



**CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS ON DEADLINE 4
SUBMISSIONS**

LONDON LUTON AIRPORT EXPANSION DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

Version – Final

Introduction

This document sets out the response of Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC) to various documents submitted at Deadline 4. The comments include input from various technical consultants.

1. REP4 - 097 – Applicant’s Response to Deadline 3 Submissions – Appendix B Central Bedfordshire Council (REP3-085)

| Document Reference | Topic | Matters Raised | Host Authorities Comment |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 3 | Landscape and Visual | Impact of the Fire Training Ground. | It is acknowledged that assessments have been undertaken as set out in the relevant chapters of the ES. However, further information is needed to understand the practical impact of the FTG (i.e. extent of fumes/smoke, nature of training operations including duration etc.). There are no visual representations showing how the FTG would operate. |
| 4 | Cultural Heritage | Clarification of public benefits | <p>The Applicant has not provided a suitable response to this point. The query raised by CBC is in respect to clarity on the public heritage benefits. The applicant has referred to the mitigation strategies within Chapter 10 of the ES and the CHMP and it is noted that no mitigation is proposed for Someries Castle or Luton Hoo.</p> <p>Mitigation is not a public heritage benefit. Paragraph: 020 of the Planning Practice Guidance for Historic Environment provides clarification on public heritage benefits.</p> |

| | | | |
|---------|----------------------|------------------|---|
| 5 | Health and Community | Baseline data | This point is being considered and will be addressed at deadline 6. |
| 6 | Landscape and Visual | Lighting Impacts | Noted. |
| 7 | Noise and Vibration | Noise assessment | <p>It is not typical for an airport noise assessment to be based on the 'reasonable worst case', as the Applicant proposes, but rather from realistic forecasts such as those used in the Core case, which itself should form the 'reasonable worst case'.</p> <p>While the overall noise effects as defined in the EIA may be comparable, the number of people exposed to specific noise levels will differ and this is highly material with regard to complying with UK aviation noise policy such as Aviation Policy Framework 2013 ("limit and where possible reduce the number of people in the UK significantly affected by aircraft noise").</p> |
| 8 to 16 | Surface Access | | Discussions are either ongoing or expected with regards to each of these matters. |

2. REP4 – 072 - 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

In Section 1.1.5 the Applicant states that they are considering removal of the Transition Period for aircraft noise – this action would be supported by the Host Authorities.

In section 2.2.7, the Applicant sets out the Local Rules currently in place at Luton Airport. These seek to demonstrate that the ‘mitigation toolbox’ supporting Green Controlled Growth with regards to noise are sufficient to enable noise contour limits to be controlled and not breached through suitable management. We note that there are no enhancements to the mitigation options that were on offer to the Airport before and during historic breaches.

In section 2.2.8, the Applicant states that they intend to make further updates to the noise controls at Deadline 5. The Host Authorities support the submission of updates for additional noise controls, as have been requested throughout the examination period.

In section 3.3.10, the Applicant states that they are considering changes to establish the ESG as soon as is reasonably practicable. The Host Authorities support this approach.

Section 5.3 discusses how slot allocations could potentially be used to reduce capacity, in exceptional circumstances. It appears that through implementation of Local Rules to manage the release of slots, alongside 5-year advanced planning (both of which are proposed), Luton Airport may be able to manage noise so as not to need to reduce capacity. Sensible Local Rules, possibly implemented in step changes as part of or in line with the 5-yearly ESG review period, are an important part of an acceptable noise control strategy.

3. REP4 – 079 - Applicant’s Response to Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action 26: Noise Insulation Delivery Programme

This document sets out research undertaken by the Applicant into how to most effectively roll out their proposed Noise Insulation Scheme and is commended by the Host Authorities.

The expected timeframes involved with rolling out the scheme and assuming a 100% take-up are positively received as they are materially faster than both the existing scheme and other comparable schemes.

The scheme has also been expanded again to account for ground noise.

4. REP4 – 049 - Outline Ground Noise Management Plan

The existing controls from the ground noise management plan have been carried through into this document, including ground running of aircraft propulsion engines, preferential use of stands and taxiways, use of auxiliary power units (APU's) and the use of ground power units (GPU's).

Correct reference is also made to the extant Operations Safety Instructions (OSI's), which instruct airline operators on how these noise sources are managed at Luton Airport.

Section 2.5 of the document secures the commitment to construct the acoustic barrier(s) required within each phase to mitigate ground noise.

5. REP4 – 080 - Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 3 Action 1: Assessment of night-time construction noise

There has not been sufficient time to review this document in detail but note that it appears to set out a common-sense strategy for construction noise. This includes a hierarchical approach as to which hours outside of core working hours should be prioritised for permitting activity, through to when night-time working should be considered, as well as limiting areas of work during the night - time to those at greatest distance or screened from noise-sensitive receptors.

6. REP4 – 070 Applicant's response to Deadline 4 Hearing Action

Action point 7: CBC would welcome discussions with the applicant with regards to protective provisions and / or side agreements with regards to highways works, the handover of assets, and the covering of reasonable costs, and will look to progress as soon as possible.

7. REP4 – 086 Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2 – COVID19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 and Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2 – COVID19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 2 Risk Assessment: TR020001/APP/8.109

Note ref. TR020001/APP/8.98 provided an overview of the trend analysis carried out by the applicant team – within which the main findings were that:

- The strategic road network had largely 'recovered' to pre-pandemic levels
- That the local road network had not experienced the same levels of 'recovery'
- That the application of TEMPRO 8 rather than TEMPRO 7.2 as a wider growth factor results in lower background levels of forecast traffic growth.

As a result of the parity or reduction in overall flows when comparing the 2016 and 2023 surveys, and the reduced levels of forecast growth as a result of the change in TEMPRO, the risk assessment concludes that it is not considered necessary to carry out any further adjustments to the updated traffic forecasts.

CBC agrees that the overall forecast growth is predicted to be lower than previously considered. This does however raise a number of questions with regards to assessment of the impacts of DCO traffic.

Whilst the comparison exercise carried out and presented is understood to exclude the Smart Motorways scheme, and it is also understood that revised forecasting will be used to inform an update to the Microsimulation modelling of Junction 10, this would also suggest that the remainder of the wider more detailed modelling, as reported within the Transport Assessment, if not updated, would continue to be based upon the previous strategic model outputs which included Smart Motorways in the 2043 forecast. The additional traffic plots provided as figures 3.7-3.12 do provide a degree of reassurance that the distribution of traffic appears not to have changed significantly as a result of the updated modelling, however without numbers assigned to the various routes it is not possible to fully determine the level of change.

With regards to areas where CBC have previously raised concern, it appears that in both the 2039 and 2043 forecast PM peak models there is no growth in traffic on the M1 north of J10 in the updated modelling (compared to the increases forecast in the previous model), which would suggest that this strategic traffic is getting displaced elsewhere within the network. It also appears that the increase in the level of traffic routing via Caddington following development, is higher in the updated modelling (the 2043 assessment).

As such, whilst it is appreciated that the scope to fully update the strategic model is limited and the reasons for the applicants proposing continuing use of the previous model are similarly understood, the areas above are of concern to CBC, with the realistic prospect of having to monitor, manage, and mitigate scheme impacts which could be different to those modelled, in terms of both the distribution and mode of development trips. To address these would place further reliance upon the TRIMMA process, and the mechanisms for addressing unforeseen impacts.

As detailed above, the information provided in Figures 2.7 to 3.12 does provide a helpful level of additional information, it is however difficult to fully identify the net changes between the two models without numbers assigned to the modelled links. CBC would therefore request a further set of difference plots with number assigned to links within CBCs network or tabulated flows for those links, and / or a plot showing the net difference between the two models (previous and updated). Following receipt of this information, and clarification of the above points, CBC would be in a position to comment more fully upon

this matter, including whether there would be a need to update any off-site junction modelling where flows are predicted to be higher in the updated modelling (as is potentially the case in Caddington).

8. REP4 – 105 - Applicant’s response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 4 – M1-A6 Routing Analysis: TR020001/APP/8.108

The additional information is noted. As with the wider trip distribution plots (TR020001/APP/8.30) the scale of the plans makes any change in flows as a result of the airport expansion difficult to isolate (either primary impacts in terms of airport traffic, or secondary impacts in terms of re-routing of existing traffic). The addition of numbering on the plans, or the provision of difference plots would make it easier to identify the impact of the expansion.

9. REP4 – 082 - Applicant’s Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 8: Off-site highway works

CBC can confirm discussions are ongoing with regards to the offsite junctions at:

- Luton Road / Chaul End Caddington
- Newlands Road / Farley Hill / Luton Road, Luton

These discussions have progressed to a reasonable level of detail and CBC expect that, subject to the agreement of an appropriate means of securing and delivering the mitigation works proposed, that these matters will be resolved shortly. Discussions are also being held with regards to the junction of the B653 with West Hyde Road, where CBC have similar concerns, although these discussions have not yet progressed the same level of detail.

10. REP4 – 084 - Applicant’s Response to Issue Specific 4 Action 29: Catchment area for staff walking and cycling

Whilst the majority of the measures to encourage staff to walk and cycle are likely to fall within the Luton Borough Council Authority area, there is a notable cluster of staff postcodes within the 30 - 45 minute banding provided as Figure 4.1, covering the Houghton Regis and Dunstable areas. This would generally appear to support the need for appropriate measures, whether based around cycling or public transport, to facilitate sustainable staff access to / from the Airport from these postcode areas. Whilst it is understood that it may be difficult to identify specific public transport routes, CBC would be seeking an acknowledgement of this demand and a commitment to include it within the measures to be reviewed through the Sustainable Transport Fund process.

11. REP4 – 048 - Trip distribution plans

CBC note the ExA’s comments in the Rule 17 letter dated 6 November 2023 and will await the updated plans to be submitted at Deadline 5.

12.REP4 – 085 Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (OTRIMMA)

The submitted document provides further details with regards to the proposed way in which the Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach will be delivered as part of the mitigation package for the DCO.

It is understood that the proposed approach is split into two main operating strands, with the works associated with the DCO and referenced within the draft document as 'offsite highways works' within Schedule 1 forming the first strand, essentially as the 'known' consequences of the proposals.

The second strand is for the less foreseeable or quantified impacts of the proposals to be funded via the RIF (Residual Impacts Fund) although the full scope and budget to be assigned to this element is not currently defined. Based upon Para 1.2.6 the RIF it is understood that this will be defined further through the Section 106 agreement associated with the DCO and CBC will review and comment upon this element as part of any wider comments upon the Draft S106.

Whilst the OTRIMMA lays out a logical and sequential approach as to how each of the two processes would operate, there are a number of queries that CBC currently have over how this would be enacted in practice. Due to the very significant weight placed upon the OTRIMMA and subsequent TRIMMA process, with most proposed mitigation being wrapped into this single process, it is considered essential that there is sufficient certainty over the ability of the associated process/es to robustly meet the wide-ranging mitigation needs arising from the DCO.

It is noted that the initial trigger for more detailed assessment, and the related need for the delivery of highways mitigations is driven in the first instance by the findings of Monitoring Level 1, which is informed by an Annual Monitoring of airport traffic at airport sites.

CBC would have some concern that, whilst this approach would capture growth in traffic routing directly to and from the airport, and therefore passing through the junctions identified within the submitted Transport Assessment, it does not take into account growth in background traffic, the displacement of existing traffic, or clarify at what point the delivery of mitigation would be required.

To provide some context to these areas of concern, this could result in a scenario in which the amount of traffic routing to and from the Airport increases initially within a phase of development, (for example when new car parking capacity is provided for on-site), but then does not grow for a number of years. An initial assessment may determine that the combination of Airport traffic and background traffic does not trigger the need for mitigation. However, during

subsequent years within a Phase, even with no further growth in traffic routing directly to and from the airport estate, due to wider traffic growth the operation of junctions within the assessment area may continue to degrade, with the combination of airport and background traffic then being sufficient to require mitigation (and with the Airport element being sufficient to justify the delivery of mitigation associated with the DCO). At present there would be no requirement for further assessment of junction operation until there was a further growth in traffic routing directly to and from the Airport under ML1, which could mean that the need for required off-site mitigation may not be identified for a number of years.

It would also appear to be the case that the review under ML1 would be both annual and global, i.e.: based upon an annual measurement and without an indication of the balance of movements across the various access routes to and from the Airport.

With regards to clarifying at what point mitigation would be triggered via the TRIMMA process, it is noted in Figure 3.2 that this is detailed as 'Thresholds to be determined'. The network is already subject to levels of congestion and delay, and whilst the Transport Assessment has identified a need for mitigation by the time certain levels of development (i.e.: Phase 1, 2a, or 2b) come forward, it does not confirm at what point prior to that Phase being delivered the works may be required, with a twelve year period between Phase 1 and Phase 2a for example, and with the operation of a number of junctions within the study area deteriorating significantly over that twelve year period.

As currently forecast, the operation of the London Road South junction would suggest the need to implement mitigation at Junction 10 earlier than Phase 2b, whilst the operation of the A1081 / Gypsy Lane Junction also deteriorates to unacceptable levels by the 2039 (Phase 2a) assessment year – as per table 10.86 of the submitted TA.

However, the level of average delay at the Gypsy Lane junction (when considered relative to the forecast baseline), improves in both the AM and PM peak periods by 2043 when taking into account full development and associated mitigation for Phase 2b (2043 assessment) as detailed in Table 10.115. This is particularly notable in the PM peak hour when average delay is reported as reducing in the with development scenario from 105 seconds to 25 seconds.

However no additional works to this junction are proposed as part of the mitigation assumed in the Phase 2(b) modelling work, which would indicate that the improvements in operation are due to the removal of constraints elsewhere on the network. This would also suggest that the wider improvements would need to be implemented at Phase 2(a) rather than Phase 2(b).

The Gypsy Lane example summarised above highlights the other main area of initial concern that CBC would have over an approach (as appears to be the current case with the TRIMMA) in which the traffic routing to individual junctions is assessed and the need for improvement works is currently identified based upon a threshold for the related individual junctions.

Within the submitted TA the highway works from Junction 10 of the M1 and along the A0181 have been modelled as a combined network within VISSIM, with the works to the M1 in particular appearing to have a significant secondary effect upon the other junctions within that modelled network (and as recognised within the submitted TA, with paras 10.3.98, 10.3.100, 10.3.102 all referring to the wider benefits of works to the M1 junction experienced elsewhere within the network).

It would therefore appear that the works within the VISSIM would be more appropriately considered as a package of schemes, and that the provision of isolated or individual elements of mitigation within that overall package would not have the same impact as the delivery of the full and combined mitigation schemes.

As such, it is the view of CBC that should the TRIMMA process be followed, there would need to be a robust set of thresholds to determine the point at which mitigation comes forward, which in a number of cases may need to be at the very earliest stages of development. Where this is the case, for example where works are detailed as being required by 2027, there would appear to be logic in providing these works outside of the TRIMMA process as a committed set of mitigation works to be delivered by the time the 21.5 mppa threshold is met, as these works are modelled as being required by Phase 1, are necessary for all further phases of development (with mitigation generally building upon the Phase 1 works), and would still require a relatively long run in period to allow for the relevant detailed design and approvals. This would also (in the case of the initial works to J10 and the A1081) allow for the works to be delivered as a single package.

In addition, that the works to J10 of the M1 and along the A1081 corridor for further phases should also be considered as a package of interconnecting schemes, rather than being considered individually within the TRIMMA process.

As a general point with regards to the above, and as preciously raised, at present the identification of thresholds for mitigation is proposed to be agreed under the TRIMMA process by the Steering Group. It is the view of CBC that the DCO should define Thresholds at this point, to provide a suitable level of certainty to the process, whether within the DCO itself or within the OTRIMMA as a certified document.

With regards to the detail of the process, and notwithstanding the specific concerns outlined above:

Figure 3.2 sets out the proposed approach to monitoring, within which CBC would query why, when airport traffic exceeds an identified threshold, the process still links to the preparation and sharing of a monitoring report. It is also unclear why the term ‘potential mitigation’ rather than ‘mitigation’ is used when thresholds are exceeded.

It is noted that Figure 3.4 provides indicative locations for survey cameras – CBC would be seeking additional survey locations to the west of the M1. The placement of a camera on Newlands Road and a camera on Luton Road would allow for the identification of any trips routing via the B4540 via Slip End, whilst also providing an overview of trips routing west of the M1. CBC would also advise that there should be cameras on the A1081 to either side of the junction with the B653 / Gypsy Lane.

It is noted that the approach proposed in para 3.3.13 now refers to the works being implemented by the applicant, which is a welcome amendment to the draft proposals previously presented by the applicant within which it was proposed that the Highway Authority would be responsible for scheme delivery. Notwithstanding this, it appears that the option for schemes to be delivered by the Local Highway Authorities may remain, including where an alternative to the scheme options included within the DCO is proposed. In such an instance there would need to be far greater definition within the document with regards to the calculation and agreement of scheme costs.

Paragraph 3.4 of the OTRIMMA refers to the assessment of Third-Party off-site car parking. It is noted that this is detailed as having been incorporated into background traffic. Further clarity on what is meant by this statement is required (as well as further detail as to how this has been accounted for within the modelling), as this traffic would only be present on the network in the scenarios including the DCO, rather than being background traffic.

It is noted that the 5 yearly review will update the distribution of airport traffic. Whilst this has the benefit of allowing for any changes in routing to be identified, this does not appear to follow through with regards to the delivery of alternative mitigation (should the need be identified), with the commitment to fund improvement works appearing to be capped at that associated with the currently submitted schemes. I.e.: Should the monitoring determine that a different form or location for mitigation is required as a direct result of development traffic impacts, as identified through the revised distribution, then the responsibility for the funding and delivery should sit fully with the applicant. With regards to Mitigation type 2 (MT2) it is noted that monitoring is proposed as being undertaken by the relevant highway authority, however it is not clear how this monitoring is to be funded (or if there is an expectation that the relevant highway authority will be responsible for funding, which would not appear to be reasonable). It is also unclear how, in the absence of baseline surveys, it would

be possible to demonstrate that issues identified are related to the expansion of the airport. Whilst it is appreciated that the MT2 approach is to look at wider, and potentially unforeseen, impacts, there are a number of locations previously identified (for example Slip End crossroads) where there has been a previous recognition of the need for further monitoring through the TRIMMA process. CBC would suggest that a list of locations where there is a reasonable expectation of future impacts, to be addressed through the MT2 approach, is agreed through the DCO and an initial baseline survey of these locations included as part of the ML0 survey work. This would then provide a sound evidence base for all parties to work from.

With regards to the split of monies assigned to different authority areas, CBC would be seeking further clarity about how such a split would be determined, to account for a likely disproportionate balance of impacts. There is also some concern that limiting the funding to a maximum sum per year may make larger, and potentially more effective, mitigation schemes harder to deliver. Some flexibility in terms of scheme funding is therefore likely to be required.

It is also noted that Parking controls are included within MT2 – with reference to the identification of where airport staff / passenger parking is impacting upon the public highway. It is unclear how monitoring could determine this, and it remains the view of CBC that parking management, in areas which are already identified as being of concern, should fall outside of the TRIMMA process and be subject to a separate and proactive approach.

With regards to data, reference is made to bus / coach stations as potential sources, and with regards to ML1 reference is made to 'using data from existing data sources' at the airport. CBC would appreciate further clarity on what the actual scale and type of data collection is intended to be. It would appear appropriate (particularly when also considering the Green Controlled Growth Framework and the site Travel Plan), that there would need to be an annual travel data collection exercise, to cover traffic surveys and manually (if needed) counting of passenger numbers at the bus / coach station, and the counting of passengers arriving via shuttle buses from offsite parking providers.

As such, whilst the additional information and detail contained within the updated OTRIMMA is welcomed, CBC have a number of queries over the universal application of such an approach, with some elements of mitigation appearing more suited to being delivered outside of the process, as well as having a number of queries related to practical implementation.

13. Draft Development Consent Order

Articles 2 and 44

The Host Authorities welcome the additional clarity brought by the amendments to the definition of “LLAOL planning permission” and new the definition for “LLAOL section 106 agreement”.

Lighting Requirement

Within REP2A – 005 Applicant’s Comments on CBCs LIR, it states that the Applicant is considering a requirement for a lighting strategy but to date this has not been captured in the amended draft DCO.

Requirement 9

Action point 28 of ISH6 required the applicant to consider comments from CBC regarding requests for cross sections, boundary treatment details and a plan showing the extent of landscaping in Requirement 9 of the draft DCO, notwithstanding wording in Requirement 9(2). Within REP3-053 Applicant’s Post Hearing Submission – ISH6, it states that the applicant would deal with this at Deadline 4, but this matter appears to be outstanding.

Part 5 to Schedule 8

The new Part 5 to Schedule 8 covering Protective Provisions for National Highways is noted. As per the representations made at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and Issue Specific Hearing CAH1, CBC would be seeking equivalent protective provisions for highways works to be carried out within the authority area and will seek to work with the applicant to agree suitable wording.

Construction traffic management plan

Requirement 13 – Additional wording is required to ensure that matters to be covered within the CTMP are not excluded from what is considered to be commencement of works. At present the definition of ‘commence’ excludes:

- Site preparation and site clearance;
- Erection of temporary buildings and structures;
- Receipt and erection of construction plant and equipment; and
- Erection of fencing

All of which would be matters relevant to the CTMP, but which could be carried out in advance of the CTMP being either submitted or approved based upon the current drafting.

Requirement 13 – CBC would suggest that the wording is broadened to cover ‘relevant highway authorities’ as the CTMP is liable to have cross authority implications in terms of traffic.

The same two comments would apply with regards to requirement 14, i.e.: that the matters to be covered by the Construction Workers Travel Plan are not

excluded within the definition of commencement, and that the associated wording refers to 'relevant highway authorities'.

Requirement 29

It is noted that under Offsite Highways Works – 29 (3) and based upon the interpretations in Part 1 of the Order, at present CBC would be classed as the relevant planning authority responsible for discharging the requirements related to a number of major highways works, including those to the M1. CBC have a number of areas of concern with regards to the related timescales associated with regards to the discharge of these requirements, detailed later with regards to Part 5 of the Draft DCO.

Requirement 29 (parts 1-4) CBC have a number of outstanding queries with regards to the TRIMMA Process, and as such remain of the view that further or alternative requirements may be required with regards to securing of some of the offsite highways works associated with the DCO. Separate and more detailed comments on this matter are provided with regards to the related document 'Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach' (doc ref. TR020001/APP/8.97)

Requirement 29 (part 4) – there appears to be no timescale associated with the delivery of any scheme identified through (3) following approval being granted by the relevant planning authority.

Whilst the OTRIMMA makes some reference to timescales for delivery of works, the wording is not binding, referring purely to works being delivered 'at a suitable time to be agreed between parties based upon their overall programme of works'. CBC would therefore query whether further wording is required in 29(3) to include the submission of timescales for delivery within the details of the mitigation scheme to be submitted to the relevant planning authority for agreement in writing.

Part 5 Procedure for the discharge of requirements retains the 'specified period' of eight weeks to discharge a submission related to individual requirements. As Offsite Highways Works fall under Part 4 (Requirements pertaining to other operational matters), it would appear that applications such as that for the works to the M1 would be covered by the same time limit (with assumed consent if not discharged and requiring consultation with National Highways). There are related requirements under Para 36. Including the need to consult by issuing the application to a relevant consultee within 5 working days. CBC have some concerns that the timescales prescribed would not be sufficient for the discharge of complex highways related requirements, particularly where the majority of the review process would sit with third parties such as National Highways.

14. REP4 – 011 and REP4 - 012 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.2 Code of Construction Practice

Chapter 16 relates to Traffic and Transport, cross referencing the Outline CTMP (Appendix 18.3 of the ES TR020001/APP/5.02 and the Construction Workers Travel Plan (Appendix 18.4 of the ES TR020001/APP/5.02). It is noted that these are both proposed as certified documents within the updated Draft DCO. CBC would refer to the comments made upon the relevant sections of the Draft DCO (Requirements 13 and 14).

16.4.5 refers to the design of temporary traffic management schemes – and that lane closures will be subject to the traffic regulation process established through the DCO. For clarity this section should state that all temporary traffic management within the public highway will accord with the processes detailed within the DCO, not just limited to lane closures.

15. REP4 – 023 Environmental Statement Appendix 16.2 Operational Noise Management (Explanatory Note) Updates

Minor updates have been made to ensure that surface access monitoring is sufficient to enable noise insulation criteria to be assessed for the small number of properties affected by significant changes in surface access noise.

16. REP4 – 025 Environmental Statement Appendix 16.3 Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan Updates

The document has been updated to account for the acceptance of setting plant noise limits at 10 dB below background noise levels, as well as stating that noise surveys should be undertaken within 12 months of acceptance of the DCO scheme, to ensure background noise creep is minimised.

17. REP4 – 020 Cultural Heritage Management Plan

The amended CHMP was previously shared with relevant officers at CBC who have provided input, and the amended version reflects those contributions. CBC welcome the amendments, notably those in respect to air quality monitoring at Someries Castle. Whilst CBC Officers are satisfied with the amendments this does not mean previous concerns raised in the CBC LIR have been overcome.

18. REP4 – 040 Glint and Glare Assessment

The focus of the Glint and Glare Assessment is on the operational activity at the airport. Sensitive visual receptors, notably for CBC Luton Hoo RPG or

Somerles Castle Scheduled Monument have not been assessed. It is noted that mitigation is proposed for car park P1 to reduce the impact on airport operations, but the document fails to assess the impact on the sensitive landscape. The comments from CBC provided in REP4 – 116 CBC Response to Action Points Arising from Issue Specific Hearings are applicable.

19.REP4 – 042 Draft Compensation Policies, Measures and Community First

With the announcement of planning permission being granted for 19 mppa at Luton Airport, the Applicant has updated the Community First pot to start applying when 19 mppa is reached, rather than 18 mppa. Given that the Airport has not yet ratified that it is implementing the new permission, this change could lead to £1 million being withdrawn from the Community First pot and should therefore be resisted.

The updates also introduce a ground noise insulation scheme to apply to habitable rooms within the 55 dB LAeq,16hour contour and bedrooms within the 45 dB LAeq,8hour contour, with £4,500 per property available. This approach is welcomed.

20.REP4 – 044 Framework Travel Plan

Whilst the detailed review of the Framework Travel Plan is ongoing, it is noted that many of the measures within the plan are reliant upon engagement, rather than direct action or funding, with no reference to the Sustainable Transport Fund. It is assumed that this will be updated following submission of details related to the Sustainable Transport Fund by the applicant at the appropriate deadline.

[End of Document]