

Section 55 Acceptance of Applications Checklist

Appendix 3 of Advice Note Six: Preparation and submission of application documents

London Luton Airport Expansion - Section 55 Acceptance of Applications Checklist

Section 55 of the Planning Act 2008 can be viewed at legislation.gov.uk, here: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/29/section/55

DISCLAIMER: This Checklist a non-statutory checklist for the Planning Inspectorate to complete. Completion or self-assessment by the Applicant does not hold weight at the Acceptance stage. Unless specified, all references to the Planning Inspectorate are made in relation to functions being carried out on behalf of the Secretary of State for Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities.

Se	ection 55(2) Acceptance of Applications				
1	Within 28 days (starting day after receipt) the	Date received 28-day due d	28-day due date	due date Date of decision	
	Planning Inspectorate must decide whether or not to accept the application for Examination.	27 February 2023	27 March 2023	27 March 2023	

Section 55(3) – the Planning Inspectorate may only accept an application if it concludes that:

Planning Inspectorate comments

Section 55(3)(a) and s55(3)(c): It is an application for an order granting development consent

Is the development a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project¹ (NSIP) (or does it form part of an NSIP); and does the application state on the face of it that it is an application for a Development Consent Order² (DCO) under the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008), or equivalent words? Does the application specify the development to which it relates (i.e. which category or categories in Sections

Yes

The Proposed Development set out in **Schedule 1** of the **Draft DCO** (**Doc 2.01**) includes development falling within the categories in s14 of the PA2008. The development is for the construction of airport-related development and satisfies section 23 of the PA2008, including subsections (1)(b), (1)(c), 4(a) and 5(a).

This is consistent with the summary provided in **section 4** of the **Application Form** (**Doc 1.02**) which states that the application is for an NSIP.

¹ NSIP is defined generally in s14 with the detailed thresholds for each of the specified categories being set out in ss15 to 30

² Development consent is required for development to the extent that the development is or forms part of an NSIP (s31 of the PA2008)

	(s)14 to 30 does the Proposed Development fall)? If the development does not fall within the categories in s14 to 30, has a direction been given by the Secretary of State under s35 of the PA2008 for the development to be treated as development for which development consent is required?	
3	Summary: Section 55(3)(a) and s55(3)(c)	The Planning Inspectorate is satisfied that the Draft DCO (Doc 2.01) includes development for which development consent is required.
	tion 55(3)(e): The Applicant in relation to the cedure)	application made has complied with Chapter 2 of Part 5 (pre-application
4	In accordance with the EIA Regulations ³ , did the Applicant (prior to carrying out consultation in accordance with s42) either (a) request the Planning Inspectorate adopt a Screening Opinion in respect of the development to which the application relates, or (b) notify the Planning Inspectorate in writing that it proposed to provide an Environmental Statement in respect of that development?	Yes On 28 March 2019 the Applicant notified the Planning Inspectorate in accordance with Regulation 8(1)(b) of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 of its intention to provide an Environmental Statement (ES) in respect of the Proposed Development. The notification was received before the start of the first round of statutory consultation on 16 October 2019. A copy of the notification letter is provided at Appendix C7 of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02).
5	Have any Adequacy of Consultation Representations ⁴ been received from 'A', 'B', 'C' and 'D' local authorities; and if so, do	Yes

³ Regulation 8 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (2017 EIA Regulations), or where Regulation 37 of the 2017 EIA Regulations applies, Regulation 6 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (2009 EIA Regulations)

⁴ Section 55(4) of the PA2008 provides that the Planning Inspectorate must have regard to the Consultation Report, and any Adequacy of Consultation Representations received

they confirm that the Applicant has complied with the duties under s42, s47 and s48?

There are 22 host and neighbouring authorities, of which 17 responded to the Planning Inspectorate's invitation to make an Adequacy of Consultation Representation (AoCR) dated 28 February 2023.

All 17 responding authorities confirmed in their AoCR that either the Applicant had complied with its duties under s42, s47 and s48 of the PA2008 and/ or that their authority had no comments/ objections to make. These local authorities were:

- North Hertfordshire District Council (B authority)
- Luton Borough Council (B authority)
- Central Bedfordshire Council (B authority)
- Dacorum Borough Council (B authority)
- Hertfordshire County Council (C authority)
- South Cambridgeshire District Council (A authority)
- Three Rivers District Council (A authority)
- East Hertfordshire District Council (A authority)
- St Albans City and District Council (A authority)
- Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council (A authority)
- Huntingdonshire District Council (A authority)
- Milton Keynes City Council (A authority)
- Buckinghamshire County Council (A and D authority)
- Cambridgeshire County Council (A and D authority)
- London Borough of Barnet (D authority)
- London Borough of Harrow (D authority)
- Essex County Council (D authority)

While none of the local authorities stated that the Applicant had not complied with the duties under s42, s47 and s48 many did raise other matters in relation to the Applicant's consultation.

Dacorum Borough Council noted that it had not been identified as a host authority until 9 February 2022. This was also noted by Hertfordshire County Council.

Three Rivers District Council noted that they were not consulted as a neighbouring authority in the first round of statutory consultation in 2019. This was also noted by Hertfordshire County Council.

Luton Borough Council stated **Table 3.1** of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**) did not include two matters which they had raised in response to the 2019 draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC). Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council stated **Table 5.1** of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**) did not record their response to the 2022 draft SoCC as they would have expected but noted that it was captured in **Appendix M** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**). Hertfordshire County Council stated that it was not clear what regard was had to four issues raised in response to the 2019 draft SoCC and one issue in regard to the 2022 draft SoCC.

Dacorum Borough Council noted their disappointment at the "severe reduction" in public consultation events and the lack of document deposit locations in their administrative area for the 2022 statutory consultation.

Huntingdonshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council both noted that they did not have any record of being invited to participate in any of the meetings for the wider local authority planning officers' group which, according to paragraph 1.4.9 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01), included all neighbouring local authorities. Both Councils noted their frustration at a lack of opportunity to engage earlier in the process.

Huntingdonshire District Council also stated that "The Council was first consulted in 2022 as part of the first statutory consultation". The first statutory consultation took place in 2019 and the Council is listed in **paragraph 4.5.4** of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**) as having been consulted at that stage. However, no response from them is recorded in the due regard tables for the 2019 statutory consultation

within **Appendix L** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**) therefore it is unclear whether they were consulted in 2019.

South Cambridgeshire District Council, Huntingdonshire District Council and Cambridgeshire County Council referred to the NATS airspace consultation and concern that this was separate to the Applicant's consultation. However, the Planning Inspectorate is content that the consultation was conducted separately.

The host authorities (North Hertfordshire District Council, Luton Borough Council, Central Bedfordshire Council, Dacorum Borough Council and Hertfordshire County Council) all referred to a number of issues remaining outstanding due to insufficient engagement prior to submission of the application.

North Hertfordshire District Council, Central Bedfordshire Council, Dacorum Borough Council and Hertfordshire County Council refer to a lack of progress on a draft Statement of Common Ground. While the Planning Inspectorate advises applicants to proactively work on Statements of Common Ground in the preapplication period, this is an ongoing process which will continue into the pre-Examination and Examination periods and a lack of progress at this stage does not indicate there has been inadequate consultation.

It is noted that North Hertfordshire District Council and Hertfordshire County Council both refer to a request for additional planning performance agreement (PPA) funding. The Inspectorate is, in principle, supportive of PPAs but this is not a matter on which the Inspectorate can comment further and does not relate to the adequacy of the Applicant's consultation.

All AoCRs received have been carefully considered and are available to view on the National Infrastructure Planning website:

https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/eastern/london-luton-airport-

expansion/?ipcsection=docs&stage=2&filter1=Adequacy+of+Consultation+Representation

Additionally, the Planning Inspectorate received submissions on the Applicant's consultations from members of the public. These have been published here:

https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR020001-000917

The Planning Inspectorate has considered all submitted representations. In relation to concerns bearing directly on adequacy of consultation. The Inspectorate is satisfied that the Applicant has complied with its statutory obligations. To the extent that other matters have been raised in responses, the Inspectorate is satisfied that these matters do not bear on an Acceptance decision and therefore do not affect the conclusion that the Applicant has complied with its statutory obligations.

Section 42: Duty to consult

Did the Applicant consult the applicable persons set out in s42 of the PA2008 about the proposed application?

6 | Section 42(1)(a) persons prescribed⁵?

2019 consultation

The Applicant has provided a list of persons consulted under s42(1)(a) on 14 October 2019 at **Tables 4.1** and **4.2** of the **Consultation Report (Doc 6.01)**.

A sample of the letter sent to s42(1)(a) consultees is provided at **Appendix C2** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**).

The Planning Inspectorate has identified the following parties based on a precautionary interpretation of The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (the APFP Regulations) that appear not to have been consulted by the Applicant under s42 at the first round of consultation:

Prescribed consultees

- NHS Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes Integrated Care Board
- NHS Hertfordshire and West Essex Integrated Care Board
- Flamstead Parish Council
- Office for Nuclear Regulation

⁵ Statutory consultees set out in Schedule 1 of The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (APFP Regulations)

Statutory undertakers

- Northern Gas Networks Limited
- Southern Gas Networks Plc
- Wales and West Utilities Limited
- ESP Networks Limited
- ESP Pipelines Limited
- Last Mile Gas Limited
- Leep Gas Networks Limited
- Mua Gas Limited
- Squire Energy Limited
- ESP Electricity Limited
- Indigo Power Limited
- Last Mile Electricity Limited
- Mua Electricity Limited
- Optimal Power Networks Limited
- National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc
- National Grid Electricity System Operator Limited

2022 consultation

The Applicant has provided a list of persons consulted under s42(1)(a) on 8 February 2022 at **Tables 6.1** and **6.2** of the **Consultation Report (Doc 6.01)**.

A sample of the letter sent to s42(1)(a) consultees is provided at **Appendix H3** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**).

The Planning Inspectorate has identified the following parties based on a precautionary interpretation of The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (the APFP Regulations) that appear not to have been consulted by the Applicant under s42 at the second round of consultation:

Prescribed consultees

- NHS Bedfordshire, Luton and Milton Keynes Integrated Care Board
- NHS Hertfordshire and West Essex Integrated Care Board
- Police and Crime Commissioner for Hertfordshire
- Flamstead Parish Council
- Office for Nuclear Regulation

Statutory undertakers

- Northern Gas Networks Limited
- Wales and West Utilities Limited
- Leep Gas Networks Limited
- Mua Gas Limited
- Squire Energy Limited
- Indigo Power Limited
- Mua Electricity Limited
- Optimal Power Networks Limited

The Applicant's **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**) does not explain why the bodies identified in both lists above do not appear to have been consulted. **Table 6.1** of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**) lists the Police and Crime Commissioner for Hertfordshire as being consulted in 2022 however it is noted that they are listed in **Appendix N** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**) as not having been consulted in 2022.

8

		It is noted that the licences held by the statutory undertakers cover Great Britain or
		various smaller areas and the operational areas of each are not clear from information in the public domain.
		None of the bodies listed above, other than ESP Electricity, have been identified by the Applicant as having an interest in the Order lands and are not listed in the Book of Reference (Doc 3.02).
		Section 51 advice has been issued to the Applicant in respect of the above matter: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR020001-000895
7	Section 42(1)(aa) the Marine Management Organisation ⁶ ?	n/a
8	Section 42(1)(b) each local authority within	2019 consultation
	s43 ⁷ ?	Paragraphs 4.53 and 4.54 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) list the relevant local authorities that were identified and consulted under s43 and s42(1)(b) on 14 October 2019.
		A footnote to paragraph 4.5.3(d) states that Dacorum Borough Council were consulted as a neighbouring authority however due to a small area of highway works within the local authority boundary they should have been consulted as a host authority. Three Rivers District Council should, therefore, have been consulted as a neighbouring authority but were not.
		The host 'B' authorities were consulted:
		Central Bedfordshire Council
		Dacorum Borough Council
		Luton Borough Council

⁶ In any case where the Proposed Development would affect, or would be likely to affect, any of the areas specified in s42(2) of the PA2008

⁷ Definition of 'local authority' in s43(3) of the PA2008: The 'B' authority where the application land is in the authority's area; the 'A' authority where any part of the boundary of A's area is also a part of the boundary of B's area; the 'C' authority (upper tier) where the application land is in that authority's area; the 'D' authority (upper tier) where such an authority shares a boundary with a 'C' authority

North Hertfordshire District Council

The host 'C' authority was consulted:

• Hertfordshire County Council

The boundary 'A' authorities were consulted:

- Aylesbury Vale District Council
- Bedford Borough Council
- East Hertfordshire District Council
- Huntingdonshire District Council
- Milton Keynes Council
- South Cambridgeshire District Council
- St Albans City and District Council
- Stevenage Borough Council
- Uttlesford District Council
- Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council

The boundary 'D' authorities were consulted:

- Essex County Council
- London Borough of Barnet
- London Borough of Enfield
- London Borough of Harrow
- London Borough of Hillingdon

The boundary 'A' and 'D' authorities were consulted:

• Buckinghamshire County Council

• Cambridgeshire County Council

A sample of the letter sent to s42(1)(b) relevant authorities is provided at **Appendix C2** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**).

2022 consultation

Paragraphs 6.4.4 and **6.4.5** list the relevant local authorities that were identified and consulted under s43 and s42(1)(b) on 8 February 2022.

The host 'B' authorities were consulted:

- Central Bedfordshire Council
- Dacorum Borough Council
- Luton Borough Council
- North Hertfordshire District Council

The host 'C' authority was consulted:

• Hertfordshire County Council

The boundary 'A' authorities were consulted:

- Aylesbury Vale District Council
- Bedford Borough Council
- East Hertfordshire District Council
- Huntingdonshire District Council
- Milton Keynes Council
- South Cambridgeshire District Council
- St Albans City and District Council
- Stevenage Borough Council
- Three Rivers District Council

		·	
		Uttlesford District Council	
		Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	
		The boundary 'D' authorities were consulted:	
		Essex County Council	
		London Borough of Barnet	
		London Borough of Enfield	
		London Borough of Harrow	
		London Borough of Hillingdon	
		The boundary 'A' and 'D' authorities were consulted:	
		Buckinghamshire County Council	
		Cambridgeshire County Council	
		A sample of the letter sent to s42(1)(b) relevant authorities is provided at Appendix H3 Part 1 of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02).	
9	Section 42(1)(c) the Greater London Authority (if in Greater London area)?	n/a	
10	Section 42(1)(d) each person in one or more	Yes	
	of s44 categories ⁸ ?	2019 consultation	
		Paragraph 4.5.1 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) states that persons identified under s42(1)(d) were consulted.	
		Paragraphs 4.5.7 to 4.5.23 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) summarise how the Applicant made diligent inquiry to seek to identify and consult persons with an interest in lands affected by the Draft DCO (Doc 2.01).	

⁸ Category 1: owner, lessee, tenant or occupier of land; Category 2: person interested in the land or has power to sell and convey the land or to release the land; Category 3: persons who would or might be entitled to make a relevant claim.

12

A sample of the letter is provided at **Appendix C3** of the **Consultation Report** Appendices (Doc 6.02). 2022 consultation Paragraph 6.4.1 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) states that persons identified under s42(1)(d) were consulted. Paragraph 6.4.8 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) explains that the methodology for identifying s42(1)(d) persons was broadly the same as that used for the 2019 consultation, however the land referencing limits were expanded. Firstly, the Applicant included the whole of the Airport Access Road within the Order limits which introduced new category 1 and 2 parties. Secondly, the Applicant altered the daytime noise level threshold which increased the number of category 3 parties. Samples of the letters are provided at **Appendix H11** and **H12** of the **Consultation** Report Appendices (Doc 6.02). It is noted in Section 13.3 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) that a number of additional parties were identified after the second round of consultation in 2022, mainly due to changes in land interests. The Applicant states in paragraph 13.3.8 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) that, in accordance with Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the Pre-application process, they wrote to these parties and advised them how to take part in the Examination, if the application is accepted. Samples of the letters are provided at **Appendix N1** and **N2** of the **Consultation** Report Appendices (Doc 6.02). Section 45: Timetable for s42 consultation Did the Applicant notify s42 consultees of Yes the deadline for receipt of consultation 2019 consultation responses; and if so was the deadline A sample of the letter sent to s42 consultees is provided at **Appendix C2** of the notified by the Applicant 28 days or more **Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02).**

starting with the day after receipt of the consultation documents?

The sample letter dated 14 October 2019 confirmed that consultation commenced on 16 October 2019 and closed on 16 December 2019, providing more than the required minimum time for receipt of responses.

Paragraph 4.5.21 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) states that some additional s42(1)(d) persons were identified during the consultation period and were therefore sent letters at a later date. While the majority of the letters were sent on 14 October 2019 some were sent on 1 November 2019 and 12 November 2019. However, these still provided more than the required minimum time for receipt of responses.

2022 consultation

A sample of the letter sent to s42 consultees is provided at **Appendix H3** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**).

The sample letter dated 4 February 2022 confirmed that consultation commenced on 8 February 2022 and closed on 4 April 2022, providing more than the required minimum time for receipt of responses.

Section 46: Duty to notify the Planning Inspectorate of proposed application

Did the Applicant supply information to notify the Planning Inspectorate of the proposed application; and if so, was the information supplied to the Planning Inspectorate on or before the date it was sent to the s42 consultees? Was this done on or before commencing consultation under s42?

Yes

2019 consultation

The Applicant gave notice under s46 on 14 October 2019, which was before the start of the first round of s42 consultation.

A copy of the s46 notification letter is provided at **Appendix C5** of the **Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02)**.

2022 consultation

The Applicant gave notice under s46 on 4 February 2022, which was before the start of the second round of s42 consultation.

A copy of the s46 notification letter is provided at **H7** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**).

Sec	Section 47: Duty to consult local community			
13	Did the Applicant prepare a Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) on how it intended to consult people living in the vicinity of the land?	Yes A copy of the final 2019 SoCC is provided at Appendix B5 of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02). A copy of the final 2022 SoCC is provided at Appendix G4 of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02).		
14	Were 'B' and (where relevant) 'C' authorities consulted about the content of the SoCC; and if so, was the deadline for receipt of responses 28 days beginning with the day after the day that 'B' and, where applicable, 'C' authorities received the consultation documents?	Yes 2019 consultation The Applicant sent the draft SoCC to Central Bedfordshire Council, Dacorum Borough Council, Luton Borough Council and North Hertfordshire District Council ('B' authorities) and Hertfordshire County Council ('C' authority) on 13 June 2019 and set a deadline of 17 July 2019 for responses; providing more than the required minimum time for responses to be received. The Applicant also sent the SoCC to neighbouring authorities. 2022 consultation The Applicant sent the draft SoCC to Central Bedfordshire Council, Dacorum Borough Council, Luton Borough Council and North Hertfordshire District Council ('B' authorities) and Hertfordshire County Council ('C' authority) on 6 August 2021 and set a deadline of 17 September 2021 for responses; providing more than the required minimum time for responses to be received. The Applicant also sent the SoCC to neighbouring authorities. Dacorum Borough Council was only identified as a host authority shortly before the start of the 2022 consultation, they were therefore consulted as a neighbouring authority on both the 2019 and 2022 SoCCs. Three Rivers District Council, which neighbours Dacorum Borough Council, was therefore not consulted as a neighbouring authority on the 2019 or 2022 SoCCs.		

Has the Applicant had regard to any responses received when preparing the SoCC?

Yes

2019 consultation

Table 3.1 of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**) provides a summary of the consultation responses from Buckinghamshire County Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council, Buckinghamshire County Council, Central Bedfordshire Council, Dacorum Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council, London Borough of Barnet, London Borough of Hillingdon, Luton Borough Council, North Hertfordshire District Council, St Albans City and District Council and Stevenage Borough Council in respect of the 2019 draft SoCC and demonstrates how the Applicant had regard to their content.

Examples of changes from the draft SoCC to the final SoCC include:

- The number of consultation events was increased:
- The number of document inspection venues was increased;
- The consultation period was extended; and
- The newsletter mailing zone was expanded.

2022 consultation

Table 5.1 of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**) provides a summary of the consultation responses from Luton Borough Council, North Hertfordshire District Council, Central Bedfordshire Council, Hertfordshire County Council, Buckinghamshire County Council, Dacorum Borough Council, East Hertfordshire District Council, St Albans City and District Council and Stevenage Borough Council in respect of the 2022 draft SoCC and demonstrates how the Applicant had regard to their content.

Examples of changes from the draft SoCC to the final SoCC include:

- Additional information on the reason for a 'digital first' consultation;
- A map of the red line boundary was included;

Section 55 Acceptance of Application Checklist – London Luton Airport Expansion

Version: August 2022

of 42

		 The approach to engagement with hard to reach communities was developed further; and Reference to the Central Bedfordshire Home Library was included. The Planning Inspectorate is satisfied that the Applicant had regard to the responses received when preparing the SoCC.
16	Has the SoCC been made available for inspection on a website maintained by or on behalf of the Applicant; and has a notice been published in a newspaper circulating in the vicinity of the land which states where and when the SoCC can be inspected?	Yes 2019 consultation The final SoCC was made available at the following locations, which are reasonably convenient having regard to the location of the Proposed Development: • The Applicant's dedicated website • Aylesbury Vale District Council Offices • Baldock Library • Beacon Villages Community Library, Ivinghoe • Bury Park Library, Luton • Cambridge City Council Offices • Central Bedfordshire Council Offices • Dunstable Library • Harpenden Library • Hemel Hempstead Library • Hertfordshire County Council Offices • Hitchin Library • Huntingdonshire District Council Offices • Leagrave Library

- Leighton Buzzard Library
- Letchworth Library
- Lewsey Library, Luton
- Luton Central Library
- Luton Borough Council Offices
- Marsh Farm Library, Luton
- Milton Keynes Central Library
- Milton Keynes Council Offices
- North Hertfordshire District Council Offices
- South Cambridgeshire Council Offices
- St Albans Council Offices
- St Albans Library
- Stevenage Borough Council Offices
- Stevenage Central Library
- Stopsley Library, Luton
- Tring Library
- Welwyn Library
- Wendover Community Library

A notice stating when and where the final SoCC could be inspected was published in:

- The Times on 8 October 2019
- The London Gazette on 8 October 2019
- Barnet Borough Times on 17 and 24 October 2019

- Biggleswade Chronicle on 11 and 18 October 2019
- Bucks Free Press on 11 and 18 October 2019
- Bucks Herald on 9 and 16 October 2019
- Cambridge News on 8 and 15 October 2019
- Dunstable Gazette on 9 and 16 October 2019
- Harrow Times on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Hemel Hempstead Gazette on 9 and 16 October 2019
- Hertfordshire Mercury on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Herts Advertiser on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Hitchin Comet on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Hunts Post on 9 and 16 October 2019
- Leighton Buzzard Observer on 8 and 15 October 2019
- Letchworth and Baldock Comet on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Luton and Dunstable Herald Post on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Luton news on 9 and 16 October 2019
- Milton Keynes Citizen on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Royston Crow on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Stevenage Comet on 10 and 17 October 2019
- Watford Observer on 11 and 18 October 2019
- Welwyn and Hatfield Times on 9 and 16 October 2019

The published SoCC notices, provided at **Appendix C1** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**) states where and when the final SoCC was available to inspect.

of 42

Clippings of the published advertisements are provided at **Appendix C1** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**). However it is noted that there do not appear to be clippings for The Times, The London Gazette, Letchworth and Baldock Comet, Luton News, Milton Keynes Citizen, Royston Crow, Stevenage Comet, Watford Observer or Welwyn and Hatfield Times.

2022 consultation

The final SoCC was made available at the following locations, which are reasonably convenient having regard to the location of the Proposed Development:

- The Applicant's dedicated website
- Dunstable Library
- Harpenden Library
- Hertfordshire County Council Offices
- Hitchin Library
- Leighton Buzzard Library
- Luton Central Library
- North Hertfordshire District Council Offices
- Stevenage Central Library
- Stopsley Library
- Wendover Community Library

A notice stating when and where the final SoCC could be inspected was published in:

- London Gazette on 8 February 2022
- The Times on 8 February 2022

- Cambridge Evening News on 8 and 15 February 2022
- Leighton Buzzard Observer on 8 and 15 February 2022
- Bucks Herald on 9 and 16 February 2022
- Luton News and Dunstable Gazette on 9 and 16 February 2022
- Hemel Hempstead Gazette on 9 and 16 February 2022
- Hunts Post on 9 and 16 February 2022
- Welwyn and Hatfield Times on 9 and 16 February 2022
- Barnet Borough Times on 10 and 17 February 2022
- Hertfordshire Mercury on 10 and 17 February 2022
- Herts Advertiser on 10 and 17 February 2022
- Hitchin Comet on 10 and 17 February 2022
- Letchworth and Baldock Comet on 10 and 17 February 2022
- Milton Keynes Citizen on 10 and 17 February 2022
- Royston Crow on 10 and 17 February 2022
- Stevenage Comet on 10 and 17 February 2022
- Biggleswade Chronicle on 11 and 18 February 2022
- Bucks Free Press on 11 and 18 February 2022
- Watford Observer on 11 and 18 February 2022

The published SoCC notice, provided at **Appendix H9** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**) states where and when the final SoCC was available to inspect.

Clippings of the published advertisements are provided at **Appendix H9** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**).

17	Does the SoCC set out whether the development is EIA development ⁹ ; and does it set out how the Applicant intends to publicise and consult on the Preliminary Environmental Information?	Yes 2019 consultation Page 6 of the final SoCC at Appendix B5 of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02) sets out that the development is EIA development and sets out how the Applicant intended to publicise and consult on the Preliminary Environmental Information. 2022 consultation Paragraph 2.2 of the final SoCC at Appendix G4 of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02) sets out that the development is EIA development and sets out how the Applicant intended to publicise and consult on the Preliminary Environmental Information.
18	Has the Applicant carried out the consultation in accordance with the SoCC?	Yes 2019 consultation Sections 4.6 to 4.13 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) set out the consultation undertaken by the Applicant. Some additional activities were undertaken, and these are described in paragraph 3.5.2 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01). Appendices E and F of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02) provide evidence that the commitments within the final SoCC have been carried out. 2022 consultation Sections 6.5 to 6.13 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) set out the consultation undertaken by the Applicant. Some additional activities were undertaken, and these are described in paragraph 5.5.3 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01).

⁹ Regulation 12 of the 2017 EIA Regulations, or where Regulation 37 of the 2017 EIA Regulations applies, Regulation 10 of the 2009 EIA Regulations

Appendices J and **K** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**) provide evidence that the commitments within the final SoCC have been carried out.

Although the Planning Inspectorate is satisfied that the Applicant has carried out the consultation in line with the final SoCC, the following observations, as stated in **paragraph 5.5.2** of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**), have been noted with regards to certain commitments:

- A consultation event due to take place in Stevenage was postponed due to red weather warnings. The event was rescheduled and advertised.
- 4,852 properties on the edge of the newsletter mailing zone were missed. These properties were sent a copy of the newsletter on 15 February 2022.
- The village of Dagnall did not receive the newsletter at the start of the consultation period, but it was posted to all 214 properties in the village on 24 February 2022.

Section 48: Duty to publicise the proposed application

19 Did the Applicant publicise the proposed application in the prescribed manner set out in Regulation 4(2) of the APFP Regulations which may encompass changes made by The Infrastructure Planning (Publication and Notification of Applications etc.)
(Amendment) Regulations 2020?

2019 consultation

Paragraph 3.4.1 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) states:

"In accordance with Section 47(6)(a) of the Act newspaper notices were published setting out where and when the SoCC could be inspected. In addition to meeting the requirements of Section 47 of the Act, the same notice was used to publicise the proposed application for development consent in accordance with Section 48 of the Act and Regulation 4 of APFP Regulations 2009."

Table 3.2 of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**) lists the newspapers and dates of s48 publicity as set out below.

A copy of the s48 notice is provided at **Appendix C4** of the **Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02)**.

Clippings of the published notices set out below are provided at **Appendix C1** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**). However, it is noted that there do not appear to be clippings for The Times, The London Gazette, Letchworth and

		Baldock Comet, Luton News, Milton Keyno Comet, Watford Observer or Welwyn and	, ,	
		2022 consultation		
		Paragraph 5.4.1 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) states:		
		"In accordance with Section 47(6)(a) of the Act, newspapers notices were published setting out where and when the 2022 SoCC could be inspected. In addition to meeting the requirements of Section 47 of the Act, the same notice was used to publicise the proposed application in accordance with Section 48 of the Act and Regulation 4 of APFP Regulations 2009."		
		Table 5.3 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) lists the newspapers and dates of s48 publicity as set out below.		
		A copy of the s48 notice (2022) is provided at Appendix H4 of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02).		
		Clippings of the published notices set out below are provided at Appendix H9 of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02).		
		Newspaper(s)	Date	
a)	for at least two successive weeks in one or	2019 consultation		
	more local newspapers circulating in the vicinity in which the Proposed Development would be situated;	Barnet Borough Times	• 17 and 24 October 2019	
		Biggleswade Chronicle	• 11 and 24 October 2019	
		Bucks Free Press	• 11 and 18 October 2019	
		Bucks Herald	• 9 and 16 October 2019	
		Cambridge News	• 8 and 15 October 2019	
		Dunstable Gazette	• 9 and 16 October 2019	
		Harrow Times	• 10 and 17 October 2019	

	<u> </u>	
Hemel Hempstead Gazette	• 9 and 16 October 2019	
Hertfordshire Mercury	• 10 and 17 October 2019	
Herts Advertiser	• 10 and 17 October 2019	
Hitchin Comet	• 10 and 17 October 2019	
Hunts Post	• 9 and 16 October 2019	
 Leighton Buzzard Observer 	• 8 and 15 October 2019	
 Letchworth and Baldock Comet 	• 10 and 17 October 2019	
 Luton and Dunstable Herald Post 	• 10 and 17 October 2019	
• Luton News	• 9 and 16 October 2019	
Milton Keynes Citizen	• 10 and 17 October 2019	
Royston Crow	• 10 and 17 October 2019	
Stevenage Comet	• 10 and 17 October 2019	
 Watford Observer 	• 11 and 18 October 2019	
 Welwyn and Hatfield Times 	• 9 and 16 October 2019	
2022 consultation		
Cambridge Evening News	• 8 and 15 February 2022	
Leighton Buzzard Observer	• 8 and 15 February 2022	
Bucks Herald	• 9 and 16 February 2022	
Luton News and Dunstable Gazette	• 9 and 16 February 2022	
Hemel Hempstead Gazette	• 9 and 16 February 2022	
Hunts Post	• 9 and 16 February 2022	

		• Wolvey and Hatfield Times	a 0 and 16 Ephruary 2022
		Welwyn and Hatfield Times The second secon	• 9 and 16 February 2022
		Barnet Borough Times	• 10 and 17 February 2022
		Hertfordshire Mercury	• 10 and 17 February 2022
		Herts Advertiser	• 10 and 17 February 2022
		Hitchin Comet	• 10 and 17 February 2022
		Letchworth and Baldock Comet	• 10 and 17 February 2022
		Milton Keynes Citizen	• 10 and 17 February 2022
		Royston Crow	• 10 and 17 February 2022
		Stevenage Comet	• 10 and 17 February 2022
		Biggleswade Chronicle	• 11 and 18 February 2022
		Bucks Free Press	• 11 and 18 February 2022
		Watford Observer	• 11 and 18 February 2022
b)	once in a national newspaper;	2019 consultation	
		The Times	8 October 2019
		2022 consultation	
		The Times	8 February 2022
c)	once in the London Gazette and, if land in	2019 consultation	
	Scotland is affected, the Edinburgh Gazette;	London Gazette	8 October 2019
	and	2022 consultation	
		London Gazette	8 February 2022
d)	where the proposed application relates to offshore development –	N/A	N/A

	(i) once in Lloyds List; and (ii) once in an appropriate fishing trade journal?		
20	Did the s48 notice include the required information set out in Regulation 4(3) of APFP Regulations, which may encompass changes made by The Infrastructure Planning (Publication and Notification of Applications etc.) (Amendment) Regulations 2020?	Yes 2019 consultation The published s48 notice, supplied at Appe Appendices (Doc 6.02), contains the requirement 2022 consultation The published s48 notice, supplied at Appe Appendices (Doc 6.02), contains the requirement.	ired information as set out below: endix H4 of the Consultation Report

	Information	Paragraph		Information	Paragraph
a)	the name and address of the Applicant.	1 (2019 and 2022)	b)	a statement that the Applicant intends to make an application for development consent to the Secretary of State	1 (2019 and 2022)
c)	a statement as to whether the application is EIA development	6 (2019 and 2022)	d)	a summary of the main proposals, specifying the location or route of the Proposed Development	4 and 5 (2019 and 2022)
e)	a statement that the documents, plans and maps were available on a website maintained by or on behalf of the Applicant. The statement must include:	8 (2019) 7 (2022)	f)	the latest date on which those documents, plans and maps will be available for inspection	8 (2019) 7 (2022)
	 the nature and location of the Proposed Development 				
	 The address of the website 				

	 The place on the website A telephone number which can be used to contact the Applicant for enquiries in relation to the documents, plans and maps. 					
g)	whether a charge will be made for copies of any of the documents, plans or maps and the amount of any charge	10 (2019) 11 (2022)	h)	details of how to respond to the publicity	11 (2019) 13 (2022)	
i)	a deadline for receipt of those responses by the Applicant, being not less than 28 days following the date when the notice is last published	12 (2019) 14 (2022)				
21	Are there any observations in respect of	of the s48 no	ice provid	led above?		
	Yes As noted above, whilst stated in the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) that a s48 notice was published in The Times and the London Gazette on 8 October 2019, there does not appear to be any evidence of this within the application. It is noted that the Applicant has provided evidence that the s48 notice was published in the Times and London Gazette on 8 February 2022, as required by Regulation 4(3)(b) and (c) of The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009.					
22	the EIA consultation bodies and to any person notified to the Applicant in accordance with the EIA Regulations ¹⁰ ? A copy			ation s48 notice was sent to the EIA consultation bodies a as confirmed in paragraph 4.9.1 of the Consultatio		

¹⁰ Regulation 13 of the 2017 EIA Regulations, or where Regulation 37 of the 2017 EIA Regulations applies, Regulation 11 of the 2009 EIA Regulations

A sample of the s42 consultation letter provided at **Appendix C2** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**) confirms a copy of the s48 notice was enclosed.

2022 consultation

A copy of the s48 notice was sent to the EIA consultation bodies as part of the s42 consultation, as confirmed in **paragraph 6.8.2** of the **Consultation Report** (**Doc 6.01**).

A sample of the s42 consultation letter provided at **Appendix H3** of the **Consultation Report Appendices** (**Doc 6.02**) confirms a copy of the s48 notice was enclosed.

s49: Duty to take account of responses to consultation and publicity

Has the Applicant had regard to any relevant responses to the s42, s47 and s48 consultation?

Yes

2019 consultation

Chapter 11 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) and Appendix L of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02) sets out how the Applicant had regard to the consultation responses received; including whether or not responses led to changes to the application.

The actions informed by the consultation responses appear to be reflected in the final form of the application as submitted. Where a particular response has not led to a change in the application, it is sufficiently clear that regard was had to it.

2022 consultation

Chapter 12 of the Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) and Appendix M of the Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02) sets out how the Applicant had regard to the consultation responses received; including whether or not responses led to changes to the application.

		The actions informed by the consultation responses appear to be reflected in the final form of the application as submitted. Where a particular response has not led to a change in the application, it is sufficiently clear that regard was had to it.			
Gui	Guidance about pre-application procedure				
24	To what extent has the Applicant had regard to statutory guidance 'Planning Act 2008: Guidance on the pre-application process' ¹¹ ?	Having reviewed the application, the Planning Inspectorate is satisfied that the Applicant has identified and had regard to the relevant statutory guidance.			
25	Summary: Section 55(3)(e)	The Applicant has complied with Chapter 2 of Part 5 (pre-application procedure) of the PA2008.			
		In respect of the minor consultation discrepancies identified, s51 advice has been provided to the Applicant how in this regard, available here: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR020001-000895			
s55(3)(f) and s55(5A): The application (including accompaniments) achieves a satisfactory standard having regard to the extent to which it complies with section 37(3) (form and contents of application) and with any standards set under section 37(5) and follows any applicable guidance under section 37(4)					
to w	which it complies with section 37(3) (form and	accompaniments) achieves a satisfactory standard having regard to the extent d contents of application) and with any standards set under section 37(5) and			
to w	which it complies with section 37(3) (form and	accompaniments) achieves a satisfactory standard having regard to the extent d contents of application) and with any standards set under section 37(5) and			
to w	which it complies with section 37(3) (form and ows any applicable guidance under section 3 ls it made in the prescribed form as set out in Schedule 2 of the APFP Regulations, and	y accompaniments) achieves a satisfactory standard having regard to the extent d contents of application) and with any standards set under section 37(5) and 37(4) Yes Section 4 of the Application Form (Doc 1.02) explains why the development falls			

¹¹ The Planning Inspectorate must have regard to the extent to which the Applicant has had regard to guidance issued under s50

27	Is it accompanied by a Consultation Report?		Yes The application is accompanied by a Consultation Report (Doc 6.01) and Consultation Report Appendices (Doc 6.02).			
28	Where a plan comprises three or more separate sheets, has a key plan been provided showing the relationship between the different sheets? ¹²		Yes			
29	Is it accompanied by the documents and information set out in APFP Regulation 5(2)?			The documents and information required by APFP Regulation 5(2) are set out in the documents and locations within the application as listed below:		
	Information	Document		ı	nformation	Document
a)	Where applicable, the Environmental Statement required under the EIA Regulations ¹³ and any scoping or screening opinions or directions	Volume 5 Environme Statement (ES) and I Documents: • ES Main Report • ES Appendices • ES Figures (Doc • ES Non-Technic Summary (Doc S	(Doc 5.01) (Doc 5.02) (5.03) (al	b)	The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	Draft Development Consent Order (Doc 2.01)

¹² Regulation 5(4) of The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 ¹³ The 2017 EIA Regulations, or where Regulation 37 of the 2017 EIA Regulations applies, the 2009 EIA Regulations

c)	An Explanatory Memorandum explaining the purpose and effect of provisions in the draft DCO	Explanatory Memorandum (Doc 2.02)	d)	Where applicable, a Book of Reference	Book of Reference (Doc 3.02)
	Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes		Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes
e)	A copy of any Flood Risk Assessment	Volume 5 Environmental Statement and Related Documents: ES Appendix 20.1 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc 5.07)	f)	A statement whether the proposal engages one or more of the matters set out in section 79(1) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (statutory nuisances) and if so how the Applicant proposes to mitigate or limit them	Volume 5 Environmental Statement and Related Documents: Statement of Statutory Nuisance (Doc 5.06)
	Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes (with minor discrepancies as noted in Box 30)		Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes
h)	A Statement of Reasons and a Funding Statement (where the application involves any Compulsory Acquisition)	Statement of Reasons (Doc 3.01) Funding Statement (Doc 3.03)	i)	A Land Plan identifying:- (i) the land required for, or affected by, the Proposed Development; (ii) where applicable, any land over	Land Plans and Crown Land Plans (Doc 4.03) Special Category Land Plans (Doc 4.10)

32

				which it is proposed to exercise powers of Compulsory Acquisition or any rights to use land;	
				 (iii) any land in relation to which it is proposed to extinguish easements, servitudes and other private rights; and (iv) any special category land and replacement land 	
	Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes		Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes (with minor discrepancies as noted in Box 30)
j)	A Works Plan showing, in relation to existing features:- (i) the proposed location or (for a linear scheme) the proposed route and alignment of	Works Plans (Doc 4.04)	k)	Where applicable, a plan identifying any new or altered means of access, stopping up of streets or roads or any diversions, extinguishments or creation of rights of way or public rights of navigation	Streets, Rights of Way, and Access Plans (Doc 4.08)

Version: August 2022 of 42

	the development and works; and (ii) the limits within which the development and works may be carried out and any limits of deviation provided for in the draft DCO				
	Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes (with minor discrepancies as noted in Box 30)		Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes
l)	Where applicable, a plan with accompanying	(i) Volume 5 Environmental Statement and Related Documents	m)	Where applicable, a plan with accompanying	Volume 5 Environmental Statement and Related Documents
	information identifying:-	ES Figure 8.1 Ecological Statutory Designated		information identifying any statutory or non-statutory sites or	ES Figure 10.1 Location of Designated Cultural Heritage Assets (Plan 1 of 2) (Doc 5.03)
	(i) any statutory or non-statutory sites or features of nature conservation eg Sites (Doc 5.03) Figure 8.2 Ecological Non-Statutory Designated Sites (Doc 5.03)		features of the historic environment, (eg	ES Figure 10.2 Location of Designated Cultural Heritage Assets	
		Designated Sites (Doc		scheduled monuments, World Heritage sites, listed buildings,	(Plan 2 of 2) (Doc 5.03). Assessment:
	sites of geological or landscape importance;	ES Figure 8.3 Ecological Constraints Plan (Doc		archaeological sites and registered	Volume 5 Environmental Statement and Related Documents
	(ii) habitats of protected species, important habitats	5.03) ES Figure 14.7 Landscape and Visual		battlefields) together with an assessment of any effects on such sites, features or	ES Chapter 10: Cultural Heritage (Doc 5.01)

or other diversity features; and (iii) water bodies in a river basin management plan,	(ii)	Impact Assessment (LVIA) Constraints Plan (Doc 5.03) Volume 5 Environmental Statement and Related Documents	structures likely to be caused by the Proposed Development	
together with an assessment of any effects on such sites, features, habitats or		ES Figure 8.3 Ecological Constraints Plan (Doc 5.03)		
bodies likely to be caused by the Proposed Development		ES Appendix 8.1 Ecology Baseline Report - Part A (Doc 5.02)		
·	(iii)	Volume 5 Environmental Statement and Related Documents		
		Figure 20.4 Water Framework Directive Waterbodies (Doc 5.03)		
	Asse	ssment:		
	State	me 5 Environmental ment and Related ments		
	ES C 5.01)	hapter 8: Biodiversity (Doc		
	ES C Visua	hapter 14: Landscape and		
		hapter 20: Water urces and Flood Risk (Doc		

	Is this of a	Yes		Is this of a satisfactory	Yes
	satisfactory standard?			standard?	
n)	Where applicable, a plan with any accompanying information identifying any Crown land	Land Plans and Crown Land Plans (Doc 4.03)	0)	Any other plans, drawings and sections necessary to describe the development consent proposal showing details of design, external appearance, and the preferred layout of buildings, structures, drainage, surface water management, means of vehicular and pedestrian access, any car parking and landscaping	General Arrangement Drawings (Doc 4.09) Scheme Layout Plans (Doc 4.02) Airport Access Road and DART Long Section Drawings (Doc 4.11) Airport Boundary Plan (Doc 4.12) Strategic Landscape Masterplan (Doc 5.10)
	Is this of a satisfactory standard?	Yes (with minor discrepancies as noted in Box 30)		Are they of a satisfactory standard?	Yes (with minor discrepancies as noted in Box 30)
p)	Any of the documents prescribed by Regulation 6 of the APFP Regulations:	N/A.	q)	Any other documents considered necessary to support the application	Application Form (Doc 1.02) Introduction to the Application (Doc 1.03) Consents and Agreements Position (Doc 2.03) Mitigation Route Map (Doc 5.09)

				Planning Statement (Doc 7.01)
				Transport Assessment (Doc 7.02)
				Design and Access Statement (Doc 7.03)
				Need Case (Doc 7.04)
				Employment and Training Strategy (Doc 7.05)
				Sustainability Statement (Doc 7.06)
				Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note (Doc 7.07)
				Green Controlled Growth Framework (Doc 7.08)
				Design Principles (Doc 7.09)
				Draft Compensation Policies, Measures and Community First (Doc 7.10)
				Equality Impact Assessment (Doc 7.11)
				Surface Access Strategy (Doc 7.12)
				Framework Travel Plan (Doc 7.13)
	Are they of a satisfactory standard?	N/A	Are they of a satisfactory standard?	Yes (with minor discrepancies as noted in Box 30)
30	Are there any observati	ons in respect of the documents provide	led at Box 29 (a) to (q) abov	/e?
	Volume 5 Environmer	ntal Statement (ES) and Related Doc	uments	
	Visual representations colour.	are provided in ES Figure 14.7 (Doc re	f: 5.02) but are noted to be	difficult to view due to line weight and

An odour assessment has been provided at ES Appendix 7.3, and the proposed Water Treatment Plant includes odour mitigation; however, some minor discrepancies have been noted related to how the conclusions have been reached.

ES Appendix 20.1 Flood Risk Assessment (Doc 5.07)

The extent of interaction between the Off-Site Highways Interventions and the flood risk zones, whilst small, are not particularly clear, together with the delineation of what areas are FRZ 3a and 3b. It is recommended this be clarified to understand the application of the exception test in these areas.

Land Plans and Crown Land Plans (Doc 4.03)

Plot numbers 1-07, 1-08, 1-09, 2-92, 2-93, 2-97, 2-99, 2-116 and 5-26 cannot be found on the Land Plans.

Areas of land coloured yellow are within airport boundary. If the yellow demarcation is removed then it needs to be clarified whether this is operational airport land (grey) and so remains within the airport boundary or the RLB needs reducing (airport boundary plan and RLB don't necessarily correlate).

Insets are not consistent in where their label points are placed. Some are placed on the line not inside the inset. Also thickness of lines used could be thinner to allow clearer marking of small plots.

It would assist all parties if Crown land was shown on a separate plan.

Works Plans (Doc 4.04)

Unidentified Work adjoining Work No. 3(a)(01) on Sheet 2 of 4 of Part 3 of the Works Plans.

Work No. 6e(b) appears to be incorrectly labelled as Work No. 6e(f) on Sheet 2 of 14 of Part 6 of the Works Plans. Work No. 6e(b) is also not listed in the Works Plans Drawing List.

It would assist all parties if roads and other features were labelled on the Works Plans.

General Arrangement Drawings (Doc 4.09)

Some text on the 'Indicative General Arrangement Terminal 1 Baggage Hall Extensions Plans & Section' is not legible.

Design and Access Statement (Doc 7.03)

Some figures are not legible.

Section 51 advice has been issued to the Applicant in respect of these and a number of other matters: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR0200001-000895

31	Is the application accompanied by a report identifying any European site(s) to which Regulation 48 of The Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 applies; or any Ramsar site(s), which may be affected by the Proposed Development, together with sufficient information that will enable the Secretary of State to make an appropriate assessment of the implications for the site if required by Regulation 48(1)? ¹⁴	A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) No Likely Significant Effects Report (NSER) is provided at Appendix 8.3 of the Environmental Statement (Doc 5.08). The HRA NSER identifies relevant European sites and the likely effects on those sites. It is considered that the information provided in the report is adequate for acceptance. Note: The Examining Authority will be able to ask questions during the Examination. This may result in additional information being required to inform the HRA Report and the competent authority. Depending upon the type and availability of information required it may not be possible to obtain this during the statutory timetable of the Examination.
32	If requested by the Planning Inspectorate, two paper copies of the application form and other supporting documents and plans ¹⁵	No hard copies requested.
33	Has the Applicant had regard to statutory guidance 'Planning Act 2008: Application form guidance', and has this regard led to the application being prepared to a standard that the Planning Inspectorate considers satisfactory?	Yes The Planning Inspectorate is satisfied that the Applicant has demonstrated regard to the guidance principles.
34	Summary - s55(3)(f) and s55(5A)	The Planning Inspectorate concludes that the application (including accompaniments) has been prepared to a standard that it considers satisfactory.
		In respect of the discrepancies identified in Box 30 of this checklist, to help facilitate an efficient and effective examination of the application s51 advice has been provided to the Applicant in conjunction with the decision to accept the application.

Regulation 5(2)(g) of the APFP Regulations
 Regulation 5(2)(r) of the APFP Regulations

		That advice is published on the National Infrastructure Planning website, here: https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/TR020001-000895			
The	The Infrastructure Planning (Fees) Regulations 2010 (as amended)				
Fee	Fees to accompany an application				
35	Was the fee paid at the same time that the application was made ¹⁶ ?	The fee was received on 24 February 2023, before the application was made.			

Role	Electronic signature	Date
Case Manager	Siân Evans	27 March 2023
Acceptance Inspector	Jo Dowling	27 March 2023

¹⁶ The Planning Inspectorate must charge the Applicant a fee in respect of the decision by the Planning Inspectorate under section 55 of the PA2008. If the Applicant fails to pay the fee, the Planning Inspectorate need not consider the application until payment is received. The fee must be paid at the same time that the application is made