

AUDIO_ISH3_SESSION3_27092023

Thu, Sep 28, 2023 9:01AM • 43:56

00:06

Okay, the time is now 526 If we can reconvene the meeting,

00:13

just to give people a prospect of an end in sight, I'd like to wrap up by six o'clock at the absolute latest endeavor to get through the last points in that timeline.

00:25

So work on that basis. Before the recess, Miss Lam born, you had raised a number of points relating to quote accounts, uncomfortable, I understand the difference between the different types of quote accounts, I don't think we need to pursue that any further.

00:40

So moving on to my next question, and the applicant, could you explain how the green curl green controlled growth limits based on faster growth scenarios would meet the ANPS requirements cure appropriate mitigation for any significant effects, and the ANPS and nbsc tests to make particular efforts to avoid significant adverse effects on health and quality of life noise

01:09

given that, in the faster growth scenario, there would be a number of uninsulated properties until noise insulation had been rolled out.

01:22

Column sharp for the applicant.

01:26

So, we have demonstrated and set out in chapter 16 of the environmental statement and also the planning statement as one to two how the proposed development meets the three aims of of the noise policy statement for England, which of course are also referenced in the airport's national policy statement.

01:46

So

01:49

firstly, I think it is important to note that the installation scheme is a substantial improvement, both on the current scheme and in terms of policy expectations, it goes significantly wider than then is required

and expected by government policy sets out even in terms of the proposed extensions in aviation and 2050.

02:12

But we do acknowledge that as a result, because of the quantum of properties, there is a

02:18

challenge with the rollout. And that's acknowledged in chapter 16, as you as you referenced,

02:24

in terms of

02:27

how both green control growth and the noise insulation scheme meet the three aims of noise policy, I think I'll just list them out quickly, because it's important then to kind of consider them in, in in context. So I'm specifically interested in basically the gap between having noise insulation and not adding noise insulation. So in the absence of noise insulation, how can it meet the tests during that period? Yeah, understood. So I'll skip then really to focus on the second day of the noise policy statement for England,

02:57

which is to mitigate and minimize adverse effects. And in particular, paragraph 2.24, of the noise policy statement for England, states that all reasonable steps should be taken to mitigate and minimize adverse effects on health and quality of life, while also taking into account the guiding principles of sustainable development. And that sustainable development point is is key because that's referenced across three aims. Sorry, but the effects between lol and solar mitigate, mitigate, minimize, and it's above soul, which is to avoid? And that's the particular point I'm interested in. Yeah, yeah, I will get there, I promise. And it's just it's important to kind of set the context I apologize.

03:37

So then, in terms of above, so of course, the

03:40

concept is to avoid, but again, that is in the context of sustainable development in the same way that the second aim is. So the approach to meeting the first aim is that the scheme will prioritize and rollout as fast as reasonably practicable, the insulation scheme. Now, the paragraph 2.2 for the NPC, which talks about the sustainable development is the concept of as far as reasonably practicable. And that kind of dates back to

04:07

General noise policy and noise legislation. As far back as the control of Pollution Act, which requires that mitigation is considered

04:17

is sort of equivalent to the policy covenant best practicable means. So mitigation should be applied, taking into account local conditions, which in this case, is the practicalities of market supply and delivery of noise insulation. And of course, the financial implications of cost is also a factor in that sustainable development and best practicable means. So really, the way that it meets those aims, I just finished quickly is that we're doing everything or the applicant is doing everything I can to rule out that integration scheme as quickly as possible. And just one more point, which is to build on the discussions that we had yesterday. We were aware of this issue we have been working on

05:00

And we are actively pursuing an accelerated delivery program, which we can report back on deadline for in terms of the efforts that the applicant will be making to ensure that that is rolled out as as fast as reasonably practicable.

05:17

But to bring it just to conclude, back to your to your sort of first question, I think that the way that it meets the AIMS is that it is as fast as reasonably practicable. And it's in the context of sustainable development, which is how those aims are required to be met.

05:32

I was going to come in to comments on the practicalities of market supply being within the gift of the applicants resolve, but I think you've responded on that point with the deadline for submission. So thank you for that. And we'll look at that when it comes in the local authorities have any comments

05:54

or ask for the host authorities if we can wait till we see the applicants and submission at deadline for and respond to that, please. Okay, thank you.

06:05

And on a given day, how would a member of the public know if the airport development proposed in the DCR application was operating within its consented noise contour area?

06:18

Callum sharp for the applicant.

06:22

There is no compliance on a given day day per se because the compliance is based on the 92 day summer annual average. But that compliance would be reported in the annual noise monitoring reports.

06:38

So at any at any given day, you would be able to see those annual noise monitoring reports and check that the airport was in compliance

06:46

and additional submission as one to one, which compares the consented and proposal question noise controls, explains that the current reporting requirements are three monthly on the noise contours,

07:01

including and that includes reporting of actual and forecast movements as well. And in light of the increased importance of the noise envelope as a control for the operation of the airport wouldn't use of a shorter monitoring interval than the annual monitoring period be more appropriate.

07:19

Calum sharp for the applicant, again, because the

07:24

specifically for the green controlled growth and the noise Ember limits, because those are a 92 day summer average, they only apply once per year.

07:32

So reporting that quarterly in that particular instance, wouldn't provide any additional information. It is noted and understood that the applicant currently sorry, the operator currently provide quarterly monitoring reports, there is present not just information on noise contour data, but a host of other pieces of information that are considered relative relevant and of interest to the community. So just number of aircraft movements, modal split various things that have been developed over time within the airport operators noise action plan, and in discussions with the various committees, there is no

08:12

expectation that that would change those those reporting would continue, as as committed to in the noise action plan. That's considered a sort of ongoing reporting, community relations aspect of the reporting that is undertaken by the airport operator, which is not specifically applicable to the noise envelope limit and the green controlled growth. And it's those green controlled growth reporting requirements that are secured within the aircraft noise monitoring plan. But it doesn't mean there would there would continue to be quarterly reporting in the same way there is today.

08:56

My colleagues just asking how that would be secured if the current planning permission is wiped out. And a later question just around the status of the noise action plan, post DTF DCO authorization if that was to occur, so perhaps we can touch on that now.

09:16

Certainly, Callum sharp for the applicant. So that's the commitment actually also within the noise action plan. So if the current planning permission falls away the commitment remains in the noise Action Plan, which is which is separate to the current planning condition requirements for reporting

09:33

in terms of usually move on to the general noise Action

09:39

Plan point, and or is that

09:42

yes, if you could, please. Yeah. So the current noise well, that the new noise action plan which would run from 2024 to 2020, is in line with the environmental noise. England regulations has been drafted by the airport operator. It has been a

10:00

has

10:02

developed in consultation with with local stakeholders we understand including airlines, community groups and the host authorities. It is currently in a draft form and has been submitted to the department for environment Food and Rural Affairs for their adoption.

10:16

I should have made the point at the beginning the noise action plan, of course, is a document made by the airport operator, not the applicant. But that's our understanding from from discussions with the operator.

10:27

I would also confirm that the noise action plan will be updated if development consent order is approved. In line with, again, the environmental noise regulations which require the review and if necessary, update of action plans should a major development occur.

10:48

So in that context, the current commitments within the noise action plan that have been secured through the planning permission would effectively be wiped away and just replaced with green controlled growth. Is that correct?

11:00

I'm sure up for the applicant. No, it's not quite correct. The noise action plan covers the business as usual.

11:09

Ongoing noise mitigation and measures that are undertaken by the airport operator, whilst those would all have to sit within the green control growth framework, there is still a separate process that the airport operator will undertake. And they will produce their own noise Action Plan, which will have to demonstrate that the green controlled growth noise envelope limits are are

11:33

satisfied, but would presumably introduce another series of measures as well just as part of the ongoing operation of the airport.

11:50

So I'm sorry, in terms of the interaction between the noise action plan and green control growth and

11:58

the if a DCA authorization occurred,

12:02

the noise action plan would be reviewed. At that point in time any controls from the green control growth framework would sit within the noise action plan, but there would also be existing controls as well.

12:20

And I'm sure it for the applicant, maybe if I explain how the current noise action plan works within the context of the current conditions that might help. So the noise Action Plan produced by the operator at the moment includes all the airport conditions that are within the planning permissions, sorry, doesn't read the noise action plan. So I'm familiar with the documents. We don't need to go through the content, but it was more, what will that content look like in future than trying to pin down I suppose. Yeah. So the perhaps it's also important to note the noise action plan itself doesn't secure anything, it just outlines the plan that the airport will be doing over the next five years

13:02

in line with the environmental noise regulation, so it will list all the various conditions and then planning controls that are secured within the DCO. It won't replicate or replace or reduce those, it will just simply state that that's what they are. And then there may be a whole host of additional measures which the airports may consider employing.

13:27

But they would not replace or overwrite or change anything in green controlled growth. Green controlled growth will be the secured means of delivering that outcome.

13:42

Sorry, they said the price action plan simply reflects the controls that are enforced through the existing permissions, which means that once those existing permissions fall away, it would simply be the green control growth that will be referenced within the noise to action plan going forward. So yes, correct. Thank you, sir. Yeah, just to be clear, sir, Rebecca clutton for the applicant. The noise action plan is not secured by the 2012 planning permission. The noise action plan is simply in response to the environmental noise regulations. And whilst it has content that is reflective of the planning commission, it is not secured by the planning permission. Thank you for that clarification.

14:28

We talked about

14:30

a noise contours some extent, the existing consents included noise contour reduction over time to 2028.

14:40

I know that although the current green control growth framework indicates there would be some reduction in noise contour area between 2027 and 2038, and a one kilometer squared reduction by 2043. There doesn't appear to be any form of more challenging targets set for the airport. Why is the applicant

15:00

It's not set a similar target in the green controlled growth framework to demonstrate sharing of technological benefits.

15:09

Lm sharp for the applicant.

15:13

The reason the current permission steps down, of course, is the transition of new generation aircraft and into the future fleet. That's taken into account in our noise assessment and the noise envelope and the green controlled growth up to phase one and phase two a were effectively the fleet becomes almost entirely new generation. And because of our assumption that next generation aircraft are no quieter than the generation they replaced, there's there has been no further reduction that we can bring into the fleet.

15:47

In terms of securing that at this time, because as we've have discussed there is there is a degree of uncertainty about the noise performance of those aircraft. However, the noise envelope does contain a defined mechanism to review those noise limits and reduce them in the future. Should such aircraft exist in the future. And once we know what their noise performance is. So in that instance, that noise limit review would be reduced, would be introduced to reduce the noise contour area limits and incentivize the adoption of those quieter next generation aircraft into the fleet.

16:24

And we've done as we've discussed a sensitivity test on what that might look like on on an assumption that the next generation aircraft

16:32

would provide a similar noise reduction to the new generation aircraft. And as we've discussed, we're not relying on that assumption, but it is a sensitivity test and an illustration. And if that were to be the case, the inserts in the green controlled growth explanatory note at 217 illustrate that in that example, the noise envelope limits would would step down continuously over time.

16:58

Thank you.

17:02

It's an amble nandrolone with bladder cancer. A very brief point on that is my understanding is that the

17:09

future, increasing the contours won't just be because of the next generation aircraft, we will be because of the growth in the number of movements or passengers.

17:21

As we've said, in written reps, the next generation aircraft are unlikely to be quieter. So we don't see any certainty that there could be a reduction in long term noise. Thank you.

17:35

Thank you, Miss Lambert.

17:37

And the rep two dash 03 to noise envelope improvements and works example, provides a worked example of the green controlled growth press process, as you've mentioned, and how it might have applied from 2014.

17:53

And you've identified a number of improvements to the current green controlled growth framework on that basis, which are positive. So that's amending the thresholds. And I'm with the NE TG recommendations, removal of off schedule movements from the noise contour calculation, which was going to be something I wanted to ask about.

18:15

And use of total day and night critical controls, from the point of which the level one thresholds are exceeded, we we did have a short discussion about quota just before the break. My question to you on the close counts in terms of the total is, is given that

18:35

at level one, you identify the need for this and that brings control and force efficient why wouldn't you just have that from the outset as a as a control? If you know you're going to potentially need it as movements increase and noise levels increase? Why wouldn't you just have it on the face of the order for example?

19:01

Sharpe for the applicant, really, that's in line with just the overall principles of the green controlled growth, which is that there are a series of checks as you increase noise levels and come closer to the limits which require more effort, more scrutiny and more planning to be put into make sure that you don't exceed those limits. So as part of that forward planning process, if in a situation where the airport is sufficiently below the noise contour limits less than 85%, then we think the risk of exceedance of those limits, which is ultimately the control that we're trying to seek is sufficiently lower that

19:40

that wouldn't necessarily be required.

19:45

So But if,

19:47

if there's no likelihood of exceeding that limit, what is the problem with including it on the face the order and just having it as a standing limit on the operations of the airborne

20:01

I'm sorry for the applicant. I think it's really about the proportionality of the controls and at what point they're needed in order to achieve that outcome.

20:17

Okay, thank you to the local parties happy comments.

20:23

And outcome for the local authorities, the

20:27

proposed tool of QC would seem to be quite a sensible thing to just have running at all times, it'd be much better to know if you were 1% below a threshold, or if you were 50%, below a threshold, it would presumably greatly assist the planners and the teams within the operators and team to know precisely where they're at.

20:55

Thanks. Thank you.

21:02

Oh, sorry, David Gertler for losing Borough Council. And I'm not clear whether you've actually got the section 106 agreement that goes with the section 73 Planning application that vary the original project, Kareem.

21:16

We've talked about the noise Action Plan, which, which as Miss Carson mentioned, comes under the 2006 regulations. So it's not part of the planning condition. But under the section 106 agreement, and under the original 2012 Planning application, and were for noise conditions. The second one is six agreement, then the secured quite a few noise controls, which Mr. Lamborn will say how complicated they are. And we're hoping that if the 2019 90 million application goes through, there was a much simpler process, we'll explain what everything is, but under the 2012 application, and then repeated in the 2015, section 73 application, there is a section 106 agreement. And there's section 73 application, which is references 15 slash 00950, slash var c o n, the section 106 agreement,

22:13

references and always action plan. But that's not a planning control. It references a noise control monitoring scheme, and noise control scheme and the noise management plan. And the noise management plan is definitely a control that we in the 19 million planning application inquiry.

22:33

Were really strong or wanting to see, simplified, made much clearer, clearer for members of the public for the community groups to understand how these controllers will be carried forward. So I I'm not sure if the examination authority has got the the original section 106. I've tried to look for it.

23:05

Sorry, we'll we'll check that and come back to you if we don't have a copy. And if you'd be able to submit it, that would be helpful. Thank you.

23:23

Going back to the noise envelope paper,

23:27

table 6.1 of the noise envelope paper appears to show that even with new controls in place, a breach would still have occurred

23:37

just delayed by one year.

23:40

Is that correct?

23:53

Callum sharps for the applicant this example Did you say Insert 6.1 Or to table 6.1? It's the second of the table showing how the

24:04

process would work between 2014 and 2019. And introduces the quote count. And it shows that the activities would have exceeded the quota. Is that simply because obviously there wasn't a control in place?

24:17

Contract for the applicant? Yes, indeed. So this this table

24:22

assuming Yeah, so this is showing what that five year look ahead would have been had it applied at the current in the current planning permission. So it is indicating that even in 2015, there would have been a predictive exceedance of the limit earlier than has occurred with the current planning permission. So it

isn't saying that that exceeds would have happened. This is about that forward planning look in that five year look ahead that is now required as part of the noise envelope that would have highlighted that a limit would have been exceeded in the future if the airport operator did not at that point. Make changes.
Ken Thank you

25:14

We touched yesterday on slot allocations. And I don't want to get into a big discussion of sauce allocations at this point in time. But I asked the question about removal of slot chests and I'd like to rephrase that question now. So I'm absolutely clear on the answer.

25:31

Is there any mechanism to remove a slot that has been allocated and has grandparent rights?

26:08

Rebecca clapper the applicant, sir, my understanding of that was that you just said you didn't want to discuss the allocation and that you were simply asked rephrasing the question that we're going to respond to separately in writing that.

26:22

There is there isn't a yes or no answer as I understand it.

26:29

Yeah.

26:31

Yes, I think we'll just come back on that in writing, if that's okay. I don't want to cause any confusion.
Thanks.

26:39

If we turn briefly to other forms of mitigation and compensation, we had a discussion at the compulsory acquisition hearing, hearing about noise compensation policies,

26:51

and the defined series of contours that triggered certain compensation requirements. Firstly, I'd like to thank the applicant for confirming that they would be happy to assist interested parties and understanding what their likely compensation offer would be under the compensation policy if they were requested to do so I think that's helpful. One question that was raised in the compulsory acquisition hearing, but defer to today was the matter of eligibility for compensation based on various contours. And paragraph six, point 1.4 And table 1.1 of the compensation policies and community first document set out mitigation for effects exceeding soul and lol in the daytime, but no nighttime low contour is identified. Can you explain how the current contour eligibility satisfies the MPSC requirements to mitigate and minimize effects between local and so specifically in the nighttime period

27:50

like a glutton for the applicant, Dr. Sharpe is going to deal with this point for you. Thank you.

27:57

Callum sharp for the applicant. I think really this goes in hand with the previous discussion we had about how the timing of the noise installation policy meets the three aims

28:09

of of the noise policy statement for England, there is no policy requirement to introduce noise and installation at the at the lowest observed adverse effect level. I'm not aware of any airports

28:23

either current or in terms of expansion that has introduced noise insulation at the lowest observed adverse effect level, where we rely on the noise insulation scheme to meet the noise policy statement aims as above the significant observed adverse effect level where we avoid significant adverse effects by the provision of noise insulation. And it is worth noting that the noise assessment only identifies significant effects on health and quality of life and adverse likely significant effects above the soul in any event. So there are no adverse effects identified below the between the lowland sore there are, of course then voluntary measures and discretionary measures to go further down to the 54 decibel contour. And as you will have seen from the compensation documents, there are five schemes that cover a very wide range.

29:16

We have not added any additional nighttime noise contour eligibility into that mix, because it would it would simply

29:24

overlap and duplicate with the daytime schemes. You will see from the from the figure in the appendix to the compensation policies document but it's already quite complex with a number of schemes that are that are quite close to each other and overlap.

29:39

But it is not the case that people exposed between the lowland saw would not be eligible for noise installation, because they would be eligible under the daytime scheme, which is why we haven't then introduced additional nighttime schemes because we think we would just simply over complicate the scheme and duplicate what is already available under the daytime scheme. So just to illustrate that exam

30:00

For

30:01

paragraph 16 point 9.147 of chapter 16 of the environmental statement notes that this is just an example for phase one, they're equivalent paragraphs for phase two and phase two B.

30:14

But there would be 13,000 people below the nighttime. So who would be eligible for noise installation under under the daytime scheme? So there is there is an installation offer between

30:27

the lowland so for nighttime, it just is under the daytime scheme, which overlaps with the nighttime contours as you as you would expect.

30:37

Thank you.

30:40

The Mr. Reddington. Did you have a comment? Yes. I'm glad you cleared that one up, because that was possibly going to be one of my questions, because we have seen that there's a descending scale going from, I think it's 57 DB. Daytime,

31:00

down to 54. Sorry, I'm reading all the conversation needs to be directly through me. And

31:08

we have seen the the diagrams showing the daytime noise contours for eligibility,

31:16

which is the

31:18

first drawing in

31:21

I think it's part of the compensation. And there is the second drawing which shows just the nighttime so

31:30

and it doesn't show

31:32

any contours beneath the soul, which were equivalent to the daytime. And it's not clear to me as a layman from reading the documents that these are actually fixed.

31:49

So am I to

31:51

to understand then that yes, there is a sliding scale for nighttime but using daytime contours.

32:01

And that is my understanding was sharp, would you like to come back?

32:06

I'm sorry for the applicant? Yes, that that's correct. It may be worth in particular referring to

32:12

figure a 1.1 which shows both the nighttime and the daytime contours on a single figure to help with that.

32:22

Thank you

32:31

I'm conscious of time. And I have a number of questions still left.

32:40

If you can give me two seconds I'd like to just lead through those and see which can be rolled over into written questions rather than being discussed now.

33:16

And up to one seven. The green controlled growth explanatory note makes reference the toolbox of interventions to manage and mitigate environmental effects. Can you explain what noise intervention interventions are in the toolbox? And whether these constitute targeted mitigation measures for the purposes of the aviation policy framework?

33:39

Callum Sharpe for the applicant? I think this is the item that we discussed previously that we've agreed with the host authorities. We would add into that document in the update to the green controlled growth. Yes, thank you. Document. Okay.

33:56

What changes to the operational use of the civil airspace around the airport not requiring an airspace change are available to reduce noise at ground level.

34:11

I'm sorry for that and could you repeat that please? Airspace change? What changes the operational use of the civil airspace around the airport not requiring an airspace change are available to reduce noise at ground level for example.

34:25

We have touched slightly on steeper climbs steep descent approaches,

34:30

keeping landing gear up as long as possible minimum altitude requirements. These are things that don't necessarily require a formal airspace change but are within the gift of the airport to manage through operational means.

34:42

Callum sharp Caltrop for the applicant. So some of those items are addressed within the airport operators ongoing noise control management process they're described for example in the noise action plan. So the operator has continues to send a

35:00

Approach targets set within that plan which are generally met, they have trialed a steeper descent approach. And at the moment, I understand it is still being reviewed under safety reasons. So there are various aspects that are being looked at by the airport operator at the moment. Those are some of the things that we may include in the toolbox of measures available to the airport operator. But again, it's it's not anything that we are securing in in the DCO. Partly because they aren't entirely within the gift of the airport operator. A lot of those are down to the airlines and how they fly. So it is about engaging, and setting limits and proactively discussing with airlines about how they fly. But nonetheless, those are the things that the airport operator will will do on an ongoing basis to control noise, particularly again within the context of the noise envelope limits.

36:00

Thank you.

36:05

And many representations have been received suggest that flight paths have changed and altitudes have lowered over time, worsening conditions for local communities. I appreciate that the applicant previously provided a statement that this was not the case. But I was wondering if the applicant could provide any evidence to support this statement.

36:33

I can talk to the applicant that's a matter we'd need to take away, sir and come back to you on.

36:37

I'm aware of the loosened annual noise monitoring reports include figures showing our students live path information over time. So there's information in the public domain that could potentially be compiled in some fashion. Yeah, thank you. I would take that away, sir.

36:51

Very quick point Andrew Lambo Lumpkin point of information there, there was a change in 2015, when a new departure procedure navigation method was introduced, which was called our nav. And, yes, I'm aware of that from your representations, thank you.

37:23

And, as one to one comparison of consensus and proposed operation noise controls, explains the ground noise controls and complaints handling are well established and will be retained as part of the ongoing noise management and noise Action Plan process and appreciate this is beginning to feel a bit like Groundhog Day in terms of some of these questions.

37:43

The Applicant data, it's not necessary to secure requirements with respect to these elements. And my question is, in the absence of a requirement to secure specified ground noise controls and complaints handling procedure, what mechanism would ensure that these continued to be implemented?

38:01

Sure, for the applicant, indeed, that that's been noted. And we've picked up on that from relevant representation. So although we believe they would be continued to be operated, we are going to be bringing forward an outline ground noise management plan, which would be secured to a requirement to the DCO. So we're working on that at the moment. And that will be submitted at deadline for which will include some of the controls that you mentioned.

38:35

It's great, thank you.

38:37

And

38:40

I think possibly my final question, actually, is

38:47

a number of the representations have indicated that local residents considering that they're likely to be subjected to higher noise levels than assessed in the Yes.

38:58

My question to you is, what evidence would they need to provide to the airport to be able to demonstrate eligibility for compensation if they fell outside of the current consoles?

39:23

count for the applicant as as is standard practice and continue and practice at the moment. The eligibility for the noise installation scheme would be based on the noise modeling outputs, which in turn is validated by noise measurements, at noise monitoring terminals, where we are able to verify quite accurately the noise level and exactly which aircraft are flown for that purpose. Some of the representations that we've received about noise levels and other locations it's not it's not particularly clear from those representations exactly how that was measured. And I think there's also a confusion

40:00

You're most likely with noise metrics. So for example, when you are measuring a maximum noise level, it's going to be a lot higher than an ally Q Loise level, which is the output of the noise model. And is the metric which policy and guidance requires us to assess. And as the metric which government policy requires us to introduce for noise insulation.

40:22

So I think we are we are confident that the eligibility is accurate. And we can, throughout the sort of scrutiny of the noise model, noise validation process and the noise technical panels, we can provide evidence to that effect, but I think,

40:39

yeah, that's our position on that, I think.

40:43

And thank you.

40:45

So much all of the questions I had today, there will obviously be first written questions. So the mentioned on 10th of October. Does anyone have any final comments that would want to make?

40:59

So Mike Frey from from Luton Borough Council,

41:04

can I make any other business point now is that appropriate? I'm grateful. So just really a matter to put on the examining authorities radar that we're becoming increasingly concerned about the timetable. But the local authorities and perhaps the interested parties in that deadline for is on the first of November, and the examining authorities, it sounds like it'd be provided with a great deal of additional information and documents. Those have to be commented on by local authorities and by interested parties by deadline five, which is on the 15th of November. And at the same time, we'll be commenting on the responses to first written questions, which, again, I'm going to wager again, be quite significant and lengthy. So there's quite a great deal of information that needs to be get through and got through. And I'm just concerned that two weeks is going to be insufficient. So I don't have a solution. But I wanted to put it on your radar, sir, and suggest that perhaps we could give some consideration to a deadline five B or something shortly before the ice H's which are planned at the end of November.

42:13

I'm afraid the timetable is set as the timetable is but we will take an action to have a look at how we might want to handle the information whether it can be staged in a slight way. I'm going to say.

42:28

Are there any other comments?

42:31

If not, I'll hand back to my colleague Miss Holmes to close the meeting.

42:39

Thank you, given the number of action points rather than go through these in detail now. There'll be published on the project page of the NA website in the next day or two.

42:50

If there's no other items relevant to this hearing, may I remind you that the timetable for this examination requires that parties provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline three, which is Thursday, the fifth of October. May I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the spreadsheets website as soon as practicable after this hearing. The next event for this application will be issue specific hearing for which will be examined in traffic and transport and will be held tomorrow morning. The agenda for which is available on the project page of the national infrastructure website. So before we close I'd like to thank all of you for your participation today. And I know it's been a long afternoon. We shall consider all of your responses carefully. And they'll inform the examining authorities decision whether further written questions and or further round of hearings will be necessary. The time now is 10 plastics and let's issue specific hearing on noise and vibration and related effects for the proposal pose London Luton Airport Expansion Project is now closed. Thank you