



Tim North
& Associates
Limited

Chartered Town Planning
& Development Consultants

Maple Gate
Brampton Abbots
Ross-on-Wye
Herefordshire HR9 7JD



**Representations prepared on behalf of Holiday Extras Ltd as it relates to
Gatwick Airport DCO Application**

Deadline 7 - Monday 15th July 2024

PINS Reference No. TR020005

Registration Identification No. 20044870

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1.00 INTRODUCTION	3
2.00 COMMITMENT 1	3
3.00 COMMITMENT 8A	4
4.00 ANOMALIES IN THE APPLICANT’S CAR PARKING STRATEGY [DOCUMENT REP1-051]	5

1.00 INTRODUCTION

1.01 The representations raised by Holiday Extras Ltd at Deadlines 4, 5 and 6 remain unaltered, save insofar as they are superseded by the contents of this document. A new Table 1 has been inserted into **Document REP6-068** following the ISH8 meeting on 18th June 2024, at which time the Applicant confirmed there were serious errors surrounding what was previously included as Table 1 in GAL's response to the Rule 17 letter on Car Parking [**Document REP4-019**], concerning a comparison of future baseline and proposed development on airport passenger/visitor parking.

2.00 COMMITMENT 1

2.01 Commitment 1 set out in **Document REP6-031** being an amendment to Appendix 5.4.1: Surface Access Commitments - Tracked Version, as with earlier versions of the same document, states that GAL must achieve by the third anniversary of the commencement of dual runway operations and on an annual basis thereafter, a minimum of 55% of air passenger journeys to and from the airport to be made by public transport. An examination of revised Table 1 in **Document REP6-068** reveals that with the Project, the passenger transport annual model modal share is expected to reach 55.2% in 2032.

2.02 It is my clients' view that the Examining Authority should be concerned that this figure is only 0.2% above that for which there is a mandatory public transport modal share requirement of 55% three years after commencement of works relating to the Northern Runway project. This has implications seen in terms of the overall governance of sustainable modal share targets, reinforcing the view that an independent mechanism is required which has as its basis requirements for defined caps to be provided in the Section 106 Agreement as well as in the Development Consent Order relating to passenger journeys to and from the airport.

2.03 Indeed, it is only in 2038 that the development with the Project shows total passenger car parking spaces on airport to exceed the total number of passenger car parking spaces expected in accordance with the future baseline. The public transport annual model modal share throughout the latter stages of the period of the DCO application, reveals that between 2041 and 2047, the aspirational target of a minimum of 60% of air passenger journeys to and from the airport to be made by public transport as set out in paragraph 7.1.3 of **Document REP6-031**, falls short by 4.1%. This would suggest that it is unlikely

that the aspirational target will be achieved within the time frame of the DCO application, reducing its significance in the same document.

3.00 COMMITMENT 8A

3.01 **Document REP6-031** introduces additional wording to Commitment 8A, such that it now reads:

“GAL shall assess the need for additional parking over and above that required to replace capacity lost as a result of construction in connection with the Project, and provide sufficient but no more additional on-Airport public car parking spaces than necessary to achieve a combined on- and off-airport supply that is consistent with the mode share commitments (commitments 1-4); and GAL shall consult with the TFSG in advance of providing such parking.”

3.02 This additional wording is consistent with Obligation 5.6 of the current Section 106 Agreement and is intended with other commitments to give the joint local authorities comfort that the sustainable access commitments provide effective control, avoiding the scenario of excess parking being provided which the same joint local authorities say may contribute to the same sustainable access commitments not being met.

3.03 The amendments to Commitment 8A, along with the provisions set out at paragraph 4.2.2 of **Document REP6-031** including the definition of “airport related facilities” defined as “those hotels which are within or adjacent to the airport boundary and provide accommodation to passengers prior to departure, and airport-related car parking (including both on-airport and off-airport car parking) whether operated by GAL or not”, places an increased onus on long term off-airport car parking providers to positively contribute in meeting the sustainable mode share targets now sought by the Applicant.

3.04 As the Applicant states, GAL has no control over those lawful long term off-airport car parking companies. They have not been invited to the Airport Transport Forum and no mechanism has been set up for regular meetings with the same long term off-airport car parking companies. It appears to the writer that these amendments, devoid of any working relationship with long term off-airport car parking providers, has been inserted to ensure the Applicant stands the optimum chance of achieving the 55% public transport commitment, whilst at the same time avoiding a cap being inserted in respect of any sustainable transport modes to the airport which would provide an independent controlling mechanism governing the same issue.

- 3.05 The Applicant in its amendments now incorporated into **Document REP6-031** sets out details in which a statement detailing the use of the sustainable transport fund is to be provided, yet no indication is given as to whether this statement is to be made publicly available.
- 3.06 It can be seen that it is also the Applicant's intention, with which my clients are in agreement, to reduce traffic movements involving kiss-and-fly, as well as taxi modes insofar as they involve twice as many trips than passengers' cars parked at **or near the airport** (paragraph 2.1.4 of **Document REP6-084**). It is the view of the Applicant that it is important to reduce these trips as much as possible, particularly when the highway networks are busiest. My client would agree with this sentiment.
- 3.07 The contents of paragraph 2.1.5 of **Document REP6-084** go on to state *"This means that if the Applicant is successful in turning more of these types of trips into car journeys that park at or near the airport, the actual number of cars on the road may increase even whilst the public transport mode share remains static, or even drops."* Unfortunately, the restrictive stance adopted by the airport towards allowing airport related car parking outside the boundaries of London Gatwick Airport are not conducive to meeting these aims, and as a consequence, doubts must be cast on the extent to which independent governance will guarantee the 55% public transport modal share target is actually achieved.
- 3.08 It can be seen that the amendments which are now incorporated into the mode share commitments set out in **Document REP6-031**, with its reliance placed on authorised long term off-airport operators, does not sit comfortably in the absence of any tangible mechanism which will allow long term off-airport providers to actively contribute to ensuring public transport mode share targets are met. If this were to be achieved solely through dynamic pricing, and flexibility afforded to the Applicant to amend its on-airport parking product, then there would be no need for the amendments now sought whereby long term off-airport car parking companies have a role to play in ensuring Commitments 1 to 4 are met.
- 4.00 ANOMALIES IN THE APPLICANT'S CAR PARKING STRATEGY [DOCUMENT REP1-051]**
- 4.01 There are anomalies present in the approach adopted by the Applicant in the Car Parking Strategy, which in turn is materially different from the approach taken by GAL to ensure

surface access commitments, particularly where they relate to the 55% of air passenger journeys to and from the airport to be made by public transport are met.

- 4.02 In respect of the Car Parking Strategy advanced by the Applicant, “*on-airport*” means airport operated on-airport spaces only, ie. those spaces that the airport can influence and directly control, and spaces and locations which do not fit this description are defined as “*off-airport*”. This is a matter referred to in paragraphs 3.1.8 and 3.1.9 of **Document REP6-068**. The stance adopted by the Applicant in paragraph 3.2.5 of **Document REP6-078** is however different in that those spaces which are defined as off-airport in paragraph 3.1.9 of **Document REP6-068** are included and have been accounted for in Table 2 of the Car Parking Strategy.
- 4.03 This has an impact in Row B of Table 2 set out in the Car Parking Strategy **Document REP1-051]** and becomes immediately apparent in Table 1 entitled “*2047 Car Parking Requirements*” set out in **Document REP6-127**, being representations provided on behalf of Holiday Extras Ltd. There is a need for a consistent approach which in adopting the stance set out in **Document REP6-068** means deducting what the Applicant refers to as off-airport spaces from Row B, and similarly adding the same number of spaces in Row A. In my client’s view it appears there has been an attempt to confuse the situation, particularly given the contents of paragraph 3.2.5 on page 10 of **Document REP6-078** insofar as adopting the Applicant’s methodology, an over-supply of passenger car parking spaces results a matter evident from Table 1 of **Document REP6-127**.
- 4.04 The Applicant during the time it was preparing its DCO application has at no time sought to carry out a robust assessment of lawful off-airport car parking in the vicinity of London Gatwick Airport, which is a major omission on a project of the current size. Instead, reliance is placed on the methodology set out in the Annual Gatwick Car Parking Survey. The applicant in paragraph 3.1.12 of **Document REP6-079** refers to paragraph 18 of the Inspector’s decision letter in which it is stated that the surveys are only a snapshot of available parking on a particular day, before adding that the have proven to be reliable over the years on the basis that they have carried out the same standard methodology. That comment arises from an application which sought a temporary 3-year limited period permission for a long term off-airport car parking facility, where the central issue was to show a demonstrable need for off-airport car parking at the time of the proposed development.

- 4.05 In contrast, the current proposal is a DCO application comprising a major infrastructure project extending over a period to 2047. The Applicant has not disputed the fact that there are lawful sites which are limited in terms of their seasonal use, and more importantly have not sought to show that any of the sample of ten sites referred to by my client in **Document REP4-018** accurately portrays the number of lawful off-airport car parking spaces present.
- 4.06 It is not disproportionate to carry out an exercise which accurately portrays the number of long term off-airport car parking sites, and it is absurd to suggest that there is no expected change in off-airport car parking. That simply is not consistent with the facts which show a continued number of sites coming forward, not through planning permissions being granted, but through Lawful Development Certificates being issued by surrounding local planning authorities. It is a situation arising as a consequence of a lack of resources available to the respective local authorities, resulting in sites coming forward which are increasingly unsustainable in terms of their distance from the airport.

-o0o-