

# AUDIO\_LUTON\_ISH7\_SESSION2\_28112023

00:06

Good afternoon, everyone like to welcome you back just as we're all coming into the room. It is incredibly warm in this room and I realised that some of you may be used to the more formal surroundings of inquiries rather than wilting. Please do feel free to remove your jackets, should you want to, I'd prefer that and your active participation, rather than being overwhelmed with heat. So I'm going to pass back to miss Holmes, who's going to pick up the agenda.

00:38

Thank you. Okay, we're gonna move on to cycling and walking now. A deadline for in response to action point 29 For issue specific hearing for the applicant submitted a report regarding the catchment area for staff walking the cycling, examination library reference, but 4084 Could the applicant show figure 4.1 of this report, which shows the cycling catchments and then just talk us through what it's showing please

01:12

you just give me the reference to the document.

01:14

It is rep 4084. And it's figure 4.1 which shows the cycling catchment.

01:49

Just in relation to that. My question was, I understand that currently 2% of staff cycle, not the 2020 figures. So looking at this catchment, what percentage of staff live in the not 15 minutes and 15 to 30 minute areas? So, I'm trying to work out realistically how many staff could you increase the cycle to work?

02:14

Sorry, Richard, you can either the applicant So Madam just to explain the diagram. In kind of broad terms, what we've done is identified a cycling catchment of the airport in terms of different time bands in increments of 15 minutes. And that's based on an analysis of the actual network on the ground as well. So it takes into account any obvious barriers or impediments such as the airport runway that would restrict catchment on certain sides. And what you can see in the red dots is based on a sample of staff numbers, it's the number of staff currently living in, you know, across those catchments. So that's the sort of proxy of potential if you like, that is a sample of staff numbers, it's not total staff numbers. So that would need to be factored up to give a overall kind of assessment of total. And you can see from that, you know, what the sort of potential catchment is for staff living in proximity to the airport. And in the same report, table 4.1 provides details of the percentage of staff within those catchments by time bands. So you can see from within that 28% of staff within 50 minutes cyclable, dirt journeys night further 9% 15 to 30 minutes, etc.

03:38

But just show that a table that be helpful, thanks.

03:49

And is, is this on the number of staff that you surveyed? Or is this actually your total staff?

03:56

It's a proportion of stuff based on the sample, but that should be representative of the total if the sample is represented as you get my point. Yeah,

04:03

yep. Thank you. Okay, so So looking at that, realistically, you've got 28% staff that are within 15 minutes cycle of the airport. And at the moment, you've only got to present yourself cycling. So you know, the immediate thing is realistic that you could,

04:22

yes, so I think what this is doing in a relatively simplistic way is looking at the cycling potential for journeys to work. Now, of course, there are a whole series of factors that are relevant here. Depending on an individual's preferences, their age, the time of day, they travelled to work whereabouts they live in that catchment, whether they own a bicycle. So elsewhere in this report, you can see some detail around suggested barriers to cycling and what might be the measures that would encourage people to cycle which is clearly sort of really helpful data, sort of in preparation for things like the framework travel plan to identify what sorts of measures would be next Sorry, to increase cycling mode share the staff.

05:05

Yes. And have you, you're going to do any changes to what's in the framework to have a plan to reflect what's come out of this study?

05:12

Yes, I think so. So the framework travel plan is sort of an illustration of what, you know, a travel plan, you know, could cover in the future. So when we get to the preparation of the first travel plan, this kind of data and any updates to this will be really important evidence to understand what sort of measures are necessary in what sort of time period to promote cycling to work.

05:35

And, in summary, the report states that there was a potential for staff to switch to more active modes, if high quality infrastructure or the incentives were provided, and it says, for example, cycle lanes and develop public transport services. Can the applicant just show figure eight point 12 and pout to afford the transport assessment? So that's examination library reference a s 123. That was figure 812.

06:10

Though this figure shows the existing and proposed pedestrian cycle routes.

06:25

Yes, madam, because we understood from the agenda that you are going to ask about these things we've produced. Another plan that we hoped might be slightly more helpful. It is not currently an examination document, but one that we'll put in it would clearly be an early deadline six document. But we thought because it's illustrating things that are there in writing, it's not changing something. It's just sort of illustrating something. You and others might find it helpful. I think that's it. That's been Yes. That's that's the other one, isn't it? No, that's the other one. Could we would you mind if we put up this new one? It may just Yes, that's very similar to a plan that's already there, which shows the location of other transport interventions. And I think it also shows you can see in the dotted, the dotted lines as a blue and purple dotted line, some cycling interventions show I get Mr. React just to talk through

07:41

that. Yes, I think I mean, what is shown in the figure, what I was going to bring up was that it was clear that some cycle weeks were missing from the other plant, clearly if you've added more detail into this one. And what I would like to see and what I wanted to ask was why? Why cycle routes for the whole of the not 30 minute catchment not covered because surely you need to know where they all are in order to assess what where the staff could travel from on high quality sacraments.

08:11

Richard, again, I for the applicant, if I perhaps just explain a bit of context to how we've been approaching this. Before I hand over to Mr. React to talk about some of the specific kind of junctions. We've been working closely with the Highway Authority LBC to look at what is already planned in terms of cycling and walking improvements through the LC whip kind of approach, which identifies a number of corridors for enhancing facilities. And what we've been doing I can

08:39

I just check is those improvements that are mentioned in the West safety audits, that there's proposed work? That's going to be done by later right, that was a later question. Thank you.

08:49

So clearly, what we're trying to do here is to align any modifications and changes that we are making to highway infrastructure ourselves to planned improvements that the council have to improve cycling and walking links, with our overall ambition to grow cycling and walking mode share for staff. So overlaying all of those different kinds of datasets around catchment potential existing network planned improvements, but also junctions that we know we need to mitigate as part of our mitigation and saying, How can we bring all of that together to deliver an overall uplift in improvements for cycling and pedestrians that support our ambition to grow mode share for those. So that's the kind of dialogue we've been having. And what this diagram shows, is a combination of some of the enhancements that Luton Borough Council are proposing through their ALC whip programme alongside some of the junctions that we need to mitigate and how they're important kind of interface points where they like they come together to help improve cycling across the board because what we know are some of the kind of barriers to cycling is the lack of continuity. So the more or that we can align our proposals and ambition with that of the council, the more likely we are to achieve and deliver corridor improvements

that are more likely to change behaviour. So that's our overall ambition. I'll hand over to Mr. React to talk about any of the specifics.

10:17

Carry out for the applicant. I think, as Mr. Decane is set out there, what we've tried to do is align the works with the proposals which are within the LC whip. And I think one of the purposes of his plan was to articulate where the LC with routes are, how we interface with those LC with routes and the kinds of measures which we're looking to implement. So what we've tried to show on this plan for you is that at junctions where we're proposing to undertake works for example, signalization, those junctions will incorporate toucan crossings and advanced cycle stop lanes, where we are undertaking improvements along the carriageway and where the carriageway allows for we're looking to improve footway width. So where we've got existing shared cycle lanes, generally we're improving the widths of those those locations. So we're tying in the mitigation works, which we're proposing as part of the scheme with the proposals for for LC weapon. You'll see from from a plan that a number of schemes which we're proposing to upgrade, tie in with route so the route showing in dotted lines are the sort of LC web routes. And we've not shown on this plan the the wider routes on the LC web which go beyond this area as well, for principally routes which are tying in with areas where we're proposing mitigation. So it's complementary to the proposals which LC weepers is proposing and one of the important aspects around the LC which of course is that was also taken account of the waiting I think as part of the LC whip for priority corridors which LV CSU has been important for promoting and encouraging walking and cycling.

12:14

So in terms of that plan, have you covered all the existing cycle routes that could be used for staff within that not 30 minute catchment?

12:25

Do these cover the roots within the immediate area of the airport, as I say DLC with dust cover routes that would go beyond this. And I think this possibly ties back to the earlier discussion around things like measures that can be delivered through the frame of travel plan. And the funding that sits alongside that there is a potential to support delivery of wider measures to beyond the immediate junctions and the immediate area you provide additional measures and what I what I

12:59

was hoping to say was something along the lines of what was done for the boat bus and coach survey. So a map of this is what we've got now and look this is what we're doing so you can quite easily see the connections and that the areas are covered. So I think probably do need to add a bit more to this plan. But this is really useful to see to see where you're going with the cycling

13:17

we can certainly amend the plan before we submit it to show that for you

13:29

and yes, so can this be done for deadlines six to up to use the plan that you've got but then adding adding more detail.

13:38

We should be able to produce up to six Yeah, yeah. Thanks.

13:43

So did you want to add something?

13:45

No, madam Joe Richard again off the opinion I was just going to say as well you may find it helpful if it as part of that plan. We included those catchment areas as well in terms of 15 to 30 minutes so you just had that in the background so you can see how they're related to and then you have everything in one place

13:59

yes please thank you

14:11

they if I could just turn to Luton Borough Council Enlai, with these improvements. Can you let me know when this work would be? When's it planned? This work will be done

14:24

by Nancy swivelling Borough Council, just to clarify your question, in terms of the work do you mean development

14:31

and cleanup pavements and cycle routes?

14:34

Okay, the improvements are town wide over 10 years. They, some of them have which already features part of our capital programme. So we would expect to see realisation of a couple of our priority corridors come forward in the next two years. We do have a pipeline of schemes which will take us beyond that. It's very difficult to say with any kind of reasonable certainty that we will be able to deliver every single one of those schemes within the next 10 years. But certainly we are committed to the first two of those routes identified in the OSI whip and are working with active travel England to secure the funding needed to deliver them.

15:18

And can I just give you an action point for deadline six? Could You supply me just a short written report on the cycling routes and programme in terms of which routes are coming up when? Thank you? And can I just go across to the applicant? So given that you're relying on Luton Borough Council to do these works to meet your requirements? What Wait, can I give the improvements if they're not part of your application?

15:47

Richard account for the applicant. So I think as part of the preparation of the first framework travel plan will be looking to identify cycling improvements that are deliverable within that first five year period. So we'll be working closely with the council to clarify which of those routes will be delivered in that timeframe. So we can match that with the timescale for our own mitigation. So we can try and deliver some corridor improvements within a planned period. Because we know that one of the barriers to cycling is the sort of inconsistency. So our priority will be looking at where we can improve sort of corridors where there's greatest potential. Obviously, that is a little bit dependent on timing of things outside our control. But the first travel plan will identify which corridors have the potential to be delivered in combination with works the council are doing, and then back to the previous discussion around sustainable transport funding and priorities for that first travel plan period.

16:44

Thank you. Can I just ask Luton Borough Council in terms of the proposed highway works, particularly in the Wigmore area? Do you confident that the work you want to do to improve cycle J can actually be fitted in and that location?

16:59

Anthony swift Learning Council? Absolutely, yeah, we're very confident that the emerging designs coming forward from the applicant are entirely consistent with the proposals that we have outlined within the LC whip. It should be noted that the LC whip is a strategic plan. It's a 10 year plan. Therefore, anything that we've included in and around the airport is subject to detailed design and feasibility. But having seen the concepts coming through and the extensive dialogue we've had with the applicant, I'm very confident that the plans will help realise our ambitions for for cycling and walking in and around the airport. Thank you.

18:00

Though I am still slightly concerned about the location with my lane in particular, having been there again today in terms of what width is going to remain for cyclists and people walking. When I travel around there this morning during the rush hour. People going to school there was lots of people with push chairs, motorised wheelchairs, scooters, you had everything going on there going to schools. When I asked you in question TT 119 19 Yes, I did ask what? What will be left to What books would be left? And what areas you wouldn't be able to achieve the recommendations in local transport note 120 You didn't exactly answer that question. You told me about things that you could do. still needed to provide me with some information in terms of what actual locations you can't achieve the requirements of local transport when I 120. And the reasons why. Just so I can I can understand what's happening particularly in that location. Is that something you could supply me for deadline six

19:05

jaggery up for the applicant? I think that's part of our response we pride is to teach you on 19 We set out our understanding of the existing available space and the widths available and also the potential which that were available for us to be able to provide upgrade to the walking and cycling infrastructure along with Nora lane. And I think generally what they showed were that along the length of Wigmore

lane, there was the potential to upgrade the existing available wits to a better lens. I think in terms of the proposals that were looking at they are shared use paths which is in line what's provided there at the moment but as I say with an improved with to cater for of the use along that corridor. So that's the your proposals in terms of Wigmore lane.

20:08

So what in terms of local transport note 120, what with it is recommended to supply for shared cycle and pedestrian footwear in that location.

20:21

I'd need to look back and provide the details around that as well for you. But I think what we need to do is take away through to those sections and identify where there are the pinch points that we wouldn't be able to meet the minimum requirements on that link. The other thing I'd add is a generally where there are constraints. There are a couple of location, I think there are existing constraints where we are improving them. And the sightlines are generally quite good through those. So they're localised pinch points, but we can identify those for you as well.

20:52

Yes, because I'm concerned, obviously, you've said before, it's important that cycle routes are continuous, and having pinch points can put people off. And I'm not just simply concerned about staff who want to cycle and walk, but the people who are already using that area to cycle and walk and what consideration you've given. For those who isn't using that area at the moment. I was I was concerned because in your response to that question TT 119 which is examination Library Reference rep for dash O six, nine, it states that the proposed offsite highway mitigation works in principle is designed to accommodate increased volumes of traffic, which I understand. But it does appear to me that the highway mitigation work appears to be favouring cars over active travel, particularly in the with my lane area.

21:41

Jaggery out for the applicants. Yeah, I'd certainly like to clarify that. The Works cater, have been designed to cater for both existing corridors through there have uncontrolled crossing points, and the proposals will include improved crossing for cyclists to make that safer. And I think that ties in with the aspirations for for route J through there. So I think it should have probably said there's a balance in terms of what's been derived for all users.

22:15

So if if Debtline, six, you could provide me information about what locations you can't follow the recommendations of, of 120. And also design locations where you feel that there's any detriment to any pedestrians in that location as well. But thank you.

22:36

That's all I had on agenda item three. Before I move on to the framework travel plan, agenda item four. Does anybody else have anything that need to raise specifically on sustainable transport? That we've missed? Yes.

22:50

That makes for the Hertfordshire host authorities. So just in relation to the wider 30 minute catchment for their cycling walking. The St Albans LC whip identifies the need for segregated cycling provision between Harpenden in Luton along the A 1081 corridor, and the need for improvements to servicing and surfacing and lighting on the Luton top and in Greenway. The Harpenden to Luton route is also identified as a key prioritise route in the England's economic Heartland active travel strategy. And it would be good to kind of build on that as part of this development application, particularly for this staff access to the airport, ensuring good links with the Luton Dart station from Harpenden to help contribute to some of those mode share targets from Hartford cheer. And just a question really, whether the parkway Dart station has secure cycle staff parking provided or whether staff would be able to take bikes free of charge on their trains. For example, just thinking a bit more around the wider catchment for cycling walking as well. Okay,

24:04

thank you. Could the applicant just respond to that point, please?

24:09

Yes, because Mr. McCarney has this other commitment and as had to leave, I think Mr. Rhodes is able to cover this

24:22

and Matthew roads on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, I think in terms of other other cycling improvements that maybe prioritise in the future. I think that that's where the sustainable transport fund, funding the framework travel plan measures would would come in. So I think when we would seek to set the prioritisation of the first framework travel plan. Those measures could be considered and funded via the SDF, if deemed appropriate by the ATF Steering Group.

25:00

Thank you, Luton Council.

25:02

I have the support from local council just to make the colleague aware there that I have been in touch with officers or my counterpart at Hampshire County Council a couple of times regarding the Lutens for Harpenden link being a key strategic link. And as a colleague from the applicant just mentioned, the vehicle in which to to help see that would be the sustainable transport pond and the airport transport airport transport Forum.

25:34

Thank you, anything from Buckinghamshire Council, North Hertfordshire District Council are central beds.

25:45



Thank you, Madam only really just refer back to the the representation representations by the deadline five, noting that the catchment showed quite demand to the northwest particularly at the airport, which bleeds across into central Bedfordshire with regard to the Dunstable connection. So that's something that we've made representations on and we'll continue to do. So thank you.

26:07

Ken, thank you any more points on sustainable transport before we move on? So moving on to Agenda Item four, which has the framework travel plan in relation to the targets of mode share, setting the travel plans, from the applicants response to written question TT, one, seven, and the some of the targets and the travel plans will be required to be no lower than the green control growth limits should strive to be more ambitious? Can the applicant explain how the framework travel plan or other documents in the application encouraged or secure these more ambitious targets?

26:45

Madam in a sense, this goes to the point we were sort of exploring a few minutes ago about I'll let Mr. Rhodes come in at this point that the If one was to look at I think it's table 6.1 in the green controlled growth framework that says sets the limits and thresholds for surface access and those series of percentages. The framework travel plan says that the the actual travel plans will set more ambitious Mosha targets, then that that was that paragraph 141, that I read out. The sustainable transport fund is geared to meeting those higher those those higher target mode shares, clearly if the sustainable transport fund succeeds in doing that, great, and we would exceed all, but thresholds and and limits under GCG, we would never do anything. But if they don't, then the GCG limits are kick in and those level two plans and mitigation plans and everything kicking in and the operator would need to fund that. So that's that. I hope that relationship Yes, Mr. Rhodes must resist the temptation to explain everything, Mr. Smith's Yeah.

28:20

Yeah. And just just to clarify, it's, it's more, how is it secured? I'm encouraged that the targets will be more ambitious. How is that how is that done in the applicant documents? Documents?

28:37

I mean, I mean, because this is what the framework travel travel plan makes clear that they they should be there'd be no sense no point having them if they weren't more ambitious, if

28:53

what I'm saying is that in the travel plan, it says that the targets will be no lower than green control growth. Yes. And will should strike should strive to be more ambitious, right? How is it going to? How is it encouraging it to be more ambitious? Where is it written down? And how is it secured, that's why is the child are not just going to be the same targets as the green control growth.

29:19

Matthew roads on behalf of the applicant, so the first travel plan that would be submitted post. So once the road is grow was was issued would would effectively set those set those targets and that there would be those those measures would have to be agreed with the with the authority. So the targets that

are set in that first travel plan would be discussed and agreed with the authorities. And as as already noted, would seek to set higher higher mode shares than than those limits. So So it'd be secured in that for As they travel plan that is that would come forward and be agreed with the authorities.

30:08

So there's nothing else written the same whichever plan that provides any more encouragement or persuasion that the target should be higher,

30:17

not not at this stage of purely because the framework travel plan is, is that it's setting the framework for how the future travel plans will come forward. The governance via via the ATF and the ATF steering group to future travel plans, will will be the mechanism for how those will be evaluated. So the the ATF will play a role in and the travel plan coordinator will come will report into the ATF. So there'll be an ongoing governance around how the travel plan is performing against the targets that have been set in the first travel plan are reviewed every five years.

31:01

Okay. In the applicants response to that and question TT one six, it stated, the surface access strategy and framework travel plan set out the measures the applicant poses to increase sustainable transport travel mode share at the airport for both passengers and staff. These will reduce the number of vehicles travelling to the airport. Though if the mode share targets were not more ambitious and only match the green controlled growth limits than other the percentages go down over the phases. Due to the associated rise in the passenger and staff numbers. The actual number of people travelling by non sustainable means would increase, which would result in an increase of number of vehicles travelling to the airport, not a reduction. So have the applicant determined what the targets would need to be to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to the airport for each of the phases? And do they consider that these targets would be achievable.

31:56

And Matthew roads on behalf of the applicant. So there is an acknowledgment that the number of vehicles through each phase of the development would go up. And that is why see we've set set out the highway mitigations required to deal with the increased number of vehicles as a result of that we haven't at this stage, set the targets in the travel plan. So having at this stage, you know undertaken that that piece of work to work out how to achieve a reduction in car vehicles, the the the TA and the mitigation proposal in the TA is there to deal with the additional vehicles that would be generated for each phase. What I would say is that as part of the travel plan and achieving the limits and LinkedIn to the the O trimmer, there is the opportunity not to bring forward highway mitigation if we've been successful in achieving reduced car levels as a result of the airport growth. But that would come forward under the travel plan coordinators role as the travel plans are produced in the future. So

33:13

I think it's important, first of all, getting an understanding as to what the percentages would need to be in order to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to the airport. Because that is something that you've said that the surface access strategy in the framework travel plan would aim to do, because you as an

action point, work out what those percentages would be for each of those phases. And give me a bit of commentary on whether you think those targets are achievable. And he def deadline six, please. Yeah,

33:42

Matthew wrote on behalf of the outcome. Well, we'll have a look at that and come back to you for deadline six.

33:49

Thank you. The highway authorities are concerned that the monitoring period set out in the travel very much our plan is to long in vet three dash 124 national highway states that national highways believes that the monitoring of the travel plan targets every five years is too infrequent, as there could be significant changes in mode share. And the target should be monitored more frequently. National Highway sticks discuss with the applicant and the local authorities to confirm the frequency for the review of the targets. Can I just ask the applicant if this discussion has taken place?

34:22

Matthew wrote on behalf of the applicant? Yes. So we have had that discussion. I just wanted to clarify something with regard to the monitoring of targets versus the monitoring of the travel plan. We have stated that there would be a monitoring report that would be produced every year. It's the targets and changing of the targets that we've said would be every five years and that was to give the measures that were being implemented during that five year period of time to have an effect on travel behaviour. So there would be a reporting it into the airport transport forum by the travel plan coordinator on an annual basis as to the performance of the travel plan, it would just be the targets that would be modified every five years that would align with the surface access strategy for the airport. But also, as I say, give time for any measures to have taken effect.

35:23

Thank you for clarifying that. And national highways, would you like to raise anything on that?

35:30

Madam, thank you, Howard Bassett on behalf of national highways. The first thing to say is that we were not sure if we have had the meeting in relation to the travel plan just yet, I'm instructed that that is yet to take place. So we look forward to that discussion in due course, in relation to the use of the framework travel plan, in order to change behaviours, I think you've, you are interrogating an important point in that in order to understand the impacts of the development, ensure they're properly assessed, and to ensure the mitigation is secured, we need to have harder controls. And ideally, they should be they shouldn't be specified. One would have thought as well that if there is going to be a perennially improving situation, you need some sort of Ratchet effect in the way that the framework travel plan is reviewed each five years so that you can see on its face, that there will be an improvement and not by a single car, it has to be at least so there has to be something in there. And I think that it's important that that is captured now rather than being left, we can look at the substantially in accordance with question but if the framework travel plan is so loose, that you could be substantially in accordance with it. without specifying the sort of information. It's it provides a risk in terms of capturing and securing mitigation for later. In terms of the review of targets every five years, we we note in the tremor that there

is an annual report on traffic. And we note that it's intended that there'd be a Quinquennial review. We're concerned in relation to that on a number of levels, the information richness that supports the annual report on the information richness supporting the Quinquennial review, is in our view, not quite at the level we would expect or somewhat below that level, we would expect. And you will see in our representation questions about the number of cameras, whether it is constant monitoring for something of this complexity, and importance, one would expect there to be a level of monitoring that may be ANPR based and being real time and constant so that rather than focusing on single week at a given time of year, we will talk about EMS, I won't shoot your fox then madam, we can come to that later. But those sorts of things need to be borne in mind. And there is an interrelationship between the framework travel plan, the work we've just been doing in relation to sustainable travel, the the tremor, all of that interacts and really understanding that map, some sort of framework document, which shows how they all interrelate, how they relate to the funding pots is also really important, we would say at this stage. I think I think I've captured most of the things or now but we have concerns which we believe need to be addressed in respect of the SRN. There may be concerns that the other highway authorities are concerned about as well, but these need to be addressed with the SRN. I'll just check with my instructing client what those things to pick up. Thank you, madam.

38:54

Thank you. Can I just check with the applicant when this meeting is actually going to occur?

39:02

Matthew rose on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, apologies. I think we've we've talked we have talked about the Java plan in broad terms in our socg meeting but I appreciate we need a specific meeting on this week, we can arrange that as soon as possible. I would expect within the next one to two weeks.

39:17

Very grateful.

39:20

I think might have also the the sort of if you like flow diagram for understanding how various of the documents fit together as in the surface access strategy, which is a double P two to eight and figure 1.1 is the surface access Document Map and it shows how the transport assessment in chapter 18 of the EIS flows down into green controlled growth and also the outline construction traffic management plan and workers travel plan that green control growth flows down into the monitoring plan for surface access. It also then links across to the framework A travel plan. And and that's fed into by the surface access strategy, which again has a relationship with a sustainability statement. So what's not on on? There are some of the sub details to that like tremor and so on. But but in a sense, you know, a lot of those. It's it. I hope it's clear from that, or at least I hope that helps.

40:25

Yes, I have. I've seen that that I think what we're discussing here is more how it's actually going to work in practice. Yes, and the flow diagram, national highways,

40:34

how it basswood on behalf of national highways. Mme, you have have the point is that if a given event occurs or fails to occur, or changes observed, then what is the consequence? Does it flow through GCG through the tremor through the framework, travel plan review, does it produce something which is programmed in through the requirements and the in one lot of mitigation or through a mitigation which is which is neither in the tremor, nor if it is in another thing? We need to know where it goes? Who are the decision makers? Because they are there are a number of different decision makers for different items. And then where is the money?

41:18

Thank you. It flows through being controlled growth. It's absolutely clear and the various groups on that and the thresholds and the targets were public transport mode shares, which must be agreed and tremor, as you know, has the two types of mitigation mitigation type one, which is the identified mitigation mitigation that's been identified through the transport assessment, and schemes that are included within the DCO itself. What tremor will do through his monitoring is assist when when those need to be brought forward. Mitigation type two is is in the sense wholly innovative, I don't think there are any other developments that I can really think of in the country at the moment that have this that provides a mechanism for mitigating through the residual impact fund for impacts that are not identified at this stage. They are not known. Normally, if this was a development that you you just wouldn't mitigate for those because we've said it's not identified.

42:32

I'm I'm grateful for that. And we are going to talk about the tumour later. So yes, but I think

42:36

in answer to the question, we need to understand how this fits together. That is how it fits together. And and then the other things travel brainwork travel plan, the travel plans, and the sustainable transport Fund and the steering group and everything are fit on top of

42:54

that I think what's coming out of this examination is that the applicant may understand how it all works. But we're all on the couch at the moment.

43:02

Of course no, I completely understand and maybe this is one of the things where there are bilateral discussions going on that that that things can be explained.

43:12

Thank you.

43:13

My pleasure.

43:14

I understand from the recent Secretary of State decision on the 18 to 19 million passengers per annum called an application there was a condition to produce a travel plan for the airport. Has this plan been produced? And if yes, can it come into the examination? If no, when would it be produced?

43:33

That would be poor the operating company we will find out and get back to you. The councilman?

43:41

Thank you David Gertler for Luton Borough Council. We're actually in discussion with the operating company at the moment. Where actually do you want to say something Antony?

43:56

I swear to Luton really just expand on what David was saying there. We are working with the operator at the moment on a carpark management strategy and a travel plan. I believe that all right, take us from 2023 to 2028.

44:14

Sorry, that's something that you can submit into the examination. It'd be useful for us to see.

44:22

David did want to pick that up. Yeah. Sorry, David Gertler, again, Luton Borough Council. The anticipation was there are three planning conditions that need details to be submitted before they exceed the 18 million. And the airport operator is working to a timetable of first of December. I'm not convinced they'll achieve that. But hopefully before early in the new year before the examination finishes, we'll have something we Mr. Swift is working with them on one. I'm working with them on things like the carbon reduction strategy. I can't remember what the third one is. but they're too Oh, yes, and the noise reduction strategy. And their target was to submit by the first of first of December. But I'm pretty sure they won't achieve that.

45:09

If if I could just give you a small action point, if you could just confirm when this travel plan is envisioned and a work deadline, it could be submitted to the examination, I'd appreciate that. Thank you. Has anyone got anything they'd like to raise on the framework travel plan, national highways.

45:29

Thank you, Madam purposeful on behalf of national highways. One of the things that we just need to draw to your attention, and we do think some sort of decision tree or swim lane diagram is needed so that this can be understood. To draw to your attention, the first issue specific hearing on transport, it was put to us that the matters of concern to national highways would not be dealt with through green controlled growth, and we shouldn't be looking there, we should be looking at the trimmer. So we do need to understand what the applicants position is because they've asked her two different things in two different hearings. So if that could be clarified? And how it all fits together, that would be really helpful.

46:06

Thank you. Okay. Can the applicant clarify that? I'm happy for you to do that in writing? As an action point?

46:14

Yes, we can certainly do that the works to junction 10 are included in the order and therefore in the tremor, and therefore, in that sense, part of GCG. If I don't know precisely what said the earlier issue specific hearing, I have a general sort of briefing and I've read the notes. But

46:40

if you could just clarify that and doesn't actually require just put a brief notice to answer national highlights this question, just excuse me for a moment.

47:39

Apologies for that was just a brief group discussion. And it's becoming very clear that what you understand by the green control growth framework, and what a lot of people are understanding will be delivered by the green card and whole green, green controlled growth framework, and maybe two different things. And we are having a hearing on this day with regards to being controlled growth. And I think there are various points in the agenda where we've invited the applicant, to have the opportunity to explain the new green control growth framework has obviously got a new green front control growth framework framework that's come forward in some detail. What I'd just like to highlight at this point is, when you prepare that, those comments, can you bear in mind the conversations that we're having today? And try and answer those questions that are arising out of it. So that because obviously, the green control growth framework is your key to unlocking the whole of this development. And therefore, it's very important that we all understand how that would work. And a lot of the questions that are being answered here, from the answers you're given today, seem to be being resolved by the entrance control growing framework, that message isn't getting through. So I think I just like to highlight you have the opportunity on Thursday to get that message across. And then obviously, we can then pick up on those points at that point in time. Madam,

49:05

that's really helpful. Thank you.

49:10

Before I move on to the next agenda item is anyone else get an update on the phone, whichever plan they want to raise. I'll go to Buckinghamshire first Please. Mark

49:17

Westman Smith for Buckinghamshire County Council and just just a very short point in relation to that clarity that is being sought. It extends also to what is mitigation and what funding is allocated. And where, for example, the sustainable transport fund document that was provided that deadline five we're at five a five six specifically says that the SDF provides detailing around funding to demonstrate how interventions and measures in the framework travel plan will be delivered. The framework travel plan is undoubted. plea mitigation, it's identified as mitigation. Through the mitigation route map. It's part of

forms part of the access strategy, as we saw from the document flow chart, referred to by Mr. Humphries. So there's an overlay there, that indicates that actually, the funding in the SDF is directed towards mitigation that just needs clarification at the least. But Mr. Duncan, just want to make one point on FTP. Yes,

50:30

forgive me for raising question. There are a number of points within the framework travel plan, which relate to the structure of the building and the terminal and the site and everything else, such as showers and changing facilities, by parking Signage through the through the site? My concern is are those considered to be deliverables from the Stn? Or are they deliverables from the development itself? They're baked into the whole development? Because if their deliverables from the STS, then we're robbing the SGF of its ability to carry out the functions that were discussed earlier this afternoon. And I would worry that we wouldn't actually deliver anything wider than the site if certainly not nearly as if that was the case.

51:30

Thank you, would the applicant like to respond on that first,

51:35

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant, I just wanted to reiterate the role of the ATF steering group but in in effectively allocating the funding from the STF. So if they deem it is a measure that the operators should be bringing forward as part of the construction of the works, then that discussion can take place and, and to ensure that the the fund is spent on on the measures that the group see is the most most important and the priority. So I think just to draw that distinction, that there is a scrutiny group around the spending of the SDF and all the host authorities are a member of that group.

52:17

Okay, thank you, I guess, national highways limited Smith.

52:20

This is very much the point that we picked up last time, which the national highways responsible for the strategic road network can't be beholden to the other public authorities. We need to be in a position where the group can't decide it's a good idea to do something on the strategic road network if it needs doing it needs doing and it should be paid for.

52:40

Thank you, Mr. Smith.

52:45

John Smith, private resident, the works that are planned for junction 10 of the M one What if they are undertaken? Where's the traffic gonna go?

52:59



So we are going to talk about junction 10 in more detail, and they'll cite how we work so maybe we'll cover your point there if that's okay. Okay, if there's nothing else, I'll move on to the next agenda item. So moving on to parking. First, I'd like the applicant to provide a brief update with regards to the recent fire in the woodstove carpark and in particular how this may or may not affect the application.

53:26

Madam Thank you. Sorry, I've omitted to keep saying this but is Michael Humphries. Madam as you know on the 10th of October this year, the carpark TCP two was subject of a of a major fire incident. This was when our diesel Range Rover caught fire on the third floor and the demolition of the carpark unfortunately is required due to the extent of the damage. The drop off zone for the airport was in the ground level of TCP two and this has also had to be decommissioned as a result of the fire and a temporary drop off zone is currently being considered but for now an interim solution has been implemented in the midterm carpark. The airport currently expects the demolition process to commence in January 2020 for the carpark will have to be fully demolished to ground level and that's demolition is expected to take about 15 weeks. The planning for the rebuild of the carpark is underway, and is expected to replace the facility to pre incident status. That's what's expected at this stage subject to any necessary approvals. The planning build time is being obviously developed at this time. And is subjected to design and contractor appointment but it's envisaged at this point it will take 14 to 18 months on the working assumption that the DCO has consented by the end of 2024. And given the long term phasing of DCO growth, we do not envisaged any impact from the carpark works on the DCO scheme.

55:29

Thank you, thank you for that clarification.

55:41

Just moving on to fly parking. We talked about it and last issue specific hearing. I just like the applicant to provide me an update on the work done since the last hearing regarding this issue, including a summary of the engagement is had with the relevant highway authorities.

55:58

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant so the applicant is discussed fly parking with all of the authorities since well, certainly the host authority since last hearing with regards to Luton Borough Council. Fly parking is frequently discussed at the quarterly airport Consultative Committee attended by the applicant airport operator and Luton Borough Council. Back in 2017, there was a discussion around the control parking zone in the Wigmore area, which was ultimately rejected. And this is represented on a drawing in appendix A of the transport assessment a pp 200. But the applicant is continuing to discuss this topic with Luton Borough Council in the context of evolving Luton borough Council's area wide parking strategy. We've also had discussions with central beverage council with regards to concerns that they have raised about fly parking in the caddington area. In particular, the use of offsite car carpark shuttle buses to access the airport and and it's been indicated to the applicant by central Bedfordshire that they may support the introduction of CPS Ed, in the area. So recent discussions with regards to that have taken place and central beds have sent through some information to us about potential coverage of CPS Ed and potential cost of a CPS ed for the area in terms of how that may be

taken forward, we're still under discussion with them as to exactly how that could be brought forward. One option is the outline transport related impact monitoring and mitigation type two, as a unforeseen impact of the scheme due to the airport growth, but there are other other discussions around other mechanisms that we're also having, having around that topic. So yeah, obviously there is the mechanisms within the residual impact fund or sustainable transport Fund to potentially fund additional CP said, CP said zones if in the future as part of the airport growth. We we see further areas that are affected by fly parking, but we've had some very productive discussions, as I outlined, then

58:36

could just go back to the discussion with little Birkhauser. You said that the Parking Scheme proposal was rejected. Why was it rejected?

58:52

Is it from Luton Council. If I came back my colleague Chris got on online to come in here who has was involved with that scheme.

59:03

And is Chris Gordon Luton council there, and it was rejected by the residents at the time because they didn't want a resident permit parking scheme in that location. The nearby Vauxhall Park area did take up the the opportunity for a residence permit scheme. It may be now time to re consult in that area and see how thoughts have changed and I believe that's on Lutens programme works to be done aside from the DCO.

59:33

So I understand that the residents rejected the scheme Do you know why they rejected the scheme?

59:40

The when you the feedback we get from residents, when we carry out such a consultation, you get an awful lot of reasons. But primarily it's down to the cost of permits. And also it's an area that has quite a bit of off road parking already. So they didn't feel it was entirely relevant to them at the time.

59:59

There was There's been a discussion about how the cost of permits could be reduced, or who could pay for the permits, if not the residence scheme could be encouraged.

1:00:13

Yes, Chris Gordon at Luton, we have a policy in place at Luton, where we don't encourage developments to pay directly for permits. So we might look for the airport to fund the consultation and implementation that really works, but permits the cost of that it's felt should fall to the people who are benefiting from from the permit effectively.

1:00:33

That does seem a bit unfair, because they're being dissed, benefited by the five parking. It's a problem that is potentially caused by the airport. So I do have some sympathy that why should they have to pay

for the parking permits. There's other other alternatives been looked at in terms of how this could be met the scheme work?

1:00:53

With Chris Gordon at Luton we offered at the time as well. Limited waiting in the area that had some interest. It is it is a while ago, and at the time residents weren't so keen on the idea in the Wigmore area, because they weren't suffering at that time from from the fly parking to such a degree that the voxel Park area was um, no, not directly involved in parking. But as far as I'm aware, a lot of the parking from Vauxhall hasn't migrated, particularly into the Wigmore area so far.

1:01:29

Okay, thank you. Could I have it as an action point that either the applicant or Luton Borough Council work a bit more on this, maybe talk to the residence again and have a look at what what potential solutions there could be for fly parking? Because I feel that this is this is a an alive issue that does need resolving

1:01:52

habits of Anthony swivelling counsel, perhaps I could respond first. Appreciate where we've got rapid timescales on this, this DCO and what Chris has referred to there is quite a potentially a complex, sensitive issue that will require some investigation. I mean, I can provide some confidence here that we are developing as a council a a town wide parking strategy. We have in the last sort of few weeks been liaising with key colleagues at the airport to be involved in that strategy. Identify those places which are potential sort of, quote unquote nuisance areas for fly parking. I think it would, if Okay, come back to in writing in terms of what we can do between now and these impending deadlines. If we're implying a parking survey here, that's a very chunky piece of work, which we're happy to commit to as part of our town my parking strategy, but just in the context of the DCO timescales would prove extremely challenging.

1:02:54

Yes, no, and I appreciate this isn't an easy thing to solve. I see I've got some hands before I do that. I just like to go to Central Bedfordshire first to get their their feedback on discussions in terms of flight parking.

1:03:07

Thank you, Madam Jess replanted from Central Bedfordshire Council, just to confirm the comments made by the applicant that we have been in discussion with regard to particularly looking at the slip end area with regard to potential options. I think it's fair to say that it's the preference of central Bedfordshire council to that's looked at outside of the tumour process as we see this as more of a foreseeable unforeseeable impact if you'd like. But that is something that's still being discussed in terms of particularly what mechanisms might be suitable for delivery. Thank you.

1:03:38

Now, if I could just go to Mr. Smith,

1:03:41

John Smith, private resident, please Could I ask you to include Harpenden fly parking is now a growing problem within Harpenden, particularly in the north of the town. And secondly, we're talking about trying to find out areas of risk. Well, at one of the earlier the first open floor hearing, which I believe it was in August, a representative from Luton said there's a website that people can access to find out the best roads to park on so the information should be there. Thank you.

1:04:11

Thank you. And then if I could go to Mr. North online, please.

1:04:18

Thank you, Madam Chairman. My point is partly been discussed already, we're not entirely in terms of fly parking and interventions and mitigation type two, as determined to the trimmer is to consider residual traffic related impacts arising from a proposed development. We understand that the basis of delivering this mitigation is through the ATF steering group, and the airport operator will review the outcomes of the ATF steering group. It's understood that the residual Impact Fund may fund mitigation effects of traffic growth, including circumstances where vehicles owned by airport staff and passengers Park on public highways are causing a nuisance to use as the adjacent properties, with any supplementary planning works requiring separate third fund third party funding sources. But this is a particularly important issue to my clients, madam, because they operate a long term off airport car parking facility at Slip n. And previously, the parish council who we do have a good relationship with have indicated that this by parking was a source of people parking on site and it was directly due to the working of our operation. So 10, which was true, proved to be untrue. The real question I have on this is, it's not clear how mitigation for traffic growth relating to the proposed development, which is funded through the residual impact fund will be open to funding from the STF in terms of fly pocket. And really my question is whether the two that is the RAF and STF can or will be used in conjunction with each other or separately in relation to mitigating fly parking. Particularly given that there are a considerable number of interventions, which I've heard that through today's hearing which require funding. My second point really in relation to the same issue is what is meant in page 14 of our EP 504 won by separate third party funding sources. I think that also has to be looked at particularly in respect to fly by, by class the right thing to see a stop of this for obvious financial reasons. But I can understand that it does cause considerable nuisance and inconvenience local results. Thank you.

1:06:55

Thank you, Mr. naff. And we'd like Applicant like to come back on any of those points now.

1:07:02

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant, the residual impact fund is that is there to to address on identified impacts on the highway, and is acknowledged that that includes fly parking so that that fund is available. For that purpose, it has been equally identified in the framework travel plan, because it's seen as obviously a measure to control vehicle use, and therefore, as a result, move people away from Park from driving their cars on to sustainable mode. So that was why there was a link into sustainable transport funded through the framework travel plan, because it had been identified in the toolbox of toolbox of measures as a potential measure that could be introduced. By its very nature, the residual

impact fund is to mitigate impacts that are currently not known at this stage. And therefore, we can't really comment any further on where that would be implemented. Because by their very nature, we haven't we don't know where those effects may may appear on the network.

1:08:13

Thank you, for that matter in

1:08:15

the in the tremor under in Section four, which is mitigation tied to a sort of more fuel note, there's a Figure Figure 4.1 At the beginning of that section that identifies fly parking as an example of something that may be identified through monitoring, and which therefore would potentially fall within mitigation type two, and therefore the residual in Impact Fund. Yes,

1:08:45

thank you. Mr. North, I see you've still got your hand up. Is that a legacy hand? Or is this something else you'd like to add?

1:08:54

No, it isn't. Welcome, Jim. My question really was, Is it open the through the development phase proposed development, that both funding sources could be used in circumstances where for instance, fly parking is particularly acute. It's a question of both funding. So I understand from Mr. Humphries, that the Ri F is is clearly a, an intervention that can be used. But can both sources be used? Because this has over a long, long period of time, going back to the 1819 application, and before that been a subject of contention. And you will know Madama through representations at the very early stage that this was an issue raised by residence, at which time it was said by the applicant, but this is a matter down to local planning authorities. I'm just wishing to see maximum effort if that's the right word being focused on alleviating what is clearly a long established potential. Problem for local residents.

1:10:02

Yes, thank you isn't enough? Yes. Thank you Mr. naff. I'd like to move on to the on site car parking. In the applicants response to written question TT 113. That's examination Library Reference. Rep 4069. It states future passenger car parking requirements have been determined from the baseline of 10,550 parking spaces required for 80 million passengers per annum. However, I note from the applicants response to written question TT 111, that's examination Library Reference rep 4069, that between January and August this year, for the onsite passenger car parks, the average daily peak utilisation was approximately 80% of capacity. And at the busiest times the car parks were full. So what was the actual number of million passengers for that time period? So were you at 80 million passengers per annum or below between that January to August period this year?

1:11:07

I think we would have to check that we could put that download an action point. I mean, it's a figure that will be known and we would build a supplier. Okay,

1:11:18

thank you. And I'll add to that then. So my next question was going to be that if you were below 80 million passengers per annum, then is the applicant confident that the baseline number of parking spaces of 10,550 is sufficient for 80 million passengers per annum? Particularly, because you're saying that, at the moment, it's 80% capacity or full of busy times? And I'm particularly worried about the effects of fly pack in that that might have. So when you answer the actual points of the numbers, if you could also consider if you think the base why the base figures are what the what you're stating. Thank you. And can you do it for deadlines? Six?

1:12:00

Man, um, I think so I'm, I'm sort of conscious. And it's, you know, we, we know, the beginning of this week with that kind of piling up a lot of actions that are not a criticism, but just simply, it's the same group of people ultimately, that we'll be responding to a lot of them so we will absolutely do our best. And if we need to slightly sort of prioritise some things and take longer on others, and we will obviously let you know, I hope that's acceptable.

1:12:31

If I can just interject, that's one of the reasons why we are trying to agree each time however, when you come out of the meeting, obviously, you're also keeping an eye out and we will publish it if it does seem unachievable. Then just like last time, if you contact us, and we can review that,

1:12:45

so I'm I'm I'm just conscious every time I say yes, there are probably people in another room groaning you know, I have done so. So we will, of course do that.

1:12:58

Thank you, in the applicants response to it and question TT 113. That's examination Library Reference rep. 4069. It states that in addition to the onsite parking, the transport assessment assumes that offsite the pack key car parking would provide part of the future parking supply for the expanded airport. Can the applicant explain how many spaces are assumed to be provided by third party car parks within the transport assessment? And how it is assessed what the impact would be if this number of spaces wasn't available in the future?

1:13:39

Matthew wrote on behalf of the applicant, I'll have to come back on the first part of the question, but just with regards to how offsite car parking was, was dealt with within the transport assessment, it was assumed that there would be a growth in offsite car parking trips in associated with the airport development, and this this approach was, was basically using the same trip distribution for those offsite car parks as exist as as existed today. And then growing that in line with the growth in trips as a result of the airport phases. I think it's it was acknowledged by the applicant that there would be a market for that offsite car parking, and that they would expect car park operators to make planning applications to increase the amount of offsite car parking to meet that demand. If that that demand didn't materialise, then there are other obviously the controls have set out within GCG that would effectively prevent the airport from going unsustainably and would require that any Additional car drivers over and above that level to, to be taken up by sustainable notes. So I think it's an acknowledgment that airport offsite car

parts do play an important role in managing parking supply. But that, that and that mode shares assumed to stay the same, and that the market would take up that opportunity to deliver that additional parking as part of the airport expansion.

1:15:31

So given that your transport assessment is based on the provision of these off sites basis, and that's outside your control, can I ask how it's going to be secured?

1:15:42

Well, it's in a sense, it's not secured in that we can't force offsite car parking, but what is secured is that the growth of the airport will not happen until it comes forward. So this is the whole point about developing a green control growth framework as a very innovative way of managing future uncertainty. So if the airport, if offside carparking, does not come forward, if we do not, therefore hit the mode share targets, then green controlled growth will slow or indeed stop growth of the airport until we have through the level two plans with mitigation plans brought forward measures to correct that, what sort of measures those are the measures that are in broad terms as a menu outlined in the service access strategy. And that's how this would be managed?

1:16:48

I'm not sure I understand how, how you mitigate against not having enough parking spaces,

1:16:56

because you would stop because before you got to that level, you would have gone through a level one threshold or a level two threshold.

1:17:06

So your concern it based on the percentages of non sustainable transport.

1:17:11

That's what the green controlled growth does. And it's in that context that Mr. Rhodes said that, you know, if necessary, one would have to bring forward further measures to move those people into sustainable modes. The

1:17:30

way I understand it, if someone wanted is someone's wants to drive to the airport, and then they can't park at the airport, and they can't park at their party sites, then there's a danger there that you're going to get more fly parking. Yes.

1:17:41

But that is on the assumption that we have got to that level, because of the monitoring that is undertaken, we would know about this sort of thing that we were getting to levels of public mode share and usage of car parks and all the other things well in advance. That's the whole point of green controlled growth and the thresholds that we then manage that in advance of time, you what you're



describing is, in effect, the old system that has occurred on every other development in the in the in the country until this point, that's why this is a more sophisticated and more appropriate approach.

1:18:25

So if, if you can the action point, if you can supply information on how many spaces It was assumed would be supplied by third party car parks, where that was where and how that was assessed to the chance for assessment over over the phases how you thought it was good, that would that would be helpful to me.

1:18:44

And that I think is the the the action you gave us a few moments ago. Yes, certainly. Thank you.

1:18:55

Just wanted to actually ask a question and potentially if Luton Borough Council or maybe even have Mr. North? It's so my old planning local authority planning hat on here. Offsite car parks are notoriously difficult to get planning permission for particularly in areas like Luton, where there's large amounts of green belts. I mean, in reality, is there in your opinion, or your experience from Mr. Nos point of view, actually, space available for this offsite parking that's going to be needed.

1:19:33

Luton is actually constrained. So you'd want to ask the neighbouring authorities who've got the green belt around them. Luton has got a policy in the local plan, which is probably LLP six which discourages offsite car parking. We have used that we are satisfied that the amount of car parking at the airport when we granted the 2012 planning applique We are satisfied that the amount of car parking there was sufficient. And therefore, we have turned down planning applications within loosen for additional offsite airport car parking. So we do have an airport car parking policy, we have tried to encourage I think it's central beds out in slip end, had our planning application a number of years ago, where we thought we could give them reasons why they shouldn't allow the offsite car parking there. But the planning permission was granted. And they justified it on Greenbelt terms is previously developed land but Luton in terms of near the airport. We don't we don't have Greenbelt. It's there's two tiny slips on the southern part of the airport. But otherwise, you're moving into North Hartfordshire.

1:20:52

Okay, so before I come to Mr. North, who is obviously an off site provider, is there anything any of the joint hosts authorities or surrounding authorities want to add on this?

1:21:04

Thank you, Madam Jasper Pinto from Central both publisher Council. As more areas of highways rather than planning, I would ask that perhaps we could provide a response after after this hearing or pass the poster in summary, thank you.

1:21:23

Anyone else before we get to Mr. North, Mr. North?



1:21:32

Thank you, Madam Chairman. Two issues, you're absolutely right. It is extremely difficult. I would go as far as to say it is probably one of the most difficult types of developments you can achieve is to get long term of airport car parking anywhere that certainly on Greenbelt land. We monitor applications all over the country. And you'll be surprised to learn that most authorities refuse applications in nearly every airport. Certainly, you've even had the operator at Manchester Airport, been refused. In recent times, for multi storey carpark on Greenbelt land outside the airport, so it is extremely difficult to get it. That slip end. The land was not Greenbelt, it was white land. It goes right back to a plan they had in 1995. I think it was in south bend. So what it was it was that that was white land and it wasn't Greenbelt. And the question which arose in 2000, when planning permission was granted its defence for its site was whether it should be used for housing or whether it could be used for car parking. At that time, we were able to persuade the inspector that there was a need for car parking and permission was allowed. But as it is, as I say, extremely difficult to get, I think it's going to be extremely difficult to achieve around the airport because of the constraints that apply, particularly Greenbelt countryside as well equally. And therefore you're looking at existing sites, and predominantly looking at those sites for decking purposes. Because that's the only way you can achieve it. decking is now looked upon as a satisfactory means of providing long term as well as short term carparking is being used throughout the country these days. Along with other interventions, which people are starting to use, they use it abroad, certainly in France are using it, I think at Gatwick with robotics, that is taking a car and parking it robotically. So you don't have to open the door. So person driving that car doesn't have to hit the door. The the actual aisles, therefore are much narrower, and you can put more more cars in it. But it is extremely difficult. And I don't quite know where the 5% which has been talked about to be provided by third parties is to go unless you have an existing lawful site.

1:24:08

Thank you very much. Mr. North. I'm going to push back to Miss homesnap.

1:24:12

Thank you. Is anyone else got anything in relation to parking? Okay, yes, Hartfordshire.

1:24:19

Stephanie bakes on behalf of the hub to host authorities. And so that just wanted to sort of reiterate the host authorities current position in relation to the offsite car parking is mainly sort of linked to the monitoring of the trips associated with that car parking, which is currently missed through the tremor monitoring. So it the additional traffic associated with the airport expansion has been accounted for in the modelling. assumptions have been made about the provision of that car parking expanding, but there's no provision to monitor the trips that are associated with that parking through the tremor.

1:25:04

We can cover that when we talk about your tumour later. Is that Is there anything else? I'm conscious that we probably do need a break? Yes, not.

1:25:15

Just to confirm that North Hartfordshire as it borders Loosen is all Greenbelt. And a little bit further away is an area of outstanding natural beauty. So it does confirm that there will be a great difficulty in securing planning consent for a surface car park in that area, and we would be concerned if the Applicant was really relying on that.

1:25:37

Thank you, yes, the applicant.

1:25:40

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, just wanted to draw the distinction between including the trips in the modelling to ensure that we've been robust in terms of our assessment of the impacts on the road network from a growth in offsite car parking. And just that that's the key point in terms of the assessment. If that demand is not taken up by the market, you know, as was outlined earlier, the green control growth limits would prevent the airport from growing in an unsustainable way. And there won't be a need to meet that demand by a sustainable transport. So I think there's a distinction between us assessing the impact of additional trips as a result of offsite car parking, and us needing that car parking. They are two different things.

1:26:30

Okay, thank you. Mr. Nava. So you've still got your hand up? Is that a legacy hand? Or is there something that you need to add? Isn't

1:26:41

the point I wish to raise is really not to do with offsite, car parking, but on site car parking, because it has an impact on the amount of off site provision that may be required in the future that are set out by the airport. It's proposed development. You will know, Madam that I've indicated on behalf of my clients, certainly deadline one and more recently in deadline three and four stages. That's our EP three hyphen, 118, and our EP four hyphen 175. But there is an absence of any explanation of the methodology employed, or indeed any signposting for how the proposed levels of mid and long term on airport passenger car parking provision at the various stages of the DCO application have been devised by clients attention has been drawn by the applicant to documents that they pp 203 They s 123. A PP. 205 and a PP 206 Which purport to answer the query raised, but the truth of it is, Madam Chairman, none of these documents consider the methodology relating to passenger car parking, in that it sets out carpark and provision on airport. It deals with such matters as highway network and existing travel demand. And the only issue where there is consideration could be said consideration is under the title development proposals in Section Eight of a s 123. And there, the applicant states that future passenger car parking requirements have been determined by the baseline of 10,550 car parking spaces, which was the level of car parking required at the point when the airport reaches permitted capacity of eating mppa. The future car parking takes account of the growth of passengers on the assumed reduction in car parking mode shifter, bracket C section error reference source not found. Madam Chair, what I'm really asking for from the applicant through yourselves. Because I don't believe you have been given that answer that yourself is for a similar situation to occur as what occurred in a document a s hyphen, one to five, that's the needs assessment. And if you look at Section six of that needs assessment, you will see an explanation of future demand forecasting. A very helpful flowchart

at Figure five, six 6.1 which deals with passenger Mark demand forecasting process. That really is what is the essence of what my clients are seeking. They're not seeking to cause problems for the airport, we just seek to need to know how these figures have been arrived at in all the three phases of the application. And with respect to the airport, we don't have we have not had an answer to those questions at all. It's very important when you're considering numbers of passenger car parking spaces. both now and into the future, both of 18 MPP 32. And in between that, and it's also very important in the context of what are the evidence that was previously presented, as you will know, at the time of the 18 to 19 mppa called in inquiry, when most of the airports in fact, there's a document that I think was produced by the Council, which showed that the car parks between May and September are virtually full. This is happening at a time when we're expected to find 5% More car parking spaces. It's the very reason why I said very early on in the process, why we tried to have a dialogue with the airport over providing a satellite facility, because we could see this problem coming up. It's it is, as I said before, extremely difficult to get off airport car parking anywhere in this area and around Luton Airport. It needs a strong coordinated approach. And I mean that not only involving my thoughts on the airport, but the authorities around the airport as well. Because unless it happens, I don't believe in all fairness that the the 5% is achievable within the timeframe of the DCO application.

1:31:17

Thank you. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Nath. I've taken them all on board. I think if there's nothing else on Park, I think this will be a good time to take short break. If we could come back, help us five. Thank you.