



**CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL RESPONSE TO ACTION POINTS
ARISING FROM ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARINGS**

LONDON LUTON AIRPORT EXPANSION DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

1. Introduction

This document sets out the response of CBC to the action points from ISH2, ISH5 and ISH6 required by the Examining Authority for Deadline 4 in relation to the Development Consent Order for the proposed expansion of London Luton Airport by Luton Rising.

2. Response to Action Points

2.1 Issue Specific Hearing 2

Action Point 2 – Dr Smith to review report and engage in further dialogue with Applicant following comments from Ms Congdon

2.1.1 Dr Smith prepared a response to the Applicant's 'Response to Chris Smith Aviation Consultancy Limited - Initial Review of DCO Need Case for the Host Authorities' [REP2-042]. An advanced draft of this response was shared with the Applicant on 17th October 2023. The Applicant indicated it would not be able to deal with this before Deadline 4 and intended to submit a reply to it at Deadline 6. Chris Smith Aviation Consultancy Limited (CSACL) response, CSACL-003 is now submitted to the Examining Authority (ExA) (submitted by Hertfordshire County Council on behalf of all Host Authorities).

2.1.2 The issues between the Applicant and CSACL primarily relate to the timing of need, influenced by the passenger-handling capacities of Heathrow and Gatwick. The Applicant has indicated that it would not be changing its assessment of the capacities of these airports.

2.1.3 This Action Point was triggered by a discussion of the Applicant's development of a Hybrid scenario for one additional runway in the London area at either Heathrow or Gatwick, but with the airport not being specified. Ms Congdon stated at Issue Specific Hearing 2 that the Applicant had "...split the difference..." between the two airports to create the Hybrid. Dr Smith had previously been told that no arithmetic relationship had been used, and the Hybrid was based on judgement alone. Ms Congdon has subsequently confirmed to Dr Smith that the correct information had originally been given to Dr Smith that the Hybrid was based on judgement alone, so that there is no need to alter this aspect of Dr Smith's report to the Host Authorities.

2.1.4 Discussions are ongoing between Dr Smith on behalf of all Host Authorities and Ms Congdon.

2.2 Issue Specific Hearing 5

Action Point 3 – Provide comment on measurable targets and specific measures to be included in the dust management plan

2.2.1 This action point has been discussed with the Council's Public Protection Team and this is considered less of a concern for Central Bedfordshire, so no further comment is provided.

Action Point 13 – Provide information to Applicant regarding a single previous incidence of suspected fuel dumping referenced by Mr Pitman

2.2.2 Whilst this action point is addressed to the Joint Host Local Authorities, it is a Hertfordshire matter, so no further comment is provided.

2.3 Issue Specific Hearing 6

Action Point 31 – Councils – provide a response on suitability of the Design Principles Document [APP-225]

2.3.1 The Applicant has sought to engage with CBC on the Design Principles in advance of Deadline 4, however this has not been possible, so no detailed engagement has taken place to date. A meeting is scheduled for early November 2023, and it is considered that this would have been beneficial in enabling CBC to respond to the action point.

Nonetheless, a review of the Design Principles document has been undertaken. The document is currently high-level and does not provide sufficient detail. Special consideration must be given to the sensitive nature of the land to the south and west that are historic landscapes of significant value, as demonstrated by the designation of Luton Hoo RPG as Grade II*, and subsequently sensitive to change. Particular emphasis needs to be given to visually prominent elements that are visible from Luton Hoo RPG and Someries Castle. As highlighted in the CBC LIR, minimising the visual impact is imperative and needs to be sensitive in terms of the colour, material finish of the buildings, reflective nature of materials, treatment of car parks, lighting etc.

The location of solar panels must also be incorporated into the Design Principles document as these could impact on the sensitivity of the landscape, notably with respect to multi-storey Car Park P1 where roof mounted PV panels are proposed (as per the Glint and Glare study (AS-146)). The panels are likely to be south-facing to maximise their efficiency but there is concern this would be inappropriate due to the sensitivities of the landscape around Luton Hoo RPG.

It is acknowledged that this is a working document and CBC welcome opportunities to discuss amendments to the document. Additionally, ISH6 Action Point 31 requires the Applicant to consider the need for a Design Code and this response will be provided at Deadline 4. CBC support the provision of a Design Code in principle and welcome the opportunity to engage on this after Deadline 4.

3. Other Considerations

At deadline 3, CBC indicated that feedback would be provided on the Glint and Glare Study (as set out in CBCs Response to the Applicant's Comments on CBCs LIR – REP3-084). This is a high-level document indicating the provision of solar panels either roof mounted or ground level provision. As the presence of solar panels has not been included in the landscape visuals there is concern that full consideration of the impact on long distance views from Someries Castle and Luton Hoo RPG have not been considered. There is insufficient information to enable a full assessment of the impact. CBC consider that solar panels on the roof of multi-storey car park P1 would be detrimental to the sensitive landscape around Luton Hoo RPG, exacerbating the visual impact when the car park is viewed from Luton Hoo Estate and Luton Hoo Mansion House, as demonstrated by Viewpoints 18 and 17A, respectively. The

Applicant has not identified any mitigation measures and as per the Applicant's Post Hearing Submission for ISH6 (REP3-053) '*it is not recommended to screen new development within a designed landscape with additional planting.*' As such, CBC consider that the provision of solar panels on Car Park P1 should be removed from the proposal.