

October 2023

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

8.55 Applicant's response to Deadline 2 submissions (Written Representations) Appendix A - Central Bedfordshire Council

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.55

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

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

**8.55 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO DEADLINE 2 SUBMISSIONS
(WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS) APPENDIX A – CENTRAL
BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL**

Regulation number:	Deadline 3
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/8.55
Author:	Luton Rising

Version	Date	Status of Version
Issue 1	October 2023	Additional Submission - Deadline 3

Contents

Page

Appendix A - Central Bedfordshire Council [REP2-047]	1
---	----------

Tables

Table A1.1: Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 submissions (Written Representations)	
--	--

Appendix A - Central Bedfordshire Council [REP2-047]

Table A1.1 Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 submissions (Written Representations)

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
1	Surface Access	<p>Central Bedfordshire Council believe that the following highways and transportation issues should be considered through the examination of the DCO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · provisions included in the draft DCO related to highways; · the modelling and assessment process; · the identified highway impact in the Central Bedfordshire authority area and approach to mitigation and · the Green Controlled Growth approach to meeting sustainable travel mode share targets <p>These are areas which the authority will address in further detail at the relevant stages of the DCO process, but which are covered in summary below. In light of these concerns detailed below Central Bedfordshire Council requests a specific hearing session on Surface Access.</p>	<p>This is acknowledged by the Applicant as a summary, with the individual points noted raised in subsequent items. The Applicant has responded in detail on the subsequent raised responses to avoid duplication</p>
2	Draft DCO	<p>Draft DCO Wording and Provisions</p> <p>The Council considers that there will be a need for negotiation on the matters set out in the draft DCO regarding determination periods, maintenance arrangements, covering costs borne by the Local Authority and approval of</p>	<p>Noted .</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		detailed design of offsite mitigation schemes. The limitations of these rights need to be agreed and set out.	
3	Draft DCO	Taking into account that the works are currently at a feasibility level of design, and potential implications in terms of earthworks, signage, or further modifications to the junction designs themselves, some allowance for horizontal deviation would allow more comfort in terms of the deliverability of proposed schemes. It should be noted that there has not been any detailed review of the junction modelling or mitigation schemes proposed at this point, and as such there is also the scope that amended or more significant junction works might be found to be necessary through the DCO process. Part 1, 10 assumes consent for works to be undertaken outside of the normal S278 process, so there would need to be a greater level of certainty in terms of the design at the time of the DCO being considered and granted.	<p>The Applicant notes the Council's comments but considers that there is sufficient detail at this stage to appropriately anticipate the use of a particular consenting mechanism. It is not uncommon for DCOs to not have detailed design at this stage of development.</p> <p>Article 10 is based on article 8 of the Model Provisions. It departs from the Model Provisions in that it authorises interference with any street within the Order limits, rather than just those specified in a schedule. This approach has precedence in The Thurrock Flexible Generation Plant Development Consent Order 2022.</p>
4	Draft DCO	The notice and determination periods proposed under the draft Order would not give the authority sufficient time to review and approve the highways works in question, nor for any standard review process, such as the Road Safety Audit process to be undertaken. As such we would advise that:	The Applicant notes the comments made and will continue to consider these further with the Council to better understand these issues and to progress as appropriate.

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>1. Scheme designs are progressed to a level where the authority can review prior to the DCO hearings, including an initial technical review and safety audit.</p> <p>2. That a longer notice and determination period is provided for within any DCO document, to allow for the necessary scrutiny and review process to be undertaken.</p> <p>3. That a separate undertaking to cover the authority's reasonable costs in undertaking and such review, in implementing any necessary traffic orders, road closures, road space booking, and inspection of works is provided.</p> <p>4. That a separate undertaking is provided to allow for an appropriate defect and maintenance period for any works undertaken as part of the DCO. (Currently Section 11 of the DCO confers ownership back to the LHA upon completion of the works).</p> <p>Alternatively, the matters above should be covered within a separate legal agreement between the applicant and the Local Authorities, which is cross-referenced within the DCO.</p>	<p>Where necessary the Applicant will consider and agree with the Applicant how such matters should be documented.</p>
5	Draft DCO	<p>Para 23: Surface access – refers to a Framework Travel Plan, which is also referred to within para 16: Interpretation but is not referenced elsewhere in the document. This appears to be an error as</p>	<p>The Applicant is unclear about which document the Council is referring to in this comment and will liaise further with the Council to understand their concerns and respond accordingly.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		para 16: interpretation states that the Framework Travel Plan is referenced in Schedule 8 as a certifiable document. Considering the importance of the plan to the overall surface access strategy, the DCO should include details of the process for agreement, implementing, and reviewing the document.	
6	Draft DCO	Para 25: The 8-week period stipulated may not be sufficient for the discharging authority to carry out the consent, agreement, or approval process in question. There is no undertaking to reimburse the Highway Authority for its reasonable costs in discharging any of the activities detailed, including checking and approving plans, inspecting works, or booking road-space / providing consents. An additional undertaking to this effect should be included.	<p>The Applicant does not agree with the Council on this point.</p> <p>Eight weeks is considered a reasonably long period of time for a discharging authority to make a decision. The Applicant is considering the costs point that the Council has raised and will provide an update when it is possible to do so.</p>
7	Draft DCO	There is no mechanism within the DCO for works not included within the redline to be delivered. For example, when addressing offsite impacts in locations such as Caddington and Slip End. The Council have previously raised concerns over impacts in these locations, related to both traffic displacement and parking impacts, and a mechanism for addressing these potential impacts, which sit outside the DCO redline, would need to be identified and agreed.	The Applicant notes the comments made and will continue to engage with the Council to better understand these issues and to progress as appropriate.

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
8	Surface Access	<p>Modelling Assumptions – Core Scenario</p> <p>It is the view of the Council that the 'Core Scenario' does not represent the most likely forecast traffic situation. Rather that the assumptions within the sensitivity tests (No Smart Motorway and Local Plan Scenario) should be combined, as each is considered to be appropriate and necessary, to form an updated 'Core' model scenario which could be considered as more representative. In the absence of this, there will be a requirement upon the various authorities to consider and report upon a range of 'nested' sensitivity tests within the Local Impact Reports, which will be both time consuming, and unlikely to result in a position where a single set of metrics against which decisions can be made can be fully agreed.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] provides a significant amount of detail on surface access, including the proposed mitigation measures which are designed to accommodate airport related traffic growth, together with growth associated with background traffic and consented developments.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] for the Airport expansion has been developed through discussions with the relevant highway authorities. This has included discussions on the assessment approach, assessment methodologies and use of transport models which have been taken forward to assess the impacts of the proposed development. The traffic modelling undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment (and developed in accordance with DfT guidance on land use scenarios) demonstrates that the proposed highway improvements would mitigate the traffic impacts from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] also contains a series of sensitivity tests which show that the package of mitigation measures that are proposed by the Applicant continue to provide significant benefits even when the underlying assumptions and approaches are different to those in the core scenarios.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>It is also noted that as part of the 'Accounting for COVID-19 in transport modelling' work, which is currently in progress, in response to the ExA's Rule 9 Procedural Decision dated 13 June 2023, the Applicant will be updating the approach to address a number of the issues (including no inclusion of any assumed capacity upgrade on the M1 between Junction 9 and Junction 10 and incorporating model demands from the strategic model into the VISSIM model) identified by CBC.</p>
9	Surface Access	<p>The scenario in which the strategic network isn't improved is expected to have a differing impact upon the local highway network to that reported within the assumed 'Core' scenario, (affecting not just Central Bedfordshire but also the other local highway authorities) and the outcome of this work is a critical reference point for our own Local Impact Reporting.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] for the Airport expansion has been developed through discussions with the relevant highway authorities. The Transport Assessment [identifies the conditions in the future baseline and then sets out the results including the Proposed Development with mitigation designed to accommodate airport related traffic growth, together with growth associated with background traffic and consented developments and demonstrates how the scheme would operate against that future baseline.</p>
10	Surface Access	<p>It is also noted that the sensitivity testing carried out is limited to the final forecast year, 2043. The modelling work associated with the currently assumed 'Core' scenario identified differing, and sometimes greater levels of impact at the</p>	<p>The sensitivity modelling has been undertaken for the most appropriate assessment years relevant to the test being considered. It is noted that 2043 provides the full development with the highest level</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>junctions within the study area during earlier forecast years, and it is therefore reasonable to expect the same with the sensitivity test scenarios. As such any revised 'Core' assessment should be undertaken for each of the forecast years and reflected in the detailed junction modelling work.</p>	<p>of future baseline growth and therefore is considered to be a reasonable worst case scenario.</p> <p>The assumption of the no M1 widening sensitivity test was only assessed in the 2043 forecast year, as it would not be required in the earlier years tested.</p> <p>Given that the Applicant and operator are committed to continue to work with local authorities to understand the impacts of the airport through ongoing monitoring as set out within the Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (OTRIMMA), there is an opportunity through this process to identify any impacts that are being realised earlier than assumed within the baseline model, and seek to implement the proposed mitigation as required.</p>
11	Surface Access	<p>The impacts of re-routing on local roads needs to be fully articulated within any reporting of the tests undertaken. This should include updated junction modelling for impacted junctions, and the identification of additional mitigation if required. If inappropriate routing through local communities is identified, this should also be accounted for, and mitigated against.</p>	<p>The sensitivity modelling has been undertaken for the most appropriate assessment years relevant to the test being considered. It is noted that 2043 provides the full development with the highest level of future baseline growth and therefore is considered a reasonable worst case scenario.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] also contains a series of sensitivity tests which show that the package of mitigation measures that are proposed by the Applicant continue to provide</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>significant benefits even when the underlying assumptions and approaches are different to those in the core scenarios.</p> <p>The sensitivity tests report on the key findings and the Applicant does not consider it necessary to consider further any potential impacts from re-routing on local roads. If CBC would like additional information this can be provided if CBC can confirm the locations of interest.</p>
12	Surface Access	<p>Modelling Assumptions – Mode Share</p> <p>The base mode share assumptions appear to be based upon public transport usage recovering to levels above the 2018 CAA mode share, in which 24% of staff used public transport, but with 2020 levels recorded at 5%. Likewise, the 2018 passenger mode share was recorded as being 33%, with the 2020 survey recording combined public transport mode share of 9%. As such the baseline 2027 level of 40% passenger public transport mode share appears to be similarly optimistic</p>	<p>The 2023 (Q1) data shows that the public transport mode share for passengers is 38%. This shows a strong recovery in public transport mode share from 2020 when the proportion dropped to 9%. Public transport use by passengers is recovering towards pre-pandemic 2019 levels, when the mode share was 38%.</p> <p>Despite the initial impact of Covid restrictions during the first few months of 2022 and concerns among the general public, the share of public transport usage rebounded swiftly, surpassing the levels observed between 2016 and 2018. Consequently, the public transport mode share in 2022 came much closer to the figures seen in 2019, which was prior to the pandemic.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>The Airport Forecast has established an initial target for the year 2027, aiming to achieve a 40% share of public transport usage.</p> <p>The 2022 staff data is currently not available, but with all Covid restrictions being lifted and strong recovery of the airport demand (13.3 mppa in 2022) it is considered to not be an unrealistic estimate that similar level of public transport usage rebound and achieve an initial target for the Phase 1 development of 27% share of public transport usage by employees.</p>
13	Surface Access	<p>At present, outside of the DART proposals, which predominantly provide for more efficient rail interchange rather than adding new connecting services, there is a lack of investment in public transport. In particular, consistent concerns have been raised over the assumption that public transport providers will respond to any demand generated by the expansion, rather than the proactive promotion of sustainable transport by providing new or improved services. It is noted that Stansted Airport has been used as a comparison within the submission documents. In the case of Stansted, it is understood that public transport improvements are partially funded by a passenger transport levy, which contributes circa £600k-£800k per annum to public transport</p>	<p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has been developing proposals for a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF), to be used to fund measures identified within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131].</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the CBC as the proposals are developed, including the size of the fund, the parameters for prioritising measures to be funded by the STF and the legal mechanisms for securing the fund. Details on the STF have been shared with CBC and further engagement will take place between deadline 3 and deadline 6.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		measures. There appear to be no comparable proposals associated with the DCO.	
14	Surface Access	A reliance upon a commercial market response to public transport demands also means that there is no overarching strategy to manage and coordinate public transport provision. As such, the Council would continue to express concerns over the robustness of the base and forecast mode share assumptions which underpin the wider modelling work.	<p>The Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and Framework Travel Plan (FTP) [AS-131] name Bus and Coach as one of the Priority Areas. There are multiple interventions associated with the priority areas, which comprise the Applicant's surface access toolbox. This longlist is contained in the FTP.. The vision and objectives of the SAS have been identified to capture the surface access Limits and Targets that underpin the strategy. The longlist includes 'Engage with bus operators to improve the existing routes and create new and extended routes, better connecting the airport to more places (especially east-west) and in particular urban areas and transport hubs'.</p> <p>The Applicant is developing more detail around bus and coach routes to demonstrate the range of potential opportunities for improving bus and coach access to and from the airport. These improvements are being developed in tandem with a Sustainable Transport Fund that will set the framework around how these types of improvements, alongside the others listed out within the Toolbox of Measures within the Framework Travel Plan , would be funded.</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with Host and neighbouring authorities on the governance, source,</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>size and scope of the fund, and the S106 agreement for securing the fund, and is developing further detail within consideration of comments raised. The fund takes the FTP's aspirations and demonstrates the airport's commitment to continuing to deliver</p> <p>Details on the STF have been shared with CBC and further engagement will take place between deadline 3 and deadline 6.</p> <p>The Airport Operator can control on-site parking tariffs and the supply of parking at future development phases if necessary.</p>
	Surface Access	<p>Modelling Assumptions – East Luton Schemes</p> <p>The forecast baseline modelling is reported as including a number of significant highways improvements schemes, adding capacity to both links and junctions. Whilst some of these works are detailed as having funding in place and being programmed for delivery, the works were originally proposed to be complete by March 2021, during which time construction costs have significantly increased. It is therefore unclear whether the works in question can still be relied upon within the baseline. The documents confirm that only one of the schemes so far has been implemented (A505 Stopsley Way/A505 Vauxhall Way junction upgrade) and does not outline the</p>	<p>The assumptions for these infrastructure measures have been agreed with the relevant highway authority, Luton Borough Council (LBC).</p> <p>LBC consider that it is appropriate to include these improvements in the Do-Minimum scenario due to the reasonable certainty that the schemes will proceed. LBC has already implemented one phase of the works through the upgrades to the Vauxhall Way / Stopsley Way junction.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		status of the other 9 schemes that form this package of measures.	
15	Surface Access	It is noted, for example, that ARUP mitigation drawing reference LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0034 Rev PO1 details a major signalisation scheme at the junction of Crawley Green Road with Vauxhall Way as the assumed baseline level of mitigation at this junction (delivered by the East of Luton Study), whereas the Strategic Modelling forecast report (under table 3.3: Forecast Infrastructure Assumptions), states that 'signalisation was initially considered... but rejected in favour of localised widening at the roundabout.' As such there appears to be a mismatch between the plans submitted showing assumed levels of committed infrastructure in the forecast years, and that which may be delivered, which could have significant effects upon the wider modelling work undertaken.	Table 3.4 of the Strategic Modelling Forecast Report [APP-201] sets out details of the proposed mitigation at the junction of Vauxhall Way and Crawley Green Road. This confirms that the scheme proposes to convert the existing roundabout into a signalised crossroads, and as such the measures shown in drawing LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0034 are correct.
16	Draft DCO	As the DCO is not proposing the delivery of the works in question, it is also unclear how these works could be relied upon within any decision without being included as specific consent order requirements, notwithstanding a wider and related concern that the inclusion of these schemes in the forecast baseline means that trigger points for provision cannot be identified. It is also unclear, where the DCO is proposing	The assumptions for these infrastructure measures have been agreed with the relevant highway authority, LBC. LBC consider that it is appropriate to include these improvements in the Do-Minimum scenario due to the reasonable certainty that the schemes will proceed. LBC has already implemented one phase of the works through the upgrades to the Vauxhall Way / Stopsley Way junction.

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		works which build upon, or modify, schemes assumed as delivered under the East of Luton project, how these would come forward in the absence of the wider underlying scheme.	<p>Where the schemes build upon LBC proposals, the Applicant will work with the relevant highway authorities to ensure that any mitigation provided is appropriate.</p> <p>Given the timeframes over which the Proposed Development will be brought forward, it is inevitable that there will be changes to the wider transport infrastructure that cannot be known about at this stage and therefore it is entirely appropriate to work with the relevant highway authorities through the detailed design and delivery at that time.</p>
17	Surface Access	The Council continue to have concerns over the relationship between the Strategic (CBLTM) and the VISSIM model, and the derivation of flows for the detailed junction models used to develop proposed mitigation schemes. If there has been a direct application of turning movements from the strategic or microsimulation models to individual junctions, then validation against turning movements in the base year would need to be demonstrated at an individual junction level, if there is to be sufficient confidence in the junction modelling undertaken. The Council have requested sight of the more detailed junction modelling undertaken on a junction-by-junction basis, using LINSIG, JUNCTIONS 9 or other	<p>The relationship between the CBLTM-LTN and the VISSIM model has been clearly set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] which also contains a sensitivity test which addresses the issue of growth between the two models.</p> <p>This is also being considered as part of the 'Accounting for COVID-19 in transport modelling' work, which is currently in progress, in response to the ExA's Rule 9 Procedural Decision dated 13 June 2023.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>specific junction modelling software, including full model inputs and outputs, to allow for an appropriate level of scrutiny and review to be undertaken and for a comparison between scenarios to be possible. In the absence of this more detailed information, it is not possible for the Council to review or fully comment upon the proposed mitigation.</p>	<p>The individual junction modelling has been undertaken to supplement the work contained within the CBLTM-LTN and the VISSIM model. The individual junction models have been developed from the geometric parameters and using forecast traffic flows from either the CBLTM-LTN or the VISSIM model. The individual junction models provide an indication of the relative impacts. Given that the upgrades to any of the junctions in CBC will require detailed design, further data can be collected at that time to confirm the local junction model base validation.</p>
18	Surface Access	<p>Wider Impacts</p> <p>The Council are concerned that the detailed modelling requested and reported within the submitted Transport Assessment (Document refs APP-200-206) identified several of the junctions as forecast to be operating significantly over capacity; but note that these locations were not identified within the initially provided wider modelling work as being areas of concern or predicted congestion. This may be due to the use of Link V/C rather than junction V/C metrics. The Council would therefore request that junction approach V/C metrics are provided alongside the link metrics, to ensure that areas of impact at specific junctions within the Central Bedfordshire</p>	<p>Since the submission of the DCO application, engagement with CBC has continued and additional information relating to a number of junctions has been provided.</p> <p>Discussions are continuing with CBC on the wider impacts to address any concerns. The Applicant remains confident that agreement will be reached with the Council before the end of examination.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		network are not missed. This may result in the requirement for further detailed junction assessments.	
19	Surface Access	This would also relate to the junctions on routes running parallel to the M1 to the east, on the A1081 and B563. Whilst the summary information provided within the Transport Assessment (Document refs APP-200-206) suggests a limited change in total two-way flow, there appears to be a more significant change in terms of tidality, particularly when looking at the link flow data provided for the links to the north and south of the B653 / West Hyde Road crossroads, which could impact upon the operation of the associated junction/s.	Please refer to the Applicant's response in ID 18 above.
20	Surface Access	The levels of predicted delay and queuing currently detailed within the Transport Assessment (Document refs APP-200-206) at these offsite locations would not be considered acceptable (with Chaul End for example experiencing increases in queuing in the PM peak from 59 to 167 vehicles following the addition of development traffic, with similar levels of increase in the Luton Road approach), and an increase in average junction delay from 263 seconds to 939 seconds. Significant increases in queuing are also predicted at the Newlands Road / Luton Road / Farley Road junction. The Council would therefore request further investigation into	Discussions have been undertaken between the Applicant and CBC with regard to the impact of development traffic on both of the junctions mentioned. Detailed modelling outputs have been provided to CBC for their comment on multiple occasions, together with options to mitigate the impact of the development traffic. The Applicant will continue to work with CBC in determining suitable mitigation at these locations.

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		mitigation options (and associated costings) for both these locations and for this mitigation to be embedded in the DCO itself.	
21	Surface Access	<p>Details of Highways Works</p> <p>The Council have consistently raised concerns that the highways works, including those within Central Bedfordshire have not been discussed in any detail with the authority, with regards to either the details of the junction modelling informing the designs or the checking of the proposed mitigation schemes, which to date have not been subject to any Safety Audits.</p>	<p>See responses to comments 17 and 20, where it is noted that details of proposed mitigation measures within CBC have been shared on multiple occasions and have been discussed as part of ongoing engagement.</p> <p>Road Safety Audits of the proposed off-site highway mitigation schemes have recently been commissioned and the results of the audits will be shared with relevant local authorities as part of our ongoing engagement before the end of the Examination.</p>
22	Surface Access	As raised within our comments upon the content of the Draft DCO, the proposed wording provides significant powers to the applicant to deliver highways works, and therefore there is an associated requirement for the local highway authorities to be satisfied, as far as possible, that the highways works are appropriate, safe and deliverable. At present the level of detail is not considered to be sufficient to allow for this.	The current assumption is that the Local Highway Authority will deliver the mitigation, but powers are being sought through the DCO to allow the Applicant to deliver the works if necessary. In circumstances where the Applicant delivers highway mitigation measures, the final design of each junction will be agreed with the relevant highway authority.
23	Surface Access	Also as outlined previously, due to the lack of supporting base model validation, individual junction models, and technical or safety audits or	Road Safety Audits of the proposed off-site highway mitigation schemes have recently been commissioned and the results of the audits will be

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>reviews of the proposed schemes, there remains the potential that the schemes in question could change, with the redline boundary drawn relatively close to the schemes in question, raising further concerns that there is insufficient flexibility within the redline to accommodate changes. The phasing of highway mitigation associated with the Surface Access Strategy has also not been agreed, with some mitigation works (for example the London Road South improvement works) being held back to later phases despite earlier impacts being identified in the modelling work.</p>	<p>shared with relevant local authorities as part of our ongoing engagement.</p> <p>Given the timeframes over which the Proposed Development will be brought forward, it is inevitable that there will be changes to the wider transport infrastructure that cannot be known about at this stage and therefore it is entirely appropriate to work with the relevant highway authorities through the detailed design and delivery at that time.</p> <p>However, given the relatively localised nature of the works, the Applicant does not expect there to be any material changes which would impact on the DCO limits.</p> <p>The mitigation strategy has been developed through the approach to Assessment Phases with appropriate mitigation identified in the most appropriate Assessment Phase. The delivery of the works would be subject to the TRIMMA and, if it is reasonably shown through this process, that the mitigation is required sooner, the opportunity exists to bring forward the timing of any of the measures associated with the proposed development.</p>
24	Surface Access	Offsite Parking	<p>Measures are contained in the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] to mitigate the effect of fly-parking.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Inappropriate and inconsiderate parking in residential roads in Central Bedfordshire is already an issue, most notably within the settlements of Caddington and Slip End, where there have been frequent examples of airport passengers parking on residential roads for significant lengths of time, having taken a taxi to the airport. Mitigation in the form of parking controls would therefore be necessary as part of any future expansion proposals. It is noted that areas of concern in Luton are highlighted for potential controls or restrictions (DCO document ref TR020001/APP/4.13). The Council are of the view that this concern could feasibly be dealt with through the DCO by extending the parking control areas to Caddington and Slip End and similar plans provided accordingly, including an associated commitment to the costs of local engagement, management, and enforcement.</p>	<p>These include 'supporting the expansion of the residents parking zone to the north of the airport' and 'carrying out feasibility studies on restricted parking zones (RPZs)'.</p> <p>Actioning of these and related measures will be governed through Steering Groups within the Airport Transport Forum, either through the Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (TRIMMA) or Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) processes. Further detail is being developed by the Applicant and will be shared with relevant parties in prior to Deadline 4.</p>
25	Surface Access	<p>There is a related concern that parking demands above those predicted could be realised if the mode share targets are not achieved, and that the additional parking demand would be generated at off-site locations. There may be increased pressure for long term parking provisions in the surrounding areas, and the implications of this need to be considered.</p>	<p>GCG mode share targets are in place and these must be achieved if the airport is to expand; as the proposed expansion cannot be achieved if these targets are not achieved, it is planned that the targets will be achieved.</p> <p>If demand for off-site parking in third party facilities increases, expansion to such facilities must be proposed by third parties and approved by local</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>planning authorities – the Applicant does not control any aspect of this.</p> <p>If demand for off-site parking in the form of fly-parking increases due to the airport's expansion, appropriate and proportionate mitigation would be funded by the airport operator. Measures are contained in the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] to mitigate the effect of fly-parking. These include 'supporting the expansion of the residents parking zone to the north of the airport' and 'carrying out feasibility studies on restricted parking zones (RPZs)'. Actioning of these and related measures will be governed through Steering Groups within the Airport Transport Forum, either through the TRIMMA or STF processes. Details on the STF have been shared with CBC and further engagement will take place between deadline 3 and deadline 6.</p>
26	Surface Access	The Council are of the view that the parking assumptions applied, which subsequently feed through to the car driver mode share within the modelling work, and in particular the lack of allowance for any increase in demand for off-site car parking, may underestimate the wider traffic impacts of the expansion, particularly on routes more remote from the airport.	The modelling and the associated proposed mitigation of the growth of airport-related traffic includes an allowance for an increase in demand for off-site parking. Per Table 9.5 of the Transport Assessment [APP-205] , the mode share for off-site parking is forecast to remain broadly the same in each assessment phase; due to the increase in passenger volumes in the same periods, this represents an increase in trips associated with off-site parking.

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
27	Surface Access / Green Controlled Growth	<p>Green Controlled Growth</p> <p>The Council are concerned that, whilst the proposal seeks to provide physical infrastructure to support sustainable transport modes, and this is welcomed, there is concern that the anticipated 45% sustainable transport modal shift may not be fulfilled due to a lack of related investment in services. There are numerous external factors that underpin the scope to fulfil this such as reliance on third parties i.e.: bus and rail operators to provide increased capacity to meet demand.</p>	<p>Whilst a number of potential improvements to bus routes have been identified, it would not be appropriate to secure and commit to funding specific improvements at this stage and further investigation and discussion with operators is required and is ongoing.</p> <p>The improvements being investigated are being developed in tandem with work towards a Sustainable Transport Fund that will set the framework around how these types of improvements alongside the others listed out within the toolbox of measures within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] would be funded.</p>
28	Surface Access	<p>The approach assumes that public transport operators will provide increased capacity in response to the SAS [TR020001/APP/7.12]. This applies to bus, coach, and rail travel. It is not considered that reliance upon commercial operators to meet demand is an appropriate strategic approach to public transport access. In the absence of evidence to substantiate demands for individual route enhancements, it is unclear how improvements would be brought forward.</p>	<p>The Applicant continues to develop more detail around public transport routes to demonstrate the range of potential opportunities for improving public transport access to and from the airport, mapping gaps in current service provision and frequencies. This study is being developed in tandem with a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) that will set the framework around how these types of improvements, alongside the others listed out within the toolbox of measures within the Framework Travel Plan [ASS-131], would be funded. Details on the STF have been shared with CBC and further engagement will take place between deadline 3 and deadline 6.</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>Whilst a number of potential improvements to public transport routes have been identified, it would not be appropriate to secure and commit to funding specific improvements at this stage and further investigation and discussion with operators is required and is ongoing.</p> <p>The improvements being investigated are being developed in tandem with work towards a Sustainable Transport Fund that will set the framework around how these types of improvements alongside the others listed out within the toolbox of measures within the Framework Travel Plan would be funded.</p>
29	Surface Access	<p>Whilst reference is made to a 'toolbox' approach, this is not currently a funded or defined process, nor is there a mechanism for the prioritisation of investment between geographical areas, modes of transport, or means of intervention. The use of terms such as 'explore' and 'consider' would carry little planning weight, as they provide no measurable commitment to implement or fund.</p>	<p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has been developing proposals for a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF), to be used to fund measures identified within the FTP[AS-131].</p> <p>The Applicant has engaged with Host and neighbouring authorities on the governance, source, size and scope of the fund, and the S106 agreement for securing the fund, and is developing further detail within consideration of comments raised. The fund takes the FTP's aspirations and demonstrates the airport's commitment to continuing to deliver sustainable transport improvements. Details on the</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			STF have been shared with CBC and further engagement will take place between deadline 3 and deadline 6.
30	Surface Access	It is unclear why there are no initial targets in the Framework Travel Plan, which it would be expected would accord with the modelling assumptions (as a minimum starting point). Alongside this, there appears to be no funding commitment associated with the Travel Plan.	<p>Whilst the Applicant's plans for the Proposed Development and assessment of its impacts have been developed on the basis of forecasting, in line with relevant guidance and using the best available data, it is inevitable that the future will bring changes which cannot currently be foreseen with certainty.</p> <p>The Covid-19 pandemic and its effects on air travel demand and transport mode choice is a clear, recent example. In this context, it is vital to be prepared with a variety of responses which are adaptable and can be used to enable the airport to remain within the GCG Limits and achieve the Applicant's surface access Targets in the context of an inherently uncertain future.</p> <p>Baseline data for passenger and staff travel has been subject to considerable variation over recent survey years. Therefore, Targets in the first TP post DCO consent will be set with reference to the latest Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) air passenger travel data and the most recent staff survey.</p> <p>Funding response is provided above (ID: 29).</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
31	Surface Access / Green Controlled Growth	<p>The only metric being applied is mode share, as self-reported through passenger and staff surveys. This should be supplemented by empirical data, such as surveys of vehicle numbers entering and exiting the site during peak periods and / or daily. It is understood that the Framework Travel Plan is likely to collect a more detailed set of metrics, and it is the view of the Council that this should feed into the Green Controlled Growth process.</p>	<p>For clarification, where it is stated that mode share is self-reported, that is strictly true in that the Airport Operator would produce the annual Monitoring Report. However, passenger survey data is collected by the CAA as part of its Departing Passenger Survey, and so is independent of the airport. Similarly, regarding the staff travel survey, as stated in paragraph F2.2.1 of the Surface Access Monitoring Plan [APP-224] “The airport operator will be responsible for commissioning a suitably qualified third-party contractor to carry out this survey”. Whilst results are therefore self-reported, the surveys themselves are undertaken by 3rd parties and the underlying monitoring data will be made available to the ESG if requested.</p> <p>It is correct that the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] will collect a more detailed set of monitoring data, and in practice, additional monitoring datasets are already commonplace as part of the day-to-day commercial management and operation of the airport. It is not considered necessary for there to be an explicit requirement for additional data to be included as part of the GCG process, as the proposed monitoring in the Surface Access Monitoring Plan [APP-224] is sufficient to determine whether a Limit or Threshold has been exceeded. However, where a Level 2 Plan or</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>Mitigation Plan is required, the Airport Operator is likely to need to utilise additional data to identify the cause of any exceedance and set out the necessary mitigation to address that issue. Such information could reasonably be expected to be provided within a Level 2 Plan or Mitigation Plan, in order for the Environmental Scrutiny Group to confirm that the proposed actions will avoid or prevent exceedances of a Limit and thus approve the plan.</p>
31	Green Controlled Growth	<p>It appears that controls don't apply if failure is for reasons outside the airport operator's control, as such further expansion is required on this wording to indicate what would be considered outside of the operator's control, for example passenger mode of travel.</p>	<p>Section A4.5 of the Draft ESG Terms of Reference [APP-219] specify the procedure for determining if circumstances beyond the Operator's control have led to the exceedance of a Limit or Threshold, the principles that must be applied when making that determination, and indicative examples. Specifically for surface access, these examples include strikes by public transport operators, or significant engineering work / other disruption to public transport services leading to more car use.</p> <p>Whilst the airport operator is able to make the case that this provision applies, it is ultimately at the discretion of the independent Environmental Scrutiny Group whether to certify or not that these circumstances apply (in accordance with the Terms of Reference).</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
32	Green Controlled Growth	It is acknowledged in the supporting documents that the ESG will impose a cost on Local Authorities but there is no detail on how the supporting technical groups will be funded to ensure an appropriate level of independent technical scrutiny that some Local Authorities may not be able to offer.	<p>The Applicant has already committed to funding a technical expert to sit on each Technical Panel (in addition to the costs associated with the independent chair, independent aviation expert and slot allocation expert on ESG) whose advice will be made available to all local authority members. The technical experts on the Technical Panels will be appointed by the chairperson of ESG to ensure that they are acting impartially in providing this advice.</p> <p>The Applicant is discussing the details of further funding through engagement on Statements of Common Ground with those local authorities that are proposed to form part of the ESG or Technical Panels.</p>
33	Green Controlled Growth	There needs to be further clarity on the thresholds for intervention, the measures that will be introduced if targets are not met and what sanctions are available and how this would be linked to minimising further impacts of the breach in question.	<p>The Level 1 and Level 2 Thresholds for the two surface access Limits are set out in Table 6.1 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework [APP-217]. Given the timescales over which the Proposed Development will be implemented, it is not considered appropriate at this stage to identify specific measures that would need to be introduced were a Level 2 Threshold or Limit exceeded, given the range of potential causes for that exceedance. Instead, the definitions of a Level 2 Plan and Mitigation Plan are set out in Paragraph 18 of Part 3 of Schedule 2 to the Draft Development Consent Order [AS-067]. These are as follows:</p>

I.D	Response Topic	Written Representation (verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Level 2 Plan” means a plan which sets out— (a) details of any proposed actions which are designed to avoid or prevent exceedances of a Limit; and (b) the proposed programme for the implementation of those actions; • “Mitigation Plan” means a plan which sets out— (a) details of the proposed mitigation and actions which are designed to avoid or prevent exceedances of a Limit as soon as reasonably practicable; and (b) the proposed programme for the implementation of that mitigation and those actions. <p>The measures introduced as part of those plans must therefore comply with those requirements, as they relate to either the passenger or staff mode share Limits, and the plans must be approved by the ESG.</p> <p>There are no proposed sanctions where a GCG Limit has been breached; however, the controls on growth mandated under Requirement 24(13) of the draft DCO where a Limit is breached are a significant disincentive to the Airport Operator.</p>