

October 2023

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

8.11 Statement of Common Ground between London Luton Airport Limited and National Highways

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.11

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

**London Luton Airport Expansion Development Consent
Order 202x**

**8.11 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN LONDON
LUTON AIRPORT LIMITED (TRADING AS LUTON RISING) AND
NATIONAL HIGHWAYS**

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Deadline: | Deadline 3 |
| Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference: | TR020001 |
| Document Reference: | TR020001/APP/8.11 |
| Author: | Luton Rising |

| Version | Date | Status of Version |
|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------|
| Issue 1 | September 2023 | Additional Submission - Deadline 2 |
| Revision 1 | October 2023 | Additional Submission - Deadline 3 |
| | | |
| | | |

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) London Luton Airport Limited (trading as Luton Rising) and (2) National Highways.

Signed on Behalf of LONDON LUTON AIRPORT LIMITED (TRADING AS LUTON RISING)

Signature:

Name:

Position:

Date:

Signed on Behalf of NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Signature:

Name:

Position:

Date:

Contents

| | Page | |
|----------|---|----------|
| 1 | Introduction and purpose | 1 |
| 1.1 | Purpose of Statement of Common Ground | 1 |
| 1.2 | Parties to this SoCG | 2 |
| 1.3 | Proposed Development description | 2 |
| 2 | Engagement with National Highways | 5 |
| 2.1 | Summary of engagement | 5 |
| 3 | Matters agreed, ongoing, or not agreed | 8 |
| 3.1 | Modelling | 8 |
| 3.2 | M1 Junction 10 | 13 |
| 3.3 | Construction impact | 24 |
| 3.4 | Commercial | 27 |
| 3.5 | Noise and vibration | 28 |
| 3.6 | Air Quality | 29 |
| 3.7 | Traffic and transport | 30 |
| 3.8 | Construction compound | 32 |
| 3.9 | Climate change | 35 |
| 3.10 | Cultural heritage | 35 |
| 3.11 | Greenhouse gases | 36 |
| 3.12 | Landscape and visual impact | 36 |
| 3.13 | Water resources and flood risk | 37 |
| 3.14 | Health and Community | 38 |
| 3.15 | In-combination and cumulative effects | 39 |
| 3.16 | Future engagement | 39 |
| 3.17 | Aviation | 39 |

Tables

Table 2-1: Engagement between the Applicant and National Highways

Table 3-1: Summary of matters

1 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) relates to an application made by London Luton Airport Limited, trading as Luton Rising (“the Applicant”), to the Secretary of State for Transport under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (“the Act”).
- 1.1.2 The application is for an order granting development consent, known as a Development Consent Order (DCO). The draft DCO is referred to as the London Luton Airport (Expansion) Development Consent Order. The DCO, if granted, would authorise an increase of the permitted capacity of London Luton Airport (“the airport”) to 32 million passengers per annum (mppa) (“the Proposed Development”).
- 1.1.3 This SoCG has been prepared by the Applicant and National Highways in respect of the Proposed Development. In particular, this SoCG focuses on:
- a. Modelling.
 - b. M1 Junction 10.
 - c. Construction impacts.
 - d. Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 1.1.4 The purpose and possible content of SoCGs is set out in paragraphs 58-65 of the Department for Communities and Local Government’s guidance entitled “Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent” (26 March 2015). Paragraph 58 of that guidance explains the basic function of SoCGs:
- “A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence.”*
- 1.1.5 SoCGs are therefore a useful and established means of ensuring that the evidence at the DCO examination phase focuses on the material differences between the main parties, and so aim to help facilitate a more efficient.
- 1.1.6 It is noted that the Examining Authority (ExA) has requested further modelling as part of the Rule 9. This considers the Department for Transport Guidance on the treatment of Covid-19 which was published after the modelling for the application had been completed. The Rule 9 work is being undertaken to enable the ExA to consider

whether the package of mitigation measures set out in the application documents continue to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Development.

- 1.1.7 As such, the submitted documents and associated mitigation strategy remain the main application documents for consideration within this SoCG.
- 1.1.8 The Applicant notes that National Highways retains the right to provide further update to this SoCG once the Rule 9 modelling is available.
- 1.1.9 National Highways have provided comments on a previous version of the SoCG, which the Applicant has sought to address where possible in time for Deadline 2 or otherwise to reflect in summary form in the National Highways position column of the SoCG. However, due to timeframes National Highways have not had an opportunity to review the updates ahead of Deadline 2 and therefore further updates will be made for Deadline 3.

1.2 Parties to this SoCG

- 1.2.1 The Applicant is the owner of the airport and is a private limited company wholly owned by Luton Borough Council (LBC). The airport is managed and operated by London Luton Airport Operations Ltd through a Concession Agreement with the Applicant and LBC. This agreement lasts until 2032.
- 1.2.2 National Highways is the highway, traffic and street authority for England's motorways and certain major A-roads known collectively as the strategic road network (SRN) and is a government-owned company which plans, designs, builds, operates and maintains the SRN. It is listed as a prescribed consultee in Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 and has been consulted throughout the course of the development of the Proposed Development.
- 1.2.3 The Applicant and National Highways are collectively referred to in this SoCG as "the parties". The parties have been, and continue to be, in direct communication in respect of the Proposed Development.

1.3 Proposed Development description

- 1.3.1 The Proposed Development builds on the current operational airport with the construction of a new passenger terminal and additional aircraft stands to the north east of the runway. This will take the overall passenger capacity from 18 mppa to 32 mppa¹. In addition to

¹ On 1 December 2021, the local planning authority (Luton Borough Council) resolved to grant permission for the current airport operator (LLAOL) to grow the airport up to 19 mppa, from its previous permitted cap of 18 mppa. Since then, the application was called-in and referred to the Secretary of State for determination

the above and to support the initial increase in demand, the existing infrastructure and supporting facilities will be improved in line with the incremental growth in capacity of the airport.

1.3.2 Key elements of the Proposed Development include:

- (i) extension and remodelling of the existing passenger terminal (Terminal 1) to increase the capacity;
- (ii) new passenger terminal building and boarding piers (Terminal 2);
- (iii) earthworks to create an extension to the current airfield platform; the vast majority of materials for these earthworks would be generated on site;
- (iv) airside facilities including new taxiways and aprons, together with relocated engine run-up bay and fire training facility;
- (v) landside facilities, including buildings which support the operational, energy and servicing needs of the airport;
- (vi) enhancement of the existing surface access network, including a new dual carriageway road accessed via a new junction on the existing New Airport Way (A1081) to the new passenger terminal along with the provision of forecourt and car parking facilities;
- (vii) extension of the Luton Direct Air to Rail Transit (Luton DART) with a station serving the new passenger terminal;
- (viii) landscape and ecological improvements, including the replacement of existing open space; and
- (ix) further infrastructure enhancements and initiatives to support the target of achieving zero emission ground operations by 2040², with interventions to support carbon neutrality being delivered sooner including facilities for greater public transport usage, improved thermal efficiency, electric vehicle charging, on-site energy generation and storage, new aircraft fuel pipeline connection and storage facilities and sustainable surface and foul water management installations.

instead of being dealt with by the local planning authority. The inquiry to consider the called-in application opened on Tuesday 27 September 2022, and closed on Friday 18 November 2022. At the time of submission of the application for development consent the outcome of the inquiry was still unknown and, therefore, all of the assessment work to date has been undertaken using a “baseline” of 18 mppa. Nonetheless, in anticipation of LLAOL’s 19 mppa planning application, the Applicant’s environmental assessments included sensitivity analysis of the implications of the permitted cap increasing. As a result, the Applicant believes that the environmental assessments are sufficiently representative of the likely significant effects of expansion, whether the baseline is 18 mppa or 19 mppa. Where the change of the baseline does affect an assessment topic, in most cases it means that the “core” assessments (using an 18 mppa baseline) report a marginally greater change than would be the case with a 19 mppa baseline. The findings of the assessment are presented in the Environmental Statement submitted with the application for development consent.

² This is a Government target, for which the precise definition will be subject to further consultation following the *Jet Zero Strategy*, and which will require further mitigations beyond those secured under the DCO.

As the Proposed Development will increase the demand for surface access trips, mitigation is proposed at several off-site locations to provide additional capacity. This includes M1 Junction 10 on the SRN and which is of interest to National Highways.

2 ENGAGEMENT WITH NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

2.1 Summary of engagement

- 2.1.1 The pre-application statutory consultation carried out by the Applicant, and the way in which it has informed the application for development consent, is set out in full in the **Consultation Report [AS-048]**. As a statutory consultee, National Highways was consulted on the Proposed Development in accordance with section 42 of the Act and submitted a formal response to the consultation carried out by the Applicant.
- 2.1.2 The parties continue to be in direct communication in respect of the Proposed Development.
- 2.1.3 This SoCG between the parties is based on an extensive programme of consultation and ongoing engagement which are summarised in Table 2-1. This sets out the meetings and substantive correspondence that took place and the topics discussed. Matters under discussion are set out in section 3.

Table 2-1: Engagement between the Applicant and National Highways

| Date | Form of correspondence | Details |
|------------------|------------------------|--|
| 18 May 2018 | Meeting | Kick-off meeting – Transport Assessment (TA) scope |
| 2 November 2018 | Meeting | Update on the Proposed Development and approach to the TA |
| 7 December 2018 | Meeting | Surface access approach |
| 1 February 2019 | Meeting | Provide overview of progress of Surface Access Study |
| 22 March 2019 | Meeting | Update on modelling |
| 25 June 2019 | Meeting | Surface access update to National Highways |
| 8 November 2019 | Meeting | Strategic transport/traffic modelling and transport strategy |
| 16 December 2019 | Email/letter | Response submitted to the 2019 statutory consultation |
| 17 January 2020 | Meeting | Surface access update to National Highways |
| 1 October 2020 | Meeting – MS Teams | Update on the Proposed Development |

| Date | Form of correspondence | Details |
|------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 10 November 2020 | Meeting – MS Teams | Travel Plan Workshop 1 |
| 9 June 2021 | Meeting – MS Teams | Update on the revised key forecasting assumptions and programme in general |
| 13 August 2021 | Meeting – MS Teams | Discussion regarding the results of the 21.5 mppa for 2027 design year scenario |
| 13 October 2021 | Meeting – MS Teams | Travel Plan Workshop 2 Engagement to collect ideas and views for promoting sustainable travel at the airport |
| 15 October 2021 | Meeting – MS Teams | Discussion regarding results of the 32 mppa for 2043 design year scenario |
| 19 November 2021 | Meeting – MS Teams | Discussion regarding statutory consultation, submission of the application for development consent, Surface Access Strategy Report, and Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report |
| 17 December 2021 | Meeting – MS Teams | Travel Plan Workshop 3 Surface Access Travel Plan Workshop |
| 17 March 2022 | Meeting – MS Teams | Consultation feedback discussion |
| 4 April 2022 | Email/letter | Response submitted to the 2022 statutory consultation |
| 26 April 2022 | Meeting – MS Teams | Discussion about outstanding modelling comments |
| 10 May 2022 | Meeting – MS Teams | Consultation feedback discussion and ongoing liaison |
| 25 May 2022 | Meeting – MS Teams | Sensitivity testing |
| 12 July 2022 | Meeting – MS Teams | Travel Plan Workshop 4 Governance |
| 25 July 2022 | Meeting – MS Teams | Update on sensitivity testing |
| 25 January 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | M1 Junction 10 proposals |
| 4 April 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | M1 Junction 10 – assessment Phase 2b LinSig |
| 12 May 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | Discussion on next steps for finalising the SoCG |
| 18 May 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | Discussion on contents of SoCG |

| Date | Form of correspondence | Details |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| 9 June 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | Discussion on matters listed in SoCG |
| 26 July 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | SoCG Modelling and design issues update meeting |
| 23 August 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | M1 Junction 10 proposals |
| 06 September 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | Update meeting |
| 13 September 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | Update meeting to discuss modelling and matters in the SoCG. |
| 15 September 2023 | Email | Comments on draft protective provisions provided to National Highways. |
| 21 September 2023 | Meeting – MS Teams | Meeting to discuss protective provisions and related commercial issues. |

3 MATTERS AGREED, ONGOING, OR NOT AGREED

Table 3-1: Summary of matters

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 3.1 | Modelling | | | |
| 3.1.1 | Passenger demand forecasts | National Highways deem the passenger demand forecasts as set out in the Need Case the Transport Assessment to be reasonable. | This has been discussed as part of on-going engagement and is agreed by the Applicant. Any updates to the modelling as part of the Rule 9 COVID assessment will be reflected in the SoCG when the work is complete. | Agreed |
| 3.1.2 | Use of the CMBTM-LTN SATURN model to assess strategic impacts and VISSIM micro-simulation to assess operational impacts. CMBTM-LTN SATURN model was also the basis of information for the Environmental Statement. | Overarching modelling approach is agreed. | This has been discussed as part of on-going engagement and is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |
| 3.1.3 | Peak hours on the highway network for assessment are between 08:00 – 09:00 for the AM peak and 17:00 – 18:00 for the PM Peak | Modelling time periods are agreed. | This has been discussed as part of on-going engagement and is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 3.1.4 | <p>Base model validation – both the CMBTM-LTN SATURN model and the VISSIM micro-simulation have been validated in accordance with TAG guidance.</p> <p>Base models continue to represent pre-Covid-19 baselines and are considered to be robust.</p> | <p>Base model validation is accepted. Use of pre-Covid-19 baseline is accepted. Following the ExA’s request in the Rule 9 letters of 16 May and 13 June 2023, part of the response work will be undertaken to understand the how traffic flows have changed over time from available data sources.</p> | <p>This has been discussed as part of on-going engagement and is agreed by the Applicant.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> |
| 3.1.5 | <p>Modelling forecast years have been set to be consistent with the passenger forecasts at three future time periods and form the assessment Phases as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Assessment Phase 1: 2027 equivalent to 21.5 mppa · Assessment Phase 2a: 2039 equivalent to 27 mppa · Assessment Phase 2a: 2043 equivalent to 32 mppa | <p>Modelling assessment years are agreed.</p> | <p>This has been discussed as part of on-going engagement and is agreed by the Applicant.</p> | <p>Agreed</p> |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 3.1.6 | <p>Forecast year do-minimum networks and forecast demands - as set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] - have been derived and include committed developments, committed transport schemes and background growth.</p> <p>Green Horizons Park (formerly New Century Park) is not included in the do-minimum modelling and only in the do-something. This is because the Proposed Development now incorporates Century Park Access Road (now known as Airport Access Road) to provide access to the proposed Terminal 2. As such, the assessment of impacts of the Proposed Development is robust given that Green Horizons Park could add significant trips in the do-minimum scenario. Airport forecast demand is in line with the current consent of 18 mppa. Do-minimum mode share assumptions for passengers of 40% and for employees of 27% is consistent with the current consent.</p> | <p>Approach accepted subject to matter 3.1.8.</p> | <p>Refer to matter 3.1.8.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|---|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 3.1.7 | <p>Forecast year do-something networks and forecast demands have been derived and include committed developments, committed transport schemes, background growth and Proposed Development mitigations.</p> <p>Green Horizons Park (formerly New Century Park) is included in the do-something modelling and therefore total impact of the Proposed Development reported in the do-something scenarios is robust given these trips would have occurred in the do-minimum scenario.</p> <p>Airport forecast demand is based on passenger forecasts and employee growth provided by York Aviation. Do-something mode share assumptions of up to 45% for passengers and of up to 40% for employees.</p> | <p>Approach agreed, subject to matter 3.1. 8.</p> | <p>Refer to matter 3.1.8.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 3.1.8 | <p>The future year 2043 baseline has included a capacity upgrade on the M1 between Junction 9 and Junction 10.</p> <p>This has been included as transport modelling showed that in the do-minimum scenario there would likely be the need for National Highways to address this constraint. This does not imply that there is an approved scheme for widening of the M1, or that hard shoulder running, or any other capacity improvement is programmed to be delivered.</p> | <p>The approach to ALR was discussed with National Highways and included within the 2043 modelling at the time of Statutory Consultation. Since that time, the Government has paused any further implementation of Smart Motorway Schemes and given that there is no committed improvement scheme for the M1 in this location, ALR should not be included within the Core Assessment.</p> | <p>A sensitivity test was included within the submitted documents which considered the impacts of the Proposed Development in the absence of any capacity upgrade on the M1. The Rule 9 modelling is addressing National Highway’s position and the Applicant will continue to work with National Highways to agree the outcomes.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide an updated response at Deadline 3.</p> | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 3.1.9 | <p>Assessment of the Proposed Development has identified no need for any mitigation to Junction 9 or Junction 11 of the M1 motorway.</p> <p>The assessment has shown that mitigation measures are needed at M1 Junction 10, and these have been developed in accordance with the designs within the published Transport Assessment [APP-202].</p> <p>Transport modelling has shown that the proposed mitigation strategy mitigates the impact of the Proposed Development on the SRN to an acceptable level.</p> | <p>Impact of the Proposed Development and mitigation measures proposed are agreed generally, however National Highways request further information regarding the impact of the Proposed Development on adjacent junctions in light of the Government's decision to cancel the Smart Motorways programme, before it can confirm its full agreement.</p> | <p>The Applicant has provided further information to confirm that the impacts of the Proposed Development in assessment Phase 2b do not have a significant impact on the SRN at either Junction 9 or Junction 11. This has included consideration of the impacts for the no M1 capacity upgrade scenario.</p> | Ongoing |
| <p>3.2 M1 Junction 10</p> | | | | |
| 3.2.1 | M1 Junction 10 Design | <p>National Highways is broadly comfortable with the mitigation proposals for M1 Junction 10. However, request to review the VISSIM model in detail to confirm acceptance in advance of submission of the application for development consent.</p> | <p>The Applicant continues to engage with National Highways and provide any further information with regard to the design of M1 Junction 10.</p> <p>Further models and modelling information has been provided for agreement. Engagement with National Highways has</p> | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | <p>Require sight of the detailed modelling for future years to be able to satisfy that adequate capacity is provided. In addition, there are detailed matters to resolve in respect of smart motorway technology and operation, including the provision of gantries and a maintenance bay.</p> | <p>continued. Concerns around smart motorway technology are addressed in Matter 3.5.8.</p> <p>Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p> | |
| 3.2.2 | All Lane Running – M1 South of Junction 10 | <p>National Highways and the Applicant have discussed the assumption that an improved capacity scheme (such as ALR) will have been implemented in advance of the final phase of the Proposed Development opening. Consultation feedback has suggested that National Highways considers this is an unlikely scenario and is not compliant with TAG guidance. National Highways request that the implications of a scenario of the Airport operating with 32 mppa without improved capacity south of M1</p> | <p>Sensitivity modelling was undertaken and was reported in the published Transport Assessment which considered the operation of the network in the absence of any upgrade to the mainline capacity. As part of the on-going engagement, further work has been undertaken and shared with National Highways. The Applicant continues to engage with National Highways on the matter to resolve any outstanding concerns.</p> <p>Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p> | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | Junction 10 (between Junction 9 and Junction 10) are investigated and agreed. | | |
| 3.2.3 | Wider impacts on the SRN | Request to confirm the modelling outputs that the SRN will not be affected by the Proposed Development at any locations other than Junction 10 and the mainline to the south of Junction 10. | <p>Further information with regard to the impacts of the Proposed Development on M1 between Junction 9 and Junction 11 have been shared with National Highways and the Applicant continues to engage with National Highways with regard to the SRN.</p> <p>Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide an updated response at Deadline 3.</p> | Ongoing |
| 3.2.4 | Impact of the M1 Junction 10 mitigation works | Request for sufficient assessment of the impact of the M1 Junction 10 mitigation works (and the main airport works) on nearby receptors within the Environmental Statement (ES) to enable National Highways to understand the impact of the Proposed Development on its performance measures, which are monitored on | Section 13 of the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] considers the transport impacts of the construction works associated with the Proposed Development and shows that the impacts are not expected to be substantial. The movement of construction vehicles will be discouraged during the normal peak traffic periods and the Outline Construction Traffic | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | <p>behalf of the Government by the Office of Road and Rail.</p> | <p>Management Plan (Appendix 18.3 of the ES [APP-130]) sets out further measures to reduce the impacts of construction traffic.</p> <p>Details of the construction phasing of any works associated with the SRN will be discussed with National Highways as part of the detailed design.</p> <p>Each aspect (or technical assessment Chapter 6 to 20) of the Environmental Statement describes appropriate Study Areas within which potentially significant effects may be identified and receptors therefore included in the assessment, as agreed through EIA Scoping and ongoing engagement with technical consultees as reported in each chapter. Each chapter reports the assessed effects and appropriate mitigation measures, and where relevant, includes those receptors near Junction 10 and the M1,</p> | |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | <p>including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural Land [APP-033]; • Air Quality [AS-076]; • Biodiversity [AS-027]; • Cultural Heritage [AS-077]; • Health and Community [AS-078]; • Landscape and Visual [AS-079]; • Noise • Traffic and Transportation [AS-030]; • Water and Flood Risk (including climate change allowance) [AS-031]; and • Cumulative effects [AS-032]. <p>The Applicant considers this Environmental Statement provides more than adequate information for National Highways to understand the effects on the environment from the Proposed Development at this planning stage, and allows them to make their own judgment how that may affect their performance. Further engagement as the design and</p> | |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|---|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | <p>measures develop will be conducted as the project progresses.</p> <p>Where specific issues are raised below, specific responses have been provided.</p> | |
| 3.2.5 | Junction 10 enhancements – lane widths | It is important that lane widths within the curved section of the circulatory are able to accommodate HGV swept paths without cross-lane encroachment. | <p>Tests have been undertaken to ensure that the proposed circulatory lane widths are able to accommodate side-by-side HGV movements and further information can be provided to National Highways to confirm this.</p> <p>Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide an updated response at Deadline 3.</p> | Ongoing |
| 3.2.6 | Junction 10 enhancements – Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards | The circulatory at Junction 10 is part of the National Highways network, with the SRN boundary situated on the A1081 approx. 420m east of the eastern edge of | Further engagement with National Highways has been undertaken regarding the design proposals for Junction 10. The broad principles of the design are agreed, however, it | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | <p>the J10 circulatory carriageway. DMRB standards will need to apply to these sections of road and confirmation is required that no departures are expected to be required (or of any that are), before National Highways can agree to the outline design.</p> | <p>is acknowledged that design will remain an ongoing discussion at the appropriate detailed design stage. The Applicant accepts that DMRB should be complied with or any departures should be secured. It would be expected that detailed discussions around this will be undertaken during the development of detailed design drawings.</p> <p>Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide an updated response at Deadline 3.</p> | |
| 3.2.7 | Junction 10 enhancements – northbound exit slip | <p>Providing improved stacking capacity on the M1 Junction 10 northbound exit slip is welcomed. National Highways would like to discuss the land-take implications and road markings.</p> | <p>The mitigation drawings which were discussed during several engagement meetings with National Highways give an indication of land take and road markings.</p> <p>Engagement with National Highways is on-going. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide an updated response at Deadline 3.</p> | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|----------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 3.2.8 | Junction 10 enhancements – smart motorway technology | An overview of the design has been provided by the Applicant and at this stage the impact on the existing smart motorway technology is expected to be limited and it is agreed that this is a matter that can be addressed as part of the detailed design stage. | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |
| 3.2.9 | Junction 10 enhancements – northbound entry slip | Further engagement has been undertaken by the Applicant to provide an understanding of the design and whilst this is a standing matter, it is agreed that engagement would continue as part of the detailed design stage. The J10 study- currently being undertaken by National Highways - is assessing whether any further capacity improvements could be included at this junction. | Engagement with National Highways is on-going. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3. | Ongoing |
| 3.2.10 | Junction 10 enhancements – CCTV coverage of the new proposed merge | Further engagement has been undertaken by the Applicant to provide an understanding of the design and whilst this is a standing | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | matter, it is agreed that engagement would continue as part of the detailed design stage. The matter is closed at this stage. | | |
| 3.2.11 | Junction 10 enhancements – safety audits and assessments | A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit should be undertaken as soon as possible. | Stage 1 Road Safety Audit will be undertaken once the preliminary design is agreed. | Ongoing |
| 3.2.12 | Junction 10 – southbound slip | Further engagement has been undertaken by the Applicant to provide an understanding of the design. Engagement is ongoing to ensure that this matter can be closed at this stage with further detail to be agreed at the detailed design stage. | The Applicant notes that this matter is subject to ongoing engagement. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3. | Ongoing |
| 3.2.13 | Effective operation of circulatory carriageway at M1 Junction 10, with five lanes on the western side | There will not be a balanced utilisation of lanes on the western side of the circulatory and that there will be resultant weaving, congestion and safety issues. Design for M1 Junction 10 to incorporate sufficient signing, including gantries, and be agreed in the DCO in principle. | Noted. The Applicant will address signage as part of the detailed design, however it is acknowledged that amendments will be required to the existing sign provision. Sensitivity testing on lane utilisation was undertaken and discussed with National Highways, which demonstrated that even with an unbalanced | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | <p>usage of the northbound off-slip, queues did not block back to the M1 mainline during peak periods.</p> <p>Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide an updated response at Deadline 3.</p> | |
| 3.2.14 | Operational impacts at M1 Junctions 9, 11 and 11a are not fully understood | <p>In the absence of All Lane Running (or similar), more traffic will use M1 Junction 9 as an alternative to Junction 10, which may lead to congestion and safety issues. Through traffic may also divert onto the A5 via Junction 9 and either Junction 11 or 11a.</p> <p>VISSIM modelling undertaken on Junction 9, with no All Lane Running in place to understand the impact, with mitigations agreed and included in the DCO if required. Saturn modelling [is requested] to understand the scale of diversion onto the A5 and VISSIM</p> | <p>Information relating to J9 and J11 has been provided to National Highways as part of the on-going engagement for both the core modelling and also for the M1 sensitivity test. The information showed that the development proposals would have minimal impact on J9 and J11 and indeed in some case, reduce traffic with the improvements provided at J10.</p> | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | modelling/mitigation if necessary. | | |
| 3.2.15 | Replacement maintenance bay at M1 Junction 10 not provided in the design | <p>Inadequate access to technology assets if replacement maintenance parking facility not provided, with safety implications for staff.</p> <p>Maintenance parking bay [should be] incorporated into the design and included in the DCO. This may require land-take outside the highway boundary.</p> | <p>Noted. The design has been checked to ensure that a replacement maintenance bay could be accommodated on the eastern side of the gyratory, within the highway boundary and within the land requirements identified for the DCO. This can be shared with National Highways as part of the on-going engagement.</p> | Ongoing |
| 3.2.16 | Lack of detail available concerning the traffic monitoring regime for determining when interventions at M1 Junction 10 are required | <p>Inadequate protection for National Highways in respect of how the timing/trigger points for the requirement for implementation of mitigation works will be managed.</p> <p>Agreement by all parties needed to a detailed monitoring regime for the M1 Junction 10 works, which is then incorporated into the DCO.</p> | <p>The Applicant notes that the monitoring regime for relevant locations (including M1 Junction 10) is subject to further consideration and will be reported to National Highways in due course. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide an updated response at Deadline 3.</p> | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| <p>3.3 Construction impact</p> | | | | |
| <p>3.3.1</p> | <p>Construction Workers Travel Plan</p> | <p>Outline Construction Workers Travel Plan (CWTP) - Appendix 18.4 of the Environmental Statement. A full CWTP will need to be secured through a planning condition stating that prior to the commencement of the development, a CTMP and phasing plan shall be agreed and approved in writing with the local planning authority/highways authorities/National Highways.</p> | <p>The Applicant has produced and submitted an Outline Construction Workers Travel Plan (CWTP) at Appendix 18.4 of the Environmental Statement [APP-131], to identify key matters that will need to be considered by the lead contractor during the logistical planning and execution of the construction works. As stated in the Outline CWTP and secured by Requirement 15 in the Draft DCO, a CWTP for each part of the Proposed Development will be prepared by the lead contractor, substantially in accordance with this Outline CWTP, and will be submitted for approval from the relevant planning authority (in consultation with the relevant highway authority) prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|---------------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 3.3.2 | Construction Traffic Management Plans | Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) - Appendix 18.3 of the Environmental Statement. A full CTMP will need to be secured through a planning condition stating that prior to the commencement of the development, a CTMP and phasing plan shall be agreed and approved in writing with the local planning authority/highways authorities/National Highways. | The Applicant has produced and submitted an Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) as Appendix 18.3 of the Environmental Statement to identify key matters that will need to be considered by the lead contractor during the logistical planning and execution of the construction works. The final CTMP will be a live document that will be prepared by the lead contractor, building upon the Outline CTPM. The final CTMP(s) will be submitted for the approval of the relevant planning authority following consultation with the relevant highway authorities. This will include National Highways in relation to the SRN. This is secured by Requirement 14 in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO. | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 3.3.3 | Construction traffic impacts | Request that an assessment is undertaken with a proportion of construction traffic arriving during the peak periods as a sensitivity test. | The Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] sets out the impact of the Proposed Development on the highway network, whilst the construction traffic is dealt with in the Construction Method Statement and Programme Report. This includes as Appendix A an outline programme. Inset 18.1 in Chapter 18 of the ES [APP-044] shows the total construction vehicles travelling to site by quarter over the course of the two phases of development. It is considered that the level of construction traffic is not sufficient to warrant a dedicated modelling scenario. | Ongoing |
| 3.3.4 | Construction assessment considerations | Request for the construction assessment to consider the number, distribution and mode of travel of construction workers. | This is covered within Appendix 4.1 of the Environmental Statement, the Construction Method Statement and Programme Report [APP-048] , as well as Section 13 of the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] . | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | Further detail on construction impacts has been shared with National Highways as part of the ongoing engagement. Construction impacts are agreed and no further information is required at this stage. | |
| 3.4 Commercial | | | | |
| 3.4.1 | Future maintenance requirements | Reviews of the highway mitigation designs are required to enable an assessment of the future maintenance requirements and calculation of a commuted lump sum, which will need to be provided to National Highways. | Details of the proposed highway mitigation were included in the application. Discussions are ongoing with National Highways as to protective provisions including an appropriate commuted sum. | Ongoing |
| 3.4.2 | SRN works | Discussion and agreement on the delivery model for the SRN works and the role to be played by National Highways. | It is agreed that a delivery model will need to be agreed with National Highways and SRN works will form a key element. Protective provisions addressing the SRN works and the role of National Highways are under discussion. | Ongoing |
| 3.4.3 | Section 278 agreement | A s.278 agreement is needed to fund National Highways' costs in support | Protective provisions addressing these issues are under discussion with National | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | of the Proposed Development during the construction phase. | Highways. | |
| 3.4.4 | Funding of costs during the pre-construction stages | Request for the Applicant to fund costs during the pre-construction stages in support of the Proposed Development, above and beyond its statutory role. This is in line with National Highways' approach on other major third-party Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. | Protective provisions addressing these issues are under discussion with National Highways. | Ongoing |
| 3.5 Noise and vibration | | | | |
| 3.5.1 | Construction noise impacts on residential areas | The ES concludes that the likely noise effects on residential receptors close to M1 J10 will be negligible during construction. This conclusion appears to only relate to construction traffic, and does not appear to consider noise from the M1 J10 construction compound. Applicant to demonstrate how noise from the construction compound has been assessed, and what the | The methodology for the construction noise assessment is based on current industry standard approach and is presented in Section 16.5 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [AS-080] and details of the works that are included in the assessment are presented in Section 5 of Appendix 16.1 Noise and Vibration Information [AS-096] of the Environmental Statement (ES). As set out in this appendix, the | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|------------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | associated effects are. | assessment is based on reasonable worst-case activities that are likely to generate the highest noise levels during construction. In line with this methodology, the construction compound has not been assessed due to the relatively minor works required, limited duration of noisy works and distance to the nearest sensitive receptors. Measures included within the Code of Construction Practice [APP-049] are deemed to be sufficient to manage noise and vibration emissions from the construction compound. | |
| 3.5.2 | Operational noise impacts on residential areas | The ES concludes that the likely noise effects on residential receptors close to M1 J10 will be negligible during operation. | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |
| 3.6 Air Quality | | | | |
| 3.6.1 | Air quality impacts | The ES concludes that there will be no significant air quality effects associated with the M1 J10 works. | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 3.7 Traffic and transport | | | | |
| 3.7.1 | Monitoring approach | The Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (TRIMMA) does not give sufficient detail on how the monitoring approach will be undertaken. There will likely be further comments as a result of the DCO review. | A more detailed TRIMMA is currently being produced and will be discussed with National Highways. | Ongoing |
| 3.7.2 | Oversight of the travel plan data | National Highways is particularly interested in how the travel plan will be managed and monitored, as current demand forecasts for the SRN rely on the travel plan targets being met to achieve the modal share assumptions. Whilst there is an intention that the travel plan will be monitored and data shared with the local authorities, National Highways requests to be a partner in this arrangement and to have an oversight of the monitoring of the travel plan data. | The Framework Travel Plan [APP-229] sets out the measures to be implemented to ensure sustainable access to the airport is encouraged. As part of this process the existing Airport Transport Forum will be used and a new Environmental Scrutiny Group established as part of the Green Controlled Growth (GCG) governance. National Highways have agreed to have a role on the Technical Panel that supports the Environmental Scrutiny Group, which will allow them to retain oversight of the monitoring of surface access data. | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 3.7.3 | Public rights of way (PRoW) | Public right of way FP12 is shown on figures as being close to the M1 Junction 10 works, but Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement [APP-040] does not specifically assess it. | The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding FP12 is answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 of 4 [REP1-027] page 125, in response to RR-1076. | Ongoing |
| 3.7.4 | The Transport Assessment has been produced with reference to DfT Circular 02/2013[i]. | The Circular was updated in November 2022 and significant changes were made to how scheme developers must treat the SRN. | Noted. The new Circular[ii] requires that new development should be facilitating a reduction in the need to travel by private car and focused on locations that are or can be made sustainable. The airport currently has a bus interchange and the Luton DART which provide access to a comprehensive network of bus and rail services. The Applicant aims to build on the existing provision in the Proposed Development with an extension of the Luton DART, a new bus and coach station at Terminal 2 and restricted growth in car parking spaces which will be supported by Travel Plans. Through the GCG Framework [APP-218] proposals, the Applicant is committed to a series of clearly specified | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | | <p>'Limits' for the lifetime operation of the airport. Surface access monitoring and controls form one of the key components and breaches of these Limits could result in the airport's ability to grow being limited if appropriate and reasonable actions are not implemented.</p> | |
| <p>3.8 Construction compound</p> | | | | |
| <p>3.8.1</p> | <p>Assessment of construction compounds</p> | <p>The construction compound, located on fallow farmland field, is variously referred to within the ES as 'Compound 6', but with other references also to Compounds 7, 14 and 15. It is unclear whether this refers to distinct phases of the construction period to be sited within the same compound boundary, or whether these are differing locations. This is not described clearly in the assessment reports and should be clarified, as should the precise footprint of the compound</p> | <p>The Applicant considers that the issues raised regarding the compound next to J10 is answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representation Part 4 of 4 [REP-027] page 119 in response to RR-1076.</p> | <p>Ongoing</p> |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|
| 3.8.2 | Landscape and visual impact | <p>The chapter specifically assesses the impact of the M1 J10 construction compound and works on users of Bridleway Slip End BW1 and Half Moon Lane.</p> <p>The nearby public right of way FP12 is shown on figures as being close to the M1 J10 works but does not appear to be specifically assessed in the chapter.</p> | <p>The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding FP12 is answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 of 4 [REP1-027] page 125, in response to RR-1076.</p> | Ongoing |
| 3.8.3 | Impacts on agricultural land | <p>The ES states that <i>'approximately 0.6ha of agricultural land to the west of Junction 10 of the M1 highway intervention would be affected by the Proposed Development, some of which is no longer being farmed'</i>, however there is a lack of clarity which land parcels this affects, as the highway verges are non-agricultural land within the highway boundary (NH ownership). The precise footprint of the construction compound(s) should be clarified in order</p> | <p>The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding agricultural and non-agricultural land near J10 is answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 of 4 [REP1-027] page 121, in response to RR-1076.</p> | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---------|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| | | to determine the impacts on agricultural land. | | |
| 3.8.4 | Vegetation clearance | <p>Within the Arboricultural Report, it is noted that off-site highway works are not included within the assessment and ‘are to be considered separately;’ no inclusion is given therefore to tree retention or facilitative clearance/removal, and it is unclear where or if the impacts on the highway tree estate are assessed.</p> <p>Given the nature of the existing junction circulatory being surrounded by mixed deciduous woodland cover, it would be assumed some level of tree, shrub and scrub clearance would be required to accommodate the widening and/or construction compound establishment. This should be clarified</p> | The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding vegetation clearance is answered within the Applicant’s Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 of 4 [REP1-027] page 122, in response to RR-1076. | Ongoing |
| 3.8.5 | Management and operation of the compound | Management and operation of the construction compound, such as any | The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding management and operation of | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|-------------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | | Section 61 applications, expected Traffic Management arrangements, and site lighting (in the absence of other street light sources on Half Moon Lane) should be detailed. | the compound near J10 is answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 of 4 [REP1-027] page 77, in response to RR-1076. | |
| 3.9 Climate change | | | | |
| 3.9.1 | Measures to reduce climate change impacts | NH require that the final M1 J10 design is or can be compliant with appropriate drainage standards and climate change scenarios | The Applicant considers that the issue raised drainage standards is answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 of 4 [REP1-027] page 123, in response to RR-1076. | Ongoing |
| 3.10 Cultural heritage | | | | |
| 3.10.1 | Construction impacts on cultural heritage assets | The nearest listed building to M1 J10 is the Church of St Andrew (Grade II, reference 1114661), and neither the listed building itself nor its wider setting is affected by the scheme. No significant effects on this or any other assets or potential assets were identified due to the works | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| | | at M1 J10. | | |
| 3.11 Greenhouse gases | | | | |
| 3.11.1 | GHG emission assessments | The ES chapter assesses the greenhouse gas effects of surface access (which includes use of the SRN) and construction for the Proposed Development, both of which are pertinent to National Highways. | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |
| 3.11.2 | Emissions mitigation | The ES chapter does not specifically consider the construction works at M1 J10, although it does refer to good practice methods and mitigation during construction generally, which is sufficient. The Surface Access Strategy aims to provide a long-term shift away from private car use, which would entail a reduction in emissions from traffic using the SRN. | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |
| 3.12 Landscape and visual impact | | | | |
| 3.12.1 | Assessment of landscape and visual impacts | The chapter specifically assesses the impact of the M1 J10 construction | The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding FP12 is answered within the | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|--|-------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | | <p>compound and works on users of Bridleway Slip End BW1 and Half Moon Lane.</p> <p>The nearby public right of way FP12 is shown on figures as being close to the M1 J10 works but does not appear to be specifically assessed in the chapter.</p> | <p>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 4 of 4 [REP1-027] page 125, in response to RR-1076, and 3.8 above.</p> | |
| 3.12.2 | Land quality impacts | <p>The soils and geology chapter of the ES included only brief and passing references to M1 J10; there are not expected to be significant effects as a consequence of the works to this junction but this should be confirmed.</p> | <p>The Applicant believes that the assessment reported Chapter 17 Soils and Geology of the ES [APP-043] and quoted here is robust and correct. It agrees that there are not expected to be significant effects as a consequence of the works to this junction.</p> | Ongoing |
| 3.13 Water resources and flood risk | | | | |
| 3.13.1 | Surface water management plan | <p>We have not assessed the SWMP or the HEWRAT assessment. We assessed the relevant ES chapter and noted only that there would be no significant effects.</p> | <p>This is agreed by the Applicant.</p> | Agreed |
| 3.13.2 | HEWRAT assessment | <p>We have not assessed the SWMP or the HEWRAT assessment. We assessed</p> | <p>This is agreed by the Applicant.</p> | Agreed |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | the relevant ES chapter and noted only that there would be no significant effects | | |
| 3.14 Health and Community | | | | |
| 3.14.1 | Health and Community | <p>There is no reference to Pepperstock or Slip End, two settlements immediately west of M1 J10. These two are also outside the study areas shown on Figure 13.1. There is reference to a generalised wider study area, which presumably these two settlements would fall into. Significant effects would not be expected on Pepperstock or Slip End as a result of the SRN works, but there should be a justification as to why they are excluded from the core study area</p> | <p>As stated in Chapter 13 Health and Community of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-039], (paragraph 13.3.5), the study area has been defined based on the spatial distribution of the environmental, social and economic impacts of the Proposed Development and the location of sensitive receptors. The 'local neighbourhood area' is the area in which the majority of direct and indirect effects on health and community resources are likely to occur. The 'wider study area' covers the whole of the boroughs of Luton, Hertfordshire, Central Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire. A figure of the wider study area has not been provided as it is defined by the location of impacts from other relevant topics and</p> | Ongoing |

| SoCG ID | Matter | National Highways position | The Applicant position | Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed |
|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|
| | | | therefore varies with determinant. | |
| 3.15 In-combination and cumulative effects | | | | |
| 3.15.1 | In-combination and cumulative effects assessment | The ES chapter noted that there were no significant in-combination or cumulative effects. We are satisfied that this is the case. | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |
| 3.16 Future engagement | | | | |
| 3.16.1 | Future engagement on Environmental Matters | National Highways seeks clarity on how they will continue to be engaged. | The Applicant will be happy to engage with National Highways going forward, times / dates can be discussed. | Ongoing |
| 3.17 Aviation | | | | |
| 3.17.1 | Passenger demand | National Highways consider the passenger demand forecasts to be robust, as confirmed in National Highways relevant representation | This is agreed by the Applicant. | Agreed |