



# Gatwick Airport Northern Runway Project

## The Applicant's Response to Actions ISH8: Surface Access Commitments

### Book 10

VERSION: 1.0

DATE: JUNE 2024

Application Document Ref: 10.50.1

PINS Reference Number: TR020005

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Action Point 1	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 3: Surface Access Commitments. The actions relevant to the Applicant are as follows:

Action No.	Action	Deadline
1	Clarify in written submission how failure to meet mode share targets won’t necessarily result in more traffic. Example of 54.2% to 53%.	Deadline 6

- 1.1.2 The sections below provide the Applicant’s response.

## 2 Action Point 1

- 2.1.1 The Examining Authority has asked the Applicant to clarify in written submission how failure to meet mode share targets won’t necessarily result in more traffic. Example of 54.2% to 53%. The following response is provided.**

- 2.1.2 It is important to place the mode share targets in context. The mode shares are annual mode shares; whereas, the Transport Assessment and the ES looks at a busy summer day in terms of impacts on the road network. The annual mode share may actually be reflective of different levels of mode shares at different times and these are assessed and reported on a quarterly basis to the CAA. This means there are short term fluctuations in mode shares that won’t necessarily translate into changes in traffic flow on any particular day or impacts on peak periods of traffic. The peak levels of traffic that are included in the model are based on a robust set of assumptions which have been validated and checked through the modelling process and the Applicant is confident that the mode share commitments in the SACs are realistic and achievable based on both pre-COVID and post-COVID traffic levels.

- 2.1.3 Further, whilst self-evidently a lower public transport mode-share at any one time would mean a corresponding higher proportion of non-public transport travel to

the airport, there is nuance in the types of non-public transport in terms of their potential impact on the network.

- 2.1.4 For instance, journeys that are not made by public transport include car journeys that are parked on and off airport, trips made by taxi modes or drop off/pick up journeys, all of which will result in traffic movements on the local or strategic road networks. The nature of these trips mean that drop-off/pick up and taxi journeys result in twice as many traffic movements than cars that park at or near the airport; it is important therefore to reduce these as much as possible, particularly when the highway networks are busiest.
- 2.1.5 This means that if the Applicant is successful in turning more of these type of trips into car journeys that park at or near the airport, the actual number of cars on the road may decrease even whilst the public transport mode share remains static or even drops. The tools at the Applicant's disposal to drive change include car parking charges for the on-airport parking it operates, forecourt charging and incentives for staff to use sustainable modes allowing flexibility to target higher public transport mode share, and lower road traffic during the peak season and at peak times of day. One of the elements in the mitigation plans set out in the **Surface Access Commitments** [[REP3-028](#)] is the regular monitoring of road traffic and parking demand, which will support this proactive approach. Similarly, and of relevance to the implication of the question, a lower public transport mode share during periods when there will be less general traffic on the network compared to the modelled busy June weekday would not necessarily then correlate to any change to the overall impact assessed.
- 2.1.6 In support of this, the Applicant's technical note "Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling" [[AS-121](#)] identified the Covid-19 pandemic has led to reductions in background highway and rail demand of up to 14% compared with that assessed in the DCO Application modelling, and similarly less road traffic congestion and rail crowding in the future baseline scenarios than that shown in the DCO Application modelling. The analysis showed that the impacts of the Project are still similar to those presented in the DCO Application, and often reduced, particularly from a highway magnitude of impact perspective, given the lower forecast levels of traffic and congestion levels. The analysis suggests that the assessment of the with Project effects in the DCO Application is potentially conservative and forms a robust basis under which to consider the transport related impacts of the scheme.
- 2.1.7 This means that in the unlikely event that the mode share commitments are not met at any point, and car-travel mode share was correspondingly higher, it would

be experienced on a 'post-Covid' transport network that was less 'busy' than that forecast in the core assessment under the TA/ES, under which no significant effects/impacts were identified, so providing an additional level of assurance that adverse impacts would not result. As a further contingency measure, the Transport Mitigation Fund has been proposed to address such circumstances where there are any unforeseen/unintended impacts – to enable additional mitigation to be brought forward to address any such adverse impacts which are identified to result from the Project, to ensure such impacts are not continued.

- 2.1.8 The above is to demonstrate that there are a number of contextual factors that will be relevant to the implication of any departure from the mode-share commitments, or the trajectory towards them, and which would not automatically result in any corresponding adverse impact on the network, or its users. This is why the SACs prescribe a rigorous monitoring process to identify any necessary, specific, remedial action in circumstances where there is such a non-compliance, forecast or actual.