



Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

The Applicant's Response to Actions
ISH8: Car Parking

Book 10

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: JUNE 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.50.2

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Action Point 2	1

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This document provides the Applicant’s response to the actions arising from Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) 8 in relation to Agenda Item 4: Car Parking. The actions relevant to the Applicant are as follows:

Action No.	Action	Deadline
2	Provide a corrected Table 1 [REP4-019] of the Applicant’s R17 including corrections to parking accumulations and mode shares.	Deadline 6
3	Tim North to provide detailed car parking calculations referenced in oral submission that have not previously been submitted.	Deadline 6

- 1.1.2 The below sections provide the Applicant’s response. For actions which require a more detailed response, a reference to the appropriate document is included.

2 Action Point 2

- 2.1.1 **The Examining Authority has asked the Applicant to provide a corrected Table 1 [REP4-019] of the Applicant’s R17 including corrections to parking accumulations and mode shares. The following response is provided.**

2.2 Introduction

- 2.2.1 The **Response to Rule 17 Letter - Car Parking [REP4-019]** contains two tables presenting comparisons of mode share, parking demand and parking provision for the future baseline and with Project cases, for air passengers and for Airport employees.
- 2.2.2 At Issue Specific Hearing 8 (ISH8) the Applicant confirmed in oral exchanges that the information contained in Table 1 of the **Response to Rule 17 Letter - Car Parking [REP4-019]** was incorrect. The Applicant apologised and committed to

providing a corrected version of the table at Deadline 6. A revised version of the Rule 17 letter itself is submitted at Deadline 6 **Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking** (Doc Ref. 10.21 v2) together with a redline comparison against the original version of that document.

2.2.3 In the course of correcting Table 1 of [\[REP4-019\]](#) it has become apparent that the mode share information for 2029 and 2032 contained in Table 2 of [\[REP4-019\]](#) is also inconsistent with employee mode share information quoted in Table 74 and Table 137 of **Transport Assessment Annex B - Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [\[APP-260\]](#). The Applicant is therefore taking the opportunity to correct Table 2 as part of this response.

2.3 Revision of Table 1 of **Response to Rule 17 Letter - Car Parking** [\[REP4-019\]](#)

2.3.1 Table 1 of the **Response to Rule 17 Letter - Car Parking** [\[REP4-019\]](#) provided information on parking related to air passengers. The errors contained in that table are identified below, together with the corrections that have been made.

2.3.2 The figures for air passenger public transport mode share in 2029 and 2032 (columns 2 and 6 of the original table labelled "PT Mode Share (%)") were incorrectly drawn from old data and are not consistent with the responses given in Table 4 of **The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) - Traffic and Transport** [\[REP3-104\]](#), in response to question TT.1.41 which were based on the modelled mode shares used in the Transport Assessment [\[REP3-058\]](#). The mode share values for 2029 and 2032 have therefore been corrected to be consistent with the modelled mode shares and as reported in Table 4 of the question TT.1.41 response [\[REP3-104\]](#) and the interpolation of mode shares for other years has been recalculated. Mode shares are now shown to one decimal place in the revised Table 1.

2.3.3 In addition, the figures for estimated peak air passenger parking demand (columns 4 and 8 of the original Table 1 labelled "Est. Parking Demand (day)") were not correct and not consistent with the modelled mode shares and as reported in 2029 and 2032 in Table 4 of **The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) - Traffic and Transport** [\[REP3-104\]](#), in response to question TT.1.41. The peak parking demand figures for 2029 and 2032 have been corrected to be consistent with the modelled mode shares and Table 4 of the question TT.1.41 response [\[REP3-104\]](#) and the interpolation of parking demand for other years has been recalculated. The figures from the original Table 1 incorrectly referenced a single day parking demand, and did not reflect the added accumulation from an increase in trips across the peak period,

which affects the available capacity on a busy day allowing for the higher build up of demand.

- 2.3.4 Separately, it was also identified that the figures for the total number of air passenger spaces (columns 3 and 7 of the original Table 1 labelled "Total Spaces") were not correct from 2025 onwards. This resulted from the inclusion of 3,700 additional spaces for the future baseline expansion of MSCP7, rather than the correct figure of 3,250 spaces as reported in paragraph 4.4.6 of **ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation** [APP-029], paragraph 12.6.58 of **ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport** [REP3-016] and paragraph 3.4.2 of the **Car Parking Strategy** [REP1-051]. This was a transposition error and the parking supply figures have been corrected in the revised Table 1.
- 2.3.5 As well as correcting the data errors discussed above, to assist the ExA, the table has been extended to include years up to 2047, so that the ExA has information on the profile of parking capacity and demand for the full period assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Traffic and Transport** [REP3-016].
- 2.3.6 The revised table of parking information for air passengers is provided at Table 1 of the revised **Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking** (Doc Ref. 10.21 v2) submitted at Deadline 6.
- 2.3.7 In the light of the revisions presented in the revised Table 1, the Applicant has provided further commentary below in relation to some of the areas of discussion which were raised in ISH8.

Introduction of robotic parking technology

- 2.3.8 The planned introduction of robotics technology, as a method to achieve greater car parking density through block parking cars, within the existing South Terminal long stay area, to increase air passenger parking capacity by 2,500 spaces, is a future baseline project, as described in paragraph 4.4.6 of ES Chapter 4: Existing Site and Operation [APP-029].
- 2.3.9 The Applicant proposes to bring this forward irrespective of the Northern Runway Project under its permitted development rights as necessary and it does not therefore form part of the Project. This is explained further in response to ISH4 Action Point 7 in **The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISH2-5** [REP2-005] and in response to ISH7 Action Point 12 in **The Applicant's Response to Actions - ISH7 – Other Environmental Matters** [REP4-037]. Additional information regarding the justification for the proposed provision of these additional spaces is provided in the subsequent paragraphs below.

Car parking supply and demand – future baseline

- 2.3.10 The revised Table 1 shows that the supply of parking spaces will increase between 2024 and 2027 as a result of the introduction of future baseline parking projects. These comprise an additional 3,250 spaces at MSCP7 and 1,000 robotics spaces in 2025, a further 1,000 robotics spaces in 2026 and 500 robotics spaces in 2027.
- 2.3.11 Peak air passenger car parking accumulation in the future baseline is expected to increase steadily, leading to peak parking occupancy of around 80% of supply in 2038 and just under 90% of supply in 2047.
- 2.3.12 Without the inclusion of the robotics technology proposal, peak parking occupancy in the future baseline would be close to 95%.
- 2.3.13 As the Applicant noted during ISH8, the optimum level of peak occupancy is between 85% and 90% because in practice the nature of how car parks are managed explained further in the subsequent paragraphs below.
- 2.3.14 As the Applicant noted at ISH8, the 87.5% occupancy figure is derived by the need to operationally maintain a buffer due to several factors that make achieving 100% occupancy (every space occupied at one time) unachievable. Paragraph 3.5.5 in the Car Parking Strategy [[REP1-051](#)] outlines the need for operational flexibility and for the continued turnover of vehicles.
- 2.3.15 In practical terms, for both on and off-airport parking, there are several reasons why 87.5% is the figure used. When passengers arrive to park and when they arrive to collect their car is often variable to what time is actually booked; impacted by flight delays and cancellations, actively extending or curtailing their trip (parking length of stay) and amending or cancelling their parking booking. Operationally, to allow for traffic to flow and people to be able to access the car park and find a space, plus the continued turnover of vehicles there are limitations at certain times of days / days of the week (when you delve into the profile of flight times and even more granular when you apply airline mix and propensity to park) which mean a buffer is needed to ensure a stable operation.
- 2.3.16 The 87.5% figure also represents a blend across different parking products which have slightly different characteristics of how full they can operate at; for example, Valet Parking has a throughput per hour dynamic which involves availability of labour, bussing, traffic flow, arrival / returns and ensuring cars are where they should be at the right time which are impacted by the factors outlined in the previous paragraph.

- 2.3.17 Additionally, on-airport parking provision reserves a percentage of spaces for roll up parking demand which is inherently hard to forecast and can be impacted by external events like industrial action on the rail network.
- 2.3.18 Furthermore, since the information in the **Car Parking Strategy** [\[REP1-051\]](#) was prepared, the Applicant has agreed that the potential increase of 820 spaces at the Hilton hotel car park should not be included in the future baseline parking supply figures. This reduces the assumed air passenger parking capacity available in the future baseline and leads to expected occupancy levels slightly in excess of the 87.5% target used for the calculations in Table 2 of the **Car Parking Strategy** [\[REP1-051\]](#). Nevertheless, even without the Hilton spaces, peak occupancy would be generally less than 90%, which the Applicant considers is manageable as it would only occur for a relatively short period during the peak summer months.

Car parking supply and demand – with Project

- 2.3.19 The estimated number of air passenger parking spaces in each year with the Project varies from 2025 to 2038 because of changes that would be made to car parks during the construction of the Project, which would lead to the loss of some existing spaces and their successive replacement, together with provision of the net addition of 1,100 spaces sought as part of the Project.
- 2.3.20 The additional 5,750 spaces from the future baseline projects would become available between 2024 and 2027, offsetting the losses that would result from the closure of other existing areas of parking for construction. Between 2027 and 2032, supply would increase again as some of the replacement parking provision is completed. Between 2032 and 2037 the overall supply of parking would fall as further spaces are removed for construction activity, with replacement spaces becoming available in 2037 and the final provision being reached in 2038.
- 2.3.21 During construction there are forecast to be some periods between 2034 and 2036 when total on-airport capacity operated by the Applicant is reduced to a level where forecast occupancy is above 90%. Whilst it is sub-optimal to operate at these high percentages over the long term, during these limited periods the Applicant will act, where possible, to schedule those construction projects that impact car parks to start after the summer peak period or finish before the summer peak period. It may also be possible to temporarily allocate some staff spaces to block-parking, through the use of incentives for staff to increase their use of sustainable modes during the summer, and use dynamic pricing to manage passenger spaces across all parking products and maintain choice for passengers.

- 2.3.22 The revised Table 1 shows that peak air passenger parking accumulation is expected to decrease slightly in the years prior to the commencement of dual runway operations (2029), as a consequence of introducing measures to increase public transport mode share and achieve a trajectory towards the mode share commitments in **ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments** [\[REP3-028\]](#). Once dual runway operations have commenced, parking demand is expected to increase relatively quickly between 2029 and 2032 and thereafter at a steady but slower rate.
- 2.3.23 As noted in the answer to question TT.1.38 in **The Applicant's Response to the ExA's Written Questions (ExQ1) - Traffic and Transport** [\[REP3-104\]](#), despite removing the 820 Hilton hotel car park spaces from the calculation of future parking supply, the Applicant has not sought to increase its proposal for a net addition of 1,100 air passenger car parking spaces.
- 2.3.24 The figures in the revised Table 1 suggest that this fluctuation in air passenger parking supply combined with the profile of peak parking accumulation could lead to peak occupancy levels of between 90% and 98% in the period from 2033 to 2036. It is, however, important to note that the table provides a 'snapshot' figure for parking supply for a single year. In practice, and as described above, the Applicant would consider opportunities to phase the removal and replacement of parking during construction to maximise air passenger parking supply as far as possible in the busy summer months. As paragraph 3.1.5 of the **Response to Rule 17 Letter - Car Parking** [\[REP4-019\]](#) notes, this could also include temporarily allocating some staff parking for air passenger use if required to meet demand.
- 2.3.25 The continued flexibility to plan and respond to changes in air passenger parking supply and demand during the construction period is therefore important to allow the Applicant to manage parking effectively and limit pressure on off-airport parking capacity.
- 2.4 **Revision of Table 2 of Response to Rule 17 Letter - Car Parking** [\[REP4-019\]](#)
- 2.4.1 Table 2 of the **Response to Rule 17 Letter - Car Parking** [\[REP4-019\]](#) provided information on parking related to Airport employees.
- 2.4.2 The figures for car driver mode share in 2029 and 2032 (columns 2 and 5 of the original table) were not consistent with those given in Table 74 and Table 137 of **Transport Assessment Annex B - Strategic Transport Modelling Report** [\[APP-260\]](#). The mode share values for 2029 and 2032 have been corrected to be consistent with the relevant tables in [\[APP-260\]](#) and the interpolation of mode

shares for other years has been recalculated. Mode shares are now shown to one decimal place in the revised table in order to confirm consistency with Table 4 of [\[REP3-104\]](#).

- 2.4.3 The revised table of parking information for Airport employees is provided at Table 2 of the revised **Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking** (Doc Ref. 10.21 v2) submitted at Deadline 6. For completeness and in line with the revised Table 1, the revised Table 2 has also been extended to include years to 2047.
- 2.4.4 The amendments to the car driver mode share in the revised Table 2 provide consistency with other information submitted to the Examination and do not alter the Applicant's position that it will not increase staff parking as part of the Project (Commitment 11 of **ES Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments** [\[REP3-028\]](#)).