

November 2023

# London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

**8.114 Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions  
Appendix B - Dacorum Borough Council, Hertfordshire County  
Council & North Hertfordshire Council (Response to D3  
Documents) (REP4-163)**

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.114

**The Planning Act 2008**

**The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010**

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

---

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO DEADLINE 4 SUBMISSIONS  
APPENDIX B - DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL, HERTFORDSHIRE  
COUNTY COUNCIL & NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE COUNCIL  
(RESPONSE TO DEADLINE 3 DOCUMENTS) [REP4-163]**

---

<b>Deadline:</b>	Deadline 5
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:</b>	TR020001
<b>Document Reference:</b>	TR020001/APP/8.114
<b>Author:</b>	Luton Rising

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Issue 1	November 2023	Additional Submission - Deadline 5

# Contents

---

	Page
<b>Appendix B – Dacorum Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council &amp; North Hertfordshire Council (Responses to Deadline 3 Documents [REP4-163]</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>12</b>

## Tables

Table 1.1 Applicant's response to submission by Dacorum Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council & North Hertfordshire Council at Deadline 4

## Appendix B – Dacorum Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council & North Hertfordshire Council (Responses to Deadline 3 Documents [REP4-163])

Table 1.1 Applicant's response to submission by Dacorum Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council & North Hertfordshire Council at Deadline 4

1.1.1 Please also see **Appendix A Luton Borough Council (Response to D3 Documents)** for responses to the Host Authorities comments on ISH1, ISH2 and ISH3 post hearing submissions [TR020001/APP/8.114].

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
1	Surface Access	<p>Matters raised</p> <p>Off-site Highway Works at three junctions in Hitchin.</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The works proposed at the three junctions in Hitchin are relatively minor highway capacity based solutions. The Host Authorities have ongoing concerns that the proposals do not meet their policy requirements in terms of providing for sustainable travel (active travel and public transport) in relation to their Growth Transport Plan (GTP) and also that a larger more expensive scheme will not be possible if it is not developed at the planning stage because additional funding may not be available or would be competitive through the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF), and therefore an enhanced scheme may not be delivered.</p> <p>Active travel enhancements are likely to reduce the traffic capacity and need to be modelled accordingly as part of the Transport Assessment, rather than developed in more detail at a later stage, e.g., A602/B656 Hitchin Hill Roundabout where increasing the flow capacity will increase the peak traffic flows in the A505 and B656 through Hitchin, exacerbating congestion and reducing bus service reliability within Hitchin. A signalised junction improvement to reduce congestion at Hitchin Hill roundabout would also provide the opportunity for improved pedestrian crossing/active travel facilities and improved bus journey time reliability. At Pirton Road roundabout a signalised junction scheme could be preferable to provide improved opportunity for crossing facilities. These options are not considered in the current proposals.</p> <p>Furthermore, the mitigations proposed at all three junctions do not assist with prioritising buses (i.e., shortening and/or reducing variability in bus journey times), which is essential to achieving modal shift targets for Luton Rising and HCC. The Host Authorities are also still awaiting further information on the "potential traffic management / traffic calming schemes" at locations in Hertfordshire, these will need to be tested with local communities, designed and costed in order to ensure they are deliverable if and when required, and not contingent on funding being available in the STF.</p> <p>The Host Authorities look forward to understanding the airport traffic impacts and the effect of the proposed mitigation by considering the queues, delay and ratio of flow to capacity in more detail for each scenario as per the ExA request for the additional traffic analysis which is expected at Deadline 4.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding the proposed mitigation measures within Hitchin and LTP4 compliance was answered within the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 2A of 4 [REP1-021]</b> pages 229 and 231, in response to RR-0558, RR-1119, and RR-0297.</p> <p>With regard to the Growth Transport Plan (GTP), the current proposals for the A602/B656 Hitchin Hill Roundabout will significantly reduce delays through the junction as well as queues on the A602 corridor which should reduce congestion and improve bus reliability when compared to the future baseline condition.</p> <p>The GTP aspiration for the A602/B656 Hitchin Hill Roundabout is described in SM47 Package 5 and would seek to upgrade the junction to a signalised junction. The GTP also includes an aspiration to signalise the Pirton Road roundabout (SM48 Package 5). No further details are provided with respect to the design and deliverability of the schemes for either junction however the Applicant believes that the current DCO proposals would not preclude the authority from developing proposals at these locations.</p> <p>Whilst the proposals associated with the Application are currently delivered in conjunction with Assessment Phase 2a, the Applicant has set out an approach to monitor the Airport impacts through the TRIMMA and the Applicant will continue to engage with the highway authority to support the development of measures which address both the impact of the airport and meet local needs in conjunction with the TRIMMA monitoring. Please see the <b>Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (OTRIMMA) [REP4-085]</b> which was issued at Deadline 4.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the issue raised regarding the potential locations of traffic management measures was answered within the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 2A of 4 [REP1-021]</b> page 233, in response to RR-0558, RR-1119, and RR-0297.</p>
2	Surface Access	<p>Matters raised</p> <p>Opportunity to introduce other locations into the TRIMMA.</p>	<p>The Applicant will be responsible for monitoring associated with 'Offsite Highway Works' contained in Schedule 1 of the DCO' (defined as 'Mitigation Type 1' (MT1)</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Host Authorities are concerned that the TRIMMA sites in Hertfordshire may not be adequate to capture the travel demand associated with the airport via rural routes. The Host Authorities understand the Applicant's position there will be an opportunity to introduce additional locations for monitoring in Hertfordshire through the TRIMMA, which will be part of the Airport Transport Forum (ATF) and that a steering group will be set up for the TRIMMA. The Host Authorities are concerned that the level of governance around the ATF has not adequately been set out – and require that additional core monitoring sites in Hertfordshire need to be identified and locked in from the start with the ability for further additional sites to be added on a needs basis later on through the ATF. The Host Authorities welcome further information to confirm the sites that are included and to enable them to propose additional sites for further consideration by the Applicant. As a starting point we have identified 6 additional sites which would benefit from the airport ANPR monitoring</p>	<p>in the updated <b>Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (OTRIMMA) [REP4-085]</b> which was issued at Deadline 4.</p> <p>This responsibility includes the definition and delivery of the monitoring survey, which is outlined in the aforementioned document and which will initially be completed following the serving of the 'notice to grow' pursuant to article 44(1) of the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes appropriate representations to shape the definition of the monitoring survey and intends to engage on this matter with the relevant highway authorities as part of ongoing SoCG discussions in advance of deadline 6.</p>
3	Surface Access	<p>Matters raised</p> <p>Future rail capacity.</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Host Authorities remain concerned that the impact of the airport on the rail capacity at stations in Hertfordshire is not covered in a sufficient level of detail in the Transport Assessment to be able to understand the impacts on existing passengers and capacity. The Applicant in its submission refers to the physical capacity of the DART station / Luton Airport Parkway but does not confirm that the stations on the line can accommodate the forecast additional peak hours trips. The assessment of capacity to date has been based on the available capacity per train on the routes, not in relation to specific sections of the route or stations. Hertfordshire is still concerned that the Hertfordshire stations are already at capacity for some journeys and the development will have an impact on existing passengers alongside general growth back to pre-pandemic levels [REP2-058, RR-0558, RR-1119, RR-0297].</p> <p>Noted that Network Rail is looking at capacity issues for the appropriate deadline which will assist with Host Authorities formulating a view on this if their assessment is related to station capacity.</p>	<p>With regards to rail capacity please see the Applicants response to OFH Action 20 – <b>Rail Capacity Report [TR020001/APP/8.121]</b> submitted at deadline 5.</p>
4	Surface Access	<p>Matters raised</p> <p>Discussions with bus and coach operators.</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Host Authorities have ongoing concerns about the development proposals not providing for the new and enhanced east-west bus services and public transport links from the outset to influence travel behaviour. The proposals associated with improved bus and coach operations has not been detailed in the transport assessment to provide assurance that the services will be funded and provided for airport passengers and staff accessing the airport from the east and that sufficient consideration has been given in terms of the mode share targets. The Applicant references the importance of the East-West public transport links but is not making any proposals or provision for this from the outset. The Host Authorities still have concerns that the timing of the</p>	<p>The Applicant has developed a <b>Bus and Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122]</b>, submitted at Deadline 5, identifying gaps in provision and potential new/improved services that could receive financial support through the Sustainable Transport Fund.</p> <p>The provision of bus and coach services is not within the Applicant's direct control, but there will be engagement with relevant parties through the Airport Transport Forum (ATF). New / improved routes need to be evidenced to be commercially viable in the longer term to receive funding support from the transport operator. These routes can be considered for funding through the STF. See Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4, Action 26 - <b>Sustainable Transport Fund - TR020001/APP/8.119</b>.</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) is not appropriate for providing pump-priming for bus services and that the size of the funding pot through the STF will not be sufficient to provide support for long enough (Updated Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement, REP 2-058, Hertfordshire County Council Relevant Representation RR-0558, North Hertfordshire District Council Relevant Representation RR-1119, Dacorum Borough Council Relevant Representation RR-0297). It is unlikely that the new bus services could be commercially operated from the outset so they would need funding support.</p> <p>Hertfordshire County Council has provided additional information to Arup on bus service gaps in Hertfordshire and aspirations for bus service improvements as set out in our adopted local transport plan documents (Growth and Transport Plans) as part of ongoing discussions around the SoCG. Further discussion and negotiation around this is still required with The Applicant.</p>	<p>It is proposed that every five years post-consent, the Applicant will commission a market study of bus and coach services accessing the airport to ensure that opportunities for new or improved services are identified and reported to the ATF and ATF Steering Group. This will gauge the interest and planned services of bus and coach operators, as well as the propensity of travel behaviour change for conurbations within the airport's catchment, as the Proposed Development is delivered.</p> <p>The Applicant would consider pump priming routes to improve their commercial viability if they are shown to be the appropriate routes to improve connectivity to the airport.</p>
5	Surface Access	<p>Matters raised</p> <p>Bus mode share &amp; staff bus usage</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>Staff mode share improvement is cited with reference to improving bus/coach mode share which, post-pandemic, is still 6% behind the pre-pandemic levels. The evidence to support how this mode share can be increased by bus / coach from the east-west is not detailed sufficiently in the Transport Assessment to be able to ensure that sufficient funding through the STF will be in place to pump-prime the services potentially over a long timeframe (Updated Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary Statement, REP 2-058, Hertfordshire County Council Relevant Representation RR-0558, North Hertfordshire District Council Relevant Representation RR-1119, Dacorum Borough Council Relevant Representation RR-0297).The Applicant should provide more detail on the services that will be provided and the expected level of funding available for these.</p>	<p>The Applicant has developed a <b>Bus and Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122]</b>, submitted at Deadline 5, identifying gaps in provision and potential new/improved services that could receive financial support from the future Travel Plans through the Sustainable Transport Fund.</p>
6	Air Quality / GCG	<p>The Applicant's response on lag time on the one hand seems to imply that monitoring results would be reviewed only annually with several months lag time before any action is confirmed, but on the other hand that "...the airport's operator will then essentially have early warning of any problems associated with air quality..." The Host Authorities would request the Applicant advises the ExA on what mechanism would be put in place to alert the operator of a potential problem, and how this would work if monitoring results are only to be reviewed once per year. As the Host Authorities have suggested in their Issue Specific Hearing 5 post-hearing submission [REP3-096], this could be achieved by continuous monitoring of rolling annual mean concentrations – rather than annual means for each calendar year. Responses on monitoring Thresholds and lag time in reporting do not adequately address concerns previously expressed in Paragraphs 7.4.10 and 7.7.15 of the Local Impact Report [REP1A-003].</p>	<p>The Applicant proposes that monitoring data to be open source, much like its existing monitoring data from the air quality monitoring station at Wigmore Valley Park. Therefore, near real-time monitoring data will be available to the operator and the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) to allow continuous review of the monitoring results throughout the year to allow for an early warning. It will be in the interests of the airport operator to monitor air quality throughout the year and to take action where risks of exceedances are identified in order to avoid reporting the breach of a Limit and associated restrictions on airport growth.</p> <p>However, the monitoring report will be produced annually which will provide the final ratified annual results, which will inform the decision for whether action via the GCG process is required, This does not preclude any actions that the operator may well decide to take in light of an early warning.</p>
7	Cultural heritage	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Tranquillity as a component of the setting of Registered parks and gardens.</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that quietness can make an important contribution to the setting of a cultural heritage asset; however, that quietness may not be a key factor in its historic significance. The assessment presented in the Environmental Statement <b>Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage [AS-077]</b> provides an assessment on an asset by asset basis as to whether quietness is a factor in the understanding and appreciation of significance. Where quietness has been</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Paragraph 8.1.11 states that St Paul's Walden Bury would experience "a negligible change to the park's noise environment, which would result in imperceptible change to the park's setting and would result in no harm to its heritage significance." The assessment is further outlined at paras 8.1.14 which states that change 'could be noticeable' and para 8.1.15 which states "Aviation noise from overhead aircraft is already a component of St Paul's Walden Bury RPG's setting" (again noting that the Applicant has treated the park and garden as a whole, including all of the individual heritage assets located within the park and garden). It is also acknowledged in Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage of the ES [AS-077]) that there would be 'a noise increase from the future baseline [...] which would be a negligible change.' However, as guidance makes clear even where this tranquillity has been impacted by later developments (e.g., from aircraft noise), there is still the potential for the Proposed Development to further detract from that setting. As Historic England's Good Practice Advice Note 3, The Setting of Heritage Assets, (2017) notes of cumulative change: "Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development affecting its setting, to accord with NPPF policies consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset."</p> <p>This also relates to the issue of 'quietness' at Paragraph 10.7.44 of Good Practice Advice Note 3 which refers to registered parks and gardens specified at Paragraph 10.7.43, including the Grade II* Knebworth Registered Park and Garden. Further information or explanation is needed. to clarify these overall assessments.</p>	<p>identified as being a factor, the impact of any changes to this significance have been assessed.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the setting of heritage assets can be impacted by an increase in an existing situation, for example the increase in noise already experienced from aircraft movements. The assessment presented in the Environmental Statement <b>Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage [AS-077]</b> includes a cumulative assessment of impacts caused by the increase in noise as a result of the Proposed Development.</p>
8	Landscape	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Updates to the photomontages to be addressed by the Applicant.</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>Viewpoint parameters are still not present on the figure template as required by Landscape Institute guidance and explained further in the Issue Specific Hearing (ISH 6) Post Hearing Submission Note [REP3- 097].</p>	<p>Position of photographs and angle of view etc are provided in the following: <b>5.02 Environmental Statement - Appendix 14.6 - Winter and Summer Viewpoint Photography Viewpoints [AS-088 – AS-095]</b>.</p> <p>Cross referencing from these documents to <b>5.02 Environmental Statement - Appendix 14.7 Accurate Visual Representations [AS-037-AS-041]</b> has been undertaken to minimise duplication of information. The Landscape Institute guidance referred to (assumed to be the Landscape Institute's TGN-06-19 on visual representations (Ref 1) does not preclude cross-referencing to other documents.</p>
9	Landscape	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Discussion relating to the accuracy of the visualisations and how they are used in the LVIA.</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The latest photomontages in Appendix 14.7 of the Accurate Visual Representative Viewpoints [REP3-012] still show winter views of deciduous hedge with full leaf cover. Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) based on winter views should illustrate proposed vegetation in a predominantly defoliated state. Although the Applicant states that the photomontages are 'illustrative' the scale of any proposed vegetation should be accurate. The Host Authorities request that the AVRs are updated to illustrate an appropriate state of seasonal leaf cover.</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider it necessary to provide additional AVR's showing the proposed vegetation in a predominantly defoliated state. The illustrative views/photomontages of the vegetation provided enable the effects of introducing this planting into these views to be understood.</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
10	Draft DCO	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Use of the terms “paragraph” and “sub-paragraph”</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>Requirements 23(3) and 24(2) use the phrase “This paragraph applies...”. whereas the corresponding provisions in requirement 23(1) and 24(1) refer to circumstances unless “subparagraph” (3) or (2) applies. The Applicant is requested to review to ensure clarity and consistency of drafting.</p>	<p>The Applicant has reviewed the use of the terms “paragraph” and “sub-paragraph” and has updated, as appropriate, the draft DCO submitted at deadline 5.</p>
11	Draft DCO	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Use of “substantially in accordance with” and “reflect”</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Host Authorities note that there remains a significant number of provisions that require submissions of detailed documents to be “substantially in accordance with” the outline documents certified under the draft Order. The Host Authorities note the explanation in Table 1.1 to the Applicant's Post Hearing Submission from ISH1 [REP3-048] that “in accordance” is used where compliance is required with a final or approved document and “substantial accordance” is used in relation to outline documents. The Host Authorities consider that greater certainty would be provided by ensuring a consistent standard of conformity (i.e. “in accordance with”). Furthermore, the Host Authorities are not clear on the justification for the use of “reflect” in requirement 16(2).</p>	<p>The draft DCO submitted at deadline 4 [REP4-003] included revised drafting to relevant requirements removing the reference to ‘substantially’ where appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant's position when it is appropriate to refer to ‘in accordance with’ or ‘substantially in accordance’ remains as stated in its Post Hearing Submission from ISH1 [REP3-048]. It is appropriate to refer to “in accordance” where compliance is required with a final or approved document as the expectation is that compliance should follow the terms of the approved document.</p> <p>It is appropriate, however, to refer to ‘substantially in accordance’ when used in relation to outline documents as is legitimate and necessary to allow a limited amount of flexibility when referring to a draft document which will inform the structure and content of the final document. Such final documents are approved in writing by the relevant authority so appropriate safeguards are provided to ensure that the final document properly reflects the intent and purpose of the draft.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the reference to ‘reflect’ in requirement 16(2) was changed to ‘substantially in accordance with’ in the version of the draft DCO submitted at deadline 4 [REP4-003].</p>
12	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>The Host Authorities [RR-0558, RR1119 and RR-0297] queried the proposed traffic calming locations. The Applicants' response that the locations were informed by the outputs from the Strategic Model based on change in AADT with and without the development. The Applicant stressed that locations of traffic calming are indicative and will work with the local authorities to identify traffic management proposals subject to TRIMMA.</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Host Authorities are keen to ensure that their network is sufficiently protected and mitigated from the additional traffic associated with the development and access to the airport from the east. The Host Authorities would like to see further details of the modelling outputs to understand the wider forecast traffic increases within their network [REP 2-058, RR-0558, RR-1119, RR-0297]. The supplementary traffic distribution plots will assist with this, as set out in Table 1.1, Action 4 of the Applicant's Post Hearing Submission – Issue Specific Hearing 4 [REP3-051].</p>	<p>The Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report <b>7.02 Transport Assessment Appendices – Part 2 of 3, Appendix F Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report [APP-201]</b> provides further information on access to and from the east of the airport.</p> <p>Para. 7.4.5 states ‘<i>there are forecast to be traffic flow increases on rural routes to the east of Luton towards the A1(M) to the south of the A505,</i>’.</p> <p>Para. 7.4.6 states ‘<i>These forecast flow increases on rural routes to the east of Luton are due to the additional connectivity provided by the AAR to the east of Luton, resulting in these routes being forecast to be more attractive than the alternative A505 route to / from Hitchin and the A1(M)</i>’.</p> <p>The forecast increases are illustrated in Figure 5.3 and 5.4.</p>



I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
13	Green Controlled Growth Framework	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Table 4.1.... The table gives details of all Air Quality monitoring sites proposed by the Applicant.</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The table should include additional monitoring sites very close to the airport perimeter to enable airport source contributions to be more clearly 'visible' when analysing the monitoring data. See Page 14 Issue Specific Hearing 5 post-hearing submission [REP3-096].</p>	<p>As outlined at Paragraph 7.13.2 of <b>Chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement [AS-076]</b>, operational monitoring is described in the <b>Outline Operational Air Quality Plan [APP-065]</b>, secured through Requirement 31 of the <b>Draft Development Consent Order [REP4-003]</b>. The Outline Operational Air Quality Plan states at Paragraph 2.8.4 that there is a commitment to continue the current Luton Rising air quality monitoring beyond 2043 and undertake annual air quality monitoring results to be available to the public and the local authority.</p> <p>The locations of current air quality monitoring locations are detailed in <b>Environmental Statement Appendix 7.2: Air Quality Baseline Data [APP-062]</b> at Table 1.1 and Table 1.6. This includes both automatic and diffusion tube monitoring sites within the airport boundary and close to the airport perimeter. This data is available for the airport to use in analysis of GCG monitoring data to facilitate the investigation of airport contributions to a limit exceedance.</p>
14	Green Controlled Growth Framework	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>"...if legal Limits or interim targets change, this will trigger a review of GCG Air Quality Limits and Thresholds. It is proposed that this review should be carried out (...) within six months of the new legal Limits being published ..."</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>It is noted that the statement has been amended from "... new legal Limits coming into force..." to "...being published...". But what does this actually mean? The statement should be amended to be clear that a review will be carried out when the Government publishes its intention to introduce new legal Limits or targets, and the review will be concluded in advance of these coming into force.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the points raised in this response have been addressed in the Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 5 Action Point 18 on page 35 of the <b>Applicant's response to Deadline 4 Hearing Actions [REP4-070]</b>.</p>
15	Green Controlled Growth Framework	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Such a review cannot introduce new pollutants to the GCG Framework."</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>This additional statement is not acceptable to the Host Authorities as it rules out potential future regulations for ultra-fine particulate matter for which airport related vehicle and aircraft operations are known sources.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to the points raised previously – please refer to the Applicant's response to GCG.1.11 on pages 7-8 of the <b>Applicant's response to Written Questions – Green Controlled Growth (GCG) [REP4-058]</b>.</p>
16	Green Controlled Growth Framework	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>"This review will consider the appropriateness and practicality of revising the Air Quality Limits and Thresholds to align with the new UK legal Limits (or interim targets); however, there will be no absolute requirement to do so."</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>This apparent lack of commitment is considered unacceptable to the Host Authorities. How can the Applicant justify not revising the GCG Air Quality Limits and Thresholds in the event of new legal Limits/targets?</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to the points raised previously – please refer to the Applicant's response to GCG.1.11 on pages 7-8 of the <b>Applicant's response to Written Questions – Green Controlled Growth (GCG) [REP4-058]</b>.</p>
17	Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note / Air Quality	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>"GCG will therefore ensure a proactive approach to managing environmental effects, with Limits applying in four key areas: (...) b. Air quality"</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the lag time in obtaining, analysing and reporting on data will be the same regardless of whether a calendar year or rolling annual concentration is used for the purposes of GCG, as in both cases the airport operator will be required to collect and report on a full year of data. Using a rolling</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>In relation to air quality, the Host Authorities contest that the GCG framework does not ensure a proactive approach to managing environmental effects [REP1-069, para 2.2.15.1.1, 2.2.15.1.3 and page 72] - especially given the long lag time in obtaining, analysing and reporting on data for each calendar year [REP3-096, page 14]. A better approach would be to set the Level 1 and 2 Thresholds for rolling annual mean concentrations REP3-096, page 14] and initiate investigation and appropriate action when triggered by the continuous monitoring. Furthermore, Thresholds for shortterm concentrations should also be set to ensure that emissions can be managed effectively so as to avoid causing acute health effects [REP1A003, para 7.7.14].</p>	<p>annual average in this way would make the GCG process less efficient, as at present the Airport Operator is only required to submit a single annual Monitoring Report to the ESG and Technical Panels for consideration, with the timings associated with this aligned to timings for the process of the airport declaring its capacity and going through the slot allocation process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the GCG framework will ensure a proactive approach as it will be in the interests of the airport operator to monitor air quality throughout a calendar year and to take action where risks of exceedances are identified in order to avoid reporting the breach of a Limit and associated restrictions on airport growth. Similarly, Paragraph D2.1.5 of the <b>Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix D: Air Quality Monitoring Plan [REP3-025]</b> sets out that near real-time monitoring data will be available to the operator and the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) to allow continuous review of the monitoring results throughout the year to allow for an early warning.</p> <p>The Applicant has responded to the points raised regarding short-term thresholds previously – please refer to the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 2A of 4 [REP1-021]</b> pages 24-27, in response to RR-0558 and RR-0297.</p> <p>The Applicant is currently preparing a technical note covering the issues raised as well as other air quality issues to inform ongoing discussions with the Hertfordshire authorities over their Statements of Common Ground (SoCG). It is anticipated that this note will be submitted alongside updated SoCGs at Deadline 6.</p>
18	Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note	<p>Figure 2.11 appears to indicate that Air Quality monitoring (data collection) is limited to a three-month period (October - December) each year. Can the Applicant confirm to the ExA that this is correct? If so, then this is inadequate. Monitoring needs to take place continuously over all months in every year.</p>	<p>As outlined in Section 2.3.1 and in the caption of Figure 2.11 of the <b>Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015]</b>, the airport operator will be required to carry out annual monitoring to enable oversight of the airport's performance against the GCG limits. This is required for all topics considered as part of GCG, including air quality.</p> <p>For air quality specifically, Paragraph 20(2) of Schedule 2, Part 3 of the <b>draft Development Consent Order [REP4-003]</b> requires air quality monitoring to be carried out in accordance with <b>Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix D – Air Quality Monitoring Plan [REP3-025]</b>. Section D2.3 of this document sets out that air quality monitoring must be carried out continually throughout the year.</p> <p>Figure 2.11 of <b>Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015]</b> has been provided to illustrate the timing relationship between receipt of annual monitoring data and development of monitoring reports to be provided to the Technical Panels for each topic. The timeline of this figure showing monitoring between October and December to inform the GCG process leading in to the airport's capacity declaration the following September has been selected purely for illustrative purposes to demonstrate this monitoring and reporting relationship in an appropriate level of detail and does not reflect the actual timings of annual monitoring that will be undertaken over the calendar year for air quality.</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
19	Green Controlled Growth	<p><b>Matters Raised</b></p> <p>A quorum for an ESG meeting is met where the independent chair, independent aviation specialist and slot allocation expert (or a substitute agreed as per paragraph A2.1.12) are present.</p> <p><b>Host Authorities Comments</b></p> <p>The Host Authorities understand that the rationale for reducing the Quorate to independent chair, independent aviation specialist and slot allocation expert relates to a review of the Terms of Reference by the Applicant to ensure that the ESG could still function if there were a failure (however unlikely) to secure 50% of the other members. Given the importance of the role of ESG the Host Authorities are of the view that their engagement in ESG and the decisions that it makes is crucial and that it is entirely appropriate for the DCO to make provision for and require a reasonable representation of other members to be present. The text should be returned to "where the independent chair and independent aviation specialist (or a substitute agreed as per paragraph A2.1.12) and at least 50% of other representatives are present".</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the points raised in this response have been addressed in regard to Question GCG.1.12 on page 8 of the <b>Applicant's response to Written Questions – Green Controlled Growth (GCG) [REP4-058]</b>.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that this has been highlighted as an area of concern by the Host Authorities in their Deadline 4 submissions, and as such the Applicant has made further changes to <b>Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix A - Draft ESG Terms of Reference [TR020001/APP/7.08]</b>. Section A2.2 of this document now requires a minimum of one representative from a local authority to be present to be quorate.</p>
20	Green Controlled Growth	<p><b>Matters Raised</b></p> <p>"Within six months of any change to UK legal Limits for concentrations of NO2, PM10 or PM2.5, the airport operator will prepare and submit to the Air Quality Technical Panel an Air Quality Limit Review that will consider the potential for the Air Quality Limits and Thresholds to be changed to reflect the new legal Limits, and whether any shortlisted air quality monitoring locations should be brought into or out of scope of the GCG Framework."</p> <p><b>Host Authorities Comments</b></p> <p>Can the Applicant explain to the ExA why changes should not be considered as soon as the intention to change is announced by the Government?</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the points raised in this response have been addressed in the Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 5 Action Point 18 on page 35 of the <b>Applicant's response to Deadline 4 Hearing Actions [REP4-070]</b>.</p>
21	Green Controlled Growth	<p>The Host Authorities understand that the rationale for reducing the Quorate to where the independent technical expert is present relates to a review of the Terms of Reference by the Applicant to ensure that Technical Panels could still function if there were a failure (however unlikely) to secure 50% of other approved representatives. Given the importance of the role of the Technical Panels the Host Authorities are of the view that their engagement in them is crucial and that it is entirely appropriate for the DCO to make provision for and require a reasonable representation of approved representatives to be present. The text should be returned to "where the independent technical expert and at least 50% of any other approved representatives (as per Paragraph B2.1.7) are present" . If it is considered there needs to be some form of provision made for Technical Panels not meeting, then it should be crafted in a manner where it is assumed that meetings will happen unless there is agreement of membership otherwise.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the points raised in this response have been addressed in regard to Question GCG.1.13 on page 8 of the <b>Applicant's response to Written Questions – Green Controlled Growth (GCG) [REP4-058]</b>.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that this has been highlighted as an area of concern by the Host Authorities in their Deadline 4 submissions, and as such the Applicant has made further changes to <b>Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix B - Draft Technical Panels Terms of Reference [TR020001/APP/7.08]</b>.</p>
22	Surface Access	<p><b>Matters Raised</b></p> <p>Covid 19 Modelling</p>	<p>Selection criteria were set to include, ideally, October (base model data collection month) from 2016 to 2022, September (to capture the trends of post Covid-19 – first assumed month of post-Covid-19 is September 2022) from</p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Applicant should explain what selection criteria was applied removing the following sites from the Covid-19 Modelling update analysis, A414 east of M1 J8 (south of St Albans), A1 north and south J8 and A5183 (west of M1 and Slip End).</p>	<p>2016 to 2022 and April (most recent available data on WebTRIS from 2016 to 2023). Data were processed to analyse:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AM peak hour (08:00 - 09:00);</li> <li>Interpeak hour (average 10:00 – 16:00);</li> <li>PM peak hour (17:00 – 18:00); and</li> <li>Daily in the form of Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT).</li> </ol> <p>Once applied, the selection criteria ruled out some of the locations, as it would not be possible to track changes over the Covid-19 period due to incomplete sets of data.</p> <p>The data, where available, were split by vehicle type, i.e. Cars, Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs) and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).</p> <p>Please also see <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.98 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 Trends Analysis. [REP4-086].</b></p>
23	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Covid 19 Modelling</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>These slides present very high-level comparisons of all traffic. The Applicant should provide more information of the trends by different vehicle types, cars, Light Goods Vehicle's (LGV's) and Heavy Goods Vehicle's (HGV's), between 2016 and 2023 where available.</p>	<p>Information on vehicle types will be provided in the final report for this work, currently proposed to be submitted at Deadline 6.</p>
24	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Covid 19 Modelling</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm to the ExA why HCC site 232 has not been taken into consideration in the count analysis? The area shown in Slide 10 (page 12) from which traffic counts have been used to undertake comparisons between 2016 and 2023 is a lot smaller than the simulation network, presented in Figure 18.3 of the ES [AS-030]. The Applicant should provide justification as to why counts across the wider simulation network have not been considered. As a result of a smaller area being considered, the number of counts used for the local network is very small, only two have been used for HCC and two for CBC. This is not adequate enough to provide a clear picture of the changes in traffic flow across the study area between 2016 and 2023. It is expected that trends between 2016 and 2023 will vary between different vehicle types therefore this is an important aspect of the analysis which appears not to have been undertaken. The Applicant should clarify whether comparisons between vehicle types have been undertaken, cars, LGV's and HGVs</p>	<p>Site 232 (A505 West of Hitchin) is the A505, which connects Hitchin to Luton. The data provided to the Applicant by the highway authority for the location (HCC) only covers one week in April 2023 and cannot therefore be used to track changes over the Covid-19 period.</p> <p>Data from a larger number of count locations across the wider simulation area was requested and would have been preferred. However, there were only a few sites provided to the Applicant where the data conformed with the selection criteria. Count sites data from LBC were subsequently obtained. Please also see <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.98 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 Trends Analysis. [REP4-086].</b></p> <p>Information on vehicle types will be provided in the final report for this work, currently proposed to be submitted at Deadline 6.</p>
25	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Covid-19 Modelling</p>	<p>The month of April was used for this site. The Applicant is not aware of any other explanation other than Covid-19. Please also see <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.98 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific</b></p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>Site 372 sees a significant decrease in peak hour traffic post Covid. The Applicant should confirm the month the data has been compared for and that it is consistent between the years. The Applicant should clarify whether there is any other explanation for this reduction other than Covid-19.</p>	<p><b>Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 Trends Analysis. [REP4-086].</b></p>
26	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Covid-19 Modelling</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Applicant should confirm the month which data has been used for at each site. At both sites there is a significant reduction in peak hour traffic, in excess of 20% in some instances. The Applicant should clarify whether there is any other explanation for this reduction other than Covid-19.</p>	<p>For information on the months used, please see <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.98 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 Trends Analysis. [REP4-086].</b> The Applicant is not aware of any other explanation other than Covid-19.</p>
27	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Covid-19 Modelling</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>It is stated that "Trends analysis conclusion – SRN largely 'recovered', LRN not 'recovered' and there may therefore be a case for post model slight downward adjustment to traffic forecasts". This is not correct. The adjustment should be to the base year traffic flows upon which forecasts are developed (and possibly to the traffic forecasts in addition). The Applicant should explain what adjustments they plan to make to the base and future year forecasts.</p>	<p>The overall approach to this work was set out in <b>Additional Submission, accepted at the discretion of the Examining Authority. Rule 9 Response Cover Letter.</b> The approach was also discussed with National Highways and local highway authorities (Central Bedfordshire Council, Luton Borough Council and Hertfordshire County Council) in July 2023.</p> <p>At an October 2023 meeting on the Rule 9 work with National Highways and local highway authorities, it was subsequently discussed and proposed, not to make adjustments to the base and future year models (apart from the recent updated changes) in order to continue to make a 'robust' assessment of overall future year traffic volumes. The Applicant has therefore recommended no further adjustments are required to the updated traffic forecasts.</p> <p>The reasons for this recommendation are set out in <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.109 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 2 Risk Assessment. [REP4-106].</b></p>
28	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Page 21 Slide 19 Growth in trip productions by mode</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Applicant should confirm whether this graph is showing National or Local Growth Productions by mode.</p>	<p>The graph shows national data. Please also see <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.98 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 Trends Analysis. [REP4-086].</b></p>
29	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Page 22 Slide 20 Growth in all trip productions through time</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Applicant should confirm whether this graph is showing National or Local Growth Productions by mode.</p>	<p>The graph shows national data. Please also see <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.98 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 Trends Analysis. [REP4-086].</b></p>

I.D.	Topic	Deadline 4 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
30	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Page 23 Slide 21 Trip productions by purpose - % change 2021-2051</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>The Applicant should confirm whether this graph is showing National or Local Growth Productions by mode.</p>	<p>The graph shows national data. Please also see <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.98 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 Trends Analysis. [REP4-086].</b></p>
31	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Covid-19 Modelling</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>"Demand model and highway assignment model runs taking place for reporting in October, including new 2023 forecast year and comparison with count data." The Applicant should confirm the methodology adopted to produce the 2023 forecast matrices.</p>	<p>This is documented in <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.109 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 2 Risk Assessment. [REP4-106].</b></p>
32	Surface Access	<p>Matters Raised</p> <p>Covid-19 Modelling</p> <p>Host Authorities Comments</p> <p>No information has been provided in the pre and post Covid-19 changes in use of public transport bus / rail / air. The Applicant should provide information of the analysis undertaken.</p>	<p>Analysis has not been undertaken in use of public transport, bus / rail / air. This is because the work is centred around assessing if there are any risks associated with the proposed highway improvements that have been proposed to mitigate the impact of the airport expansion. Please also see the section on Rail Trends in <b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.98 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 Trends Analysis. [REP4-086].</b></p>

## REFERENCES

---

Ref 1 The Landscape Institute (2019) Visual Representation of Development Proposals, Technical Guidance Nolte 06/19, 17 September 2019