

November 2023

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

**8.107 Applicant's response to Deadline 3 Submissions -
Appendix C LADACAN (REP3-121)**

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.107

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

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

**8.107 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO DEADLINE 3 SUBMISSIONS -
APPENDIX C LADACAN [REP3-121]**

Deadline:	Deadline 4
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/8.107
Author:	Luton Rising

Version	Date	Status of Version
Issue 1	November 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 4

Contents

	Page
Appendix C – LADACAN [REP3-121]	1
References	17

Tables

Table C.1 Applicant’s response to submission by LADACAN at Deadline 3

Appendix C – LADACAN [REP3-121]

Table C.1 Applicant’s response to submission by LADACAN at Deadline 3

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising’s Response
1	GCG	<p>The GCG Explanatory Note (APP-217) Figure 2.9 PDF p35 shows that a period of between one and two years could elapse while the Airport Operator becomes familiar with new processes (paragraphs 2.2.41 – 2.2.46). No such period was necessary for the current permission. Such familiarisation time should not be necessary: significant monitoring obligations currently exist and the Airport Operator would have time to instantiate new arrangements between agreement to permit the DCO (should it be granted) and receipt of permission to commence.</p> <p>APP-217 paragraph 2.2.45 indicates some uncertainty regarding process and timeframes during the Transition period, which would also suggest that the DCO obligations may not be secure.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Actions 20, 21, 24 and 26 and Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action 28: Green Controlled Growth – Transition Period and Slot Allocation Process [TR020001/APP/8.86] submitted at Deadline 4 which responds to this query.</p>
2	Draft DCO	<p>The dDCO contains specific provisions for the protection of the interests of LLAOL, one of which (in Schedule 8 item 19(2)(b)) protects LLAOL’s ability to operate the airport safely and expediently, yet it seems obvious that this ought to be a</p>	<p>The various protective provisions included in schedule 8 are for the respective protection of the identified parties.</p> <p>With regards to the protective provisions provided for the protection of the current airport operator, these reflect the fact that the DCO is being made during the term of an incumbent</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>general protection for any concessionaire, not just LLAOL.</p>	<p>concession holder and so reflect the particular requirements of that operator.</p> <p>Any future arrangement to operate the airport would be the subject of a new agreement, and this would take account of the DCO from the outset.</p>
3	Project Curium	<p>We raised the point about the incomplete Project Curium works to provide a taxiway to link to the eastern end of the runway. It was observed by the Applicant's team in ISH-3 that this work "was not necessary to achieve 18mppa". However, data analysis conducted jointly in 2023 by LADACAN and LLAOL of a full-length runway westerly departure trial showed slight noise reduction for such departures which – were the taxiway extension to have been afforded some priority – serves as an example of potentially sharing benefits with communities rather than simply prioritising decisions for the commercial benefit of the Airport Operator. Therefore, the work should be prioritised</p>	<p>LADACAN's point regarding the potential noise benefits of the proposed Project Curium taxiway link is noted. As stated at paragraph 7.2.3 of the Need Case [AS-125], this eastern taxiway link is due to be completed no later than 2026, as originally planned, and has been included as part of the baseline layout for the Proposed Development.</p>
4	GCG	<p>Under the provisions of APP-217, there are substantial loopholes in the control provisions of the proposed GCG mechanism.... For example:</p>	<p>As outlined in Section 2.2.4 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015], the fundamental principle of the Green Controlled Grow (GCG) Framework is to provide a mechanism which ensures a series of escalating checks are</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>a) para 2.2.8 explains that the airport would routinely be operated above Level 1 Thresholds, hence the Level 1 Thresholds would effectively be meaningless and offer no protection;</p>	<p>implemented as the airport continues to grow and/or when environmental effects increase.</p> <p>The Level 1 Threshold is proposed as the first of these checks, whereby any exceedance of this Threshold would require the airport operator to include commentary in the Monitoring Report on the avoidance of the exceedance of a Limit as part of its annual monitoring and reporting. In effect, this acts as an “early warning” and requires the airport operator to be proactive in monitoring and potentially undertaking early interventions to mitigate any effects of future growth against the potential exceedance of a Level 2 Threshold and ultimately, the Limits. On this basis, the Applicant considers that the Level 1 Threshold exists as the necessary and proportionate first check as part of this approach.</p> <p>This is in contrast to the alternative, in which GCG does not exist. In this alternative case, airport growth would potentially be allowed to occur in an uncontrolled manner, without any proactive measures to monitor or mitigate the increase of environmental effects associated with growth and ultimately avoid an exceedance of the Limits.</p>
5	GCG	<p>b) paras 2.2.13 and 2.2.31 explain that slot allocation (and hence throughput) could increase even if a Level 2 Threshold is breached, which renders that threshold ineffective;</p>	<p>Please refer to the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Actions 20, 21, 24 and 26 and Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action 28: Green Controlled Growth – Transition Period and Slot Allocation Process [TR020001/APP/8.86] submitted at Deadline 4 which responds to this query.</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
6	GCG	c) para 2.6.5 provides no clear and reliable mechanism or immediate timeframe for reduction of issued slots if a Limit were to be breached, so effective control is not achieved;	Please refer to the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Actions 20, 21, 24 and 26 and Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action 28: Green Controlled Growth – Transition Period and Slot Allocation Process [TR020001/APP/8.86] submitted at Deadline 4 which responds to this query.
7	GCG	d) para 2.7.2 explains that breach of a Limit would not be a misdemeanour, but rather the failure to follow the GCG process – the get-out fundamentally undermines enforcement;	<p>As outlined in Section 2.7.1 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015], the fundamental principle of the GCG Framework is to improve the transparency of decision making, including in potential scenarios where Limits have been breached. It is for this reason that the GCG Framework and requirements of the Draft DCO set out the processes that must be followed in this scenario. It is considered that the alternative of including the Limits expressly as DCO requirements and leaving the processes undefined would provide less surety and transparency around the mitigation of environmental effects above Limits.</p> <p>As described in Section 2.7 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015], a breach of the GCG Framework would still constitute a breach of the DCO, enabling statutory planning enforcement to take place under the Planning Act 2008 and so enforcement is not considered to be undermined.</p>
8	GCG	e) paras 2.7.3 and 2.7.6 explain that LBC is still ultimately responsible for enforcement, yet it is known that LBC is financially conflicted and that it did not enforce the previous breaches;	The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding LBC's potential future enforcement role was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 2C of 4 (Non-Statutory Organisations) [REP1-023] pages 235-253.

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>The Applicant would also like to draw attention to conclusions outlined in the P19 Decision Notice regarding LBC's enforcement of previous breaches.</p> <p>The Panel considers enforcement at Paragraphs IR8.109 to IR8.114 and states that in their role as the Local Planning Authority (LPA), LBC have <i>“followed an entirely orthodox, proportionate and lawful approach of responding to the breaches”</i> and that <i>“far from there being any basis for suggesting any improper or less than exacting process of scrutiny of the Airport, the whole history has been characterised by exactly the opposite”</i>.</p>
9	GCG	f) para 2.2.56 explains that Limits cannot be altered to permit materially worse environmental impacts, but the materiality is not defined, so adverse effects could therefore occur.	<p>The Applicant considers this phrase does not need to be defined. The concept of “materiality” in the context of environmental impacts is heavily preceded in the context of DCOs (see, for example, the A57 Link Roads Order 2022).</p> <p>In short, a materially worse environmental effect is either (a) an effect that is significant in EIA terms and has not been reported in the scope of the environmental statement (ES); or (b) an effect that was reported in the ES but in respect of which there is an adverse change in the significance attributed to the effect.</p> <p>The Applicant would note that any change to a Limit would have to be approved by the ESG, and it is therefore considered that there are appropriate safeguards in place to ensure that Limits are not altered improperly.</p>
10	GCG	g) If a Limit can be increased to permit ‘non-materially’ worse environmental impacts, then a series of such ‘salami	Please refer to response I.D. 9 above in regard to materially worse environmental impacts. For the reasons set out above, such an eventuality could not occur.

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		slice' increases could eventually create a material worsening.	
11	GCG	The Limits relate to environmental impacts which are themselves largely dependent upon numbers of flights and numbers of passengers.	<p>Noted. The four environmental topics included within GCG (noise, air quality, surface access and greenhouse gas emissions) have been included for this very reason, as they are the environmental topics that could result in adverse environmental effects, that are most closely correlated with the growth of the airport in terms of passenger numbers and aircraft movements.</p> <p>As a consequence, these are the effects that are subject to greater potential uncertainty over time, as the extent of these effects will change as the airport expands.</p>
12	GCG	The maximum number of flights is ultimately constrained by terminal and runway throughput, but can be limited by the number of slots available to (and used by) airlines. The number of passengers accommodated by those flights depends on the aircraft seating capacity and load factors.	Please refer to the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Actions 20, 21, 24 and 26 and Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action 28: Green Controlled Growth – Transition Period and Slot Allocation Process [TR020001/APP/8.86] submitted at Deadline 4 which responds to this query.
13	GCG	The Airport Operator is in direct control of its declaration of capacity to ACL ahead of each season. Effective oversight therefore has to influence that capacity declaration before it is made, since it is known to be difficult otherwise to regain control, as the experiences of 2016 (forecast breach) and	<p>Noted. The Applicant also notes that Figure 2.10 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015] outlines the links between monitoring, reporting and summer season capacity declarations.</p> <p>Further detail regarding the capacity declaration has also been provided in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Actions 20, 21, 24 and 26 and Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		2017-2019 (worsening breaches) showed.	28: Green Controlled Growth – Transition Period and Slot Allocation Process [TR020001/APP/8.86] which has been developed for Deadline 4 and responds to this query.
14	GCG	The oversight function of the ESG and TPs is therefore compromised by occurring after capacity has been declared, then by the long delay in producing monitoring information (APP-217 fig 2.10) and then further hobbled by the time taken to produce, review and agree a mitigation plan.	<p>The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding the timing of reporting through GCG was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 2C of 4 (Non-Statutory Organisations) [REP1-023] pages 240 to 241, in response to RR-0817.</p> <p>Further detail regarding timings has also been provided in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Actions 20, 21, 24 and 26 and Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action 28: Green Controlled Growth – Transition Period and Slot Allocation Process [TR020001/APP/8.86] submitted at Deadline 4.</p>
15	GCG	Neither the ESG nor the TPs would have access to the noise modelling and fleet forecasting tools and models necessary to double-check the mitigation proposals, so it is unclear on what basis they could confidently assess any mitigation plan put forward by the Airport Operator	<p>It is not necessary for the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) or the Technical Panels (TPs) to have access to the noise modelling tools. The assurance of the noise model is through the annual validation and compliance with Civil Aviation Guidance on noise modelling standards. The annual validation will be undertaken in consultation with the Noise Technical Panel (see paragraph C4.2.1 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix C - Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-023]).</p> <p>As outlined in A4.2.7 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix A – Draft ESG Terms of Reference [REP3-019], the airport operator is required to make underlying monitoring data available to the ESG on a confidential basis at</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>their reasonable request as part of their review of a Monitoring Report. It is expected that the availability of this data will support the ESG and Technical Panels in their review of mitigation plans.</p> <p>The availability of fleet forecasting and other models would be at the discretion of the Aviation Expert on the panel. However, it should be noted that there are no fleet forecasting tools as such, information is simply drawn from that within the public domain, which are open to anyone. Therefore, should the Aviation Expert draw on these sources, they are likely to make this clear.</p>
16	GCG	<p>The ESG/TPs are unlikely to be able to propose or evidence a workable alternative approach to that proposed by the Airport Operator, which further undermines confidence in independent oversight. To evidence this we refer the ExA to REP1-095 Appendix 1 section 6 paras 47-62 inclusive, as a case study in the near-impossibility for an external agency after the event to retrieve a breach situation created by an airport operator releasing too much capacity too soon, and thereby exceeding limits.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the matters outlined in REP1-095 Appendix 1 section 6 paras 47-62 regarding “Failure to control noise” has been addressed in the Noise Envelope – Improvements and Worked Example [REP2-032].</p> <p>Further detail regarding airport capacity and slots has also been provided in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Actions 20, 21, 24 and 26 and Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action 28: Green Controlled Growth – Transition Period and Slot Allocation Process [TR020001/APP/8.86] which has been developed for Deadline 4 and responds to this query.</p>
17	Noise and Vibration	<p>We note that REP2-032 suggests an approach which may have prevented the night-time breaches, though it is silent on whether it would have prevented the subsequent day-time breach in 2019. Such an approach merely exemplifies an</p>	<p>It is not the case that the Noise Envelope – Improvements and Worked Example [REP2-032] document is silent on the 2019 daytime breaches. How the lessons learnt, improvements and approach applied to daytime is outlined in paragraphs 3.1.2, 3.2.6, 4.2.1a, 4.2.6. Also, all of Sections 5.1 and 5.3 (which explicitly</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>internal tool for an airport operator, which also relies on detailed data that would not be available to the ESG/TPs, and is not proposed to be provided.</p>	<p>applies to both day and night), 6.1.4, 6.1.11 and throughout the conclusions in Section 7.</p> <p>The issue raised regarding sharing of noise modelling tools is addressed above in I.D. 15.</p>
18	GCG	<p>The GCG provisions appear to overlook that noise contour models can be used to forecast contours as well as retrospectively to assess them. This capability is currently being used to provide annual contour forecasts to the Airport Operator – as exemplified by the Nov 2016 report by Bickerdike Allen which forecast the 2017 breach and diagnosed it as due to excessive aircraft movements.</p>	<p>It is not the case that the forecast contours are overlooked by Green Controlled Growth (GCG). The GCG Framework explicitly requires the production of forecast noise contours, in addition to the retrospective calculation of contours. See paragraphs 3.2.10 onwards of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015].</p>
19	GCG Noise and Vibration	<p>A suite of monitoring, reporting and noise management provisions is currently secured under the Section 106 Agreement pertaining to Project Curium (details to be provided by LBC in action point; please also see the summary in REP1-095 Appendix 1 section 5 paras 39-46 inclusive).</p> <p>The current monitoring and reporting obligations do not appear to be secured by any provision other than the assurance of the Applicant, which is insufficient. Monitoring and reporting has been</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the issue raised regarding noise controls under the current permission has been answered several times, most recently in Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions (Comments From Interested Parties On Deadline 1 Submission) Appendix A – LADACAN [REP3-060], page 89.</p> <p>Requirements for the airport operator to undertake monitoring and reporting in line with the Green Controlled Growth Framework are outlined and secured within Part 3 – Requirements Pertaining to Green Controlled Growth of Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003].</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>influenced by the diligent work of community representatives on the LLACC and NTSC2 over many years, and it would be appropriate for the continuity, content and regularity of such reporting to be secured under the dDCO, or by an equivalent means, if the existing Section 106 falls away.</p>	
20	Climate change	<p>The Applicant appeared to indicate the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSA) is a carbon trading scheme, but this is not correct. CORSA requires only that any emissions from international aviation above an agreed baseline (currently, the level of aviation emissions in 2019, changing to 85% of the 2019 level of emissions from 2024) be offset through the purchase of credits. CORSA has no trading element and there are fundamental differences between the design and operation of offset schemes and trading schemes</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that both CORSA and the UK ETS are market-based mechanisms designed to control emissions from participating operators.</p> <p>The Applicant is happy to acknowledge that unlike the UK ETS, CORSA is not an emissions trading scheme in that aircraft operators do not trade formal emissions rights. Rather than trading emissions rights as under UK ETS, aircraft operators required to participate in CORSA can buy and sell eligible carbon credits required to offset their emissions above a baseline or specific percentage of the baseline.</p>
21	Climate change	<p>It is likely that the UK ETS will continue operating until at least 2050, whereas CORSA will finish in 2035 and no international agreement has yet been reached on what measure, if any, will replace it.</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that CORSA will operate until 2035, with a special review performed before the end of 2032 regarding the termination of the scheme, its extension, or any other post-2035 improvements. The Applicant acknowledges that there is a degree of uncertainty around whether CORSA in its current form will be extended, or what may replace it.</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>The Applicant notes that in Figure 3 of <i>Jet Zero Illustrative Scenarios and Sensitivities</i>¹, the UK Government provides a number of assumptions affecting Scenario 2: High Ambition representing current government policy around aviation decarbonisation. Among other assumptions, Figure 3 contains projected carbon prices in 2030 and 2050 for both the UK ETS and CORSIA.</p> <p>The fact that a carbon value for CORSIA (or equivalent) can be provided for 2050 indicates that the UK Government expects CORSIA to be extended or replaced with a similar scheme, and it is reasonable for the Applicant to make a similar assumption. Therefore, the Applicant will be led by UK Government's requirements or CORSIA if/when it is extended.</p>
22	Noise and Vibration	<p>We indicated that the average measured air noise of a given aircraft type can change from year to year, and that the noise contour model therefore ought to be validated annually in this respect (as well as for any changes in fleet mix and aircraft tracks) as is currently the case.</p> <p>Evidence provided to the 2022 Inquiry showed that the average air noise for A320ceo aircraft did change year-on-year</p>	<p>The Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-023] was updated at Deadline 3 to confirm that noise modelling will be validated annually.</p>

¹ Department for Transport, 2022. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1096929/jet-zero-strategy-analytical-annex.pdf

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>because its two main operators used different departure procedures which produced different average noise levels at the fixed monitors, and the proportions of A320ceo aircraft flown by each operator switched from low/high to high/low over a 5-year period.</p> <p>Aircraft type noisiness can also change due to fuel weight as a result of being assigned longer or shorter routes, so stage length is relevant as a validation measure, again as per current practice.</p> <p>The Bickerdike Allen contouring validation report for 2019 demonstrates the current approach, and it would be inappropriate to provide reduced validation for the proposed contour modelling.</p> <p>We ask the ExA to agree that contour model validation should at least meet current standards.</p>	
23	GCG	<p>Current noise monitoring and regular 3-monthly reporting is key to enabling informed scrutiny by (for example) the DfT-required LLACC and NTSC, which meet quarterly. The Applicant's proposed Noise Monitoring Plan (APP-221) appears to be a backward step for the following reasons:</p>	<p>a) The Applicant considers the issue raised regarding agreement with the Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) has been answered before, most recently in the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions (Comments From Interested Parties On Deadline 1 Submission) Appendix A – LADACAN [REP3-060], page 75. It is not the case that Noise Action Plans are voluntary, they are a requirement of the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations (Ref 1). The Noise Envelope is a</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>a) C2.1.3: The Noise Envelope was not agreed by the NEDG, and Noise Action Plans are voluntary and have no weight or force since they are not overseen by DEFRA once agreed.</p> <p>b) C2.1.4: The only noise monitoring measures which could trigger action are summer contour areas (C3.2.1), night movements limit (C3.1.3) and passenger limit (though it is unclear if that limit is over any 12-month period as now, or a calendar year). Significant scope for control is lost versus currently consented provisions. We analyse the AS-121 comparison in section 3.7.</p> <p>c) C2.1.5: Demand is likely to spread to other times of year, which have no noise protection.</p> <p>d) C2.1.6: Clarity is required over whether another noise model will be set up – see Annex C1 – but as per C4.2.1 this is proposed only to be validated against air noise data every 5 years.</p> <p>e) C2.1.7-8: These commitments are meaningless since communities and stakeholders have no executive power, neither does an Airport Consultative Committee: each can be disregarded if the Airport Operator so chooses.</p>	<p>separate requirement to Noise Action Plans and is secured through the Green Controlled Growth Framework.</p> <p>b) The Applicant also considers the issue raised regarding the use of noise contour area limits as the indicator in the Noise Envelope has been answered before most recently in Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions (Comments From Interested Parties On Deadline 1 Submission) Appendix A – LADACAN [REP3-060], page 64. The passenger limit is per annum, i.e., in any 12 month period, as specified in Requirement 26 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003]. It is not agreed that control is lost compared to the current consent. The Noise Envelope has been designed to improve upon the existing noise control regime and to effectively prevent breaches from occurring. This is set out in the Comparison of Consented and Proposed Operational Noise Controls [AS-121] which provides a direct comparison between the current and proposed operational noise controls, noting that the Noise Envelope provides several enhancements to the current consented noise controls. Those enhancements are designed to prevent breaches before they occur, such as independent scrutiny and oversight, increased transparency, adaptive mitigation and management plans and noise Limit reviews. Improvements have been made to the Noise Envelope since submission, and a worked example has been provided that can be used to reasonably conclude that the Noise Envelope would have avoided the historic breaches that occurred in 2017-2019,</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>f) C3.1.1: The key need is to monitor performance versus Thresholds, yet this is missing, and I is meaningless.</p> <p>g) C3.1.4: Talks of noise management targets, yet these are not specified.</p> <p>h) (sl(e) above)</p> <p>i) C4.1.6: As highlighted above the obligation to produce the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) appear to fall away under the DCO, and no new AMR or its contents appear to be secured.</p> <p>j) C4.2.2: There is no obligation to improve noise monitoring – just “if necessary” in LLAOL’s view.</p> <p>k) I1.1(c): This needs to specify the intended limits and reduction over time.</p> <p>l) C6.1.1(d) iv-ix : A fixed E/W modal split may prove inappropriate as a basis for noise modelling particularly as worsening climate change may affect the split.</p> <p>m) Annex C1 (i): Population counts are likely to change during the period up to 2043.</p> <p>n) Annex C1 (j): It is unclear which user defined metrics are being referred to</p> <p>We recommend the ExA requests comparison between currently secured</p>	<p>see Noise Envelope – Improvements and Worked Example [REP2-032].</p> <p>c) The Noise Envelope contour area limits use the 92-day summer period of 16th June to 15th September to reflect when the airport is at its busiest and when people tend to open windows and use gardens and open space more frequently. The use of 92-day summer period is in line with standard practice, aviation noise policy (Ref 2) and guidance from the Civil Aviation Authority (Ref 3, Ref 4). There are controls outside of the 92-day summer period from the passenger cap and the movement limit in the night quota period (23:30 – 06:00) which are both annual. Ultimately, the fact of a constraint on the peak period of the year acts as a limitation to growth as the market for services in the rest of the year.</p> <p>d) The Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix C - Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-024] makes clear in paragraph C4.1.2 and Annex C1 that the Noise Model for demonstrating compliance with the GCG/Noise Envelope Limits and Thresholds (“The DCO Noise Model”) should be consistent with the model used for the noise assessment presented in Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003]. The Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix C - Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-024] has been updated to commit to annual noise model validation, see paragraph C4.2.1.</p> <p>e) It is not agreed that reporting and engaging with communities and stakeholders is meaningless. Stakeholder</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>monitoring and reporting obligations for noise impact parameters, and what would be secured in the Application.</p>	<p>engagement is important regardless of whether communities have 'executive power'.</p> <p>f) Monitoring performance against Thresholds (as well as the Limits) is a fundamental part of the annual Monitoring Reports secured through Green Controlled Growth, see for example paragraph C4.1.6 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix C - Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-024] and paragraphs 2.2.6 to 2.2.21 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015].</p> <p>g) This is in reference to voluntary noise management targets that are over and above the specified Limits and Thresholds. These are not specified now and should remain flexible according to the current situation of the airport.</p> <p>h) See response to e).</p> <p>i) Paragraph C1.1.2 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix C - Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-024] is clear that there is an obligation to undertake annual monitoring and reporting through paragraph 21 of Schedule 2 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003]</p> <p>j) The current noise monitoring terminals comply with CAA guidance with respect to noise model validation. Further information on when and how updates to noise monitoring terminals would be made has been provided in the Applicant's response to Written Questions - Green Controlled Growth (GCG) [TR020001/APP/8.72] in response to Written Question GCG.1.2.</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 3 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			<p>k) The Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix C - Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-024] will be updated at Deadline 5 to specify the limits and reduction over time.</p> <p>l) The use of fixed modal splits is standard practice and is advocated by the Civil Aviation Authority (Ref 5) and the Noise Envelope Design Group (Noise Envelope Design Group Interim and Final Reports, see Environmental Statement – Appendix 16.2 Operational Noise Management (Explanatory Note) [APP-111]). Contour areas using the actual modal split will also be reported annually, see Section C7 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix C - Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-024].</p> <p>m) Changes in population would be accounted for in the annual reporting of population within noise contour bands (see Section C7 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix C - Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan [REP3-024]).</p> <p>n) This is stated in the referenced sentence – the user defined metrics are $L_{Aeq,16h}$ and $L_{Aeq,8h}$. They are called user defined metrics as AEDT is a piece of software produced by the United States Federal Aviation Authority and so does not come with the UK specific $L_{Aeq,16h}$ and $L_{Aeq,8h}$ metrics predefined.</p>

REFERENCES

Ref 1 Her Majesty's Stationery Office (2006), The Environmental Noise (England) Regulations.

Ref 2 Her Majesty's Stationery Office (2013), The Aviation Policy Framework.

Ref 3 Civil Aviation Authority (2021), CAP1506 Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014: Aircraft Noise and Annoyance, Second Edition

Ref 4 Civil Aviation Authority (2021), CAP2161: Survey of Noise Attitudes 2014: Aircraft Noise and Sleep Disturbance

Ref 5 Civil Aviation Authority (2017); CAP1616a: Airspace Design: Environmental Requirements Technical Annex.