



National Infrastructure Planning
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer Services:
Email: 0303 444 5000
GatwickAirport@
planninginspectorate.gov.uk

The Applicant

Your Ref:

Our Ref: TR020005/ PD-025

Date: 15 July 2024

Dear Sir/ Madam

**Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) - Section 89(3); and the Infrastructure Planning
(Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – Rule 17**

**Application by Gatwick Airport Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent
for the Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project**

Request for further information and written comments

We are writing under Rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 to request further information. These questions are set out in **Annex A**. They are addressed solely to the Applicant.

Responses should be submitted by **Deadline 8 (7 August 2024)**. Any Interested Party wishing to respond to such responses can do so by Deadline 9 (21 August 2024).

Yours faithfully

Kevin Gleeson

Lead Member of the Examining Authority

This communication does not constitute legal advice.
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.

R17c	Question to:	Question:
R17c.1	The Applicant	<p>North Terminal Decked Long Stay Parking.</p> <p>As part of Project Change No. 4 for the proposed onsite Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) it is proposed to replace the resulting lost surface car parking by increasing the size of the proposed decked car park on part of the North Terminal long stay surface car park. This revised decked car park would not increase in height but would increase in surface area. This enlargement of the area of this proposed decked car park would not require any alteration to the draft DCO [REP6-005]. The only control specified in the draft DCO is the 11.0m height shown on the Parameter Plans [REP6-011] and in Schedule 13 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>ES Chapter 5 Project Description [REP6-013] has been updated to allow for the replacement of surface parking lost by increasing the size of this decked car park. In paragraph 5.2.116 and Table 5.2.2 the level of replacement parking has been increased. The draft DCO would allow for this increased number of decked car park spaces to be constructed and used even if the onsite WTW is not constructed and the existing surface car parking had not been lost. In this scenario there would be an additional 1162 spaces constructed, which have not been accounted for in any of the submitted assessments. How would this scenario be controlled by the draft DCO?</p>
R17c.2	The Applicant	<p>Draft DCO [REP6-013] – Control Over Parking.</p> <p>The parking scenario set out in the above question raises the possibility that parking numbers on site could be increased without further consent. Estimate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="629 1091 1935 1203">i. The theoretical maximum increase of onsite parking numbers that could be achieved by increasing the plan areas of all proposed decked or multi storey car parking to utilise all practically available corresponding surface parking site areas; and <li data-bbox="629 1208 2031 1362">ii. The theoretical maximum increase of onsite parking numbers that could be achieved by utilising existing permitted development rights under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 8 Class F. This number should be based on the completed layout of the Proposed Development.

R17c	Question to:	Question:
R17c.3	The Applicant	<p>Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP6-067] – General Clarification</p> <p>Confirm that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public transport mode share is the annualised average and not peak month; • Estimated parking accumulation is peak August level; and • Traffic analysis undertaken in the TA and the ES is based on June peak traffic levels.
R17c.4	The Applicant	<p>Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP6-067] – Future Baseline Parking</p> <p>Paragraph 3.5.5 of the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] states “<i>The calculations include authorised off-airport passenger parking sites continuing in operation and also assume that the maximum practical occupancy of on- and off-airport car parks would be 87.5% of total provision. This still allows for operational flexibility and reflects both the continued turnover of vehicles and some variability in passenger arrival times, which means that it is not possible for every individual space to be occupied at one time.</i>”</p> <p>The revised Table 1 shows that with the currently proposed future baseline parking provision the maximum practical occupancy does not exceed the 87.5% level until 2046. The ExA understands that the MSCP7 (3250 spaces) is expected to be complete by 2025. This would take the total spaces in the future baseline to 43570 and at that level the maximum practical occupancy level of 87.5% would not be exceeded until 2038. The ExA would like to understand why the delivery of the 2500 robotic parking spaces, by means of permitted development, is planned to start to be delivered in 2025/26 when occupancy levels would be predicted to be less than 75% until beyond 2033.</p>
R17c.5	The Applicant	<p>Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP6-067] – Robotic Parking Provision</p> <p>Should the Secretary of State approve the DCO and based on the analysis provided in the revised Table 1, the ExA can understand how the 2500 robotic parking spaces may form part of the parking provision required for the Proposed Development. If the DCO is approved the future baseline parking provision would be subsumed into the Proposed Development case and in this scenario the revised Table 1 seems to provide evidence as to the need to increase spaces early on to allow for the</p>

R17c	Question to:	Question:
		construction programme to progress. On that basis why does the 2500 spaces requirement not form part of the Proposed Development case?
R17c.6	The Applicant	<p>Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP6-067] - Use of Block Parking</p> <p>In the Car Parking Strategy [REP1-051] paragraph 3.6.3 states that <i>“Although the full range of parking products available on-airport will be retained, GAL will continue to manage available spaces flexibly, in order to maximise efficiency during construction. This is likely to include the increased use of block parking temporarily while spaces lost to construction are replaced with new facilities.”</i></p> <p>Explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. If and how this use of block parking is quantified in the revised Table 1 in the “with Project” case? ii. If a more general change in parking management occurred towards providing block parking, provide an estimation of the maximum practical possible increase in parking numbers that could occur on site; and iii. The parking controls proposed in the draft DCO that would reassure the Secretary of State that more use of block parking would not lead to an overprovision of car parking on site than the levels assessed.
R17c.7	The Applicant	<p>Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP6-067] – Mode Shares</p> <p>The ExA is unclear how the notes to the revised Table 1 signpost the modelled mode share in 2029, 2032, 2038 and 2047. Explain or signpost the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Note1 – It is stated that these annual average values are taken from the Transport Assessment [REP3-058] but the location of the data is not clearly signposted as in Note 5. The ExA has assumed that Table 72 in the Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260] is the source of the data but is unable to reconcile the figures. Provide a table reconciling the figures for the relevant years in Table 1 with their source information.

R17c	Question to:	Question:
		ii. Note 5 - The location is clearly signposted as Table 135 of the Transport Assessment Annex B – Strategic Transport Modelling Report [APP-260]. The ExA is unable to reconcile the figures. Provide a table reconciling the figures for the relevant years in Table 1 with their source information.
R17c.8	The Applicant	<p>Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP6-067] – With Project Parking Accumulation.</p> <p>Provide a detailed explanation, referencing source data and calculations as to how the Estimated Parking Demand falls from 32800 in 2023 to 30480 in 2029 and only rises to above the 2023 figure in 2031 by which time there is predicted to be almost 29 mppa more than in 2023. The ExA notes that in the future baseline case this does not occur.</p>
R17c.9	The Applicant	<p>Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP6-067] - Commuter Parking Spaces</p> <p>Note 2 to Table 1 explains why the passenger parking capacity has been reduced to 40,320 by the removal of a total 290 “commuter” parking spaces. Provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Location plan of this parking area; ii. An explanation of the term “commuters” in this context; and iii. An explanation of how this parking would be controlled in the draft DCO for this use and not be used as part of the overall passenger parking provision if required.
R17c.10	The Applicant	<p>Response to Rule 17 Letter – Car Parking [REP6-067] – Staff Parking</p> <p>Table 2 sets out details of staff mode share, employee numbers and car parking capacity. Given the shift working and mode share changes there is no direct comparison that can be drawn from the overall employee numbers between the current position and the 2047 position. The ExA would like to understand the likely parking demand given the changes in mode share and employee increases. Provide:</p>

R17c	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Details of current peak parking demand and also an estimation of the 2047 “with project” peak parking demand; and ii. If the 2047 parking demand exceeds the available parking capacity, an explanation of how this demand will be met or parking demand will be constrained within capacity.
R17c.11	The Applicant	<p>On Airport Parking Not Operated by the Applicant.</p> <p>The ExA understands why the expired permission for 820 spaces has been removed from the parking numbers associated with the Project. However, the ExA is not clear why they were included in the original with project onsite parking numbers. Explain why these spaces were originally included within the on airport numbers when all other spaces not operated by the Applicant are regarded as offsite provision?</p>