

November 2023

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

8.26 Errata Report

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.26

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

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

8.26 ERRATA REPORT

Deadline:	Deadline 5
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/8.26
Author:	Luton Rising

Version	Date	Status of Version
Issue 1	August 2023	Additional Submission - Deadline 1
Revision 1	November 2023	Additional Submission - Deadline 5

Contents

	Page	
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Structure of this document	1

Tables

Table 1.1: Errata Identified in the DCO application

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1 This document sets out the Errata that have been identified to date within the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the London Luton Airport Expansion ('the Proposed Development').
- 1.1.2 The DCO application was submitted by Luton Rising (a trading name of London Luton Airport Limited) ('the Applicant') on 27 February 2023 and was accepted for examination on 27 March 2023.
- 1.1.3 Errata are defined as minor errors within the DCO application documents which do not impact on the assessment or conclusions of any of the documents submitted to date. This Errata Report captures matters that have arisen from the examination submissions and additional Errata identified by Luton Rising at the time of Deadline 5 on 14 November 2023.

1.2 Structure of this document

- 1.2.1 Table 1.1 lists the Errata that have been identified at Deadline 1 (in Issue 1 of this document) and Deadline 5. A strikethrough has been used to show text which should be replaced, and the amended text is shown in red.
- 1.2.2 As the Errata identified are minor, the application documents they relate to have not been reissued however, they should be referenced against the changes contained within this Errata document.

Table 1.1: Errata identified in the DCO Application

Application Document Reference	Section and Paragraph Reference	Errata	Amendment / Replacement Text
Issue 1 – Deadline 1			
APP-219 7.08 Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix A.	A4.13 Document Management Paragraph 13.2, page 19.	A typological error in the reference number.	Paragraph A4.13.2 should refer to clauses A4.13.3 to A54.13.7 (not 23.3 to 23.7), see below: Level 2 and Mitigation Plan shall be publicly available on request unless clauses 23.3 to 23.7 13.3 to 13.7 apply.
AS-082 5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Construction Method Statement and Programme Report.	2.5 Assessment Phase 2b (2.5.1, f. Landslide, vi.), page 8.	A typological error.	In section 2.5 Assessment Phase 2b, f. Landslide – a “Waste and Recycling Centre” is listed. Section to be removed as the separate recycling centre has been removed from scheme. vi. Waste & recycling centre.
AS-045 5.03 Environmental Statement Chapter 20 Water Resources	Figure 20.1, page 3	Figure error	Study area missing from Figure 20.1. Included in legend however missing from actual Figure.
AS-078 5.02 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Health and Community	Table 13.6, page 27.	A typological error (deletion of row in table).	Table 13.6 Deletion of row below the heading ‘Wider Area’ (see below): ‘Areas within which there are likely to be environmental impacts (e.g noise and visual impacts of the airport; construction and surface access traffic routes)’. Environmental impacts from the construction and operation of the airport are not relevant for the wider study area.
AS-078 5.02 Environmental Statement Chapter 13 Health and Community	Paragraph 13.9.3, page 64.	A typological error in paragraph.	There is a significant health effect during all assessment phases relating to the health determinant of ‘Perception and uncertainty’.

Application Document Reference	Section and Paragraph Reference	Errata	Amendment / Replacement Text
AS-045 5.03 Environmental Statement Figures 20.1-20.7	Figure 20.1	Figure error	The 1km study area listed in legend as 'Main Application Site 1k Buffer' is not shown on map. The title of Figure 20.1 is Risk of Flooding from River and Sea (EA dataset), which is shown in the figure. Therefore, the 'Main Application Site 1k Buffer' in the legend can be ignored, or the reader can see the study area on Figure 20.2 if required. No amendment is proposed.
AS-077 5.01 Environmental Statement Chapter 10	Table 10.6, page 20	Typological error	Consultation meeting events with Historic England to align with the SoCG should read: 'Response to 2022 Statutory Consultation dated 04 April 02 April 2022 '
AS-077 5.01 Environmental Statement Chapter 10	Table 10.6	Event missing from the table	Consultation meeting events with Historic England described in Table 10.6 should include a further meeting that took place on 06/12/22 to align with the SoCG.
AS-125 7.04 Need Case	Section 6.6 Parameters for environmental assessment, surface access planning and capacity assessment, Paragraph 6.6.13, page 127	Typological error within paragraph	Paragraph 6.6.13 refers in error to Figure 6.8, it should read Figure 5.8. 'In addition to this upward shift in aircraft capacity, the main airlines operating at the airport have also been focusing on increasing the proportion of seats sold on each flight (the load factor) in recent years. These carriers historically targeted selling around 80-85% of all available seats, but recently have actively sought to increase this over 90%. This is illustrated in Figure 6.8 Figure 5.8 , illustrating the upward trend'.
APP-012 3.03 Funding Statement	Section 4.3 Proposed delivery approach for assessment Phases 2a and 2b, Paragraph 4.3.3, page 8	Typological error within paragraph	Paragraph 4.3.3 refers in error to paragraph 5.3.1, it should read 4.3.1. 'Some elements of assessment Phase 2, such as the fuel farm and EV charging infrastructure, are likely to be funded by third party providers. However, for the purposes of this funding statement, it is assumed for now that all costs are funded as set out in paragraph 5.3.1 paragraph 4.3.1 and these costs are included in the Estimated Total Project Cost.
APP-136	Figure 5	Typological error in legend	Legend states, in error, Groundwater Locations, should read Groundwater Monitoring Locations

Application Document Reference	Section and Paragraph Reference	Errata	Amendment / Replacement Text
5.02 Environmental Statement - Appendix 20.3 Hydrogeological Characterisation Report	Groundwater Monitoring Locations, page 41		<p>'Groundwater Monitoring Locations'</p> <p>NB: An updated version of this report is submitted at Deadline 1, however does not include this change to Figure 5.</p>
APP-137 5.02 Environmental Statement – Appendix 20.4 Drainage Design Statement	Section 3.1 Potable Water Scarcity, Paragraph 3.1.2, page 8	Typological error within paragraph	<p>Paragraph 3.1.2 refers in error to 2019/2020. The total airport water consumption is total for the calendar year 2019.</p> <p>'LLAOL advised that the total potable water consumption for the entire airport during 2019 2019/2020 (illustrated in Appendix E), was 236,756m³. An average AW supply was calculated accordingly at 7.5l/s</p>
AS-080 5.01 Environmental Statement – Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration Revision 1	Table 16.26 and 16.27	Typological error in the tables	<p>Tables 16.26 and 16.27 contain larger Do-minimum contour areas from a superseded model iteration. The tables have been updated in a revision of Noise and Vibration chapter to reflect correct numbers used for the future baseline assessment and have been submitted in Deadline 1.</p>
AS-080 5.01 Environmental Statement – Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration Revision 1	Section 16.9 Assessment, Paragraphs 16.9.236 and 16.9.248	Typological error within paragraphs	<p>Paragraphs 16.9.236 and 16.9.248 refer in error to Hotel Ibis London. The hotel referred to is a Holiday Inn.</p> <p>Paragraph 16.9.236 'Three hotels, the Courtyard by Marriott Luton Airport, the ibis budget Luton Airport and the Hotel Ibis London Luton Airport Holiday Inn London Luton Airport, adjacent to the A505 Airport Way and close to the southern end of the proposed Airport Access Road are expected to experience an increase in road traffic noise of over 3dB.....'.</p> <p>Paragraph 16.9.248 'The same three hotels (the Courtyard by Marriott Luton Airport, the ibis budget Luton Airport and the Hotel Ibis London Luton Airport Holiday Inn London Luton Airport) identified in paragraph 16.9.236 with respect to assessment</p>

Application Document Reference	Section and Paragraph Reference	Errata	Amendment / Replacement Text
			Phase 2a, are also expected to meet the criteria given in Table 16.19 in assessment Phase 2b'.
AS-085 5.02 Environmental Statement – Appendix 14.3 Arboricultural Impact Assessment	Executive Summary (paragraph 3) and Section 3 Arboricultural Impact of the Proposals Table 2 paragraph 3.1.2	Typological error within paragraphs	Within the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Appendix 14.3 of the Environmental Statement [APP-090]) it states that the Category A tree (T343) which is a re-grown ancient and veteran coppice, will be re-coppiced and translocated to another area of the site (see Executive Summary and Table 2 at paragraph 3.1.2). Appendix A - Tree Schedule of Arboricultural Impact Assessment states " <i>Fell</i> " in error.
Revision 1 – Deadline 5			
APP-110 5.02 Environmental Statement – Appendix 16.1	Section 6.14 Aircraft Fleet Information Table 6.40: Do-Minimum Average Summer Day Aircraft Movement Data	Typological error within table 6.40	The 2027 Do-Minimum fleet was not updated from the 2022 PEIR Appendix.
AS-125 7.04 Need Case	Section 5.3 Catchment area and leakage Figure 5.19 and paragraph 5.3.18	Percentages for Other and Six Counties transposed for 219 in Figure 5.19	However, this growth has largely been in visits to the Three Counties and the Six Counties, with the proportion staying locally increasing from 43% of inbound visitors using the airport to 53%. This suggests strongly that, as the airport grows its route network, it can contribute to growing the number of tourist visits within the local area, thereby supporting wider economic benefits as explained later. There has been growth in the proportion of inbound foreign visitors staying in the Three and Six Counties from 27% to 31% whilst the overall volume of visitors using the airport has grown.
AS-125 7.04 Need Case	Section 8.4 The operational economic impacts of London Luton Airport Paragraph 8.4.4	Typological error within paragraph 8.4.4	Shops, hotels and restaurants together support employment for around 1,100 workers. Shops, hotels and restaurants together support employment for around 1,500 workers.

Application Document Reference	Section and Paragraph Reference	Errata	Amendment / Replacement Text
AS-074 Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement: The Proposed Development	Work No. 2b(02) – New airfield equipment Paragraph 4.6.27	Typological error within paragraph 4.6.27	The proposed IRVR works would be localised small pieces of equipment with a maximum height of 3.3m over an area of approximately 37,300m² The proposed IRVR works would be localised small pieces of equipment with a maximum height of 3.3m over an area of approximately 37,300m ² .
APP-084 5.02 Environmental Statement – Appendix 13.2	Section 2.2 and Table 2.3	Section 2.2 and Table 2.3 included in error	Section 2.2 and Table 2.3 of Appendix 13.2 included in error.
APP-201 7.02 Transport Assessment Appendices – Part 2 of 3 (Appendix F)	Section 5 Figure 5.5	Typological error within Figure 5.5 title	Forecast Routeing to / From Luton Airport in 2039 TAG-based “with” Expansion Scenario, AM Peak Hour Forecast Routeing to / From Luton Airport in TAG-based “With” Expansion Scenario
AS-096 5.02 Environmental Statement – Appendix 16.1	Section 4.3 Sound Monitoring Results Table 4.4	Typological error within Table 4.4	ML2 was included within Table 4.4 of Appendix 16.1 of the Environmental Statement [AS-096] erroneously.
AS-124 Design and Access Statement Volume II	5.6 Earthworks and landfill Paragraph 5.6.4	Typological error within paragraph 5.6.4	An estimated 3.7 million m ³ of material will need to be excavated and imported from a variety of locations within the site.
APP-196 7.01 Planning Statement Appendix B – Green Belt Assessment	Section B3 Proposed works in the Luton Green Belt. Paragraph B3.1.2	Typological error within paragraph B3.1.2	The SMR would be positioned on a steel lattice support tower measuring approximately 13m in height and a footprint of approximately 4m ² . It would be surmounted by a red construction obstruction light and an access track would be constructed from the existing airport perimeter road, outside the existing perimeter fence, to provide access for regular (weekly) checks and ad hoc maintenance.
REP1-003 and AS-096 5.01 Environmental Statement Chapter 16: Noise and Vibration	Table 16.9 in Chapter 16 and Table 11.1 of Appendix 16.1	Typological error in Table 16.9 and Table 11.1	Daytime assessment criteria for schools (first row) in Table 16.19 of Chapter 16 and Table 11.1 of Appendix 16.1 should read "55-62 dB LAeq,16h" instead of 55-59 dB LAeq,16h".

Application Document Reference	Section and Paragraph Reference	Errata	Amendment / Replacement Text
5.02 Environmental Statement – Appendix 16.1			
REP1-003 5.01 Environmental Statement Chapter 16: Noise and Vibration	Paragraphs 16.9.193 and 16.9.213	Typological error within both paragraphs	Assessment for the Ibis Budget in paragraphs 16.9.193 and 16.9.213 was mistakenly grouped with the assessment for the Courtyard by Marriot which sits immediately adjacent within the same complex and has predicted noise levels within 0.3dB of the Ibis Budget. This grouping does not affect the conclusions of the non-residential ground noise assessment presented in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP1-003] as the same conclusions (not significant) apply to both hotels.
REP1-003 5.01 Environmental Statement Chapter 16: Noise and Vibration	Paragraph 16.9.71	Typological error within paragraph 16.9.71	The number of HGVS in paragraph 16.9.71 should read 100 instead of 97. This does not affect the reported noise change in the same paragraph nor the conclusion that the impacts are not significant.
REP1-003 5.01 Environmental Statement Chapter 16: Noise and Vibration	Paragraph 16.9.73	Typological error within paragraph 16.9.73	The number of HGVS in paragraph 16.9.73 should read 171 instead of 198. This does not affect the reported noise change in the same paragraph nor the conclusion that the impacts are not significant.
REP1-003 5.01 Environmental Statement Chapter 16: Noise and Vibration	Paragraph 16.9.75	Typological error within paragraph 16.9.75	The number of HGVS in paragraph 16.9.75 should read 108 instead of 127 and the resulting noise increase should read 0.5dB instead of 0.6dB. This does not affect the conclusion that the impacts are not significant.
AS-139 5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 14.5	Detailed Visual Impact Assessment Visitors of Wigmore Valley Park Construction assessment Phase 2a and interim aircraft Movement effects (c.2033 - 2036) Pg 41	Typological error within Significant of Effect column	The Proposed Development is assessed to deteriorate the visual amenity experienced by this receptor but only from a few locations. The effect is assessed to remain moderate adverse , which is not significant .

Application Document Reference	Section and Paragraph Reference	Errata	Amendment / Replacement Text
AS-139 5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 14.5	Detailed Visual Impact Assessment Users of footpath Offley 004, 005 and 006, east of Tea Green Construction assessment Phase 2a and interim aircraft Movement effects (c.2033 - 2036) Pg 142	Omission of text error within Significant of Effect column	The effect on this receptor is assessed to rise to moderate adverse , which is significant .