

# AUDIO\_ISH6\_SESSION2\_29092023

Fri, Sep 29, 2023 3:01PM • 1:31:56

00:06

Welcome back, everybody, the time is now half past 11. And it's time for this hearing session to resume.

00:14

We're moving on now to landscape and visual.

00:20

And in the first part of the MISC Listen, it's I'm so sorry. So Rebecca into the Applicant. And Mr. wooley, my landscape expert has just gone back to get his things he did not got them. So it's just coming back now and he'll be here he is. That's just didn't want to start without him. That's fine. Thank you.

00:39

We have 100 online, Mr. Zack, consume them, please.

00:46

Hi, there. I just wanted to inform that tends to have to be dropping off the call now. But thank you for having us today. And we will take our action offline, too.

00:56

I believe we were getting a statement in writing for the inspectorate. So we will do that at our

01:02

our next opportunity. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you for your participation today. Thank you.

01:09

Okay.

01:12

Basically, um, the first item under this topic was going to be approach to methodology at the landscape vision impact assessment, I think in the interest of expediency, the questions that I've got on that will be better in first written questions. So I'm actually going to move on to the appropriateness of the photo montages and visualizations, and I have a few a couple of questions for the applicant first. So firstly, can you explain what regard has been had to tree cover in wintertime in the accurate visual representations when illustrating the proposal, which planting and the accuracy of the photo montage is in illustrating this

01:54

Rebecca Clutton for the applicant? Can I just introduce the two landscape witnesses to you first of all, sir, that to my left, I have Mr. Julian Wooley. Mr. Wooley is a technical director with WFP. He's a landscape and visual lead.

02:10

And then to

02:13

Mr. Wooley's left is Mr. Mobley who you met the other day. Mr. Mobley is a Senior Associate town planner and landscape architect, and he's a deputy to Mr. Wooley. I believe that Mr. Mobley is going to be taking these questions. But just before he does, we've noted that on some of the montages, there are typographical errors. And we're just going to just to advise you that we're going to correct and resubmit those at D three, a deadline three writing, we'll put that as an action point for

02:45

updated is that the the typos? Is that in the appendix? 14.6 and 14.7. So that's your assessment. You've obviously got your accurate visuals and obviously your sort of baseline photographs. Is it typos over both documents? Oh, for both of them. David Mobley on behalf of WA on behalf of the applicant. It's just in Appendix 14.7, sir. Okay, it's the accurate visuals right? Thank you.

03:25

Do you need me to repeat the question?

03:29

Data modeling on behalf of the Applicant, just with regard to the accuracy of the vital ontology to the visualizations

03:37

we have to take into account

03:40

the US during the wintertime the all of the photo montages, the visualizations that have been

03:48

produced and presented in Appendix 14.7.

03:53

Those photographs are all taken

03:57

during the wintertime, to ensure that they do sort of show the the worst case scenario as it were.

04:05

So that's the baseline photographs. I know in you in Appendix 14.6, you've got winter photographs and summer photographs as a baseline. So you've used the photograph that is the winter photo, but in terms of the hedging itself, does that actually reflect the appearance of what that would be like in the wintertime? Obviously, once

04:28

sort of trees have leaves it felt more off that off those hedges

04:35

David Mobley on behalf of the applicants.

04:39

So when you refer to the hedging, could you just you're able to just to

04:45

pick particular sort of people for example, are you referring to the

04:51

the illustrative photo montages? I think that you requested in the royal nine letter back in June I believe it was yes, it's it's it's which

05:00

which have been helpful, that have been submitted. But what I'm just trying to understand is how representative that is when sorts of into the winter months when you have leaves that have fallen off the hedges or the trees, so that actually probably visibility towards the airport will be more just how representative that is on the photographs. So it, it could we could use an example of photos, but it's just in general, you know, you've got viewpoint 28, which shows quite a heavy tree, hedge planting LBC viewpoint 56, which is sort of along the footpath to Wigmore Valley Park. So it was just a more general question about all of the photo montages. Really.

05:41

David probably on behalf of the BSP, I think with the illustrative photo montages, we've just we've, we've just showed sort of illustrative planting, we've not really,

05:51

you know, shown,

05:55

but hedgerow planting, because it would be in winter, for that,

06:00

I'd have we'd have to come back and sort of consider whether

06:03

that's sort of necessary to understand the effects.

06:08

You know,

06:09

it'd be useful if you could sort of have a consideration that and bring some comments back to us in terms of necessarily have to update the visuals, but at least some commentary to try and actually sort of explain what the likely changes would be on those particular viewpoints during sort of winter months. So if that's something that you could you could take away, that would be it would be good. If I could, as an action point,

06:35

and a sort of deadline that you could likely do that for.

06:42

US notice it like

06:45

Rebecca, Clanton, the the applicant, sir, I think deadline for that.

06:52

And just buying finally on that, all of the hedges, I think I sort of I'm correct in saying that they reflect the position of the hedgerows that you've shown in your strategic landscape master plan. Am I correct on that? And that on what's been shown on the photo montage, is

07:11

that correct? That's correct. So yes, yeah. In terms of the trees, I don't

07:16

recall seeing any sort of detailed plans of actual tree planting within those. So are they more indicative on the photo montages?

07:27

David Mobley, on behalf of the applicant. Yesterday, also because, obviously, at this stage, it's we're not, we're not at the detailed design stage yet. So it's just illustrative. Okay. Is there any intention at some point during this examination to actually submit some plans that actually show detailed tree planting?

07:48

David, probably, on behalf of the applicant could have just one moment to just confer with my colleague on up thank you.

08:14

Thank you for that. So mobile on behalf of the applicant, yes, that will be delivered under the sort of late stage with the detailed design stage, but not not at this stage under the DC okay. So Rebecca Clampett so just to be clear, when we were not anticipating submitting anything into the examination that will be posted consent, the requirement nine

08:39

requirement nine I think it is so the requirement five or requirement nine secures the submission of detailed landscape plans in accordance with the site,

08:49

the outline one, and that will do that's where the tree planting will come in. Okay, thank you.

08:55

My next question concerns have been raised from the host authorities regarding the use of wild lines as opposed to block form and that a consistent approach should be adopted. And the applicants position in the response to the local impact report as noted on page 31, of the response to central Bedfordshire Council and that is referenced rep one a 002 Is that wireframes have been used for long distance views and where little or none of the proposed development is visible with block photo montages, which has been used for short and middle distance views. I'm gonna turn to the host authorities here.

09:33

Is this response sufficient to address your concerns? Or do you require blocked views from some of the key viewpoints of such as Luton who or summaries castle and I'm going to turn to central Bedfordshire Council first please.

09:46

Thank you sir Caroline microteaching central Bedfordshire Council, I think this is something that we're still considering internally. So we will have to provide a written response to that.

09:57

Okay, thank you.

10:00

And again, I'm going to turn to Hartford share

10:04

in your on page 20 of your updated principal area of disagreement summary statement. It's this illustration of some key views with fully rendered images of the proposed development would aid understanding of this of the issues. Could I ask you to elaborate further on exactly what

10:22

illustrations and from key views that you would need?

10:28

That are asked for the three Hartfordshire authorities? Also,

10:33

I'm going to invite Mr. David Stocco, please, who is online to respond to that point?

10:43

Hello, David stoke on behalf of the horse authorities.

10:50

Yeah, I think this point arose when we viewed some of the photo montage is particularly

10:59

in relation to views from the east, while the north and east

11:04

where you see views of large scale

11:09

buildings in an elevated situation. And I think this is a bit of a concern. So just to add understanding

11:21

of how this would be perceived, I think it would be beneficial if we did have more

11:29

detailed visualizations, just providing more illustrations of how surface finishes that type of thing, I appreciate that.

11:44

Some of those issues will be addressed in

11:48

as part of the detailed design phase, but

11:52

just just simply viewing the block model isn't always helpful in terms of understanding

12:00

the full visual effects and some of these views.

12:06

Okay, thank you. So would you be looking for something where you have to match or sort of more accurate visuals that maybe reflect some of the Indicative elevations that have been produced in the general arrangement drawings with some sort of muted surface finishes? Is that what you're seeking

just to make it more helpful? Oh, yeah, that would be helpful. I think if we could work with the applicant to agree, which view points received that treatment, that would be a good way forward.

12:39

Okay, thank you. I'll turn to the applicant just to see whether that's something that you will be receptive to doing, and and agreeing, you know, precisely which ones are necessary to do.

12:53

Rebecca claim for the applicants, they will take that away and continue discussions with the host authorities in relation to that and see if it's possible to reach agreement. Could I ask for something for deadline for on that, please? That'd be would that be acceptable? Yes. Thank you, sir.

13:12

came. Thank you. One. The only final question I have on this one is actually to central Bedfordshire Council in your local impact report. And this is paragraph 5.7 point 19. It states the further viewpoints in the north northwest and west of Luton needs to be assessed Can you explain what location you consider is required and why?

13:50

Thank you sir Caroline microteaching central Bedfordshire Council, I think we need to have some further internal discussion on that and we'll come back to you writing if that's okay. Okay, is that something you can do for deadline three or deadline for

14:06

Kerala Macaronesian, we should be able to provide that for deadline three. Thank you. Thank you.

14:17

Okay, moving on now to the assessment phase in respect of landscaping visual impacts. This is more of a request from for me, really. So the response from WFP on behalf of and this is sorry, this is a request of the applicant. The response from WFP on behalf of the host authorities,

14:36

states that a figure showing all the key visual locations and receptors should be provided. Now I'm aware that your response to this and the relevant representation

14:46

and that's on page 166. In part two, we have four so this is document rep 1021. You've you've been advised that there's a large number of visual receptors were rested

15:00

Representative viewpoints are used to capture a representation of potential impact of these receptors. And it would be difficult to show clearly on a drawing all of the visual location receptors assess that there's 48 visual receptors that you've assessed in your landscape visual impact and

15:19

trying to piece all of those locations together is actually quite difficult. And I would actually find it quite useful. If you could submit that information. This is more for the visual receptors, I can I can understand when you're trying to illustrate sort of landscape receptors that is a little bit more difficult on the map. But in terms of the visual receptors, I do think it would be quite useful if you can actually have a map that actually shows where they are located. So if it's footpath X, you've got a plan that actually shows where that is. So then. And so then it's actually easy when you're looking through the landscape and visual impact assessment in particularly the different assess what you've done, where they're located. So you can actually understand that, is that something that I can ask you to consider? Julian, will AWS pay for the applicant? Just to clarify, so we have a public right away plan, and we have a few points or location plan? Are you asking for us to combine those two into one figure? I think what you've got is fine. I wouldn't want to an over complicated plan. I think it would be useful to have a separate plan. Sorry. That's why bed is an additional just Yes. It's an additional Yes, yes. So not a combination of the two, just a separate one. So keep what you've got effectively, but supplement that with the plan showing that

16:41

Julian will leave a WS PC applicant. Yes, that's something that we can take on board. Okay, thank you.

16:47

Children conservation boy got your hand up. there's anything you'd like to ask. Thank you Michael Stubbs children's conservation board. So this might be for the next item. But on the assessment findings in respect of landscape visual

17:00

part of what we wanted to discuss and we can park this by all means is the potential boundary extension of the children's AONB. Now, that's a matter that's going to run in it. It may not help us entirely this morning. But just to park that point, sir, because that may affect the calibration of assessment findings by the consultant team on behalf of the applicant. And more than happy to come back to that.

17:25

Yeah, it's I'm aware of the ongoing

17:29

position regarding the boundary extension in Natural England submitted comments that actually provided quite a helpful sort of position of where we're at, it wasn't something I was going to touch on today, it was probably something more that I was going to explore later and sort of further written questions. So I'm not intending to explore that item today. But just to say that we are aware of, of the potential for a boundary extension.

17:53

So I'll just leave that there. But thank you for you know,



17:59

just going back on my point, the applicant though one the

18:03

additional submission what what's timescale? Could you potentially submit allow for I'm assuming a deadline for a minimum

18:14

so

18:15

generally, VSP the applicant sorry struggling with buttons? Yeah, I think we will have to go back but yes, it will be at least deadline for

18:31

Thank you.

18:33

I'm gonna move on now to the visual impact of the water treatment plant and fuel storage facility nurses been raised by Harper chair, county council. I think at this stage it would be worthwhile for the applicant to share accurate visual representation 28 which is in document a s 143.

19:38

Thank you, and my question here is actually to Hartfordshire county council so I'm gonna bring you in.

19:45

Here Miss Ross.

19:47

Your written representation submissions raises substantial concerns regarding the visual impact of the water treatment plant and the fuel storage facility. So we've obviously had these additional visuals were submitted on them.

20:00

Like the Baugus, which has shown a little bit in more detail, the mitigation that is proposed for this, do these visuals, including planting actually address some of the concerns? Or is there any more comments that you can add to, to your previous comments?

20:18

Thank funerals for the de Hartfordshire authorities if I could ask em David Stoker, who's online to pick up on that point, please.

20:29

David Stokoe for the host authorities.

20:34

To some extent, the these visualizations do allay some concerns.

20:43

It would be helpful actually, if we could see some kind of a cross section through here. So we understand how the

20:52

the BUILT DEVELOPMENT relates to the modified land form.

21:00

But in in terms of the visual impact of the structures mentioned, yes, this visualization is helpful in allowing some of those concerns.

21:13

Can't I just want to in terms of cross section?

21:18

Are you wanting that added on to the photo montages with the hedges on so that you can sort of visually see more where the buildings would be located or sorry, the water treatment plant would be located?

21:34

Yeah, that's correct. So that is part of the original submission, our cross sections, but it'd be helpful if that could be more illustrative. So we could see the

21:46

existing land form the proposed land form the proposed build development and proposed areas of existing woodland plant and

22:00

Okay, see you wanting a visual that actually shows effectively the what the proposed development would look like without that hedge planting? I'm talking just about a straightforward technical drawing in this case. Okay.

22:18

I think would it be worth obviously, you're going to be engaging with half a chair on the previous issue we talked about, would it be worth it? I think this particular item to that as well and providing an update, Miss Miss Cohen? Yes. Yeah. Rebecca Klump for the applicant? Yes, sir. I think that's right. And then we can be absolutely clear about what it is that Mr. staker would like and make sure that anything we provide is actually useful. Okay, that's, that's great.

22:44

Just want to clarify something else to to Hartford shear. The local impact report states that the hedge on this viewpoint, it won't be planted until phase two B. However, the text in

22:56

the representative viewpoint, which is in document as oh nine two sees that it would be planted in phase one is, is that something that you had noticed?

23:13

Miss Ross, apologists and Miss Ross for and three Hartfordshire authorities if I can identify to David Stokoe. Again, please who's online?

23:25

Sorry, would you mind repeating that question, please? Yeah, that's that's fine. It's in the Hartford share local impact report, it states that the hedging in this location will be planted until phase two B but my reading if the representative viewpoint Texas, it says that it would actually be planted in phase one. So when you look at the representative viewpoint of phase two, we would actually have hedge planting. I just wanted to check that. Actually. Were you aware of that? And would it change the comments that you had made in the local impact report?

23:58

Yeah, sorry, I didn't fully

24:01

appreciate that point. But thanks for clarifying it. And yes, it would change the comments we made. Okay, I'll let you take that away. And you can have those days as part of your discussions with the Applicant bank. Thank you for that for sir. Julian Walid ODSP. If the applicant just to clarify the or the headrow is proposing phase one. And that's shown on figure 14 point 11 The Phase One landscape mitigation plan.

24:29

Figure 14 point 11. Yes, yeah. Okay, thank thank you for that time. Sorry, as 102 as to thank you for that clarification. Okay, I'm gonna move on now to the fire training grounds. So this is really for central Bedfordshire Council. This point it would be worthwhile if the applicant if you could share accurate visual representation 20 To begin with, and that same document as one for two

25:12

That's brilliant. Thank you to central Bedfordshire council to following the submission of this accurate visual.

25:22

Did you provide an updated that you now have sufficient information to understand the visual impacts of the training ground? Or are you seeking more than this?

25:33

Thank you sir Caroline Macaronesian for central Bedfordshire Council. Now we've received this additional information and we're satisfied that we've got enough to make an assessment. Thank you bringing in this that's near the assessment that you're going to make is that going to follow the deadline? Probably three might be bit too soon, but maybe deadline for if you can provide some comments on that line makrut Each and yes, I think more likely dead one for Kalyani. Thank you.

26:08

Okay, moving staying with the same document if you could just scroll down to

26:14

point 25, please, which is from summaries castle?

26:31

Case, next one.

26:35

That's the one. Yeah.

26:39

So on this one, this is to the applicant.

26:45

Going back to the comments that I made, before where you said that you'd used wire

26:51

wire lines on the visuals for long distance views, this is probably more shorter distance. So can I just ask why you've used a wide line on this particular photo montage to illustrate the fire training ground rather than a block form.

27:08

So that we could probably see a bit more than likely visual impacts on the scheduled monument.

27:17

David Mobley on behalf of the applicants? Yes, just in this one. So I think it's just because we just feel that you see comparatively little of the development in this view. I appreciate it is quite close up.

27:31

But a

27:33

large proportion of it is screen. So we felt it was

27:38

appropriate in this instance to do us a wildlife.

27:43

Okay, thank you.

27:47

So the final question on this item is to the council. This is just a general

27:53

question, really, in terms of the approach has been taken to mitigation? Are you actually satisfied with the overall approach that's been taken in sort of in terms of the approach to planting a new hedgerows to reduce the identified significant landscape visual effects from the development to

28:10

a number of not significant residual effects? And are you satisfied that enough consideration has gone into actually considering whether such mitigation is appropriate to this landscape setting on each of those? So I'll start with the Hartfordshire. Councils on that one, please. Thank you, Fiona Ross, for the 30 Hartfordshire councillors. Again, if I can please ask Mr. David Sokol, who's online to pick up that point.

28:36

David Steele, co host authorities

28:39

in terms of the proposed landscape treatment, it's illustrated in the the master plan. Apologies haven't got the reference to hand, I think that's generally well considered its comprehensive.

28:58

The range of landscape elements and treatments seems appropriate.

29:08

But my concern remains

29:11

the mitigation of the effects of introducing large scale build development and that elevated situation, particularly as perceived from viewpoints to the east.

29:29

And the landscape mitigation that's been proposed doesn't can't really fully, fully mitigate the effects of that large scale development. So that that is that's my main concern.

29:42

Rather than

29:46

the the details of the

29:50

the master plan that's been proposed

29:55

Okay, so yeah, really, in sort of BIA terms, it's it's

30:00

More of a secondary mitigation that's been put forward. And would you be sorry, sort of seeking more primary mitigation in terms of the bill form? And we'll probably discuss this a little bit more in the design section in a bit where I do have a few couple of questions about the built form.

30:16

But is it sort of more that you would be looking at sort of more primary mitigation in terms of some of those buildings and structures on the the more prominent on the edge of the site? Yeah, that's exactly the point. I guess it relates to the point made earlier in relation to the visualizations

30:36

and also, in terms of the

30:40

overall design evolution

30:45

and design objectives, how that's being considered in those documents.

30:51

Okay, that's going to be I have a couple of questions on that actually coming up. So we can maybe pick up that point, where we will be picking up that point in due course.

31:01

Your contributed central Bedfordshire Council, please have your comments. Caroline macro Deacon central Bedfordshire Council. And as set out in our local impact report, we have raised a number of concerns with the mitigation and I'd like to pass over to my colleague Jonathan Prosser.

31:20

Thank you, it's Jonathan Prosser, Conservation Officers central Bedfordshire.

31:26

We have raised

31:29

concerns in respect of the impact of impacts in respect of

31:38

Luton who the registered park and garden

31:42

in particular,

31:44

the multi story car park p one, which is going to be visible

31:52

along the Luton drive

31:57

which is viewpoint 18.

32:01

In the LVA.

32:05

At a point where

32:08

the work of Capability Brown

32:13

which is why the registered park and garden is so significant, the work Capability Brown is most evident at this point, particularly in his use of the sweep of the dry valley of hog trough.

32:29

And of course the the lakes that were created.

32:34

And there is a concern that carpark p one is going to break the break the tree line,

32:43

as it's as it's shown in the representation. And certainly, we will be looking, we will be looking at mitigation measures on that partly through the use of materials. And obviously the way that any carpark lighting is configured. I think it's important to remember that we need to think about

33:09

day and night impacts

33:12

in terms of impacts on tranquillity and the landscape.

33:17

So we've expressed a concern about that. And we've also expressed a concern about the fire training ground the relocated fire training ground, which

33:31

is in close proximity to the scheduled monument to summary skacel.

33:38

And I think the point I would wish to raise at this at this time, is that we are seeking further clarification

33:49

about the visual and environmental impacts of the fire training ground in use. We the presentations that have been made,

34:03

relate to the installations, but not actually to their use. And that is an important point to consider.

34:13

The It is my understanding that

34:19

there will be the burning of liquid liquefied petroleum gas and wood. And it's certainly not an infrequent.

34:27

It's not going to be an infrequent occurrence. It's going to be both during the day and night, on average 12 times a month. And that's just by the airport's fire services with additional periodic use bytes by external fire services. So it's going to be very frequently used. And we have asked for clarification on what that will mean.

34:51

Certainly in both landscape and the way that the designated heritage assets are experienced

35:00

summaries cancel scheduled monument, which is close. And then further away, losing who in the registered parking garden, what use of that fire training ground

35:11

will actually mean. So it was so we have we are engaging. We have asked for further clarification. And I think that's a valid point say which I'd like you to note.

35:23



Yes, thank you for that we're actually will be touching upon this a bit more in the cultural heritage one for Luton who so I can bring you in at that particular point. Oh, and you actually answered the question. I was going to say whether this was more visual or cultural heritage, but actually, it's a combination of the two. So, so thank you for for clarifying that. I will now ask the applicant really know whether you want to

35:47

provide a response to that point. And if you are looking towards having sort of producing the information that Mr. Prosser is actually seeking.

36:09

Dealing with AWS pay for the applicants? Yes, we will be considering it. And we will need to go back and get more information about the fire training ground.

36:18

Yes, I slammed the applicant. And so just to be clear, though, operational effects have been considered in the ES obviously, we can clarify further in the written responses, Mr. Willis says but they have been taken into account.

36:31

It Thank you. Thank you for that. Is that something that I could ask you to do as an action point for deadlines? Or is that okay?

36:45

Is there any body else who wants to raise any points on this particular item before I move on?

36:52

I don't see any hands in the room. I don't see any online. So I'm now going to move on to the next item, which is the Chilton Hills area of outstanding natural beauty.

37:05

K.

37:08

I've read in the submissions, obviously that can you're working on following comments and Natural England and also the children's conservation board that you're actually working on a further assessment of the

37:22

AONB and particularly with the special qualities. Could I ask you to provide an update on what the current position is with preparing this assessment and the timescales for submission please?

37:42

Julian willing to support if the applicant, so we're currently preparing this, these documents in the first instance, it obviously needs to go through our process but then be shared with Natural England?

37:58

And I can't provide an exact sort of timescale on that.

38:05

Okay.

38:07

Yes, it starts with Natural England. Could I ask you what the consultation you're doing with other bodies that may have an interest in this document, particularly the local authorities within these areas, and also the Chilton Conservation Board? Are you engaging with them? On this particular matter? Or is it just Natural England?

38:30

Julian, really the VSP for the applicant is just Natural England, sir.

38:36

Okay, I'll bring in some of the parties on that particular point in a moment.

38:44

But I'll probably do that. Now, actually, whether I'll start with the Children's Conservation Board, if you'd like to make some comments from that, please. Thank you, sir. Michael Stubbs children's conservation board, just to say we haven't been involved in the discussions, we know it's Natural England and the applicant, the applicant did kindly copy us a draft draft copy, I dated 31st of July.

39:06

But wasn't inviting comments. That's not a criticism, but we are happy to be engaged with the applicant as this progresses, if they would like to, we are a statutory body for NCAA DCO. Not for planning applications. So there is a confusion there. But we are very happy to be involved in that conversation. Julian believed we support PC applicants and just as an update, we will be sharing it with the a&p Conservation Board, find a Natural England. Okay, and that's great. And the reason that I think that would be important is because I wouldn't want a situation where a document is submitted.

39:42

And it goes off for comments. And then you get feedback that we need, you know, some other body team, we need to input this and then you have to go back and do it and given obviously, the tight timescale of the examinations. So I think if you can consult with those bodies, in particular, some of the local authorities as well and I'm going to ask those

40:00

Now who would actually like to be involved in that? So I will start with I'll start with Luton Borough Council because I know it doesn't all within your area but it is surrounding is this something that you would want to be involved with

40:15

Michael private Luton Borough Council yes we'd certainly have a look. We don't have any particular points to make but it'd be worthwhile looking for accounts costing and if so I'm grateful.

40:25

Thank you and hardship

40:28

that Thank you. Yes, I think also the authorities would welcome engagement on this matter. Okay. And the same with central beneficiary?

40:35

Yes, currently backwardation central Bedfordshire? Yes, we'd like to be involved in any future discussions. Okay, and to just check in with a booking and shear has some line Mr. Westman, Smith.

40:48

Thank you. So I think given our geographic position, we don't need to be involved with that we've already had discussions with the claimant as as, as I indicated earlier, and we're content with where we are.

41:01

Okay, thank you very much.

41:05

Mine. So if I can just ask the applicant, if you can engage with those those parties that have expressed a desire to do so so that you can actually try and capture all the comments in the first goal that I think would be really useful.

41:20

Thank you.

41:22

I know you've not submitted this document yet. But I do want to try and understand what it's likely to cover, and particularly what sort of methodology so

41:35

I suspect that it will be if you'd like to, if you can actually tell me where you are, actually, in terms of what the methodology is, and then I've got some potential questions, but I'll happily let you tell me what position you're at in terms of what you're covering in in your assessment so far. Julian wooley ws p for the applicants. In regards the special qualities and methodology there isn't actually a specific

guidelines. So we have prepared a document based on nature Scott's assessments for the assessment of national special qualities of national scenic areas and in Scotland, which are a similar designation to AONB areas of outstanding natural beauty aonbs within within England, we submitted a methodology to Natural England

42:36

in July, this year, and then had a response on the 22nd of August, which essentially clarified that they were

42:46

they agreed that though specific method methodology existed, and they were content with the approach we were taking, in terms of the content,

42:57

we are looking at the relevant special qualities that that apply to the the area in question that we're looking at.

43:12

Okay, thank you.

43:15

From my answer, so are you actually considering the children's ARB management plan to feed into that?

43:24

Julian Willie W. SP, if the applicant Yes, that was the source of the special qualities that we've we're reviewing and is informing the our assessments and the relevant special qualities to our assessments.

43:40

I'm going to bring in the children's conservation board now and I am aware of the

43:47

basically your document you to me it looks like three main special qualities or relative tranquility relative dark skies and panoramic views. Am I correct in that? Yeah. Microsoft's John's conservation law Yes, sir. Yeah, have you ever and obviously you've got strategic objective do to policy deep which is

44:09

leaving the OB a oh and be better than it was?

44:14

Obviously development within the setting of an EOB as policy DPF or one of the things I

44:23

want to ask is, are there any receptors in particular within the Chilterns AONB? Were there more sets are susceptible to these special qualities being affected? So appreciate in general terms that's likely to be underneath the flight but But what I'm looking for here are matters such Are there any areas of like darkness that are enjoyed as a recreational activity within the AONB? Or where areas of panoramic views will be affected or villages that actually experienced those special qualities? Is there any receptors within that really?

44:55

Where you can really see those special qualities

45:00

microsteps Jones Conservation Board yes, the answer is yes. Looking at the proposal for airport expansion, and then trying to hone down your question to where those might have an impact on those special qualities ivinghoe beacon in Buckingham share, excuse me, National Trust have commented also, and I believe the examining authority had been to it, Kobe, Kannada cybers in that particular area, put stone on that ridge where there would be, as my understanding is Western approaches into the which already exists and already affects tranquility, into the airport.

45:40

So that's one of them. I know that warden and galley hill to the north, is also and has been dealt with in the landscape visual impact assessment paths of that.

45:53

So it's then those two sorts of zones and would want to talk about the boundary extension, but the land to the East has very similar choc landscape qualities which you've heard about this morning.

46:04

similar, but not statutory AONB.

46:09

So that's where I think the special qualities and also your reading of dp forsure is very helpful to us in the management plan.

46:17

But I will just briefly want to comment on the applicants discussion of the methodology for the tranquility assessment, because this would be quite new work, which we are happy to support for the sector, that national association of aonbs were very interested in his work. But I think I think it's fair to say that natural leader a little bit further apart from the applicants on the 31st of July document that might initially appear because they said in their representation, we require further information in order to evaluate the potential impacts arising from the application on the special qualities of the children's AONB. And they put a red flag on their loot 22nd of August written reps. So they haven't, I don't think they've given a kind of green light as it were to mix my color metaphors to the adoption of that document or the approval of that document. And we're happy to help W SP as consultants on behalf of the applicant with that work, because we see that as being quite groundbreaking for the sector. Having said that, so

very briefly, I think it's hard to imagine how an overflowing aircraft can be mitigated to affect tranquility. I think it's a difficult one. I know that may be a debate for later. And the landscaping visual impact assessment accepts there is harm to the AONB. So that's been mentioned in papers.

47:40

But we're very happy to work with the applicants on this if they're happy to engage.

47:46

Yes, I think you've indicated that you're happy to do that, which is, which is very helpful. And actually, you sort of second can respond to my questions, actually, when I may as well as this now to the applicant.

47:59

You've said in your relevant representation on page 94 of part one of four of your response to relevant representations and that's in document rep. 1020 is states that as part of the separate SPS chain process, the desirability of avoiding overflying the EO and B will be considered in line with the guidance set out in the CIA's cup 1616. Really, the question is obviously, how achievable is it for the price increase in place to avoid the AONB? And suppose that goes to the point and the question that has been raised

48:40

Do you want

48:50

Rebecca clutton for the applicant so Mr. Willis quite right. But he's not the right person to deal with that perhaps if we can come back to that you on that in in writing? Yeah, yeah, that would be fine. What deadline would you want I think that will be deadline for settling for.

49:14

And the final question I have

49:22

on this particular point is, as part of your submission, will you be producing a large Zed T fee for the children's because there is one in your

49:34

figure 14.8 assessment of viewpoint locations but it's a very small dead TV in an inset and obviously, in order to get a bit of more of an understanding of those areas, and the do have the panoramic views.

49:49

Are you looking at producing a larger set TV

49:56

Julian, Willie ws p for the applicants

49:59

you

50:00

In short, no we were not these NTV is obviously a theoretical zone of visibility. It's not what we've what we've shown on figure 14.8. It covers the study area. We've provided the inset for Ivinghoe Beacon, which was an assessment view points that we we added following the statutory consultation in 2018.

50:28

Just to summarize on the conclusion is that there is no visibility it's over 10 kilometers away with a huge amount of intervening vegetation landform and built form and infrastructure in between.

50:46

There's a you know, there's NTV

50:50

is included as an inset within this plan, just to illustrate that

50:54

it does continue but obviously there is a realistic

51:01

trying to what's the time we're looking for, you know, there's a there's over a certain distance the human eyes not capable of perceiving

51:07

a five kilometer study area is we we think is out with the overflights areas of the a&p sufficient.

51:17

Okay, yeah, it was it was more whether you would use that tool or look at it again, to sort of try and pinpoint the areas really what I'm looking at is actually where these panoramic views are that we can really focus on as part of this study is, is really what I'm sort of getting. Because obviously, you've got two viewpoints within that I can see on your on the Zed TV Ivanhoe beacon, that it's doesn't have theoretical visibility, and I visited that site. So I know what, what it's what it is, obviously, there is, but there are some other areas as well, that are shown with having theoretical visibility. And I was wondering whether as part of that process, whether you'd actually be reviewing whether there are some areas within that area where these panoramic views, whether there's more than what you've already got.

52:02

Julian Walidah, VSP if the applicant, obviously, service, this has been quite a long term process, it's an iterative process

52:11

along the statutory and non statutory consultees. As part of the landscape digital impact assessment, we established a working group with members of the host authorities, where we agreed such things as the assessment methodology, the location of representative viewpoints, of which we have, as we, as you mentioned yourself earlier. So we have 48 receptors that that translates into 60

52:37

assessment viewpoints as well as all of the representative visualizations that we've provided along with the additional representative visualizations that we've we've provided following the essays, comments over the summer.

52:55

I think we have established

53:00

a very thorough approach to the landscape visual impact assessment, and I don't think we would consider further views. I think we have worked through this process adequately.

53:13

Yeah, it is thorough. It's just more obviously, that this is this has evolved. And obviously, in our assessment, we obviously need to make sure that the, you know, when we're assessing that we're given a recommendation that the special qualities are so it does really in the way that I see this going forward is it's actually it's just homing in on those special qualities. And that's what I think we would be looking for. But I think your point, Julia, Will, it'll be SPX applicants, I think, I take that Take That comments on board, anything with the special qualities methodology, and the special quality assessment that we're currently undertaken there. There will be room for further consideration of some of those locations. And I think the opportunity to discuss these with the AONB board, we would gratefully accept that. And I think it's a very positive step to work together on this. Okay, thank you. I'm just going to I'll just if you want to come back in, please. Yeah. Thank you. So Michael Jones, conservation will be really brief because of time. We're very grateful to Mr. Willie for that offer. Could I just make a quick point that I think are beacons about tranquility, not visibility. The ova does talk a little bit about the outer flying aircraft as well, but that's our key thrust. And also so when when the applicant team go away with that work on the CIP 1616 guidance, would they be able also to look at the airport national policy statement that ANPS on that 5.2 to two, if that's an acceptable takeaway for them because that deals with nationally designated areas which includes AONB is the airport's national policy statement, if I want to to to through you sir, if that's acceptable to you.

54:58

I can ask where they've gotten

55:00

Back to the action point that we had before whether you can add that to that action point it Rebecca clapper the applicant say yes, I've just noted that down when that's going to form part of that. Okay, it's very much



55:12

that brings me to the end on this particular item. Is there anybody who wants to raise any points any further points on this? There's nobody in the room and there's nobody online. Okay.

55:24

The next item I'm looking at is effects from lighting. I don't have too many questions on this. Others say we are aware of the number of representations that we've received that raised concern regarding light pollution emitted from the airport, particularly the rural areas to the east of the site and the app I know that the application has been accompanied by a light of tuition assessment which is examination examination library references EPP dash oh, five two and EPP dash oh five, three. In the assessment it considers there will be negligible effects in significance. My question to the applicant is can you explain further the reasons for providing residents with a medium receptor sensitivity, and a magnitude of change is very low in table 8.3 of that assessment.

56:23

Rebecca clutton for the applicant. I'm afraid that friction report wasn't produced by colleagues who are sitting to my left so we'll have to take that particular point away and writing on the freighter.

56:33

Okay.

56:36

Fine, thank you.

56:46

Okay, I'll move on to the next item there. No, which is the so so just going to take that one away. question that was as an action point, would that be a deadline or submission?

57:06

Okay, the suitability of mitigation measures.

57:12

Can the applicant advise whether the strategic landscape master plan that you've produced has been the subject of any public consultation? And if so what comments have been taken on board in shaping the proposals?

57:35

Julienne will AWS pay for the Atkins the The SLM p is the strategic landscape Master Plan, which is the illustrative

57:45

plan showing showing the proposed development. This was this is based upon the plans that were provided for public consultation as again, it's an iterative process. So we're talking sort of to 2018 2019. As part of the process for preparing the SLM P, we did engage with landscape officers

58:13

from the host authorities to agree the contents, and that went through a number of iterations prior to submission.

58:30

Thank you again, because in the statement of common ground with Natural England, particularly paragraph 3.4 point 10 It says that consultation will continue during the examination period in respect of this. So that's sort of my question is whether

58:46

is there more consultation that you're proposing as part of this strategic landscape plan? Watching nothing going on here for me to ask that question to them but that was in the statement of common ground

59:03

dealing with AWS pay for the outcome?

59:06

i We believe that they they assumed as part of this process we don't have

59:15

we didn't anticipate a requirement to do further consultation with them on the document. Okay, thank you.

59:22

It's probably a question I need to ask to Natural England then in first written questions, that's fine.

59:29

Okay, the next question requirement nine fine this is to the applicant requirement nine.

59:34

Five of the draft development consent order includes a period of five years for the applicant to replace any tree or shrub planted as part of the landscape scheme. Given that it is proposed for the landscape scheme to largely be implemented as part of the first phase of works were construction the second phases will not commence for quite a period of time after that. Can you explain the reason that you've given for how

1:00:00

During a five year period

1:00:05

sir Rebecca Clarke and for the applicant, the five year period, you'll be aware as is a pretty standard period for this kind of laws. We recognize the point that you're making about the length of the landscape management plan in this particular application. And we are happy to take that point away and consider whether it might be more appropriately tied to the, to the, to the periods in the in the landscape management plans themselves. So we'll we'll come back to you on that default if that's okay. So, yes, because because of my experience there, actually you can have 10 years or even lifetime in the development. So yeah, we recognize there are a variety. The five years is well precedented. But we hear the point in this case. Yeah. Thank you.

1:00:52

What's going on? The host authorities for you on that but I take it Do you want anything to add to that?

1:00:59

Generals for the host authorities. I don't think we have a great deal to add on the

1:01:06

the point around mitigation but perhaps around requirements nine when we come to that point and Luton Borough Council

1:01:17

okay the final question I have

1:01:21

which could be requirement nine and this is this central Bedfordshire Council, you've stated in respect of offsite landscaping mitigation that's proposed along the proposed hedgerows in your locality, which is hide footpath for and hide footpath five.

1:01:38

You'd expect to see the submission of cross sections boundary treatments and a plan showing the extent of landscaping to be provided. Is this something that you consider should be in requirement nine in addition to the details that are already listed?

1:01:57

Caroline backwardation central Bedfordshire Council, yes, we consider that this could be included in requirement nine. Thank you.

1:02:06

Miss Clinton, could I ask that you also consider that and provide a response? Yes, I'm happy to do that. Sir. Rebecca, the applicant? I think in the first instance, we would note, of course, that the listed but nine two is is an inclusive list and not an exclusive list. And we would have thought that on any given application, it will be suitable, you know, available for the host authority to to come back to us and say actually, we on this particular application, we need further information, but we will consider the point. Okay, thank you.

1:02:39

That brings me to the end of the questions on landscape visual before I move on to the next item. Is there anybody any point anybody wants to Miss Clutton? Yes, Rebecca clap for the Applicant. So there's just a point of clarification that we wanted to make it relates to issues that arose during compulsory the first compulsory acquisition hearing earlier in the week. And you'll recall that there had been some concerns around hedgerows restoration and the impact that that might be having on

1:03:07

farmland in particular. Having gone back to the plans, we've realized that the some confusion we think has been caused about what is actually being proposed. And there is there's some orange hatching on those plans. And there's also blue lines where the where the actual hedgerow restoration is to take place. They are not that clear, though, in some respects. And we think that what has happened is that some affected parties have assumed or understood that areas where REITs have access or hedge row restoration or maintenance are being sought. We're actually proposing to put hedgerows when we're not. So we're going to it's really just to alert you to that issue. We're obviously going to be continuing our discussions with those affected parties and having kind of alighted on that point, we'll make sure that they are clear about the full extent of any hedgerow restoration, and hopefully that will result in a resolution or persuasion of some of those concerns. And it's very welcome. Thank you, Miss Clinton. Do you want me to record that as an action point?

1:04:18

Deadline for though, Please, madam.

1:04:24

Hello, Jana Ross for this exercise. That is it's just our final point on this agenda item around requirement nine of the draft DCO which I think might have been picked up in issue specific hearing one earlier this week as well, but it's around the terminology and using reflect rather than substantially in accordance with so just wanted to flag that.

1:04:44

Yes, thank you. I think we have butter in our supplementary agenda, but that's fine. Thank you for raising that.

1:04:52

Okay, I'll now move on to design do you need to change?

1:04:57

Indeed I do change personnel again, please, sir.

1:05:00

Yeah.

1:05:48

Rebecca Clutton for the applicant, sir. I'm going to introduce now, our witnesses on design. To my left I have Mr. Marcus Grafton. Mr. Grafton is the aviation is an aviation director with a common he's a civil engineer. And he's asking lead.

1:06:06

Thank you.

1:06:08

In the agenda, I basically asked you the applicant to briefly outline the approach that is taken to the design and this in particular the SIF process that was undertaken, which has informed the proposed development because Can I just ask you to just briefly explain how you've got to where you, you have

1:06:25

thank you so much for the applicant. So the approach to the design was set out in Volume One of the applicant's vision for London Luton Airport, which was published in 2017, with the stated aim to make best use of the existing runway and to actively manage environmental impacts. The applicant assembled an experienced team of consultants to implement their vision, and that that was developed into a series of strategic objectives. A range of alternative concept design options were then developed at a macro level really configured around the existing airport layout and drawn on inputs from the full range of specialists within that team.

1:07:04

And at the same time, a series of SIFT criteria were developed, based on by best practice of reaching back to the airport Commission's appraisal framework was a relatively recent document at the time. And so the concept design options and was scrutinized by the team members across a wide range of disciplines against the SIFT criteria that have been developed in an open minded way to identify best and worst performers.

1:07:29

That was taken through two rounds of SIFT, followed by a non strategy consultation to open up the options and the preferred option to wider audience and stakeholders

1:07:40

that they were then refined in sift three, where a clearer, preferred option became established. And then there was a follow up strategy consultation in 2019, where that was presented to the public.

1:07:54

Okay, thank you for that, I'm

1:07:58

going to ask a question in terms of because I've read through the SIFT documents. And the one one area that I just want to explore a little bit more is, as part of that CIP process, you, you did consider a single terminal option. And in sort of looking at, is there any reasonable alternatives?

1:08:19

It's is the single option to the west of the site, and that was option one B in your CIP process, and the reasons why this was not taken forward. Can I just ask you to explain a little bit more? Why that wasn't taken? Or would it even note in the comments in paragraph 4.55 of the design access statement on this, but could you just explain a bit more why it wasn't feasible for you to take the single terminal option forward?

1:08:50

Marcus got into the applicant. I think the principal reasons are that the existing terminal, which is to the west, is somewhat landlocked and extensively constrained, partly because there's a taxiway, the primary taxiway network loops around that terminal. So we have a taxiway to the east, which sends something of a bookend, we have to activate to the east that goes over a bridge over the main access road as well. So to be able to expand that terminal, which is what have been required for the option to the West would have been logistically extremely challenging. So I think it performed less well on that basis.

1:09:30

Okay, so it's effectively it's because of the and we've done fit site visits at the airport. So we've seen so it is was really down to the

1:09:40

the effectively loss of the taxiways of an aircraft stands would be the most problematic thing. Taking that option. I think that's part of the answer. Yeah, Marcus definitely is part of the answer. So but

1:09:53

airports are particularly challenging sites to undertake construction works because of the nature of the live operation. The secure

1:10:00

It implications, issues of things such as foreign object debris, which can arise to construction when it can get ingested to aircraft engines. So, whilst you see it as a prevalent approach a lot of airports because of their cost constraints, it is particularly difficult, as I say it's more costly as well. And the impact of the operation can be extremely challenging to the operator and that is reflected on impact on the airline's on the passengers alike.

1:10:27

And so in that case is

1:10:31

was there actually an option to enhance and enlarge the existing terminal explored?

1:10:38

The existing terminal will actually be enhanced in phase one assessment phase one A,

1:10:43

but within the bounds of that extremely constrained approach that I had mentioned at the outset, so.

1:10:53

Okay, thank you.

1:10:56

Gonna move on now to

1:10:59

the role and suitability Design Principles Document, but

1:11:06

the principles within the document are very high level at the moment. Can you explain how the approach that you've taken Design Principles Document will contribute to achieving good design

1:11:25

so the microscope into the applicant, so the document a PP, two to five sets out the design principles that would be adhere to the detailed design stage post consent. So that the intention is that future designers will incorporate the appropriate design standards, parameters and commitments to stakeholders,

1:11:44

secure through requirement five, and we adopted them as good practice recognizing that the proposed development is an outline design at this stage, I think that's an important consideration.

1:11:54

What they seek to achieve is to provide stakeholders with assurance of how the design of the project will be developed following the grant of consent, they set out to mitigate the effects of the proposed development, and they seek to safeguard a minimum standard of design quality. There are sort of two, I would say standards, but there's two approaches within the document, there are general overarching design principles. And then there are more specific and some areas are actually very detailed, particularly my hair at the airfield, because if we don't have a standard document that you can refer back to.

1:12:28

And there are generally in the general design principles around several references to good design.

1:12:35

Okay, is there any?

1:12:37

Is there anything in there, the principles that's not already covered by existing sort of policies and standards? And, you know, I see quite a lot of terminology about the dean, you know, for example, the

detailed design of the boards developed will be visually appropriate and sensitive to place, creating an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetics as far as possible, how when the detailed design comes forward, is that going to contribute to good design?

1:13:07

Marcus Crawford, the applicant,

1:13:10

design principles reflect the fact that at this stage, the design is an outline design, it's effectively a rebirth stage to design, which would be appropriate for an outline planning permission. So such details as the finishes have not yet been considered. And that's why it's a fairly broad brush statement. They would have to be secured through engagement with the local planning authority, is my understanding.

1:13:34

Is there any way that you can actually take into account some of the actual design principles? So we've seen, you know, some comments made about lighting, for example, on multisig, from some of the multi story car parts, can you not incorporate some more specific design criteria within these principles, because whilst it's it, I can see what I can understand what's been said within it. But I'm a little concerned at the minute that it doesn't go far enough. And it could go much further.

1:14:07

microscope for the applicant, I think it'd be very important to stress that the applicant is open to adding design principles during the examination face. So it's not a it's not a complete closed door. And we'd be willing to engage with more other than stakeholders to pursue further clarity. I think that would be useful because ultimately,

1:14:29

if consent is granted a long period of time,

1:14:33

it could be 10 years before and when somebody comes to look at this document is really important and actually captures some of the issues. So I would really encourage you to try and encapsulate anything that said to any sort of advice that you get from members of the public that they are captured so that they don't get lost in the process further down the line. So if you could keep this as a live document that I think would be very benefit

1:15:00

Fishel one thing I would like to put really because obviously, requirement five, I'm going to come on to talking about the wording in requirement five in a in a short while, but

1:15:13

it is a high level document is there merit in actually having a further stage after the design principles and sort of having a more detailed design code within requirement five so that you can actually start looking a little bit more detail before you go straight into using the design principles document to



1:15:34

to feed into the design,

1:15:37

which you think that actually having a design code after this process and the requirement for that would help.

1:15:44

So Rebecca clutton for the applicant just a couple of points to make. Firstly, obviously, in relation to taking on board comments, we're absolutely happy to do that. As we've indicated, this is a live document. I think my only observation on that will be that we do really need to do that in response to stakeholder feedback, the principles document has been put in the application so that members of the public and other stakeholders can respond, we've actually had very limited feedback in relation to the design principles documents. So if there are others who would like to make comment on that, you know, we've we're very keen to see and we will respond to that accordingly. In relation to the approach to the design principles document, we're obviously happy to consider any points raised about potential further layers to it. But what I would say is that this is an approval process, you know, obviously, ultimately, there is the control by the local planning authority through the submission of the of the detailed design, and it will be within their gift to ensure that the design adheres to the standards.

1:16:51

Thank you for that.

1:16:53

I'm going to turn to the host authority now. So Hartford share county council in paragraph nine point 1.28. At the local impact report, it says that the council's are still reviewing the design principles to ensure it is fit for purpose. So can you confirm whether you've actually managed to review this and any timescales for actually doing this so you could actually maybe feed into the to the applicants document?

1:17:18

Thank you. Fiona asked for the three Hartfordsire authorities if I could ask David Stoker to come back on that please.

1:17:30

David still called the host authorities I would appreciate some further time to consider that document and provide a written response if that's appropriate

1:17:45

Yes,

1:17:46

obviously we've got deadline three next week which I think I'm assuming will be too tight Could I ask that something is in deadline for from from Hartford cheer Council please inserted the Design Principles Document

1:18:02

Yes, that's fine. Bye. Nice. Okay, thank you very much. I'm gonna turn to Luton Council now please. Is there anything that you want to add to the Design Principles Document

1:18:16

microprofile Luton Borough Council No sir, nothing further to add.

1:18:20

Finally central Bedfordshire Council obviously, it was stated before you had some things, particularly for from Luton, who that you you would like to look at, is there anything you want to add?

1:18:33

On Macaronesian central Bedfordshire Council and I think it's something that we need to take away. But obviously my colleague Jonathan Prosser has raised concerns with regards to leasing who in some ways castle, and the approach is there, but we'll we'll provide written feedback. Okay, thank you is that what deadline Do you think you could do that for?

1:18:52

Realistically deadline for

1:19:00

can move on to the suitability of the site layout and aspects of the proposed development surge with Rebecca clutton for the applicant, we just wanted to note that obviously, we have today heard some specific design principles points, the multi story carpark point was raised. We've obviously also had to point out summaries Castle, etc, we will just to keep the momentum going take those on points on board at at this stage as an action point. The other point that Mr. scrapped and reminds me of is that of course there are design principles set out in some of the other securing documents. And it may be that we want to collate some of those but that site shouldn't be lost of the fact that there are principles in other documents as well. Yeah, I think that this document could be really key in doing that. So you bring it all together. So that when if the final design needs to be brought together then it is all in one place. So if you could do that that could be very beneficial

1:19:54

in movement moving on to the next

1:20:00

to mourn on the same level, I'm going to raise this now.

1:20:06

In respect of the design and access statement,

1:20:09

it highlights the relevant design policies and the airport's national policies, statements, the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Infrastructure commission principles, also some Newton borough Council's local plan, however, I, whilst it sets out what the policies are at the beginning, I don't see anywhere how it explains how the process actually meets those relevant policies. Can you explain further how the aspects of the design have considered policy requirements that Rebecca Clutton for the applicants, our full analysis on those matters are contained in the planning statement? That specific reference which I am just going to get for you? And so that's the location for those as one to two, I believe.

1:20:57

That's the specific reference to those rather than

1:21:02

in the the assessment in the class. Yeah. But when you look at the planning statement, and particularly the planning, policy compliance table, in Appendix E, that that refers to the planning statement, and then section 7.6 of the planning statement refers to the design and access step and, and follows and something,

1:21:28

Rebecca, it's something of a feedback loop, then we need to just pick it up. Yeah, the key thing is

1:21:35

that all the policies Oh, and that's, that's fine. Why, in my opinion, it doesn't explain very well is how the aspects of the development actually taken on board some of those policy requirements. So for example, if you look at like the hotel, it will explain and describe it. But it's not clear how it's actually taken on board.

1:21:55

The sort of the policy, so the thread through from that is not clear in the documents. So

1:22:01

if you cannot let you to review that, and you can make that clear, because obviously, when we're reporting to the Secretary of State, we need to explain how the design meets the policies. And at the minute, there's a bit of a gap there between your policies and what you've got proposed. Rebecca Clark with the applicant, we're happy to take that point away and do what we can we obviously we don't have a detailed design at the moment, but But nonetheless, the principles are there to secure good design and we can show then how those design principles have been met. Well, we'll take that action away. It's a deadline for one though again, I'm afraid sir.

1:22:34

Can Yeah, and that's fine. Thank you and some of these, my next question will probably illustrate this. So you've got policy LLP six, Part F two of Luton borough Council's plan states development proposals

for the London Luton Airport strategic allocation will ensure the heights and design of buildings will reflect the site's rural fringe setting. Its high visibility from surrounding countryside and its proximity to Luton Airport. So again, how has the height and design of the proposed terminal the hotel and particularly carpark p 10, which is cited towards the eastern edge of the platform? How is that considered this policy?

1:23:12

And that that's the sort of thing that I'm looking for, in terms of an explanation of how that's been done.

1:23:19

Rebecca clutton for the applicant. That's all Understood, sir, we'll take that point away.

1:23:24

Yeah, thank you. And I'd also add, I'd quite like to see as well, some justification on the landform. That's been proposed, particularly how it relates to landscape character as well.

1:23:35

So if I could ask you to take that away, and and provide more detail on that that would be would be great.

1:23:48

Does anybody want to add anything after that discussion that we've had? I'll just open it up to the room.

1:23:56

Is there anybody online that wants to add anything?

1:24:04

Okay, thank you. The final one the adequacy of requirement five for use in Polks consent approvals.

1:24:12

as currently drafted for requirement five, I've got some concerns that it does not precisely secure the details required for the proposed works and

1:24:22

to allow more precision and direction over the details required to be submitted for the different works. It's suggested that the requirement is actually expanded to be split, where you've got particular types of work, they're separately set out, such as for the proposed new terminal, a fuel storage facility, car parks, and that sort of thing, and access requirements. And by doing this approach, you could actually have works that fall within different local authority areas that would have a separate work section.

1:24:55

What's your thoughts on that approach of taking that approach? First the NOC and ask the applicant

1:25:00

Tom that

1:25:07

he said Tom Henderson to the applicant, I'll respond on this one as I'm ultimately responsible for drafting the DCO. Can you just elaborate further on on the structure of what you have in mind? And yeah, no, no, in fact, what I can do is actually refer you to a DCO that comes to mind, which is there is requirements form five of the Manston DCO. So it's actually sets out explicitly what work numbers for within, and then there's a separate one for the airfield works. And then what you could do from there is you can actually feed into actually the details as required. And also as well, I don't see anywhere where the actual detail final detail of the highway works are actually

1:25:46

tied down. I'm assuming it's most meant to be other works within requirement five, is that where all of the details for the airport new airport accessories that what it was supposed to be under?

1:25:59

Tom Enders for the applicant? Yes, I mean, all all of the design elements would follow the local authority approval process. And I think, as we said in issue specific hearing one, the relevant planning authority, what those words, for instance, offsite high work would be, say central Bessel works in that in that authority area, we're certainly very open to

1:26:22

refining and developing the drafting to provide some more clarity on that is your point that you you would prefer to see shedule, one work split by authority area

1:26:34

that was raised in our queries in sort of the supplementary agenda to the to the DCO. And I think there is merits in in doing the approach that I have suggested that you could actually take that on board. So I think like the fuel pipeline, for example, sits sits within Hartford shares area. So then you could actually have a separate not it doesn't have to be separate requirements, just a separate subsection within the requirement that actually specifies what that is. And then you can liaise with Hartfordshire. Council, that's exactly what details that they would want. And then for each of the works, like for the terminal building exactly what drawings or, or details that are needed in a scheme for the highway works, you can have the requirement, it's actually set. So what cross sections that you need roads, safety audits, the elevation of the bridge, that sort of airport weigh, it then just makes it more precise and sets the direction in I believe, as to what needs to be submitted. So it's not something I can ask you to take away and consider as part of this as part of this item. Tom has the applicant certainly very happy to do that. Again, that would be I think, a deadline for

1:27:47

possibly deadline five provision, but certainly happy to take that away. I mean, I would, I would, I would say in terms of what's in the application at the moment, the work expands to show

1:27:56

the administrative boundaries, actually most of the works are primarily in the parish council area, and some of them straddle areas. So we'll think of a way of developing what your I think you've got in mind and the requirements. And we're happy to flesh out

1:28:13

the information that would form an application to discharge the detailed element for work, obviously, we can't be too prescriptive, because that would need to be adaptable to the particular type of work. And obviously, the discussions that would inevitably be held with the relevant planning authority at that time. So I think I understand where you're coming from. And as I say, we're very happy to

1:28:33

to sort of refine and evolve what's there at the moment.

1:28:37

Okay, thank you. That's really helpful. We could go with deadline for at the minute, but I think, you know, an update further, because obviously, there'll be revised draft DCRs throughout the various deadlines, so they could be done. That would be great. Thank you.

1:28:53

Do the counselors have any comments you'd like to add on to that suggestion? I'll start with Luton Borough Council given that most of the works will be in your area and whether you'd find that helpful.

1:29:03

Like Michael fry, Luton Borough Council, yes, so the council agrees with the general focus of the acts as questions it does return to one of the issues that explored in is h1 read about the meaning of part and that wide meaning and it would certainly assist Limerick Council's planning authority to have some clarity on what packages were coming forward. So it wasn't done in a very piecemeal fashion.

1:29:28

And to have a chin Council, please. funerals for the three Hartfordshire authorities. I think our position is consistent with that. Thank you.

1:29:38

Okay, thank you. So can I just Yes, just one other comment on that Tom Henderson to the applicant. Again, I just wanted to just for absolute clarity of the panel and for parties here. We're very happy to provide more detail around the elements and the information that would be supplied in relation to the discharge of an component of the works that sought

1:30:00

What we don't want to do at this stage is commit to what particular phase or part of the development would be. And that's for obvious commercial reasons, the airport has to expand in relation to demand. And obviously, we have assessment phases to demonstrate

1:30:18

the lightly significant effects of that, but the ultimate development will be in response to the growing demand. And therefore, we do seek the flexibility to develop the scheme in phases that we can't define at the moment. And so that's a really important principle for us. But we're very happy to work on supply information to articulate which particular works coming forward, which ones they relate to in the DCO. You know, what we've already done and what's what's to come, for instance, but I think that's an important principle. We just wanted to land. Make sure everyone's clear on what our what our approach is on that. Thank you. Okay, thank you for that.

1:30:53

I don't have anything more to add on this agenda item. So before I complete it, I will just open the room was there anybody who wants to add anything to this? And also online?

1:31:05

I don't see any hands. So that brings us the end of the design it is it has just gone one o'clock, I think that we could break for lunch here. I'm gonna put the feelers out because obviously we are time constrained today in terms of the time for lunch, and I'm initially going to suggest half an hour. Is that likely to be problematic for anyone?

1:31:30

Is there anybody online that it could be problematic for?

1:31:35

Okay, because it's just gone one o'clock, I will ask that we will adjourn this, this hearing session until 25 to two so 1335 We will return banking