

AUDIO_ISH2_SESSION2_27092023

Wed, Sep 27, 2023 3:22PM • 1:53:34

00:06

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, we're now going to move on to Agenda Item three, which is socio economic matters, whilst socio economic covers a range of issues, because we have discussed need today, we decided that we wanted to focus on employment. As in weighing the planning balance this is seen along with need as one of the effects weighing in for the proposed development, chapter 11 of the environmental statement, a PP o three, seven, along with dependencies, a PP o seven, nine and a PPO at cover economics and employment.

00:42

I do have a number of questions regarding the various calculations, including in these documents, but given their technical nature, I've decided that these will be best done in writing rather than orally. Therefore, discussion today will be focused on job creation in Luton, and then the community first band, which I think could benefit from exploring orally in order to better understand the case being made. So on the agenda, you'll see that the first item I wanted to just to explore is to consider whether the number of jobs predicted by the applicant would be delivered, and where and when these will be provided. I just want to start off by asking the application applicant a clarification question. So it's to do with how many jobs the airport currently supports, because in your statement, you seem to use varying numbers. So I'm talking about chapter 11 of the IES here. So for example, paragraph 11 point 7.3 states at the airport directly supported 10,900 jobs. But then a breakdown provided later in the paragraph only refers to 10,700 jobs. So it would appear that as a differential of 200 jobs, I'm just wondering, which is, which bigger is correct.

01:59

So who is going to be the Applicant American, it's me again, on the sort of job numbers and colleagues will will deal with other matters. The reason that discrepancy needs to be taken away, and we'll clarify it, but the correct number is 10,900. Okay, because obviously, you started off by losing 200 jobs. Yeah.

02:17

Yeah. So if you could just do a sense check. And then just come back. And let me know why there may be that difference in that particular part of the report.

02:30

So what I'm wanting to know, first of all, is looking at what's in the both in the employment and training strategy. And in chapter 11,

02:42

the

02:44

it appears that you would be creating and this is directly related to the airport jobs 800 new jobs by 2027, which is the end of phase one rising to 2300 jobs in 2039. And rising to 4200 jobs. At the end of the when they're up on the fly is fully operational. I'm just wanting to know have the jobs predicted included an adjustment for jobs lost. So this is in paragraph 11.9. Point 10 of chapter 11, you acknowledge that some business space and employment land will be deployed will be sort of hat needs to be moved or or be provided elsewhere within the to enable the construction or the development. So there is a potential for some job loss there. So I'm just wondering whether the figures include that adjustment.

03:36

Please conduct the applicant. The figures you cited are the gross job creation before displacement. I think the displacement effects are dealt with later in the yes chapter. Okay.

03:53

And I also just want to clarify,

03:55

the green horizons park planning commission said it would deliver 3200 jobs.

04:03

But states in your assessment that 50 In the hotel and now included in the airport operationally

04:11

related to employment. But it also indicates that 543 jobs will be lost because the light industrial zone that was proposed under that scheme wouldn't be built out. Can I just again, ask whether or not the figures that you've been given I've been given include the loss of those 543 jobs.

04:29

The job numbers that you cited originally are before that displacement effect is taken into account that the the jobs that have been created by the airport and the employment training strategy that my colleague Mr. Himes will deal with is addressed at how to make sure that those jobs are productively deployed to support growth in Luton surrounding areas.

04:51

So I don't think you've answered the question. So whether 543 jobs that would have been delivered through green horizons Park included or excluded from the calculations, the figures

05:00

Use dialog before those jobs are directly.

05:05

The employment and training strategy recognizes employment and loosen is more at risk of automation and highlights baggage handling, and checking as to potential areas where going forward into the

future, those processes can be streamlined and result in need to employ less people. Can I just ask whether whether the figure in later years has been adjusted for improvements to automation streamlining,

05:28

responded to the applicant, again, yes, the figures for the future years take into account anticipated productivity improvements.

05:38

So things like automation are factored into those productivity trends for the job numbers are lower than they would have been if they had simply been extracted, extrapolated pro rata to grow.

05:48

Okay.

05:50

So, as I mentioned earlier, there's obviously a lot of emphasis has been placed on the fact that the proposal will deliver jobs. And this is seen as a benefit that would arise that when we're doing our planning balance would go into the benefits scales to balance against anything that's in the negative balance.

06:08

I understand that the delivery of jobs was seen as a key benefit for the previous planning permission to increase the passenger cap to 80 million passengers per annum.

06:17

Have you got any information given that was granted in 2012, and we're now in 2023, whether that passenger cap increase has delivered the jobs it predicted to be provided.

06:30

We started with the applicant. Again, I think it's important to bear in mind that the way the job numbers were assessed for that previous planning application was a different basis. It was an extrapolation of all of the jobs and all of the employment in the area around the airport, grown pro rata to passenger growth.

06:53

That included some jobs that are not strictly airport related, but happened to be located in the vicinity of the airport. So when you try and compare those previous job number estimates, with those for the current application, you're actually comparing apples and pears. So what we've done for this application working with Oxford Economics, is actually make sure that we only include within our economic footprint, those jobs that are genuinely related to operation at the airport. So for example, the previous employment estimates that were made, at the time, the previous application would have included companies like GKN aerospace, which are not directly airport related but happened to be in the close vicinity of the airport and are operating in an aerospace sector today would have been counted within

that economic footprint at the time. What we've done this time is make sure we strip those jobs out to give you an accurate perspective on the number of jobs that would be created.

07:54

Okay, but the 2012 application said it was going to deliver 13 and a half 1000 jobs. And the information that has been submitted by various different people seems to indicate that actually, it's 10,900. So even allowing for the fact that a wider economic footprint and different industries were incorporated into that, does that allow for that loss of 3500 jobs

08:18

in those figures? So if we strip out the additionality, that you've just referred to, would I still see an increase in in job numbers in line with what was predicted in 2012?

08:31

It was kind of Yeah, cricket, I think what we'll have to do is come back to you on that and and do a paper, it may take a little bit of work to try and go back and read out the jobs in the original 2012 work to help you with that. According to the section 106 agreement that was signed in relation to the end of 2012 Planning Commission. They are required the jobs numbers are required to be monitored annually. So you should have access to the figures that were created as a result of that planning permission. Yes, I mean, we've got access to the numbers of jobs that were created. What I don't know, is how much of that base number that you quoted was actually these jobs that are not strictly airport related. But it may take us a little bit longer than deadline three to do that. But we can come back to you on that. Okay. Can I just ask. And this may be a question for Luton Borough Council rather than yourself. There are a number of section 106 agreements linked to both the 2012 planning permission for the airports. And there's also a section one of six agreement with regards to green house, a green horizons Park regarding employment skills, procurement and trading strategies. And I think it was an employment skills and requirement plan. We had a brief discussion yesterday at the DCO hearing about what was potentially happening with those because obviously, under Article 44 of the DCO, those planning permit well, particularly their current plan commission for the airport would fall away. So what's happening with the strategies that were secured

10:00

is it that the new strategy it's coming forward would take those on board? And it would be that new strategy rolling out or would those strategies still apply? So I think it's a question for Luton Borough Council but I don't know if the applicant won't answer it, or defer to Luton.

10:18

Michael fry for Luton Borough Council what I'll do is I'll hand the examination over to Mr. Gertler planet for leaving Borough Council

10:28

is madam David Gertler, Luton Borough Council.

10:32

We haven't yet had discussions with the applicant on the section 106. And how either green horizons planning permission

10:43

the obligations within that will be carried forward, or the obligations on the project Korean the original 2012 permission 2014 Permission.

10:55

So our anticipation green horizons needs to be implemented by I think it's the 28th of June 2024.

11:08

The applicant will be talking to Luton Borough Council about discharge of pre commencement conditions. And phase one of the outline permission reserved matters need to be submitted by that date as well, in order for that planning permission to remain live. So they will be talking to Luton Borough Council about that. If they implement that, then the section 106. And its obligations which would be carried forward. If they don't implement it. There are significant planning contributions and benefits associated with green horizons. Hark. For instance, there's playing fields get lost. I understand that sport, England antiseptic consultative on the DCO. But for the 1990 planning out, they were and we had to satisfy them on the

12:02

playing fields policy. And that was something which would would have been referred whether it was referral to a secretary of state. So there needs to be secured those kinds of contributions. There's obviously the county wildlife side. So we would expect the section 106 discussions to pick those kinds of things up in case, green horizons doesn't go forward. So what it looked to me was there was a potential sort of overlapping of employment and training strategies. And what I was trying to understand is under the current proposal isn't, and they've all got slightly different names. So if I just say an employment training strategy, you will know what I mean. But say there's an employment training strategy proposed as part of the DCO. There's an existing employment and training strategy that came out of the 2012 planning commission. And it's a similar employment and training strategy linked to green horizons Park. And what I'm just wondering is how they would all work together, would they still exist? Or would for example, the 2012, employment trends training strategy fall away because it's now being replaced by the one in the DCO. So it's just trying to understand how those would work and which strategy we're looking at going forward? Because

13:13

obviously, there may be different things and each of those strategies that should potentially be picked up if it's a iterative process, and a new trick training strategies coming out, potentially, those elements should be included in. So thank you, Madam, and you throw into the mix, the

13:29

2021 planning application for the 19 million, if that comes forward,

13:35

that had again, a review of the employment screening training strategy, I would expect anything that the applicant proposes to take that on board and bring it forward. So the 2012, which was then subjected to a section 73 application, in 2015, I would expect that to fall away and something new to take over.

14:03

Dennis, the applicant wants to respond on this. Yes, Rebecca Clutton for the applicant, madam, these are matters that are obviously going to be subject to the negotiations, the program for which as you're aware, has now been set out. And one of the things I would just notice that in the planning statement was as one to two, you'll recall that there's a non-exhaustive list of heads effectively heads of terms for Section 106 that set out one of those is the replacement of the sports pitches just by way of example. So we are live to the issues that arise because of the existence of other Planning Commission's and they will be addressed through the negotiations between the parties.

14:41

I was just looking at it in terms of employment this morning, because obviously, we always have like three competing strategies, and it's whether they're all going to come into line together in what's coming through a board through the DCO whether one would call away or whether there's still sort of compete with each other because realistically, obviously, what we're looking at is how, what the effect on Luton is and this is one of the things

15:00

It's seen as a benefit, because obviously, it's meant to enable the workforce in Newton to move forward and, and get jobs and get trained for jobs that will provide them with employment. So just wanting to understand it.

15:12

Thank you for that.

15:17

So Mr. Phillips, you've got your hand up.

15:24

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Chair.

15:27

We've been dealing in the previous section.

15:30

And indeed your questions.

15:33

Right now, with forecasting.

15:36

My first thought is that there's no anchor with reality.

15:41

And what I would like the answers to your the questions that you have raised in this current session, to be anchored with Lutens GDP performance since 2012, and the previous expansion to 18 million. The reality as far as we can see, is that Lutens growth for GDP has been low, and in fact, lower than the percentage GBG GDP growth in the three counties and the adjacent six counties. And I would just like to have that as a context for the answers to the questions that you have.

16:17

Thank you very much, Mr. Phillips.

16:25

I do realize that the following point that I have on the agenda sort of overlaps with this, I'm sort of going to strain to the next section, which talks about the type of jobs that will be delivered, because obviously it relates to where and when and how the jobs will be delivered. So one of the big emphasis has been placed in the application is the importance of this proposal. In terms of the leveling up agenda. The leveling up agenda, obviously is about creating opportunities for everyone across the UK, improving jobs pay and living standards and protecting health and wellbeing. And obviously locally, that's backed up by the London vision 2040, which proposes to have Luton as a healthy, better sustainable town where everyone can thrive, and no one has to live in poverty.

17:09

The employment training strategy states that jobs at the airport are well paid, but Luton seems to have the lowest median wage in the three counties. That was in paragraph 11. Point seven of your

17:23

environmental statements chapter 11.

17:28

Can you just explain if the average wage of jobs directly supported by the airport is above average? How come that Luton as a town has a lowest median wage for the three counties?

17:44

Hello, Karen homes for the applicant? Obviously, those are two overlapping areas in the Venn diagram people employed in the place and people employed at the airport. And so there's two different potential well, your workforce populations.

18:02

That's your response. Yeah, I don't think that it's I think that the fact that you've stated are correct, but I don't think they're inconsistent with each other. Okay. But one of the aims of this application is to improve the lives of people in Luton. So how do we link those back up? So I think that's that's where the ETS, the employment and training strategy comes in.

18:23

The the types of employment that are found that the extra care housing, the applicant making, the types of employment that are found at the airport, range in skill range in accessibility, and there's actually a really good blend, which is why

18:37

as well as being well paid in terms of the sort of the higher order jobs, the jobs, the entry level jobs, the skilled jobs, the semi skilled jobs, the unskilled jobs also attract reasonably good wages. And the blend of those jobs is such that it's, it's suitable for for people entry level into to get into the employment market. The challenge and the starting point for the ETS, was that there are these pockets of deprivation within the Luton and the wider project area. So the role of the employment training strategy is to make sure that we reach out to those specific areas, but some tangible, flexible actions that can try and target those sort of harder to reach areas. And make sure that if from a leveling up perspective, that there's there's the sort of optimum competition, so that people can be prepared enabled to take advantage of the employment opportunities created.

19:32

So

19:36

as you just heard, there's an employment and training strategy linked to the 2012 planning mission, which had, as I understand it, from a look at it, very similar aims and objectives. However, we still seem to be in a situation where people in Luton are on the lowest median wage, and they're not actively employed. So what are you going to do that's different so that I can give it some weight when I'm considering it in terms of

20:00

Delivering that leveling up and leveling up agenda. So, care enhances the applicant, we haven't gone back and map to the specificity specific differences between those actions. And that's something we're happy to do. But I think what we've set out in the employment training strategy are a range of dynamic actions which do specifically address those points. So particularly working with the institutions to such as the he and FE colleges, to help them gain skills needed to get into that. Certainly also addressing the things around physical accessibility employment as well. So that dovetails for example, with the surface access strategy, working with the employers at the airport to encourage those highest standards. So it's actually sort of trying to drive that that agenda forward, not just for the the construction practice, I think it's also important to remember the ETS covers city construction elements, as well as the operational business phases, just focusing on the direct airport employments is also a good construction project. And I think also the the outreach into the local community through the sort of schools community leaders as well. So I think we're confident that the the initiatives proposed are well targeted to try and reach out into those areas.

21:14

But again, I'm just putting them because I do need the answer to this. That appears to be very same to what was set out in employment skills and recruitment plan attached to the current planning permission,

which has now obviously had run for 10 years. But again, looking at the information you provided me where the skills profile and looting is still lower than the national average. So how you going to achieve a step change to make sure that this application delivers those economic benefits you say it will do Rebecca Klum for the applicant, madam, I think this is a an item that we're going to have to take away and provide some analysis as obviously Mr. Himes yesterday. He hasn't yet gone back and tracked the differences between the two. But that's certainly something that we can do and provide that for you. It won't be at deadline three, but in due course.

21:58

Thank you very much. It's not that I necessarily agree or disagree, but I just need to get the correct answers on this. Because obviously, it's a key element of why you think the proposal is acceptable. So it's one of the things we need to explore in detail. Just just before I come to the New Economics Foundation, if I can just ask if there's anything from the host authorities that anyone wants to add to this discussion,

22:22

Madam Michael fry for Luton Borough Council. Madam as you'll be aware, the job creation and socio economic benefits is one of the key planks of liberal councils in principle support. So I would only wish to draw your attention to local impact report and my friend I don't have the the examination reference number but paragraph or two, five deals with the importance of the airports as an employer for the town and notes that it's 12% of all jobs in the town, which is I think was the Venn diagram point that the applicant

22:55

was making. Thank you, madam.

23:00

So if I can go to Mr. Westman Smith and then I'll come to you Sorry.

23:05

Mark Westerman Smith, for her Buckinghamshire Council. If I can just make one short point in relation to the ETS. Obviously, the Council supports the economic developments that we brought forward by the airport. But in order for Buckinghamshire to benefit from those it needs, involvement and effective delivery through the ETS. Now, as part of that, we have asked to be involved in the local

23:37

development local economic development working group. And the applicant has agreed to that that working group being part of the ETS, and that's recorded in our statement of common ground rep to zero to five. The question arises as to securing that. If one looks at the mitigation route map, which is as overhaul seven, there's a table in it that lists out all the proposals to be secured by way of mitigation. And in the context of economic development and mitigation roadmap, e one and E two, seeks to secure by way of work section 106 agreements, section two of the ETS, that gives rise to two issues for us. One,

24:29

the goal and initiative 1.1, which is the local economic development working group is housed in section four of the ETS. And so we think that the scope should be wider, and then there's a question of delivery for Buckinghamshire council who is not a host authority and whether there needs to be a side agreement. In a sense, the question of delivery is when we put forward through you to the

25:00

applicant to think about, I think that's a very detailed question and it possibly sways away from where I'm trying to get to this morning. So if I could just ask the applicant to do a written response to that. Yes, madam, we said Rebecca Clem for the outcome, we'll take those points out understood, and we'll take them away. Before you finish, Mr. Westminster, I just do want to ask a quick question. Obviously, we've talked about existing strategies is Buckinghamshire council involved with any of those?

25:27

Again, you might need to take it away and come back to me. In order to be accurate, I will take it away and come back to you. Thank you. If I can get the new economic foundations who've been very patiently waiting. Thank you. Thank you, Inspector,

25:40

you'll be aware that we've got quite a lot to say on this issue. I'll try to sort of paraphrase here on the basis that you can read these submissions, and I'll be putting another one in a deadline three.

25:51

Those understand it from the sort of back and forth that we've had with the applicant. So far, some serious outstanding questions remain on precisely the issues that you're asking about.

26:01

So before you continue, do bear in mind that I did have I know that you question some modeling. And I did start off by saying I do have some technical questions, but I think they're best on in writing, because I think technical discussions can sometimes be easier written on paper, and you can work out exactly what's going on. So just in order to focus your responses, if it's about modeling, could you maybe submit those in writing? If it's about the discussion, we've had this this morning, I'm more than happy for you to proceed. Thank you. I think it's about the conversations we've just had. So

26:31

as as you've pointed out, the Halcro assessment from 2012, had a significantly higher jobs forecast and is now shown to be the case.

26:41

Actually, that that needs to be backdrop against the national scenario, which is the jobs in aviation, despite significant passenger growth over the last decade or so have not increased at all over their pre financial crisis level at the national level. And we can look at other datasets not used by the applicant to look at how that has played out locally and Luton. Figure three of my written representation uses the business register an employment survey to look at direct air transport and supporting services

employment, which constitutes I believe, about 85% of employment at the airports over that period, and shows that actually, within that, within that geography, the number of jobs is some is around 1000, fewer than it was pre financial crisis now

27:27

despite something like a doubling in the passenger capacity of Luton Airport over the period, so clearly, something is wrong here. i There's more technical debate about the modeling and how that's happened, but something's not right.

27:42

Furthermore, on the issue of job quality, which I think is a vital question, clearly, employees of the airport who live within the Luton unitary authority are not paid, especially better than jobs within the region. And that's in the applicants own data. I just wanted to highlight one possible reason for that. So our recent report shows that again, national li the real wages paid to direct air transport employees have declined faster than any other sub sector of EU UK economy.

28:16

Now, again, to take that to the gluten level, the only data that I have available as an external on this to deal with that is, again, the whole chrome assessment. And we've shown again, comparing today to what was stated about the context back then, there's around about a 10% Real terms decline in wages being paid by the airport over the period, which might go some way to explaining why the airport is not making that contribution to leveling up the area. Now, the airport does raise this issue of methodological differences, which may well contribute to a portion of that difference. I mean, I would, I would have liked that they could have just repeated directly the same assessment as before. So we had a baseline that was comparable. And secondly, that it seems highly unlikely that the small tinkering around the edges of the boundary of where the assessment was set would have such a large effect to produce this, both real terms decline in wages of 10% and the disappearance of a couple of 1000 jobs.

29:18

Thank you, if I could ask the applicant when they came back on the data that I requested. If they can address that question in there, that would be helpful. We squandered the applicant Certainly. Thank you. Thank you for your contribution. Is there anything else anyone wants to raise with regards to you? Jobs?

29:37

Okay, well, I propose to move on to community three days sorry, yes, sorry. It was funerals. For the host authorities. It was simply to say that the host authorities consultant denticon is finalizing an independent review of chapter 11 of the environmental statement and the needs case on behalf of the authorities and that will be submitted at a future deadline.

30:00

So I'd just like to move on to a review of the proposals for community first. It's not including but it's including but not limited to the purpose of the fund and how it'd be secured, and how the proposed fund would be apportioned.

30:13

I've got a couple of technical questions. First of all, because obviously, again, a bit like the job creation, this is one of the big planks in the applicants case for

30:24

things waiting in the in the plus column. So I just like to confirm first that the community first fund is a fund that will be accessible to community groups, charities, parish councils and town councils in Luton in the surrounding area. And they can, under the new proposals could apply for annually for grants of up to 25,000 pounds to fund sport projects to tackle deprivation, decarbonisation, the funds will be split 60% of the bar evolution and 40% of the remaining designated area on the fund would deliver a one pound per passenger, one pound per passenger over the cap at the time that the DCO is made. I just wanted to call a couple of points of clarification. The first one is the use of the phrase cap at the time that the DCO is made. So is that 18 or 19 million passengers per annum? Because obviously it could mean a potential shortfall of a million pounds.

31:13

Rebecca Claire and for the applicant, it depends on whether the planning permission is granted for the 90 million. Okay, so if the 90 million passengers per annum, if that appeal succeeds, it will be nine 1 million pound less to the fund that That's right, madam. Okay, thank you. Can I just ask what is happening to the current fund? It's not clear. This currently provides 50 pence per passenger.

31:38

And I understand obviously looking at article 44 of the DCA, that planning commission is being wiped out. What's happening with that? What provision has been made for passengers below the 18 or 19 million cap? Is it being kept? Or are these falling away? Rebecca and for the applicant? I'm going to pass you over now to Mr. Aldridge who will be able to help you with those questions.

32:02

Thank you, counsel, the obituary applicant.

32:05

I think I just need to correct a misconception in something that you just said man. So 50 pence per passenger current that's that's not correct. We use that as a statistic as a as a specific measurement at one point in time. So in 2019,

32:20

the funds that the existing community funding program started with a total pot of about 9 million, and it was about 8 million 18 million passengers. So that that that worked out at about 50 per passenger. But that existing community funding program is not in any way linked to passenger throughput. We just use that as an example to show the level of community given that loot and rising is is currently undertaking, when we compare it in the same way, we use it as a comparison to compare that performance against other airports in the UK. So our existing community funding program is wholly separate from and will

always remain separate from any of the any proposals in the TCO. It's a long standing commitment that we've had. And the value of it is assessed on an annual basis by our board of directors.

33:17

So you're saying that their two fans would run in parallel?

33:21

Yes, they will. So so in the future, that community funding program will continue to operate

33:29

up to the whatever the existing the point that community first kicks in. So whatever the point that community first kicks in, if that's 18 or 19 million passengers.

33:40

Up from that point on every passenger above that level, that's where you get your one pound contribution to community first. So effectively, Community First,

33:50

is only for the additionality between 18 or 19. Under 30 million cap. That's correct. Okay. Just on the point with the I understand that you obviously, your proposal is that the two funds would run in parallel. But in practical terms, if the Planning Commission is falling away, how is that secured?

34:13

If I'm trying to swell planning commission that gives the existing community funding program is not linked to any other contract. It's a pure

34:25

Fluke arising constitutes of a social enterprise. And it considers that its community funding is core to its activities. And, and that's why we undertake that. So that community funding probe predates the 2012 application. Right? So it's not secured in any way. So it could fall away tomorrow if you chose not to. Absolutely, it could, but that's very unlikely. So looking at the actual what is funded so the new community funding, which is community first would be on the 18 or 19 to 32 million on a one pound per passenger basis, and that is secured by

35:00

That's exactly right. Thank you for those clarifications. And can I just ask, is the finger index linked one pound, it's not index linked, what we've said is that there will be a review of the fund on a regular basis, which shouldn't exceed five years. And so depending on needs, so if this fund is over subscribed, under subscribed, or there's some other reason to review the fund, then it will be reviewed at regular intervals with no more than five years. And at that point, then the level of the contribution is one of the one of the items that's listed as part being subjected to that review.

35:43

As I understand it, that review is carried out by the board of directors. The review is carried out by the independent administrator of the fund. So at the moment, that's BLC, if you heard you heard from them at the open floor hearings,

35:59

our expectation is that they would continue to do to run this one in the future. But we have the fund doesn't exist today, and we haven't had that discussion. But it would be it with them or a body like them that will undertake the review. Okay. I don't think this is the case. But I just want to seek the clarification. I just wanted to check there is no double counting for Luton and its ability to apply for the fund. Because I note that in the 40% split, it takes state that includes the entirety of the county of Bedfordshire including Luton and that's paragraph 9.1 point two. So

36:35

obviously Luton has access to 60% of the fun so just double checking

36:41

would clarify what we mean in that sentence is that the whole of the county of Bedfordshire including Luton sits within the county of Bedfordshire. We're just say that the whole county of Bedfordshire including Luton, but to be completely clear that the 40%

36:57

is for areas outside of the boundary of the borough of Luton. Thank you for that clarification. I didn't think that was the case. But I just needed to ask.

37:05

It says that the fund is going to be administered by an independent administrator. How would that actually be funded? I would the cost of this come out of the fund or would it be paid for separately? So again, I'll repeat what I just said. So our existing community funding program is run by the beneficiary and Community Foundation. That's an independent body, which is on the however it chooses to be funded. I don't have the details of that. We will just seek to follow us in one. I think we heard from that lady as they open. Okay.

37:37

So the purpose of the fund is to share the benefits of the airport growth with its neighbors and contribute to the London Luton 2040 vision at the London Luton vision which I understand it is for Luton to be healthy, fair and sustainable town where everyone can thrive and no one has lived in profit in poverty. I just want to know, given that Luton has had the benefit of a similar fund for quite some time, which according to documentation has in the last 20 years contributed 175 million. Yet we've still heard has issues with deprivation, why this fund will make a difference?

38:09

Well, we we're not proposing this as a panacea to all the problems of the world. We're proposing that it's

38:15

additional help. And clearly, it can't be solely down to charitable giving to solve the social problems of any particular area.

38:29

And given the impacts of the airport will be widely felt. Is the 6040 split appropriate?

38:37

Will we believe so?

38:40

And the reasons for that, I think when we look at the levels of the relative levels of deprivation in Luton and the rest of the area, are significant.

38:51

So we've done some analysis of that, using IMD data.

38:58

There are three three key different methodologies of

39:02

measuring deprivation with an IMD those that have a rank by they simply rank from the most deprived areas in the country to the least

39:14

they have a score, which is an aggregated score of a number of different indicators, which is which is weighted to create a total score and that score is then ranked nationally. And then there's also the measure which which is taken from the

39:34

it's a comparison against the top 10 most deprived wards by lower super output area. And when we look at Luton, we take the figures for Luton in any any each of those and compare them to the to the same data, the average across all of the surrounding districts which are within the zone. What what we see is that

40:00

It the range of need, if you want,

40:04

or Luton compared to the average is about it ranges between 57 and 82% of the total total of the pot. So our board of directors took the took the view that in the interest of equity, that if we were going to split the fun we should do at the lower end of that range, which is why we went for 60% to Luton.

40:26

I'm going to come to the host authorities to see if they want to respond, but obviously do bear in mind, I am aware of the comments that you've made in your local impact reports with regards to this. But if there's anything in addition, you want to add in light of what you've heard this morning. Feel free to do that now. So go to Luton Borough Council first.

40:44

Madam Thank you, Michael fry for Luton Borough Council. Madam, as you've noted, we've commented and local impact port we've seen what the applicant has said in response. Really, the devil is going to be in the detail and we don't have that detail yet. And we will respond in writing in due course, but as you might expect, we support the split as it is. Thank you.

41:07

I funerals for the host authorities. I don't think we've got anything further to add other than what's in local impact reports on this point. Mr. West, Mr. Smith, my question is for for Buckinghamshire Council, can I just introduce Donna Wilkinson who's the senior economic development officer? He's just going to respond shortly.

41:30

Thank you. I just like to say we welcome the inclusion of some parts of booking and show paths and format ELLs and avail district council area then I thought

41:38

I would just add some consideration for beginning to extend in the Bedfordshire over to ensure that the bleeding we have identified for Ward within our leveling up performance Opportunity Program that have comparatively higher level of deprivation within Buckminster

41:54

which even deprivation is going to

41:58

determine the scope of the fundamental geographical area that you're looking at with

42:03

the full board.

42:07

Thank you very much, if the Applicant could take that away, and maybe it was a response to that, Rebecca, and for the applicant as well, it's going to say, well, we're happy to take that away and consider appointment.

42:17

And I just want to briefly touch on how the community first fund would be secured.

42:25

Although it's not listed in the planning statement as an obligation, the indication is that this will be secured through section 106. Screaming Is that correct?

42:32

Answer guilty for the applicant? That's correct. Okay, given that,

42:37

looking at paragraph 57, at the National Planning Policy Framework, it states that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all the following tests, the necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. They're directly related to the development and they are fairly and reasonably related to scale and kind to the development. Can the applicant outline how the procurement proposals meet this test? Is there sufficient connection between the development and the planning obligation to make it a material consideration? And is the object of is the obligation proportionate or disproportionate to the external costs of the development,

43:11

Rebecca clutton for the applicant? If I can address you on that one? Madam, our position on that is that part of the need for the development for the proposed development is the generation of economic benefits to contribute to matters such as leveling up and, and to economic growth generally, we therefore consider that the it's the securing of benefits that seek that complies with the first part of the test that set out in the NPPF. In relation to conditions, it is necessary in order to deliver the benefits that underlie the policy compliance of the development in terms of proportionality, given the scale of the development and the scale of the benefits realized we do consider that they are proportionate as well. And obviously they do relate to land use planning.

44:06

If I could just pick up a follow up question.

44:11

In paragraph 11 point 1.3 states community first will be periodically reviewed and eligibility criteria can be changed. And note that the current current eligible beneficiaries could not be reused. So they always will stay. How would you ensure that it's still complies with the test for Section 106? For example, if the criteria were not just decarbonisation deprivation

44:39

might have in relation to that if it's okay, I think we'll take that point away and just address it in our in our summary note in response.

44:54

Think the remaining questions I have can be rolled over into writing because I realize you've got quite a lot to say

45:00

We'll get through this morning. So I just want to ask if there's anything anyone else wants to raise with regards to the matters that they've heard in relation to socio economic matters this morning, so I'm just going to go around the room the applicant.

45:10

So I'll come back to the applicant last. But that Luton Borough Council

45:15

has authorities, I can also cancel any of the third parties into the earth.

45:22

Yes, quickly.

45:26

When passengers were at 9 million a year, Luton had acceptably high levels of or respiratory health.

45:36

And for some years, every school has had inhalers for the worrying number of pupils suffering asthma, polluted air stunts, lung growth, leading to lifelong problems, shortening lives leading to heart attacks and strokes. People who are ill, and most likely to fall into poverty, which is what we've been talking about, and many unwaged or low wage people would suffer from the multiple effects effects of an expanded airport.

46:05

And Luton Council has a target, it cannot possibly meet of zero poverty by 2040.

46:13

I could say some more about pollution in written submission. Thank you. And I think those

46:18

quite a few people have used the analogy. And I, I myself am one of them of the fact that with an application like this, it's like a Venn diagram. There's a lot of overlap between the policies between all of the various different issues. And it may have been noticed that, for example, we aren't talking about health in this current set of hearings. But that is because we wanted to hear the evidence with regards to noise and air quality before we then moved on to looking at what those potential impacts are, or implications are for health. So for points that you raise may well need to be raised in the air quality session rather than in the socio economic session. Although obviously, as I just pointed out, there is this intrinsic interrelationship between all of these different topic areas can then come to the applicant. Yes, Rebecca Clinton for the applicant, Madam all I was going to say on that is that those are matters that relate also to health inequalities, and we don't have a specialist such as subject matter experts on those with us today. But those are points that if we can take those away in writing, respond to them, if that would be of assistance. Obviously, the the air quality impacts will be addressed.

47:20

On issue specific hearing. Five, I think that is Yeah, so again, it may be worth looking at the hearings holistically and putting that whilst taking away the point responding to it, maybe in combination with other things that the most appropriate during ice age five, I agree. Thank you, madam. Okay. I'm just going to take the nobody online wants to say anything.

47:45

Can't see any hands up. So I'm going to pass over to my colleagues, Miss Davis to deal with greenhouse gases and climate change.

47:51

Thank you.

47:52

First of all,

47:54

always there's some shuffling to do better if we can just have to have a change of personnel.

48:42

Madam Rebecca Clutton for the applicant, if just whilst everybody's setting up, I can introduce those people who are going to be speaking this afternoon. To my immediate left I have Mr. Ian Davies. Mr. Davies is a technical director with a calm and he is our lead for climate change resilience and greenhouse gases. To his immediate left is Mr. Mark de Mr. De is an associate with Arup. He's our strategic case, and he's a strategic case planner and also the lead on the GCG framework, and then to his left. I don't know if Mr. Murray will be speaking today. But to his left is Mr. Murray who is an associate director with AECOM, and he's also our greenhouse gas assessment support member. So if we get into some more technical detail, he'll be able to assist you. First of all, I'd like to invite the applicant to briefly summarize their assessment of the effects of emissions from greenhouse gases from a post development, which is mainly set out in chapter 12 of the IES.

49:49

Thank you, ma'am. Ian Davies on behalf of the applicant. So as you mentioned, chapter 12 greenhouse gases, which is AP zero

50:00

Three eight sets are our assessment of the impact of greenhouse gases from the proposed development.

50:07

We have the key part of our chapter is a lifecycle greenhouse gas assessment looking at the impacts of post development over its lifecycle.

50:17

We have undertaken our assessment in line with the guidance set out in the airport's national policy statement, recognizing that there's not a direct impact of under scheme. But we have followed the guidance on that, which is key key points that are sitting out emissions into four key areas which are emissions from aviation emissions from surface access journeys, emissions from airport operations, and emissions from construction. So if you've presented those four ways,

50:47

our assessment is influenced by two key policies, we have the jet zero policy, and specifically the government's preferred high ambition scenario. Looking at the impacts of that around sustainable aviation fuels netzero aircraft and aircraft efficiencies. We've also looked at the transport decarbonisation plan and the impact your unsurfaced axis journeys and looked at that within our assessment.

51:18

We also take into account two key mechanisms, government levers around the UK emissions trading scheme, and the corsia, the carbon offsetting reduction scheme for international aviation. And those are also built in the impacts of those to show how they will impact emissions from the development going forward.

51:42

We have within our assessment, developed a baseline and a core planning case. In both instances, we have built into those scenarios, the impacts of external

51:54

policy, policies and guidance and other factors. So, for example, the impacts of jet zero will have been built into both our baseline and our core planning case.

52:06

Because that will happen whether or not the proposed amendment goes ahead.

52:11

We have a number of key assumptions that we've made as part of our assessment. The first being that government has a legal duty to be net zero by 2050. And to reduce carbon emissions in line with this legally binding requirement.

52:28

We have seen that greenhouse gas emissions will decline in line with the high ambition scenario trajectory presented in the jet zero strategy. Given this is government policy and therefore can be relied on as such.

52:41

We have looked at the incremental contribution across the various aspects of jet zero. And that's presented on page seven to the environmental statement on the Insert 12.4, which breaks down the

various impacts of different reduction opportunities presented within jet zero. And collectively, those emissions will look to reduce aviation emissions by about 72% by 2050.

53:09

And then, we've also assumed that government will use their legal levers. Those mechanisms I've already mentioned, are available to them in the form of the UK Emissions Trading Scheme and CORSIA. To assist with reducing carbon emissions, where the other elements of jet zero don't get brought forward at the same pace as government forecasting.

53:33

Finally, just in terms of significance, then we've used a variety of quantitative and qualitative approaches to assess the significance of impacts while this scheme is in line with best practice.

53:46

We

53:47

judge that the impact across those four emission sources that identify that we've done our assessment on is not adverse, not significant as a result. And then as a final point, it touched upon earlier on to the airport's national policy statement, paragraph 5.82. States in terms of carbon at any proposed development should not have a cognition so significant they will have a material impact on the government's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets. And we've judged that this is the case with our proposed development.

54:22

Thank you for that very clear summary.

54:25

Before I move on, I can see we've got a hand up online Mr. Rules from Friends of the Earth. Mr. Walz, you are going to get the opportunity to speak later when I come out to the wider floor. Have you got an urgent question now? Or is it something that can wait until we've had a bit more of a discussion it could possibly be but I think it's quite pertinent question, because it's going to be mentioned a lot going forward. When exactly can we expect hydrogen fueled aircraft and electric fueled aircraft to be taken to actually be available for scheduled flights and when will sustainable airline fuels become readily available?

55:00

Yep, good question. Mr. Bowles. It's not one I'm going to address right now it might come out as part of the discussion. If not, it's certainly something we'll be looking at as part of the written questions. Thank you, you can put your hand down now. Okay.

55:17

So to begin with what he wants to try and establishes the status and weight that should be given to the jet zero strategy and also to the transport, decarbonisation plan. So, in Section 12.18, Chapter 12. And

in your comments just now, you've referred to it as policy and it's actually described as key policy which sets out government commitments

55:39

and as committed targets in government policy and legislation.

55:47

So

55:49

I want to understand

55:52

how much weight we can give that debt zero strategy, D, and the transport decarbonisation plan

56:01

given that they're not detailed policies, and that some of the representations I've got before me are clear that they see them as aspirational. I'm going to have to take a judgment on how much weight I can give those. And as you're describing them as policy, I thought you might like the opportunity to explain to me how much weight I should be giving those.

56:23

Yeah, thank you, Ian Davies on behalf of the applicant. So yes, certainly we see them as policy and therefore can be relied upon as such. And therefore we see that as weight being given to these, it is acknowledged within both of those policies. There are long term policies, and therefore there is some element of uncertainty going forward as different technologies come forward at different paces. But ultimately, the outcome of both of those documents will be to ensure that the UK aligns those sectors with its legally binding 2050 netzero targets.

57:00

My understanding of strategy is that it sets out, like you say a longer term

57:06

process for developing detailed policy and it's the policy that comes from the strategy later on.

57:14

I don't know if you want to comment on that in this lesson in terms of the legal state yes, no strategy as being policy or described as policy, Rebecca Clutton for the applicant? I think at the moment we the applicants position is that both in practical terms and as a matter of law, those represent statements of government policy. Those statements of government policy are obviously the fullest that we have at the moment. And in the absence of more detailed politics, any more detailed policies that may follow through under them, we have to treat those as being the only statements of government policy that exist. Those statements have been afforded material weight by the Secretary of State in other DCO and other decisions, including, for example, the Manston decision that we read that we referenced earlier.

And so there's no reason to attribute those anything other than for weight, they represent the vision that government has for both aviation sustainability and transport decarbonisation going forward.

58:14

Okay, the Manston case

58:17

refers as far as I can see, only to flight path to the future. And that was in quite a specific circumstance, because it was tying up

58:26

from a much older consultation document. And that's why it had been interpreted by the Secretary of State has been policy in that specific case. So I think it would be useful for us if you could pull together those other examples where it has been confirmed that strategy should be given full weight as policy. Absolutely, madam, that's Rebecca. And for the applicant, that's something we can do, we can do a short note on the weight to be given to those and where the how they've been treated and other decisions. Thank you.

58:58

And related to that, it's been brought to our attention by the IPs that the UK climate change committee is 2023 Progress Report, states that the jet zero strategy faces considerable delivery risks and concluded that there should be no net airport expansion.

59:16

That we wondered whether or not you had thoughts about whether or not less weight should therefore be given to the jet zero strategy on the back of what climate change committee's report said, bearing in mind that they are official advisors to the government on this matter. Yes, Rebecca Clutton for the applicant, madam, that was a matter that we thought might come up in this morning session. And the answer to that is, in our view, it's unlikely that that should affect the amount of weight that's been given to jet zero as a strategy. The reason for that being that a very similar statement was made in the 2022 climate change committee report that was responded to in March of this year.

1:00:00

If by the government who indicated that they got the climate change committee, it must be remembered only served to recommend make recommendations to government government decides on what the policy is going forward. government's response to the very similar recommendation in 2022 was that they did not accept that recommendation, and that they considered that that the jet zero strategy that's aviation could continue to be sustainable, and that they'd set that out later on the jet zero, obviously followed that. So we anticipate, given the comments that have been made very recently by the Prime Minister, that there will be no material change in that position, as reported back in March of this year, as a result of very similar comments made by the Climate Change committee this year.

1:00:47

Could you we should address that in the note, I was gonna say, if you could add something to that effect into the note. And then I'm gonna give everybody else an opportunity to give us their thoughts and their responses to dance.

1:01:01

On that very specific point, and that's the weight that should be given to strategy and whether or not it should be viewed as policy. I would like to open that up to other people in the room and online to get other comments pleased.

1:01:20

New Economics Foundation, I like to travel annuitized foundation.

1:01:28

I think it's fair to say to the outcomes of the gesture or strategy, the language is somewhat confused. I mean, the word policy is used in the strategy in different contexts. But when you look for the meat of what that policy actually is, you also find I think, 50 instances of the word ambition and 12 instances of the word aspiration, what you don't find is hard policy decisions apart from small numbers, such as I think it's the 10 person, fuel from staff, for example, that have some kind of sort of hard implication on the sector.

1:02:01

For that reason, I don't think that the strategy can be taken as a hard line about what the future will be, you know, government can't policy into existence a future which is uncertain.

1:02:16

I mean, to some extent, we heard this earlier around the economic benefits as well. It's government policy, that there were economic benefits from air transport Well, you can't policy into existence, something that is based on a factual reality with uncertainties and complexities of real life policies have to be sort of tangible things that are enforced on business or on wider society in some way. For me, jet zero strategy

1:02:44

is just an ambition which sets out a pathway which the government has test stress tested, itself against, but but can't be relied upon to remove for us to sit here and remove emissions from the equation which some of the language I think in the applicant statements would suggest that they want to simply say, it's dealt with, we'll put this one side government solve that problem. Actually, what this represents is a big trade off between risk and, and realism. And for me, our duty of care here is to consider risk, is there risks that some of these future developments won't materialize? Government can't policy them into existence, we have to have an eye on risk and risk is actually in other parts of government policy, a really big feature if you take the environmental principles statement that government passed a few months ago, which talks a lot about how risks should be managed about the precautionary principle and things like that. So I think we're also relevant policies to consider this in the round.

1:03:46

Thank you. That was very clear.

1:03:52

I can see I've got some hands up online before I come to those. I just finished going around the room. Ken.

1:03:59

Thank you, man. I'm Andrew Lambo fanatic and

1:04:02

our climate changing greenhouse gas expert key adviser Kate Hewitt is online. So I'd like to invite her to respond to your question on our behalf if that's okay with you. I was just about to do that. Thank you.

1:04:19

Miss you it. Would you like to make your comments?

1:04:23

Yes, thank you. I I won't repeat statements made by Dr. Chapman.

1:04:31

We wouldn't we would endorse that view that the jet zero strategy sets out a series of aspirations in relation to measures such as delivery of sustainable aviation fuel and more efficient aircraft, but few meaningful policy measures about how the government plans to have those those delivered. I wanted to comment a little bit on the status

1:05:00

To the climate change committee, I think it is, I would agree that the government clearly has the option to

1:05:11

either accept or reject the CCCs advice on any specific policy measures. What clearly the government doesn't have any option around is the delivery of carbon budgets and of the longer term targets of the Climate Change Act. So I think it's important just to keep that in mind that the advice of the climate change committee is intended to help the governments to achieve those objectives in the most What the CCC regards is the most cost efficient

1:05:42

following a cost efficient pathway, so should the government at present as reflected in the jet zero strategy, want to follow a different course to adopt more optimistic assumptions around technology improvements from aviation, and other measures? That comes with considerable risk in terms of the delivery of those future budgets and targets. And our assumption would be that if in future, therefore the government's proposed trajectory, were not to be delivered effectively, if the emissions turned out to be higher than that, then it would seem likely that a future government would need to respond with additional measures.

1:06:29

Our assumption is in relation to aviation demand. So it was just a flag about I suppose as a as a risk to keep in mind in terms of the future impact of the of the project.

1:06:43

Thank you, Miss Harriet. Mr. Morales from front of you. Who's on?

1:06:48

Thank you with with regards to jet zero been aspiration or policy, I would seriously hope we would seriously hope that it's an inspiration. I mean, such a fanciful nature of some of the things suggested or considered very industry friendly. It's actually policy suggests, shall we say, undue influence peddling? Or maybe excessive lobbying been applied to government in order to create such a? Well, it's such a ridiculous policy, quite frankly, I think that is based more in fantasy than reality.

1:07:22

Thank you, Mr. Morales, just a reminder, we're not here to debate the rights and wrongs of government policy, it is how it applies, as it is to this application.

1:07:33

Was there anybody else that wanted to make comment on this?

1:07:36

I can just cancel Mark Wiseman has to move for Buckinghamshire Council. We have no issue. And do you think it's correct to call Jeff zero policy as a matter of law, but one needs to look at the detail of it. And others, including Dr. Chapman have raised issues as to the nature of the policy, it is both forward looking over a long time and reliant on ambition as opposed to detail in many respects, that just gives rise to uncertainties and risks over a long timescale. And so what we do have comments on and it may be better to make them under assessment of significance of effects as an agenda item is the need for sensitivity studies as part of the assessment. And when it comes to that, assuming that's the correct time to do it. I will invite David Johnson, who's our climate response team leader to speak to that.

1:08:41

You've predicted my next question

1:08:43

was, was there anybody else that wanted to comment on the strategy policy issue? Joint local authorities? Thank you yesterday and Ross for the host authorities. There was simply say that the authorities position on the CCC report is as set out in Christmas report. And should we have any further comments? In light of the applicants document that they're going to prepare them, we will submit them into the process. Thank you any more comments, Rebecca Clutton for the applicant? Madam there was just one point I wanted to come back on in light of your comments about the Munson decision. In the Secretary of State's decision letter, paragraph 149. He expressly refers to both the transport deep decarbonisation decarbonisation plan and the jet zero strategy as setting out a range of non planning

policies and measures. So it was accepted as being policy in that decision. It was just think not in the examining authorities report, but it is in the decision letter. Thank you. Can you include that as part of your notes? We will? Yes.

1:09:44

Given everything you've heard today, how long do you think it'll take you to pull that note together?

1:09:50

Rebecca clutton for the applicant. We'd anticipate providing that a deadline for and then everybody else that's made comments today who's interested in that please keep an eye out for the deadline for and then respond to that the next day.

1:10:00

lined so that we can see what else you have to say thank you

1:10:08

could I say something? Yes, of course.

1:10:13

I've quite a lot I could say on climate, and I've obviously got to limit myself quite a bit.

1:10:21

Could I just it's to do with policy and strategy.

1:10:27

I think so. But are we going

1:10:30

to carbon trading in a minute after this? Okay. All right. I'll pause for a moment.

1:10:38

So finishing off on Jet zero and the application of this.

1:10:43

Given the questions around it, I was curious to know if any sensitivity analysis has been done on the delivery of those aspirational targets in jet zero.

1:11:04

Rebecca Clem to the applicant? I'm Fred, I don't have the answer to that immediately. But I'll find out if we have done and report back to you, madam, thank you. I think that'd be useful. And in light of what you find when you write your notes and taking into account everything you've heard, it might be worth thinking about whether or not it would be useful to present that to us anyway. Rebecca Klum for the applicant, I was gonna say just the same thing if if we hadn't done it, I'll investigate whether that is a possibility. And we'll report on that to you as well. Thank you.

1:11:33

My next question was for Luton Council, I can see from your written reps, that you declared a climate emergency and prepared a number of strategies and documents to inform your approach to climate change. I can't see that any of these have been submitted. So my question was, are any of those documents relevant to emissions from the proposed development?

1:11:59

Michael highfalutin Borough Council madam, we will get back to you in writing initially, we don't think so. But I'd like to reserve my position on that moment. Okay. Thank you. Is that okay for the next deadline? Yes.

1:12:19

I question for the applicants, which is to turn to

1:12:23

Mr. Su, next announcement regarding changes on the approach to climate change last week on the 20th of September, do you envisage having to make changes your assessment of the effects of greenhouse gases and the thresholds in the green controlled growth framework because of this.

1:12:38

Rebecca clutton for the applicant? Madam, I think the short answer is no. But I can ask Mr. De to address you on that in little more detail.

1:12:47

marked as the applicant? The answer is low. My understanding of the announcements made by the prime minister last week is that they won't affect aviation emissions and the ability of the UK to achieve net zero by 2050. They may have some implications on the rate of which the vehicle fleet, the surface access vehicle fleet, in terms of travel to and from the airport decarbonize is, but we've made the commitment through the green control growth framework to live within the envelope of environmental effects that were set out in the environmental statement. And we're not proposing to change the limits or thresholds at this time.

1:13:19

Thank you.

1:13:23

So I'd like to move on to the application of carbon trading and offsetting schemes.

1:13:28

So the UK Emissions Trading Scheme and corsia.

1:13:34

I want to understand if all flights from Luton Airport are captured by those

1:13:43

Rebecca clutton for the applicant, it's going to be back to Mr. Davies for these questions.

1:13:49

Thank you, Ian Davies on behalf of the applicant, the majority, vast majority of flights will be captured. We're looking at about approximate 89% share of departing flights with within the UK ETs and corsia, around 98% of flights. You might say 86%, somewhere else, you might want to check that out for the UK ETS.

1:14:12

So the majority, so what isn't included in those schemes?

1:14:17

So flights to non EEA countries would be excluded. They don't fall under the ETS at this stage, they would they would be excluded. And they're excluded from course here as well.

1:14:30

They will cost you out from 2024 will be all 27. So we'll be including all international flights. So those outside of ETs will be captured by corsia. Including those to Eastern Europe. Yes. They counted International. Yes. In this context. Yeah, right. Okay.

1:14:50

At the moment, I don't have a breakdown of that. I've just got a percentage, which I found quite confusing about how many were caught by the UK ETS. So could you confirm

1:15:00

I'm in writing, how many are caught by the EU? The UK ETS, how many are caught by corsia? And what? What's left? Because we need to understand what the potential emissions are that aren't caught by those trading schemes.

1:15:18

Certainly, we can do that I just I've just had a note passed me by colleagues that 89% will be captured by ETS, but certainly we can put a put that into a note. Thank you.

1:15:30

Good luck on on that.

1:15:34

That's fine. Alex Chapman, new economic foundations. So just to clarify on that.

1:15:41

The question is the proportion of emissions or the proportion of flights because obviously, non EU destinations are not covered by the ETS, and will be the long haul flights with much larger emissions

impacts. So we would need to see that figure in terms of emissions or versus proportion of flights that are covered by the scheme.

1:16:01

Secondly, obviously, non carbon emissions are not covered by any of these schemes, and potentially make up two thirds of the overall climate impact and are completely uncovered. It's also worth noting that airlines are at present given a free allocation under the ETS. So although they might be captured by the ETS, the airlines are not paying anything for the majority of those emissions. And finally, in terms of what you regard to be captured, the

1:16:33

it also depends on what the actual price is, that's being paid per tonne of carbon. So while the price per tonne might be, say, 50 pounds per tonne,

1:16:44

you have to stack that against what the societal cost of that tonne of carbon is. So if the value to society is 200 pounds per tonne of a carbon emission, but the airline is only paying 50 pounds under the ETS, then you might also regard that there is a compensated uncaptured component of societal damage implicated there. And that is currently the case because ETS is charging, say 8090 pounds per ton. But the base carbon value is at 240 odd pounds. So that gap also represents a loss to society. So when you net off all those factors, the overwhelming majority of admissions are not being paid for in some form. I understand. Thank you.

1:17:30

I'll come to you in a second. I just want to take that back to the applicants. And to respond to a couple of things. There's the non carbon emissions that I'm going to deal with as part of the written questions. In terms of the rights and the wrongs that the UK ETS scheme. There's a appreciate a limit to how far we can go with that. But I do hear everything you're saying. But I think the point made about how you split up by proportion is a useful one for when you provide that note. So if you could take that on board that would be most appreciated.

1:17:58

Rebecca clap for the applicant just to clarify you mean by proportion of air traffic movements or emissions? Yes, yes, thank you.

1:18:07

Buckinghamshire Council. Thank you Mark Westman Smith for Buckingham sir Council, just in relation to the coverage of UK ETs and corsia. One needs to bear in mind that corsia runs at the moment to 2037 corsia being more relevant or relevant to the proposed long haul routes. And we heard that the long haul routes would not come into effect and 2037 Earlier on from Miss Condon. And that would be accounting for about 7% of the traffic. So one needs to bear that in mind. And I think I said 2037 Twice course your runs to 2035. And the long haul routes come in at 2037. Can I just hand over to Mr. David Johnson climate response team leader just to address a couple of points on the emissions trading curves. Thank you, David Johnson, Buckinghamshire council corsia. And the application permissions

training I think is quite an important point in 12 Point 11.7. The amplicon states that the UK ETs and corsia will provide controlling mechanisms to prevent exceedance of the carbon budget which we've previously referenced. It's already been pointed out that course you're only runs till 2035. And there's an assumption within jet zero which is fine that it runs beyond that. Another key assumption that the applicant has relied on which is from the high ambitions scenario within jet zero is that the price per tonne of carbon within the ETS scheme and corsia converge between 2030 and 2050 by 2050, the price should be 378 pounds per

1:20:00

Time both schemes 2030. The ETS UK price is 150 pounds per tonne, because the cost is six pounds per tonne. This feeds into the demand modeling that was referred to earlier within the demand case as to how those forecasts were made.

1:20:19

The data that as I understand it has gone into the modeling that has been presented by the applicant to predict those forecasts. And indeed then to predict the cumulative emissions is based upon a forecast set of prices. But both of those schemes from 2033 to 2050 that were produced by bass is referred to by Miss Miss cottonwoods. And now the Department of Energy security net zero, that is a forecast as I understand it, and not government policy. And therefore, that forecast cannot be relied upon, to definitively come into, into into Bing over the next 30 years. The applicant does not seem to to have undertaken a sensitivity analysis. But what would happen if the price development of corsia and ETs would be different to that forecast put forward by Bayes at the time business now, if, for example, it were to be the case, that the increase in costs of per tonne of carbon were to be slowly you could still get to the endpoint of 378 pounds per tonne in line with government policy. But if the development of those prices was slower, or if corsia did not convert until much later than was predicted within that, what would the impact be upon the cumulative emissions if the development was slower, and the price per tonne of carbon was lower than their assumptions that would suggest that the demand could potentially be significantly higher than is contained within their within their forecasts? That would potentially just one very Oh, apologies, I just it's a bit of a convoluted point. But I think it's important that may then influence whether this application in prejudice is the government's ability to stay within its carbon budget. The other point coming back to something you raised earlier, if I may, about sensitivity studies on technology. One of our points that we did numerous times in our written representations was that we had asked the applicant to conduct sensitivity studies upon the different technological development paths that are compliant within jet zero. But for example, if electric planes or hydrogen or SAF were to develop different trajectories, so still to reach the net zero 2050 aims, but to perhaps, because there are uncertainties that are admitted in terms of how that happens. And they stated, they stated they didn't know but in the meetings that we've had, and I believe in their own documents, they state they have not done those sensitivity analysis. Thank you, I will stop you there. Because I am conscious of time, please don't feel that we don't want to hear from you because we do. But you have every opportunity to put that in writing to us. And don't forget that we have been through all of your written representations as well. So please do continue to respond and respond in detail. It is appreciated. It's just we're gonna run out of time today, if we're not careful. Apologies. Miss Hewitt, the same for you. I can see you very patiently had your hand up online. Do you have a brief point you wanted to make? Or is it something that we could move to a written response? I'll be very brief, because many of the points that I would

have otherwise made have been clearly set out by the representative, your representatives for Buckinghamshire Council, I wanted to say I think just only two things very briefly. One is to highlight that the corsia scheme is fundamentally different from the ETS, it's very much less robust. It offsets emissions above the 2019. Baseline only. And as has been stated, the future of that scheme beyond 2035 is currently unclear, the government has aspirations around this, but no more than that. And that was really my second point just to highlight that, that this is one of the many areas of very considerable uncertainty about the direction of future government policy and policy measures around this that at the moment, the government has yet to take a decision about how to handle emissions where there's overlap between the two schemes, ETs and corsia. So there remains a risk that the coverage of the ETS could be scaled back on routes where the two schemes apply. We simply don't know at the moment.

1:24:26

Thank you very much. Turning to the applicant to respond to that.

1:24:31

It may be that when you write your notes, you want to address some of those points, I think and risk of UK ETs and course you're not working in the same way in the future. Yes, Rebecca clutton for the applicant just a couple of points to make one I think if there is going to be a written note from from the representative from Bucks then perhaps we should wait a wait to give our response until we have received that so that we can respond to it once and in full, but for the avoidance of

1:25:00

have any doubt we don't accept the points that we've made, we have indeed looked at both higher and lower carbon costs in the Monte Carlo analysis that's been undertaken, and obviously as to certainty in relation to any uncertainty that exists in relation to carbon offsetting schemes. The backstop for all of this is that there are legally binding commitments on government to achieve to secure the carbon budgets and to achieve net zero. So that's, that's gonna be the backstop of what we're going to say. But I think in terms of the timing, perhaps if we wait until we've received any further submissions that are kind of come in, and when we'll respond to those points in due course, is that okay, that's absolutely fine. I will be looking for an answer to it. Obviously, something I can't say at some point. So the sooner the better to have one rather than I agree. Yep. Saying that works fine. For

1:25:51

so that I can understand.

1:25:56

I put it

1:25:59

Oh, yes. Whether or not causing it is cause you're a trading scheme or not.

1:26:05

It is a trading scheme. Yeah. Emissions Trading Scheme. Thank you. I couldn't work it out. I had before me. So that's, that's helpful. Thank you very much.

1:26:15

So at the airports NPS states that a distinction should be made between international and domestic aviation, and that the applicant should quantify the greenhouse gas impacts including a distinction between international and domestic aviation emissions. So my interpretation and I'll check with you if it's yours as well, is that distinction means quantified.

1:26:43

endeavors on behalf of the applicant, I believe we presented that in the chapter and it was quantified according to flights going to different regions, and therefore that would impact whether or not they were inside ETS. Okay, I wasn't clear for the chapter. So can you let me know where that is? Because yeah, I couldn't find that break down at the airport MPs requests. Okay, certainly could do that. Thank you. Hopefully, it's a simple job if the data already there. That may be something Rebecca planned for the applicant that may even be something we can just confirm after the lunch adjournment or something like that.

1:27:17

Turning to aviation emissions.

1:27:21

Section 12. point eight deals with emissions from the landing and takeoff cycle for each model of aircraft and the world region distance. And I'm interested to understand why does the destination matter for the landing and takeoff cycle.

1:27:39

The destination isn't necessarily taken into account in the landing takeoff cycle in our calculations, sorry, in David's on behalf of the applicant, the modeling that we do is basically looking at the different types of aircraft coming into the airport. So from 3000 feet, and below taxiing into the airport. And then it'll be there takeoff up to 3000 feet, the actual that shouldn't influence the destination is airport aircraft, it'll, it'll just be the type of aircraft that will be influencing the emissions. So it might be datatype. Because that's not clear from your report. It does say that the destination is taken into account. And obviously we haven't got sight of the detailed modeling. So if you could clarify that that would be appreciated.

1:28:21

Certainly, I'll make a very quick point on this.

1:28:26

Just to an extent the destination will affect the weight of the aircraft as it takes off, because of the amount of fuel it has to carry, and therefore could have an impact on the emissions. Thank you.

1:28:42

Jet zero commits to domestic flights being net zero by 2014.

1:28:48

And section 12.5 point 12 report states that these are target outcomes. And for that reason, they haven't been included in the greenhouse gas assessment.

1:28:58

So the aspiration in the jet zero strategy for a shift to zero emission aircraft, sustainable fuels jet zero at 2050 has been included in the assessment. So I wondered how the two are different. Why are you not including the 2040 aspiration, but you are including the 2050 aspiration?

1:29:20

Can I refer to my colleague, Mr. Murray, please?

1:29:24

Thank you, mom.

1:29:26

And Marine Corps applicants we considered that be 2040 aspiration for

1:29:33

zero emission. airport operations was a target rather than a policy and therefore couldn't be modeled in the same way that the other mitigation policies in jet zero could be. It was a it was an outcome rather than a means. How did you make that distinction though, because they're both in the same document and they're both aspirations.

1:29:55

2040

1:29:59

Target

1:30:00

is

1:30:01

described as a target. And we thought that was quite distinct from a specific mitigation measure designed to achieve a target. And that's the distinction that we made that that wasn't included, you haven't included the 24 domestic target is my understanding of it. But you have included the 2051. It wasn't included in the modeling in the GSEs. So we acknowledge or the applicant acknowledges that they have operations, you don't actually get to zero emissions in either 2040 or 20. Question about the operations later, but this is about the domestic flight.

1:30:38

Yeah.

1:30:40

So the one that you're describing as a target hasn't been included at the modeling, whereas the aspiration to have sustainable fuels and zero emission aircraft has been included. That's correct mom,

1:30:53

be

1:30:54

specific assumptions around SAS and zero emission aircraft, and improved aircraft and Essbase efficiencies was quantitatively stated in the high ambition scenario, which enabled us to incorporate that into the GHG model. Simply having an end point to aim for isn't something that we can model in the same way.

1:31:17

Rebecca clutton for the applicant, madam, would it help you to have something in writing on this just to clarify the distinctions that have been drawn on why the modeling is as it is, I think it will be useful because some of my following questions are going to be on a very similar theme. So I think tying them together would be helpful. I'll have your thinking before me. And then we can open it up to other parties to comment on then as well, because it is something that's been raised by lots of people. So I think that would be useful looking look to address that for you. Thank you.

1:31:53

So carbon budgets, aviation and shipping work specifically included in the six national carbon budgets, which was 2033 to 2037, I can see that the potential emissions from the airport have been compared against the six national carbon budget, it's in table 12.26. And not surprisingly, when you compare it to the entire budget, the percentage contribution from this proposed development is small, it's very small.

1:32:25

However, when they're setting the budget, Bayes did publish a publicly available spreadsheet that shows the assumptions that went into those model pathways that estimates the output from aviation and shipping, 14 megatons equivalent. So I was wondering, would an assessment against the model aviation and shipping emissions be possible to give a more realistic measure of the impact?

1:32:53

Better clutton for the applicant?

1:32:56

In terms of the approach that's been taken? I'm just I'll allow Mr. Davis to answer in a moment on whether it's technically feasible. But just in terms of the approach that's been endorsed by the courts and by the Secretary of State through decisions that has been an assessment against national carbon budgets and not, not anything lesser than that. So I think our primary position is that the appropriate

approach for this examining authority and indeed the Secretary of State to take will be to assess the contribution against the national budget as a whole. This is the

1:33:30

correct me if I'm wrong, but is this probably one of the first projects well, we'll have had the aviation and shipping emissions included in a future carbon budget. So there is a comparison that can be made, because until very recently, that comparison wouldn't have been possible because it was only one

1:33:49

lump as a planning assumption for aviation, aviation emissions.

1:34:08

Becca and the applicant, madam, we will just take that point away and clarify that and see whether that is a point of distinction. But I think again, would probably refer back to the airport national policy statement and jet zero strategy, but we'll clarify that for you. Thank you. I'll turn to Mr. Davis as to whether it's technically it's technically possible. So in those applicants, I mean, jet zero does set out the budget for aviation. Obviously, we've done that compare that against that budgets past bar assessment. So we could have a look at that and see if we think there's any merit in doing anything further against those.

1:34:43

Thank you. I think that'd be useful.

1:34:47

Aviation emissions are described as scope three. However, I note that descent approaches and reduced engine taxiing have been changed in the last couple of years to reduce aviation emissions.

1:35:00

means I can give you the reference for that if you want. steeper runway approaches are described as being under the airport's direct control. So my question is Should these measures be included in scope one or scope three.

1:35:16

current practice or best practice for modeling aviation sorry, in Dave's on behalf of the app and current practice for modeling aviation emissions is to assume that all falls within scope three, outside of the control of the airport. So that's how we have approached it in terms of our assessment in line with how it's been done with other with other airports. It is something you've got control over.

1:35:41

It's I wouldn't say it's in the direct control of what the actual descent is going to be in the contract not doing precisely what your report says it's in direct control. Right at that time, look at that.

1:35:53

I'll come back for questions at the end of this section, if that's okay, it was a point of information.

1:36:00

It's very brief, very briefly, entry level for ladder can. The airport recently did a study on the potential for steepest descent approaches. This is the airport operator.

1:36:13

And the response from the airlines was they weren't keen so thoroughly implies it isn't under their control. And it's not going to be done. Thank you.

1:36:24

I think this is something that I'd like clarification on. Exactly what is under the airport's control. And if these things are under the airport's control, then why shouldn't they be included in scope one, Rebecca Clutton for the applicant, madam will we're going to reserve our position on that for now, but we'll take it away and come back to you on it. Thank you.

1:37:11

Just conscious of time, so sorry for the delay, I'm just trying to work out what I can move into written questions.

1:37:24

Section 12.5 point 12 states that as target for ground operations, and the jet zero strategy to be net zero by 2040 is only a target outcome. It hasn't been incorporated in the greenhouse gas assessment.

1:37:39

Appreciate that the government is consulting on how this is achieved. But it doesn't appear that the intention is to move away from airport operations being net zero by 2040.

1:37:50

And also bearing in mind that the pledge by Luton Council in light of their declared climate emergency is to become carbon neutral town by 2040. So given this, why isn't the 2040 net zero target for ground operations being treated as something that's likely to happen?

1:38:08

In Davies on behalf the applicant, understand we have acknowledged the 2014 zero emissions target that is something that's been set out and jet zero, we have shown in our modeling,

1:38:22

that we've got it as far as we can at this stage, in terms of reducing scope, one and two emissions from the airport's operations. But we've also acknowledged that

1:38:32

when the results of the consultation come back and the government have decided the exact scope of what will be included in that scope, one and 240 emissions for airports, then within three months, we will put out a response to that to know how that will be addressed. And that's been secured in the in the

DC in DCA. Okay. So does your modeling include getting operational emissions down to 20, brought down to zero by 2040? It doesn't this, our modeling is showing that there are some residual emissions in 2040. But we acknowledge that and we say that we will address that, once we know the exact scope of the jet zero requirements around zero emissions. Okay, so I appreciate you don't know exactly what's going to be required of you. But you do know that there's going to be a net zero. So there must be some way of limiting your emissions so that you can reach that target. And the reason I'm asking is that I need to understand whether or not in principle, those numbers are achievable.

1:39:34

Even David on behalf of the applicant, yeah, absolutely. They're achievable. There are options outside of the of this DC application being looked at such as private wire connections to renewable energy, but they're not forming part of this application, but things like that coming online will reduce emissions even further, but okay, I'm gonna have a think about that. There might be some written questions on it coming up. Thank you.

1:40:00

And with operational emissions, again, these emissions are being compared against the entire UK carbon budget.

1:40:09

And they're minuscule compared to that, to the extent that it's almost a meaningless comparison. So I wondered if there are any other measures that the operational emission should be compared against?

1:40:21

I mean, at the moment, the national budgets the only legally binding carbon budgets as why we've done the assessment against those.

1:40:30

And as far as we're concerned, that's all it needs to be done as part of that assessment at this stage. That's the position we've taken. So Rebecca, clap for that. Madam, I think that falls within the scope of our note on why opposition is as it is in relation to your assessment against only the national budgets and not sectoral budgets. Yeah, great. So if you could include the answer to that, in that note, that would be very helpful, thank you.

1:40:58

Beyond the surface access access journeys, the assessment allows for the emissions for surface access journeys to be offset in the future. And I was wondering why offsetting for surface access during use has been included, but offsetting for corsia isn't included.

1:41:18

Ark day on behalf of the applicant. I think this goes back to the outline that Miss Condon provided earlier on in the hearing around the government's policy position on aviation emissions. So we've taken the view that government policy is clear in terms of both jet zero and making best use that aviation

emissions are a national issue, which should be addressed at a national level. And on that basis, we've taken the decision to exclude those from the green controlled growth framework.

1:41:47

making best use is silent specifically on service access emissions. But it does talk about other emissions from service access in respect of air quality, it recognizes that those are local impacts that are caused by aviation expansion, and that those need to be addressed locally as part households by airports to make best use of their existing runways. We've taken the view that success submissions are equivalent to that undertaking the view, therefore, they should be included within the scope of the brain control growth framework. do acknowledge, though, that emissions arising from surface access, there are measures that the airport operator and the airport owner will be able to take to influence those, but they don't have direct control over them. Hence, they're in scope three. And we saw that, for example, through the government's announcement last week around the delay to the ban of the sale of petrol and diesel vehicles, that will obviously have implications in terms of carbon emissions associated with service access travel to and from the airport. On that basis, we think it's reasonable that offsets should be allowable, in order to meet the limit that is included within the green controlled growth framework. What I would say is that we have designed the phasing of the limits in a way that aligns with the applicants sustainability strategy, which they published outside of the scope of this DCO application that commits to being carbon neutral for service access to and from the airport by 2014. And on that basis, we are proposing the limit would reduce to zero effectively by 2014. The limit of service access missions within green controlled growth, sorry, because of the offsetting. Yes, so offsetting would be allowable to reach that limit of zero. But we've aligned the limit with the commitment made by the applicant through their sustainability strategy to be carbon neutral for service access. So they would need to use offsets to achieve zero emissions or service access from 2040 onwards. So is that captured as part of this DCO it would be it would be enshrined in the limits of product green controlled growth. And the green controlled growth approach is secured through the draft development consent order. So with our setting a surface access as an example, what's to stop a developer coming forward and saying, My emissions will be zero because I'm going to buy into lots of offsetting schemes and therefore there's no incentive to reduce your emissions at source. So Mark date on behalf of the applicant,

1:44:12

I would need to provide a specific references possibly by following up in writing, but within section 3.4 of the green control the green controlled growth explanatory note, we've made reference to research which suggests that the cost of offsets is anticipated to rise quite significantly in the medium to long term. We believe that will act as a significant financial incentive for the airport operator to take action to reduce emissions at source rather than relying on offsets. So the cost of offsetting going up putting aviation emissions to one side, what's the framework to force those to go up? Is there some government strategy or policy that will ensure that that happened?

1:44:56

Mark today on behalf of the applicant it may be a question

1:45:00

This best answer by one of my colleagues, my understanding is that that is not the case. But it's more related to the availability of offset schemes that meet the criteria for use or good offsetting. There are only so many schemes that are available for use, and therefore, by supply and demand, the cost of those is anticipated to increase. But I may ask Mr. Davis, whether he would like to add on that

1:45:23

18 days on behalf of the applicant, there's not much for them I do the government route had a consultation out last year on the issue of offsetting to try and determine the scope and boundaries for what would be acceptable, so that the results of that are still pending, but gloves to be determined. So I mean, there's a number of offsetting schemes, as Mr. De said, but they have to be heavily regulated and made sure they have the right quality. And so we would anticipate the government would make sure that'd be allowed for offsets into such such games.

1:45:58

Thank you. I'll review that, I think and then I might come back to you with some questions at a future date. Thank you.

1:46:11

The greenhouse gas action plan.

1:46:14

Just a quick couple of quick questions. Should this also include the requirement for regular review of the greenhouse gas action plan? Or should the DCO have provision for a regular review?

1:46:28

It was on behalf of the applicant, we have stated in the plan that will be regularly reviewed as part of the outcome of the zero emissions by 2040. On airport operations, but also ongoing as new carbon budgets are published. We have said the plan will be reviewed and updated. So it'll be very much a live document.

1:46:51

Thank you.

1:47:03

Again, I'm going to move some of these questions over to written questions so that everyone can get some lunch before the next session.

1:47:11

But last one on green controlled growth, Transport for London has raised a concern that the phases results in very large difference in threshold at the start of each new phase saying that this blunts the framework because it would only be towards the end of the phase that there'd be pressure to meet the limits.

1:47:29

And I wondered if you'd like to take the opportunity to respond to that. Now, because in your D one submission, it didn't look like you'd answer the question. So I thought you might like the opportunity to do that now. Mark day on behalf of the applicant. So I think this goes back to the purpose of green controlled growth, which we touched on briefly in the hearing yesterday. Essentially, the purpose of green controlled growth is a commitment put forward by the airport operator to live within the environmental forecasts that are set out in the environmental statement. And rather than bringing forward a set of mitigating actions that are sort of based on a set of forecasts that are fixed at the time, the application is made to implement a framework of ongoing and proactive monitoring, and therefore action to make sure that those forecasts aren't exceeded and Lincoln growth forecasts. Now, the environmental statement, forecasts are only carried out four phases of development. So we have phase one, phase two and phase two be used as the assessment forecasts, they will give you an indicative trajectory in terms of what the environmental impact might be between those assessments. But in actual fact, the trajectory may be completely different from that lap line. What's assumed between those two widening control group will be effective, despite that is that in order to progress, ask the next milestone on to the next base. So to increase for example, beyond 27 million passengers per annum, you must have met the next forecast. So the applicant will need to reduce those environmental impacts by that point or expansion to be able to continue. Thank you.

1:49:08

And my last

1:49:10

observation question is hopefully, one that's easy to solve. And that's that the references in chapter 12 are all very muddled. They're all over they even refer to a section zero at one point. So

1:49:24

when you're revising that chapter, someone could go through those references and make sure they're correct. That will be appreciated, because it really is quite hard to follow at the moment.

1:49:35

Of course, we can do that.

1:49:37

That's the end of my questions. Oh, how go hand up

1:49:42

with hands up online.

1:49:51

Green's gone off.

1:49:54

Apologies. My screen is gone. I saw somebody had their hand up. It's Mr. Morales. Is it Mr. Ralph

1:50:00

We are out of time now. And I would like to hear from everyone in an ideal world in this event, but unfortunately, we're not going to have the time to do that. And

1:50:16

I would just like to encourage everyone, please do respond to what you've heard today at the next deadline so that we can take your comments on board. Mr. Morales, as you've had your hand up for such a long time.

1:50:30

I'll give you the chance to make a comment. But please do keep it brief.

1:50:36

Certainly, yes, it was just regarding going back to carbon offsetting, I think given the controversy surrounding it, when you only have to google offsetting doesn't work to get a whole list of reasons why it's maybe a slightly dubious technique, just wondering, maybe the applicant could provide some actual a bit more positive a bit more detail on the kind of schemes I'll be relying on to achieve net zero. So just, um, rather than just sort of nebulous promises of what we'll do in the future, actually some maybe give some examples or what they exactly they'd be looking for in terms of carbon offsetting. Thank you.

1:51:11

Thank you Mr. Ral.

1:51:14

That's the end of my questions, so I'll pass it back to miss Dowling.

1:51:22

We've got quite a number of action points. So rather than going through these in detail now, there'll be published on the project page of the national infrastructure website in the next day or two.

1:51:32

I've not been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other business that is relevant to this hearing. But before we close, can I just ask, is there anything any other matters that any party wishes to raise the room?

1:51:45

Online?

1:51:47

No, in which case, I'm not going to move to the close of the hearing.

1:51:53

If there are no other items relevant to this hearing may remind you that the timetable for this examination requires that parties propose provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline

three, which is Thursday, the fifth of October 2023 may also remind you that the recording of his hearing will be placed on his veterans website as soon as practicable after this hearing. The next event this application will be issue specific hearing three which will be examining noise and vibration and related effects which will be held this afternoon. The agenda for which is available on the project page of the national infrastructure website. Before we close I would like to thank everyone for their participation for today and assistance during the course of this hearing. We shall consider all of your responses carefully and they will.

1:52:43

They will inform the examining authorities decision when whether further written questions and or further round of hearings will be necessary. I've just been reminded by Miss Davis, that if you are watching the live stream or attending virtually you need to log out of the link that you provided this morning's meeting and log back in via the link for this afternoon's meeting. If you use the link for the morning refresh you'll be sat in an empty room by yourself.

1:53:14

So

1:53:15

the time is now 14 minutes past one and this issue specific hearing on need socio economic matters greenhouse gases and climate change. The proposed low London Luton Airport Expansion is now closed