

<p><b>Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement</b>  <b>PADSS from Network Rail</b></p>	<p><b>Version Number: 3.0</b>  <b>Submitted at: 21/08/2024</b></p>
---	--

## Contents

- 1. Land implications ..... 3**
  - 1.1. Land implications..... 3
  - 1.2. Asset protection ..... 3
- 2. Transport assessment: overall conclusion that no mitigation for rail system required ..... 3**
  - 2.1. Lack of mitigative funding for rail..... 3
- 3. Transport assessment: technical modelling approach, assumptions, comprehensiveness and conclusions ..... 7**
  - 3.1. Model supply assumptions..... 7
  - 3.2. Technical model clarification and alignment..... 8
  - 3.3. Gatwick Airport station capacity is a concern with future passenger levels..... 9
  - 3.4. Wider network capacity issues that are unacknowledged and/or assessed ..... 10
- 4. Transport Assessment: Sustainable Access Commitments queries and issues..... 12**
  - 4.1. Mode share target for rail..... 12
  - 4.2. Mode share opportunities..... 12

This Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement (PADSS) has been prepared following the format set out in the Planning Inspectorate’s letter of 8 September 2023.

The first version of this PADSS was submitted to the Examining Authority on 15 March 2024 as an annex to Network Rail's written representation. A second version was submitted to the Examining Authority on 6 June 2024. The table below sets out in track changes Network Rail's final position based on the engagement with Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) and our understanding of the measures now proposed within the Surface Access Commitments.

Principal Issue in Question	Concern held	What needs to change/be amended/be included in order to satisfactorily address the concern	Likelihood of concern being addressed during Examination
<b>1. Land implications</b>			
<b>1.1. Land implications</b>	<p>The DCO includes the proposed compulsory acquisition of land and rights belonging to Network Rail. These rights include the permanent acquisition of land, the temporary occupation of land and the acquisition of rights benefitting Network Rail, including rights of access.</p> <p>Work is ongoing to review the impact of these proposed acquisition, but these access rights should be maintained so that Network Rail can effectively and safely access and maintain the railway.</p>	<p>Technical Clearance underway within Network Rail to clarify impact and acceptability of the land acquisition proposals.</p> <p>Network Rail expects all rights that it relies on to be retained.</p>	<p>Concern addressed.</p> <p>The terms of a Framework Agreement and inclusion of protective provisions in favour of Network Rail in the Order, have been agreed between the applicant and Network Rail.</p>
<b>1.2. Asset protection</b>	<p>The DCO includes the carrying out of works which are on or in close proximity to the railway. Network Rail’s Southern Region Asset Protection and Optimisation team (ASPRO) must be engaged to support the safe delivery of works in a way which does not unduly place risk on the railway.</p> <p>In addition an ASPRO “Structures Agreement” will be required in respect of the proposed widening of the Airport Way bridge.</p>	<p>Gatwick Airport to engage with NR Southern Region ASPRO and agree any relevant Asset Protection agreements, including the Structures Agreement.</p>	<p>Concern addressed.</p> <p>The terms of the agreed protective provisions (referred to above) include a commitment to enter into an Asset Protection Agreement..</p>
<b>2. Transport assessment: overall conclusion that no mitigation for rail system required</b>			
<b>2.1. Lack of mitigative funding for rail</b>	<p>The Aviation Policy Framework notes that “The general position for existing airports is that developers should pay the costs of upgrading or enhancing road, rail or other transport networks or</p>	<p>With this policy in mind, Network Rail’s position has been that Gatwick should provide a reasonable and proportionate</p>	<p>Gatwick has proposed several mitigation measures which address the principles of the</p>

	<p>services where there is a need to cope with additional passengers travelling to and from expanded or growing airports” (p.75, para. 5.12).</p> <p>From a railway network perspective, the overall level of capacity provided in the December 2019 timetable plus lengthening limited services is the limit for the foreseeable future without further capacity upgrades, such as the Brighton Main Line Upgrade Programme. Rail industry forecasts – which only account for modest growth at Gatwick – indicate that the capacity limit on the Brighton Main Line will be exhausted in the 2030s – a similar timescale to this proposal being delivered. In particular, we are forecasting increased passenger standing on services from Gatwick in the morning peak and to Gatwick in the evening. Shoulder peak services are also forecast to experience standing. Without additional infrastructure capacity, accommodating growth over and above industry forecasts will require careful review of the allocation of services and distribution of passenger capacity.</p> <p>Additional passengers associated with the Northern Runway Project would therefore be adding to the future crowding such that many of the additional passengers are likely to have to stand.</p>	<p>contribution to the rail network to mitigate the effects of airport-driven growth for which Network Rail and the wider rail industry, on behalf of the taxpayer, are not currently funded to provide.</p>	<p>concern. These are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail Enhancement Fund (Surface Access Commitment 14A<sup>1</sup>, para (2))</li> <li>• Transport Mitigation Fund (Surface Access Commitment 14)</li> <li>• Sustainable Transport Fund (Surface Access Commitment 13)</li> <li>• Rail Monitoring and Enhancement Plan (Surface Access Commitment 14B)<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Further defined measures, in addition to the Rail Enhancement Fund (Surface Access Commitment 14A, para(1)) GAL must:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Fund the provision of additional wayfinding measures at Gatwick railway station;</li> <li>b. Commission a station gateline capacity review at Gatwick railway station;</li> <li>c. Fund the delivery of recommended measures of the gateline capacity review (proportionate to the impacts of the Project);</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

<sup>1</sup> Network Rail has agreed updated drafting to Surface Access Commitment 14A and understands this will be submitted at Deadline 9.

<sup>2</sup> Network Rail has agreed the wording of this with the applicant, and understands that a revised version of the Surface Access Commitments, incorporating 14B will be submitted at Deadline 9.

	I		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>d. engage constructively and in good faith with Network Rail on timetable consultations in order to meet passenger demand requirements;</li><li>e. participate in planning and consultation of network upgrades to improve performance and reliability on the Brighton Main Line near Gatwick;</li><li>f. to fund the costs of NR undertaking an analysis of the benefits of signalling upgrades to secure earlier/later services; and</li><li>g. constructively engage with the station operator to identify and agree measures to be carried out within Gatwick railway station to enhance the customer experience at Gatwick railway station and optimise platform capacity and use and fund the delivery of such measures.</li></ul> <p>Network Rail consider that these measures are the best achievable measures in the circumstances to resolve Network Rail's concerns due to the:</p>
--	---	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Complexity in aligning industry models with the Transport Assessment findings of the applicant due to fundamental differences in design and purpose,</li><li>• The overall uncertainty involved in forecasting future passenger demand, and</li><li>• Complexity in isolating the Northern Runway Proposal impact from the wider network position.</li></ul> <p>On this basis, NR confirms that it does not object to the proposals on the grounds that no funding for mitigation has been provided.</p>
--	--	--	--

3. Transport assessment: technical modelling approach, assumptions, comprehensiveness and conclusions			
<p><b>3.1. Model supply assumptions</b></p>	<p>Gatwick’s transport assessment provides details of the passenger services which are assumed to be operating at the time of the runway opening.</p> <p>Network Rail have reviewed this to understand differences from the services which operate today, and those which could credibly operate in the future – subject to operational funding and rolling stock being secured.</p> <p>The following services are uplifts compared to today, but are credible as there is nominally infrastructure capacity for them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) North Downs 3 tph service pattern;</li> <li>b) Restoration of 4 tph Gatwick Express peak and off peak;</li> <li>c) Reinstatement of peak hour services (as per the December 2019 timetable);</li> <li>d) Additional off peak fast services between Thameslink / London Bridge and Gatwick (Table 9.2.1) – these cannot be accommodated without a major change to service specification or increased infrastructure capacity.</li> </ul> <p>Network Rail note the table 9.2.1 in the Transport Assessment includes an uplift in the off peak fast Thameslink services in the core scenario, which is not supported as an assumption as there is not sufficient infrastructure capacity. However, it is noted that Network Rail’s capacity concerns on</p>	<p>It has not been possible to fully reconcile capacity supply assumptions used by Gatwick in the transport assessment with industry planning assumptions.</p> <p>In lieu of full alignment and agreement, initiatives which will support review of train service capacity in the future, and to engage constructively in future timetable consultations are required.</p>	<p>Whilst we have been unable to fully reconcile and agree modelling outputs due to modelling complexity and uncertainty, Gatwick have proposed several specific measures which will assist with understanding service supply requirements in the future and have been secured in the Surface Access Commitments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail Monitoring and Enhancement Plan (Surface Access Commitment 14B), and</li> <li>• GAL to engage constructively on timetable consultations (Surface Access Commitment 14A, (1)).</li> </ul> <p>It is also noted that the Rail Enhancement Fund, Transport Mitigation Fund and Sustainable Transport Fund (secured in the Surface Access Commitments) could support the delivery of measures in the future.</p> <p>On this basis, NR does not object to the proposals on the grounds of the model supply assumptions.</p>

	<p>London Bridge services are primarily peak time, so this is unlikely to materially change the findings.</p>		
<p><b>3.2. Technical model clarification and alignment</b></p>	<p>Network Rail have worked with Gatwick to review the Transport Assessment, and to compare the findings with industry demand forecasts.</p> <p>Collectively, we have identified material differences between the outputs presented in the Transport Assessment and industry forecasts, covering fundamental differences in both demand, supply, and distribution assumptions which interface with one another.</p> <p>Network Rail remain concerned with some of the Transport Assessment outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The aggregation of passenger demand by hour and service group does not reflect the significant variation that results in uneven passenger loads across each of the Brighton Main Line service groups. The Transport Assessment outputs artificially smoothen out demand; when looked at on a service-by-service basis passenger crowding and standing is more acute.</li> <li>ii. Network Rail have been unable to fully reconcile assumptions relating to assumed train capacities, including train lengths, formation and seated and standing densities. Furthermore, NR remain of the view that the requirements for airport passengers, particularly those with luggage, have a material impact on passenger</li> </ul>	<p>Full reconciliation of the models and subsequent outputs is impractical in the time due to fundamentally different model purposes, assumptions, and mechanics. Comprehensive passenger surveys would need to be commissioned to iron out some assumptions, for example.</p> <p>As these issues have not been fully resolved, Network Rail require that there are mechanisms to close this gap in understanding in the future.</p>	<p>Whilst we have been unable to fully reconcile and agree modelling outputs due to modelling complexity and uncertainty, Gatwick have proposed a number of initiatives which will support the resolution of this issue in the future, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail Monitoring and Enhancement Plan (Surface Access Commitment 14B).</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, Network Rail are preparing a Demand Forecasting Technical Note for the Brighton Main Line, and will work with Gatwick in line with existing collaborative relationships, such as through the Transport Forum and Transport Forum Steering Group to come to a common understanding on route forecasts.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Rail Enhancement Fund, Transport Mitigation Fund and Sustainable Transport Fund (secured in the Surface Access Commitments) could support the delivery of measures in the future.</p>



	<p>experience and will reduce effective available capacity.</p> <p>iii. The modelling of the Gatwick Express and the impact of fare differentials on the overall distribution of capacity may smoothen out demand.</p> <p>iv. Rail industry forecasts and observed passenger loading data indicate high levels of passenger standing on services from Gatwick in the morning peak and to Gatwick in the evening.. Shoulder peak services are also forecast to experience standing.</p> <p>v. Network Rail note that it is an industry standard to aim for passengers at peak times to not have to stand for more than 20 minutes, and no standing at off peak times.</p> <p>vi. It is unclear how much of the additional demand is allocated to the slow line services via Redhill.</p> <p>vii.</p>		<p>On this basis, NR considers that there is an appropriate mechanism to address the unresolved issues in the future and does not object to the proposals on technical modelling grounds.</p>
<p><b>3.3. Gatwick Airport station capacity is a concern with future passenger levels</b></p>	<p>The Gatwick Station Project has substantially increased passenger capacity and has transformed the journey from train to plane and given passengers travelling between Brighton and London easier, faster, more reliable journeys.</p> <p>The Gatwick Station Project delivers additional capacity but explicitly did not account for the impact of the Northern Runway Project. The evidence</p>	<p>Network Rail expect Gatwick to propose mechanisms to assess, fund and resolve forecast capacity issues at the station, in line with the Aviation Policy Framework.</p>	<p>Concern resolved.</p> <p>Gatwick have proposed a range of initiatives to manage station issues resulting from the project (which are secured in the Surface Access Commitments), specifically:</p>

	<p>provided in the Transport Assessment indicates a particular issue with congestion at two of the ticket barriers (gate lines) due to the extra passengers arising due to the scheme, which requires further investigation and potential mitigative measures.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fund the provision of additional wayfinding measures at Gatwick railway station,</li> <li>- Commission a station gateline capacity review at Gatwick railway station,</li> <li>- Fund the delivery of recommended measures of the review (as agreed between the parties),</li> <li>- GAL to identify, seek agreement and fund measures to enhance the customer experience at Gatwick railway station.</li> </ul>
<p><b>3.4. Wider network capacity issues that are unacknowledged and/or assessed</b></p>	<p>There are system-wide considerations that Network Rail must have due regard to as different proposals will interface with one another. Although these are outside the scope of Gatwick’s own DCO, the implications could be severe as pressures increase across the route from multiple directions. Concerns for the rail industry include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintaining good train service performance is an ongoing challenge on the Brighton Main Line, driven by high levels of infrastructure utilisation from several sources. The Northern Runway Proposal will increase rail passenger demand and therefore add to the overall issue.</li> <li>- The airport’s expansion will also mean engineering access for maintenance, renewals and enhancements will become increasingly difficult to accommodate. The</li> </ul>	<p>Due to the uncertainty in these applications and their cumulative or conflicting impacts with other network users, it is not possible for Gatwick to address these concerns.</p>	<p>Planning for future network requirements is the responsibility of Network Rail and train operators, and competing track access issues are managed by the ORR should these arise in the future.</p> <p>Gatwick has proposed steps which will assist with managing competing network access issues of relevance to the Airport, in particular committing to engage constructively on timetable consultations and to participate in planning and consultation of network upgrades to improve performance and these are</p>

	<p>pressure on alternative routes when passengers are diverted will also increase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The current application for expansion at Luton Airport, which is served by the same Thameslink services that would be serving Gatwick. Increases in demand at both ends of the route clearly places further pressure on the overall service.</li> <li>- The Brighton Main Line is also a busy freight corridor, and the airport's expansion proposals could conflict with Network Rail's commitments to increase freight traffic on the network due to only limited capacity being available.</li> <li>- Integration with the Elizabeth Line at Farringdon - with demand increases from Gatwick and Luton as well as general shift towards Farringdon from other London Terminal stations could result in wider system limitations and the need for interventions here.</li> </ul>		<p>secured in the Surface Access Commitments.</p> <p>The proposed Rail Enhancement Fund (Surface Access Commitment 14A(2)) also offers a mechanism to deliver improvements to address issues such as performance, with the Transport Mitigation Fund (Surface Access Commitment 14) a further backstop to assist with managing unforeseen challenges.</p> <p>Gatwick has also proposed a Rail Monitoring and Enhancement Plan (Surface Access Commitment 14B) which secures monitoring of the rail network and sets trigger points for any proposed interventions and the process by which such identified intervention will be agreed between the NR and Gatwick.</p> <p>On this basis, NR confirms it is satisfied that Gatwick has proposed appropriate measures that are within its control to address the uncertainty regarding cumulative or conflicting impacts with other network users .</p>
--	--	--	---

<b>4. Transport Assessment: Sustainable Access Commitments queries and issues</b>			
<p><b>4.1. Mode share target for rail</b></p>	<p>Gatwick's Sustainable Access Commitments (SACs) are stated as a combined 'public transport' target, differentiated by staff and air passenger trips.</p> <p>While this reflects the separate trip characteristics/modal choices made by passengers and staff, it makes it ambiguous what the rail industry mode share target is. A specific target would focus rail industry partners on a simple goal.</p> <p>This is a policy issue for the Examining Authority and relevant Local Authorities to consider, rather than an area which Network Rail requires resolution.</p>	<p>Not applicable, Network Rail is an infrastructure provider and so will work with Gatwick to achieve their modal shift targets however they are presented.</p>	<p>Concern resolved.</p> <p>Network Rail is represented on the Transport Forum and Transport Forum Steering Group, where rail mode shares are monitored and managed.</p> <p>Furthermore, one stated use of the Rail Enhancement Fund proposed by Gatwick is to support achievement of the mode share commitments.</p> <p>Finally, Gatwick's Surface Access Commitments includes higher mode share ambitions, indicating a positive direction for rail.</p>
<p><b>4.2. Mode share opportunities</b></p>	<p>The largest mode share uplift for rail demand is between 2016 and 2029 – which is a result of the completion of major schemes such as Thameslink and the Elizabeth Line. No further rail enhancements are identified in Section 7.3 of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Network Rail points to the Aviation Policy Framework which notes that “all proposals for airport development must be accompanied by clear surface access proposals which demonstrate how the airport will ensure easy and reliable access for passengers, increase the use of public transport by</p>	<p>Identification of, and funding for, rail initiatives that would support Gatwick in achieving its public transport modal shift targets.</p> <p>Further discussion on the mode share opportunities for rail.</p>	<p>Concern resolved.</p> <p>Gatwick already has the Sustainable Transport Fund, supported by the Transport Forum and Transport Forum Steering Group. In the past, these have secured investment in initiatives which sought to support an increase in rail mode share.</p> <p>Gatwick has also proposed further bespoke initiatives in response to this issue, in particular the Rail Enhancement Fund which can be</p>

	passengers to access the airport, and minimise congestion and other local impacts” (p.75, para 5.11).		used to fund initiatives which increase rail mode share and funding analysis into the benefits / costs of earlier / later services.
--	---	--	---