, about 87.5% occupied. Um, and that reflects the fact that there is a degree of friction around keeping all the spaces occupied at one time. Now, some of the off airport car parks can operate higher. Some of the off airport car parks operate at a lower rate than that. Um, on average, we think that the 97.5% is a reasonable.

00:16:13:06 - 00:16:30:24

And if we look at the Gatwick Parking Survey for 2018 and 2019, which is about the time that we were taking reference information, um, the indications are that the level of overall aggregate occupancy of the off airport parking is about 80%.

00:16:32:11 - 00:16:33:10

So hopefully that's helpful.

00:16:34:28 - 00:16:35:17

Thank you.

00:16:37:06 - 00:16:47:21

Okay, well, before we move on to item four, which is car parking, I have one point for my clarification about staff travel drop off and pick up.

00:16:49:13 - 00:17:19:04

Um, commitment for the SEC says at least 50% of airport staff journeys to and from the airport where those staff journeys originate or conclude within eight kilometres of the airport. That just in brackets, says staff journey being a single one way trip to or from the airport to be made by active travel modes. Does the qualification in brackets here exclude drop off and pick up of staff members by another person? The first question.

00:17:19:24 - 00:17:26:02

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. All employee journeys to and from the airport for the purposes of work are included.

00:17:26:26 - 00:17:32:17

Thank you. I understand the current level of pickup and drop off is 1% of staff travel. Is that correct?

00:17:33:12 - 00:18:03:28

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, yes. That was, uh, a figure that's taken from the 2023 Staff Travel Survey. Um, and the question that that relates to is, um, a mode of travel or that you regularly use for your journey to work so that 1% would be the, um, sort of regular choice for a, um, a 1%, a proportion of our, of our staff, um, not all staff present on any one day.

00:18:04:11 - 00:18:37:10

Um, staff obviously have, um, uh, you know, sort of different shift patterns, etc.. So those journeys are spread naturally, um, throughout the day as well. Um, the 1%, uh, wouldn't necessarily include the occasional journey where someone is dropped off because, um, of, of a particular event on a day, whether it's a vehicle being taken by a partner to take to a hospital appointment or some other, um, reason, but it picks up the regular, uh, journeys in accordance with that survey.

00:18:38:13 - 00:18:43:17

Well, do charges apply to drop off and pickup for staff in the same way as they do for passengers?

00:18:45:03 - 00:19:25:17

Richard Higgins for the applicant. They don't. There is a difference on the forecourt. They are the same, um, for being able to drop off and pick up for free in the long stay car parks, which is available for passengers and staff. Um, one thing that we are, um, conscious of in making provisions for staff is, first of all, the timeliness of their reporting. Um, for work, particularly where you have very time sensitive, um, uh, sort of employment within the airport, whether that be, uh, crew, airline crew or indeed operational frontline staff.

00:19:25:29 - 00:20:19:22

Um, and what we don't want to do is, um, lead to an encouragement where there is unintended, um, drop off and pick up in the local area. Um, you'll be aware that we have implemented alongside our forecourt, charging a series of red routes. Uh, and we make very clear to our staff through our regular airport notices. And indeed, um, if you are um minded, I can provide details, um, whereby staff are strongly discouraged, um, and indeed face potential consequences if they, um, are abusing the system in the in the same way they are, they are subject to the same restrictions and regulations, essentially, um, that that passengers are um, but those that regular that regularly drop off can do so in the car parks or on the forecourt for free.

00:20:22:29 - 00:20:37:15

Um, so going in the future is. Stuffed cardboard is intended to be static, but staff numbers will grow. Imagine this. There'll be more and more people picking up and dropping off as a result of that.

00:20:39:14 - 00:21:09:26

Richard Higgins for the applicants. And I might, um, uh, bring in a colleague as well in a moment. Um, we don't think that it would be a problem in terms of the management of the, um, of the forecourts. We do recognise that in helping to secure our mode, share targets and our service access commitments, that charging for any type of car journey, um, for staff, may be one of a series of measures that we could, uh, that we could take.

00:21:10:12 - 00:21:47:09

Um, I would, um, repeat that it would be reasonable for us to allow staff to to drop off and pick up for free within the car parks, um, in the same way that passengers are able to, um, passengers can drop off, pick up in long stay car parks and use the car park shuttle buses to get to and from the terminals. Um, similarly, staff would be able to um, but certainly, um, depending on the success and the, the toolkits of measures that we put in place for staff, we wouldn't discount, um, having charges for forecourt use for staff.

00:21:48:12 - 00:22:02:11

Thank you. Well, that concludes my questions for on item three. Service access commitments. Um, so there's no other comment. Yes. Councillor. Essex.

00:22:03:16 - 00:22:45:19

Thank him on behalf of Gatwick Harrier conservation campaign. Just on on your on your comment thereabouts. Drop off and pick up. It seems that for staff there's a particular issue which is reflecting the poor current public and access travel except accepting that north south we've we've got good access but east west and to many of the small communities around the airport there isn't good access, which is why it occurs. And our response to this item would be to reiterate our contention there shouldn't be any additional car travel above current levels for both the future baseline and the with project scenarios, and if the airport doesn't think it can meet the requirements, then the airport growth should be curtailed.

00:22:45:21 - 00:23:17:24

Noting that, you know, the Airports Commission said that presumably partly for transport, other airports were better to expand the Gatwick, so it needs to up its game on this. The airport can't meet these requirements. We need a different approach. We in our view, it's entirely within Gael's ability to provide sufficient public transport and staff provision and active travel modes to avoid the need for staff to drive to and from the airport. The airport could demonstrate its commitment and lead the way to low emission travel by ensuring bus procurement.

00:23:17:26 - 00:23:37:04

Also, um requires provision of non requires provision of zero emission buses. Um but but the main point is about expanding from this north south corridor to remove this requirement in the first place.

Otherwise um, it would seem that this, like all other kinds of transport, would just increase the airport gross.

00:23:37:10 - 00:23:37:25

Thank you.

00:23:39:09 - 00:23:40:01

Salinas.

00:23:40:28 - 00:24:12:02

Uh, Scotland. I'm going to ask Mr. Higgins to, uh, to pick up that point. But in the context of staff, um, parking. A couple of other points. I think, um, need to emphasize the the applicant already provides and will continue to provide incentives for staff to choose sustainable modes. It's always reviewing and updating these in the light of its requirements under the Surface Access Strategy Action Plan, which is reviewed quarterly by the TFS, G.

00:24:12:04 - 00:24:49:14

So measures such as National Rail discounts are actively considered to help transfer staff journeys to sustainable modes. The second point on staff is that they acknowledge that drop off and pick up. To some extent will be the only reasonable option for some employees, um, including those working particular shift patterns. But as Mr. Higgins has said, um, in order that we meet the SA CS and the commitments relating to staff travel, um, measures such as introducing charging for, for courts, uh, aren't off, aren't off the table.

00:24:50:05 - 00:25:25:12

Uh, I think Mr. Bedford will deal further with staff parking as well. Um, as far as this issue of zero growth is concerned as raised by. Back. I mean, the context for this is that the airport already achieves a very high mode share, particularly by rail, where staff and passengers have access to services. Our mode share compared very favourably with, uh, with other airports. Um, but there are areas within the catchment where we've got to recognise that there will be some access by car.

00:25:25:14 - 00:26:13:08

And although we're committing to significant investment in public transport to provide an alternative mode of transport to the airport, um, so as to reduce car, uh, trips, the analysis that we've undertaken shows that we're unrealistic to expect zero growth and traffic. Uh, as a matter of principle, um, we've got what we have done through the modelling and the work that's underpinning the essays is to identify the commitments that we that we can make, as well as aspirational measures that are also set out in the chassis, even if not committed to, um, so we don't accept the proposition that there should be zero traffic growth in order for this consent to be delivered.

00:26:13:18 - 00:26:28:11

Um, we note that we're already achieving a higher public transport mode share than than Heathrow, and our commitments are actually going further than the public transport mode shares that we're expected to be through in the amps. Um, so anything else that.

00:26:32:23 - 00:27:05:15

But Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, I just want to pick up on a couple of those, uh, sort of details that Mr. Lyness has alluded to in respect of, um, uh, particular travel and indeed the travel needs of, of staff. Um, and the point about, um. Uh. The point about shift patterns and the availability, both the public transport and indeed the suitability of active travel, um, at, um, you know, sort of antisocial, very late hours, early morning, very late night in order to meet shift patterns.

00:27:05:17 - 00:27:07:09

Doesn't make it, um.

00:27:09:03 - 00:27:41:09

I would say inappropriate for us to, um, designate and mandate a certain type of journey. Um, people have various, uh, reasons for, um, having different modes available to them. Um, we try and make sure that there is sufficient choice for them to have a sustainable mode, um, available to, to choose. Um, but also to make sure that they are not forced into, um, inappropriate, uh, sort of choices by making sure that they can drop off and pick up where that's necessary.

00:27:41:19 - 00:28:13:21

Um, I would just like to pick up on the point, um, uh, made by the representative from GAC in respect to, um, support for, um, low emission journeys to and from the airport. Um, you'll be aware that we've recently opened a grid serve electric forecourt charging, um, facility. Uh, we are continuing to develop, um, uh, solutions to help both staff and passengers, um, access, um, electric vehicle charging. Uh, where those are opportunities.

00:28:13:23 - 00:28:45:13

And I'd also like to, um, sort of point out and this is, um, I confess, um, a little bit of a shout out for our local bus operator. Um, because we have been very close partners with them in progressing hydrogen bus, uh, proposals. Um, and, uh, GAC and others in the room will be aware that we've supported the recent, um, zebra, uh, grant funding bid to government to secure a greater, um, a greater fleet of hydrogen buses in the local area.

00:28:45:15 - 00:28:53:17

And there are already zero emission vehicles, uh, operating to and from Gatwick as a result of those partnerships with the local authorities, um, the local operators.

00:28:55:27 - 00:28:59:24

Thank you. Scott, do you want to say something?

00:29:04:23 - 00:29:05:08

So.

00:29:08:27 - 00:29:12:04

Die. So I said, if we.

00:29:12:15 - 00:29:14:13

Apologize, I pressed the wrong button.

00:29:15:01 - 00:29:51:24

I just wanted to say. But thank you, sir. Um, Michael Bedford, the joint local authorities. Uh, we recognize that there will be some limited role for staff drop offs. So we're not, um, suggesting that there need to be measures to preclude it altogether, but it should be kept to the minimum. One aspect of that which is in part highlighted in Mr. Higgins, uh, comments, is providing available choice and opportunities for people to, uh, use sustainable modes, uh, wherever possible.

00:29:51:26 - 00:30:11:27

And that just ties back to our earlier representations that we made earlier this morning, in particular, the emphasis on the need to improve active travel routes to and from the airport. And we, as a as it were, reinforce those points because they tie back into this. So that's the the general point. Thank you sir.

00:30:12:08 - 00:30:14:15

Thank you Lisa Scott.

00:30:17:00 - 00:30:55:05

Thank you. Yes. Lisa Scott for Child Parish Council and Mill Valley Cycling Forum. And it's partly with regard to, um, not expecting people to travel into the airport, um, during, I guess, nighttime hours. Um, those of us who do cycle regularly understand that it's perfectly pleasant to cycle in the middle of the night. So as long as the infrastructure and facilities are available. So if we have adequate, um, cycling infrastructure with a wide path and it's properly lit, then, um, it will be a significant number of people that are able and willing to cycle in.

00:30:55:07 - 00:31:31:15

So I wouldn't want to see that as a prohibition. And I'd like to understand about the number of cycle parking bays, knowing that we've lost a significant amount at North Terminal. Um, and it doesn't seem that those numbers are, um, really going to be replaced fully. Um, it's focused at South Terminal, but if you're looking at staff coming in, you will need a good provision at North Terminal two, and particularly for South Terminal where it is that transport hub for people using um South Terminal train station.

00:31:32:03 - 00:31:33:01

Thank you.

00:31:34:07 - 00:31:36:19

Thank you. Hey, Mr. Linus.

00:31:39:05 - 00:32:20:25

Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, yeah. I'm, um, very, very happy to talk through some of our proposals with, uh, with Miss Scott. She's entirely correct that, um, some of the areas around Gatwick, uh, are very pleasant to cycle, um, at all times. Um, we have a duty of care to our staff to make sure that we are providing, um, suitable alternatives. And for those people who would choose to cycle, we certainly would not preclude that. Um, uh, but that we are not, um, I suppose relying on the opportunity for, um, substantial mod shares in those periods, because that's not always suitable for all users.

00:32:21:02 - 00:32:21:17

Um.

00:32:23:25 - 00:32:25:06

I would just, um,

00:32:26:22 - 00:32:29:20

apologize. I've just, uh, lost my train of thought. Um.

00:32:32:13 - 00:33:08:04

Thank you. Yes. Um, I've been reminded where I was going with this. Apologies. Um, uh, Miss Scott might also be, uh, sort of, uh, uh, unaware at the moment of the work that we are doing currently, uh, to review all the cycle parking facilities across the airport and provide additional, uh, facilities across the campus, um, over the coming year or two. And I'll be very happy to provide details of that work that's ongoing, uh, in consultation with the local authorities and, uh, and include Charnwood Parish Council in, in some of those discussions.

00:33:08:06 - 00:33:26:13

But that does pick up, uh, specific provision at North Terminal, uh, as well as additional provision at South Terminal. Uh, and some of the um, uh, infrastructure improvements to, uh, to make the existing National Cycle route, um, a pleasanter environment through the airport.

00:33:27:17 - 00:33:31:02

Thank you. Did you want to make a response to Mr. Bedford?

00:33:32:26 - 00:33:36:17

Uh, Scotland. Uh, no, sir. We can rely upon what we said earlier. Thank you.

00:33:37:04 - 00:34:11:18

Thank you. With that, then that concludes item three. We'll move on to item four, which is car parking. The availability of car parking is an important factor in mood choice when travelling to the airport. I note in paragraph 3.72 of the car Parking strategy rep 1051 you say off airport parking authorized an unauthorized typically acts with the objective to increase car travel. I'd like to hear why you think increasing on airport car parking would not typically act with the objective to increase car travel.

00:34:15:22 - 00:34:50:06

Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, I merely make the point that on airport car parking is set within a wider strategy for sustainable, uh, surface access. Uh, so there is a balance to be struck. Um, and as you'll be aware, within our current section, uh, 106, we've, uh, um, we have a, um, uh, sort of position where we provide enough car parking. Um, we do not have a particular interest in providing more car parking than is necessary.

00:34:50:15 - 00:35:25:03

Um, and we operate our current car parks efficiently, but with the aim of also achieving sustainable mode shares in accordance with our surface access strategies and our action plans. Um, none of the off airport parking either authorised or unauthorised, um, have the same, uh, requirements or responsibilities for promoting sustainable mode shares and therefore their um, operation is much more, um, commercially, uh, motivated in respect of, um, cars, uh, arriving and using their car parks.

00:35:25:05 - 00:35:27:04

So that's the distinction that we're trying to make.

00:35:27:18 - 00:35:52:25

I suppose the counter might be that authorised car parking is controlled by a local planning authority. Unauthorised can be addressed by a local planning authority. The airport can use its permitted development rights to provide more parking. So the same level of control doesn't really exist. I understand what you're saying in the context in which you're saying it. But just in terms of control, there is a difference there.

00:35:54:25 - 00:36:32:04

It's got one of the last. Mr. Mr. Higgins, um, uh, supplement that, uh. Fundamentally. So that's what the air sacs are. Therefore, I think we would resist what we'd regard as a rather sort of reductive approach to car parking, which effectively tries to say that in principle it is harmful, and one must somehow therefore apply a discrete control at to it. I mean, first of all, I think it's got to be recognised that as an airport, there's a need to provide some car parking capacity for the needs of travellers coming here by car.

00:36:32:14 - 00:37:07:10

There's nothing wrong in principle with airports making that provision or indeed relying upon permitted development rates to do so, but we recognise that has to be balanced so as to ensure that

there isn't unrestricted provision which makes car travel so attractive that it discourage a public transport use, and other measures are put in place to encourage public transport use. Instead, the starting point is to recognise that car parking and its provision is not, in principle objectionable in order to meet travel needs.

00:37:07:21 - 00:37:41:18

The second point is that you've got to view car parking. As Mr. Higgins has said in the context of the two of the measures that influence mode share at Gatwick. And that's the entire rationale behind the, say, hind, the sacs. We acknowledge that there should be headline mode share commitments. And we have, as I've said, the toolkit approach is there to allow a combination of measures that can be deployed dynamically to meet those commitments. Car park charges, um, are one forecourt, charging is another.

00:37:41:20 - 00:38:19:22

Both of those have the potential. As I said, we put in forms of control. We've also committed in the in the recent version of the service access commitments to consult the TFS and assess need for additional parking over and above that required to replace what is lost through the construction. We've also committed to provide funding for the model and provision of parking controls in the surrounding area. So those amongst the wider funds that we're making available at make clear that car parking is to be viewed as one of a package of measures that sit within this fundamental commitment.

00:38:19:24 - 00:38:26:27

And it's wrong to suggest that parking therefore needs to be controlled in a specific way, discretely through through the DCO.

00:38:29:05 - 00:38:45:07

Thank you. Well, moving on from that, I want to discuss the parking analysis providing in your response. Rep 4019 to our rule 17 letter and the car parking analysis provided in a car parking strategy rep 1051.

00:38:47:21 - 00:39:05:29

Firstly, in paragraph 3.32 of the car parking strategy say 90% of on airport parking is pre-booked and the remainder generally allowed to be on a roll up basis. I'm assuming that the daily roll up parking is taken into account in the peak parking accumulations, however. Incorrect.

00:39:07:15 - 00:39:10:26

Richard Higgins for the applicant. Yes it is. Thank you.

00:39:13:02 - 00:39:25:05

I understand you use a practical capacity of 87.5% capacity level and carpark operation. Why provide? You explain why you provide 12.5% over capacity.

00:39:30:16 - 00:40:04:02

All of that for the applicant, I think. When you think about how practically you can use that space, there is need for, um, an additional, uh, set of spaces to allow for time of day and for other variables that go into how you practically fill that space. That is, is kind of very difficult to fill it to 100%. It's that 12.5% buffer is to allow the time of day movements for labor restrictions, and for other variables that restrict getting to 100% capacity.

00:40:07:00 - 00:40:15:11

Okay. But shortly there there are methods whereby you could achieve higher capacities in 87.5.

00:40:18:10 - 00:40:49:03

A little bit for the applicant. I think it's fair to say there are methods and ways of increasing 87.5%, I think, on a, uh, that we've taken as an as the percentage used as an average. Now, you can conceivably get higher than that, but I think that adds, uh, stress into the system, which means that it's, you know, in terms of the modeling, 18.5% is is a percentage figure, which leaves enough contingency to run the operation sufficiently.

00:40:49:29 - 00:41:21:14

Okay. Thank you. Going on from this table, one of your rule 17 response, the future baseline estimated parking demand in 2023 is around 86% of the total spaces, but drops to 75% or under in 2026 to 2024 for 2034, and only rises to 78% in 2040. Just by quick calculation. If there were 2500 spaces less in 2040.

00:41:21:29 - 00:41:41:01

Total spaces were 44,020. This would be 82% of capacity, still less than your practical capacity of 87.5. This suggests to me that the need for 2500 robotic parking spaces in the future baseline cases overstated. What's your view?

00:41:42:02 - 00:42:14:14

Scott Lyons for the applicant. Sir, I should explain that in preparation for the hearing. Uh, we have discovered a calculation error in the micro accumulations that have been set out in those years. Um, the information on parking numbers is set out in the car parking strategy, which is rep 1051. Um, that is correct. The other information in the route 17 letter rep for 019 and then the table is correct.

00:42:14:16 - 00:42:38:27

But there's a there's an issue when the calculations that led to the accumulation of the parking demand, which we're going to need to correct, and we'll do that by, uh, deadline six. Um, but the fundamental point is, notwithstanding the need to correct that the accumulation figures in the car parking strategy constructed are are correct. Can I ask Mr. Higgins to confirm that?

00:42:39:25 - 00:43:15:28

Yes. Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, the car parking strategy and indeed the response, uh, to the, uh, essays questions, um, both contain the methodology that was that has been used in connection with the transport modelling, um, to develop a future, um, uh, parking overall sort of capacity requirement. Um, those, those methodologies, um, that are consistent both, um, across, uh, across the car parking strategy and the response to the essays questions, um, are correct.

00:43:16:02 - 00:43:30:00

Um, and regrettably, the, uh, figures in table one of the rule 17 letter, um, uh, do have a correction that need to be made, um, particularly in how these spaces, uh, the demand accumulates over, over time into the later years.

00:43:32:28 - 00:43:37:03

So he's saying this, this, this table one here is incorrect.

00:43:38:20 - 00:43:41:09

Uh, Rich Higgins of the applicant. Yes, sadly. That's correct.

00:43:43:15 - 00:43:57:10

I just. I was a bit disappointed. Given you took an extra deadline to do this information? Now you're telling me it's. Incorrect. A lot of my questions are based around. The issue arises from this table.

00:43:58:16 - 00:44:43:15

Uh, Scott lost the applicant. Uh, sorry. Yes. We can only apologize. We discovered this when we were preparing for the hearing. We'd say that the accumulation figures in the car parking strategy remain correct, as do, uh, the other metrics that are included in table one is just a calculation error. As far as the accumulation of the parking compound itself is concerned. I would hope, sir, though, if if you have questions relating to the way in which the figures in that table have prompted considerations that you think you need to address with us, we may well still be able to explain the substance of the point, to address a substance to the point and anticipation of the figures coming forward at deadline six.

00:44:43:17 - 00:44:44:02

Well, you.

00:44:44:04 - 00:45:06:06

Just heard one of them about 2005 hundred. Um. The next would be. Turning the rule 17. The peak parking demand in line with the project case in 2014 is 36,900, according to table one. And the increase in passengers for 2032 to 2040 is 4.5 million.

00:45:08:08 - 00:45:19:11

And the parking demand is shown growing by 1000 spaces in that in that time to 2040. So that's 4.5 million equates to a thousand parking spaces.

00:45:21:04 - 00:45:34:05

And in row J of table two of the car Parking strategy 1051. The estimated parking demand in 2025 2047 is 42,260.

00:45:36:06 - 00:45:47:00

It's basically explaining why. From 2040 to 2047, with an increase of passengers of 3.4 million, the parking demand would raise would rise by 5360.

00:45:48:20 - 00:46:05:13

From 3600 and 920 40 to 42,260 in 2047. So it's a 5360 car parking rise for 3.4 million passengers. When it was.

00:46:06:29 - 00:46:13:08

Thousand parking space rise for 4.5 million passengers in that table. That was the question.

00:46:15:04 - 00:46:29:03

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, yes. That difference would be explained in the way in which the, uh, calculation has been, uh, been done in the table that you have in front of you. Um, and, uh, and that would be corrected by deadline six.

00:46:31:23 - 00:47:06:06

Well, the other thing I was going to raise about table one. I can understand that you could see during construction that more parking would be needed to accommodate construction changes. However, at the end of construction, it looks like the ratio of parking provision to parking demand will fall well below the aspirational 87.5 to 77% from 2040. Which suggests overprovision of parking, and in turn suggests to me that controls could be considered to ensure parking overprovision does not become a factor in promoting car travel and restricting sustainable mode share growth.

00:47:09:06 - 00:47:46:29

Uh, Richard Haynes for the applicant. Um, that does, um, again relate to the to the issue with this table. Um, I would, uh, make clear that the, um, the total spaces that are shown, um, uh, indicators, you will note that we do not rise above the future baseline level of provision until 2038. So the net,

um, overall position in terms of parking capacity, um, is below the future baseline position until the final car park is complete, uh, in 2038.

00:47:47:01 - 00:47:58:09

So the provision is not, um, uh, specifically frontloaded, as it were, or over provided at an early stage. But there is quite a lot of change as a result of the construction program.

00:47:59:22 - 00:48:11:04

A bit difficult to have a conversation around that when the figures I've been working to. Clearly incorrect. And I am so extremely disappointed that completely understand.

00:48:14:18 - 00:48:25:03

Um, well, with that said, I'm expecting deadline six submission I. Probably on parking. I've got Heathrow and Gatwick parking numbers.

00:48:26:26 - 00:48:59:25

Move on to that. I've read your response in table 21 5072 where you suggest factors that would mean parking analysis per million passengers per annum provided by transport for London Rep for 082 at Gatwick and Heathrow may not be directly comparable. I understand one of the factors you mentioned is taxis being a larger mode share at Heathrow, but there's a number of variable factors. Where to? In Gatwick and Heathrow.

00:49:00:03 - 00:49:07:07

Is it possible you could provide a comparison of car driving passenger parking levels using those figures?

00:49:08:05 - 00:49:46:05

Richard Haynes for the applicant. Based on the information that is available, yes we can. We've done some, um, sort of high level figures using the information that transport for London has, uh, has provided. Um, and that takes into account a number of those key variables. So we have, uh, as you just mentioned, uh, the higher taxi, um, uh, and uh, drop off mode chair at Heathrow. The other factor, if you compare against the millions of passengers per annum as an overall, um, sort of demand level, is that there are, uh, considerably higher, um, amount of transfer passengers within the overall Heathrow number.

00:49:46:14 - 00:50:14:07

Um, that uh, general proportion of um, of passengers connecting between flights is somewhere between sort of 30, 35%, um, compared to a, um, sort of a low single digit figure at Gatwick. So by the time you net those off and start looking at the specific proportion of trips that, um, arrived by car modes, we can do a comparison, provide that information to you for deadline six.

00:50:14:22 - 00:50:35:01

I think transport for London did do that net transfer passenger one. But the thing that when I was looking at the mode shares was your public transport level, as you rightly say, is much higher than Heathrow's, as well as their taxis being much higher and it's so cannot be resolved to, you know, beyond my mouth. But car parking numbers.

00:50:36:24 - 00:51:08:22

Uh, Richard Higgins, the applicant. Yes. We'll make that as clear and transparent as we possibly can, and make sure that we make clear the assumptions that we're including, um, in respect of, uh, some of that information comparing the two airports. Um, we have, um, aggregate levels of comparison as well for, um, for Luton and Stansted Airport, which has been provided, uh, in previous submissions, we've tended to only have direct access to comparable um, airport operated spaces.

00:51:09:09 - 00:51:40:12

Um, some information is available in respect of off airport, but it's not necessarily collected in the same way as the uh, Gatwick parking survey that, uh, that exists and has been reported, uh, particularly today and in previous, uh, submissions. So, um, we can, uh, we can provide as much comparable information as we can and we will break down some of those key, um, those key parameters which perhaps, um, make make better sense of of how parking reflects the number of car journeys that are coming to and from each airport.

00:51:41:20 - 00:51:49:10

Thank you. Um, well, probably my question. So I'll hear from interested parties, Mr. Bedford.

00:51:51:06 - 00:52:26:23

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, the joint local authorities. So you will know that in a number of our representations, we've raised concerns, uh, that, uh, we don't see, um, an adequate justification for the provision of a net increase by 2040 of 1100 additional spaces with the development in place. I was going to develop that point by drawing to your attention some of the discrepancies in table one.

00:52:26:25 - 00:52:52:06

But since we're now told that some of the figures in table one are not correct, we've not been told which ones. I think it's probably not going to be productive for me to try to highlight matters by reference to specific figures. And we will await the revised version of table one at deadline six before commenting on that. Um.

00:52:54:03 - 00:52:59:00

We do, uh, certainly think, uh, that, uh, the, um,

00:53:00:18 - 00:53:24:15

uh, using the ratios that the applicant suggests, uh, it needs to use between peak demand and available spaces, whether that's the 87.5% or 85% you can see in some of the figures, uh, we do think that the 1100 spaces, uh, doesn't have a sound justification.

00:53:26:05 - 00:54:02:27

The. There is a separate issue that we have raised, which is the treatment uh, of the non Gatwick airport operated car parking spaces. Um and we've obviously rehearsed that in our submissions. I think in fairness, if it's now been clarified that for the purposes of the Mod share targets. All of those spaces and trips to them are, as it were, included, and count against the applicant, as it were, because they're all counted as car journeys.

00:54:03:07 - 00:54:52:11

Then, although we might have preferred the presentation of those spaces in some of the figures, it probably doesn't matter that much as long as the controls achieve what is intended. I say. We've been told that that is the case. Um, then, um, in terms of, uh, further points, um, on parking, which avoid getting into the detail of precise, uh, numbers. So there are issues which we have been discussing with the applicant about the adequacy of the section 106 contributions to support control over off airport parking, the um, particularly the issue of uh, enforcement.

00:54:53:14 - 00:55:36:06

And I think it's clear what certainly is clear in our view, that the provision that's made by the applicant towards that needs to be realistic in order for the control to be effective. Um, we don't expect the examining authority to want to be interested in the precise detail of the amounts that have been discussed and the posts and so on. But, um, if we can say perhaps through you openly in the

examination, not only do we think the current position is unsatisfactory, um, we are perfectly content for there to be some form of review mechanism, uh, in an improved arrangement.

00:55:36:08 - 00:56:13:03

If it turned out that the post either was not required or not required for the duration, then that could be the subject of review. There are also issues about the costs of making periodic traffic regulation orders to regulate some of this off airport parking, and also, again, without troubling you with too much of the detail, I think within Surrey, because parking is dealt with as a civil enforcement matter, there is, again, a need for further, um, um, discussion with the applicant to ensure that that is adequately being addressed.

00:56:13:05 - 00:56:30:10

So there is some dialogue about that. We've not yet reached a common position, but we do think it's important that both on airport and off airport parking are adequately controlled in order to ensure that the service access commitments can be achieved. Thank you sir.

00:56:30:28 - 00:56:33:02

Thank you. Anyone else want?

00:56:34:26 - 00:56:35:22

As Mr. North.

00:56:37:11 - 00:57:15:12

Thank you. Thank you sir. I apologize for talking earlier about this topic of car parking. Um. I points to these that um, and they relate to Rep 1051 the table there, um. And I accept what the applicant has said about Mssp seven, which I'm grateful for. But the applicant, as far as the table in rep 1051 only considers on airport passenger car parking as constituting, consisting of what is referred to as airport related on airport spaces.

00:57:15:24 - 00:58:01:06

Being that the car parking spaces which are not operated by the airport within the boundary of Gatwick Airport, as shown on the proposals map accompanying the Crawley Borough Local Plan, are considered by Gal as off airport. I referred to the fact that there are a number of these sites, um, which are not, uh, airport operated on airport spaces, but within the boundaries of the airport. Uh, it seems to me that as, uh, old hat in this situation that the fundamental has always been, I've always been told the fundamental tenet of planning law is the character of the use of land, which remains important and not the particular needs of a particular occupier there.

00:58:01:08 - 00:58:37:25

As far as, um, the ro B is concerned. So the FA is ro A is concerned of the table in rep. 1051. It would seem to me that, um, if the applicant's provisions were accepted, it would significantly reduce the importance to be attached on airport related car parking. That's parking within the boundaries of the airport, which is not operated by the airport, but would still be comply with the provisions of policy 83, the Local Plan, the Crawley Borough Local Plan.

00:58:37:27 - 00:59:14:27

That's a policy which has been hitherto robustly supported by, in its present form, by the applicant. Uh, and my concern arises from the question of choice. Which appears, importantly in recent legislation or produced by CIA on the ability to provide travellers with choice in terms of car parking. My other point, and perhaps the most significant point, relates to what I've referred to as row B in the table produced in rep 151.

00:59:14:29 - 00:59:52:29

That is, the table notated as current authorized off airport passenger parking provision. I've noted, sir, that um, in the applicant has stated on page 15 of the response to rule 17 letter on car parking. That's document rep 4019. I'm quoting here, it should be noted that the figure for 2019 reflects the position as at summer 2019, and therefore predates the 20 19th September survey, and should be aligned to the September 2018 survey.

00:59:53:12 - 01:00:23:23

Fully accept that, sir. That pausing that point. And then it says, noting the distinction that on airport spaces in the context of the DCO submission relates to airport operated spaces only. All other spaces are included as off airport capacity provided by third parties, over which the applicant has no control as far as row B of the earlier table for 21,200 figure is concerned.

01:00:24:07 - 01:01:00:09

That would seem to to me to incorporate spaces which I would term on airport, namely non-legal spaces in the airport boundary. My fundamental point is this, that this application, which you now have before you is not a recent process. It's been going on since 2019. Now repeat what I said earlier. No robust assessment of authorized off airport passenger car parking spaces has been undertaken by the applicant.

01:01:01:05 - 01:01:31:18

I understand from the applicant that he has placed reliance on the Gatwick Airport Car Parking Survey. Those surveys are notoriously underestimated and do not take into account the formal planning status of each individual site, some of which are only seasonally operated and others. Which do not have, um. Which are not related to off airport car park and who do not have planning permission.

01:01:31:20 - 01:02:03:20

They do not have certificates. And there is a need to distinguish. So in hotel car parking, which is ancillary to a car park at Hotel North Airport. Car parking. Two are not the same. And there's been appeal decisions around Gatwick which actually reveal that very material change of use, i.e. from car parking, incidental or ancillary to a hotel and off airport car parking, which really is not solely related to the hotel.

01:02:04:20 - 01:02:35:28

A lot of airports. A lot of hotels around here, actually. Um, have rooms which bear no relationship. The number of cars in the survey. Um, so that put simply. If it's assumed that all hotel car parking can be used lawfully off airport car parking cases. That, in my view, is a fundamental error which reflects itself in the whole of the table in rep 1051. I have, um, in acting for the Clerks Act for.

01:02:36:23 - 01:03:07:24

The survey of ten sites. Taken from the 2018 Gatwick Airport Car Parking Survey. I looked to each one of those sites. And I did what I think with due respect to Yale should have done, and that is to assess the planning status of every one of those sites. I came up with an estimate, an overestimate of 1040 spaces, given the planning status of these sites on the respective councils websites.

01:03:08:23 - 01:03:39:05

Well that overestimate. If it is approximate, a thousand plus spaces should be added to the overprovision. Of car parking spaces, which are denoted to current authorized off airport car parking, but effectively on airport not operated by GA. You take the thousand spaces. And what I have calculated has been figures banded about a 4000 604,500.

01:03:39:07 - 01:04:18:12

I calculated B 4939. You add the two together. That's the 4939 spaces. It's from the applicant's point of view, comprise authorized off airport spaces, but are actually within the airport boundary. The 1040 spaces over provision of simply the tent sites. We've got nearly 6000 spaces, 5979 spaces. That figure should be deducted. The authorized off airport car parking total 22,587, which was the figure in 2018, not 21,200.

01:04:19:14 - 01:05:00:23

And that gives an off airport requirement of 16,608 authorized off airport car parking spaces. Now I can quite happily, and I've quite readily provided this information to the examining authority if that's if that is required. But at the end of the day, if you follow the methodology employed in that table, rep 105 actually involves an oversupply of spaces at the end of the day. Um, and as I think you've said already. So that doesn't mean you need 2500 robotic car parking spaces, but it really does require a thorough assessment of each individual site to look at the planning stages of that site.

01:05:00:25 - 01:05:32:18

This is a major application, and I'm staggered that a DC application doesn't consider every single car parking space off airport. The end. The interesting fact about all this, and there's been talk of, um, of increasing car parking charges or increasing forecourt charges. Recent events have shown that a third of all off airport car parking spaces, and it's because the policies operated around Gatwick are restrictive.

01:05:32:20 - 01:06:04:10

I fully accept that are all granted permission through certificates. Some of those spaces, even example one, which I was actively involved in, um, is shown on the latest car parking survey is 20 spaces. That site has a lawful use, both storage of cars and off airport car parking, and a number of car parking spaces that vary considerably. They go up to about 600 spaces on that site.

01:06:05:03 - 01:06:23:19

That's just one of those stories. I've been in others. I've been involved in others on that site. So I don't believe that this table, which is showing you that there is a net provision, which should only be 1100 spaces, is in any way accurate. And I will go further.

01:06:23:21 - 01:06:29:07

Mr. Mr. North, could I could I ask you have you submitted all of this in your.

01:06:29:13 - 01:06:36:08

I have submitted some of this. Yes. I have in representation at the last re deadline five.

01:06:36:18 - 01:06:41:17

Well a lot of it is very detailed. Would be very difficult for the applicant to respond to here. And now.

01:06:42:00 - 01:06:45:25

That it's in that is in my step four and.

01:06:45:27 - 01:06:57:27

Five. Okay. Well perhaps anything additional you have about the detail, the the numbers of parking spaces in car parks could be submitted in writing and the applicant could respond to that.

01:06:57:29 - 01:07:02:26

Be a deadline. Six yes, it would be, yes. I'm quite happy to do that. I have supplied that information.

01:07:02:28 - 01:07:03:23

Thank you. Thank you.

01:07:05:04 - 01:07:43:01

The other point, if I may. Is the figure of maximum occupancy of 87.5%, which has been mentioned today. That needs to be varied between whether the off airport car parking in terms of off airport car parking provision. I'm talking here, whether it's one of these traditional park and ride facilities, of which there are few, but they do remain, or whether it is catering merely for meet and greet specialists. Waiting for meet and greet specialists. 87.5 is too low because it's mostly block part, or it's exclusively on what I call traditional park and ride facilities.

01:07:43:12 - 01:08:15:07

They're not Lockport, but 87.5. May I have to accept be around about correct. Although it has increased. Um, but I think there's a need to examine again, it goes back to where in terms of off authorised off airport car parking, what is actually going on on that particular site? To to to use the appropriate occupancy rate because majority of them majority of the off airport lawful car parking sites uh block part.

01:08:16:26 - 01:08:19:04

I think that has a fundamental effect on these figures.

01:08:21:14 - 01:08:29:00

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. North. Anyone else have a comment? Car parking. Know what, Mr. Linus?

01:08:30:20 - 01:09:04:07

Scott. Linus for the applicant. Just on that final point on car parking, sir. Anticipated what I was going to say. There's a number of detail points there, including Mountain View, understandably raised at deadline five. To the extent we're able to deal with those, we'll cover those in the deadline six response. And if there's anything extra that comes in at deadline six will respond to that. Um, accordingly. Um, uh, beyond that detail, though, I think our position at this stage is that we've taken information that has been supplied by local authorities, and we see no reason why we shouldn't be able to rely upon that when preparing our figures.

01:09:04:09 - 01:09:36:16

But we can explain that again in response to the figures that have been provided. Um, as if I can just go back to some previous points that were that were raised. I just want to emphasize, sir, that although there are some errors in relation to the parking demand accumulation in table one of the rules 17 response table two uh, of the car parking strategy at rep 051. Those figures are still correct. So if there were any questions relating to parking provision to which that table is relevant, we are still able to answer them, obviously.

01:09:37:04 - 01:10:08:22

Um, secondly, I would say in response to this broad point at the rear by the JLR about the need for 1100 extra spaces, I think the way that has been put ignores the wider context for car parking provision, to the extent there is any allegation of potential over Overprovision. Um, that does not take into account that that is really a matter for, uh, Google as far as its compliance with the Saxe is concerned.

01:10:09:04 - 01:10:38:01

Ultimately, insofar as any concern is expressed about car park capacity and the potential for it to influence mode share, the airport still has to meet its sustainable surface access commitments. And that is a moderate risk as to how it delivers those. So if there is any alleged overprovision, that's not to get around the fact that we still have to meet the commitments removed from our share. Um.

01:10:40:15 - 01:10:41:00

Told.

01:10:45:01 - 01:11:20:25

Richard Higgins for the applicant. Um, I'd just like to, uh, I think pick up on a more, uh, I think general point, um, perhaps sort of, um, uh, implied or related to the information that Mr. North, uh, gave in his, uh, in his representation, um, in the, I think the, um. The approach to looking at every individual space is disproportionate to the overall approach to looking at market demand and available capacity for car parking.

01:11:21:04 - 01:11:59:15

Um, yes. It's absolutely appropriate that we should have an accurate and reasonable representation of where parking exists in and around Gatwick. Um, we accept that there is a terminology, uh, complication about having on airport but non gal operated spaces. Um, but fundamentally in terms of the overall capacity that's being provided and under current local plan policies, um, no expected change in those off airport, uh, parking capacities or indeed on the on airport non gal operated spaces.

01:11:59:26 - 01:12:27:21

Then if we were to then apply those that capacity into our models and use the models to estimate future demand. Future demand is estimating a requirement for an additional 1100 spaces. Um, and hence our proposal for 1100 additional spaces on airport as being, first of all, the most sustainable location for secondly, the location which is permissible under current development rights.

01:12:34:01 - 01:12:53:12

Thank you. Could I just make a point? Now, you've said that it reminded me about this table. Is what you're saying to me about table one and a rule 17 response is the estimated parking demand. Is incorrect. You get a column that says estimated parking demand.

01:12:53:20 - 01:12:57:23

Richard Higgins for the applicant. Yes, that's correct. The numbers that are in that column of that table.

01:12:57:25 - 01:13:15:19

Well, the thing that strikes me as having thought about it now, right at the beginning on the surface access commitments, they ask you about the 53% I took out of this table as the chair, which you said is actually should be 54.2. So is that public transport mode share column correct then?

01:13:17:24 - 01:13:41:18

Uh, Richard Higgins for the applicant. We will look in that and make sure that we're picking up any potential errors in there. Um, there may be, um, uh, rounding changes in there. The 54.2%, uh, which I think you're referring to is the 20 is the, um, 2029 figure. Um, so we'll review where we are with, uh, with, with all the figures that have gone into that table.

01:13:42:17 - 01:14:01:12

This service allows for the applicant if it would help. So obviously we're going to provide the correct figures at deadline six. But if it would help you to understand. The substance of what that detail will include at deadline. We're happy to explain that after lunch if you're going to find that helpful at this stage.

01:14:01:16 - 01:14:19:09

No, I mean, I'm hoping, correct me if I'm wrong, to have a replacement table. What? Yeah. Well, I mean, basically what I wanted to start with. And that's why I was a bit disappointed that this is the wrong one. But it would be fine as I understand what I'm going to get, I think.

01:14:20:19 - 01:14:23:08

That's going to play well. We apologize again, sir. Thank you.

01:14:23:19 - 01:14:34:25

Thank you. Well, that said, it is now almost 1:10, so I think this is an appropriate time to adjourn for lunch till so we say 2:00. So this meeting is adjourned.