

# AUDIO\_LUTON\_ISH7\_SESSION3\_28112023

00:07

Thank you, if you already will continue.

00:11

So I'm going to move on to agenda item six. Now the site highway works.

00:17

First, I'd like to discuss the stage one road safety audits. So that's the examination Library Reference rep 5055.

00:26

I would like the applicant to provide a brief update regarding the engagement this had with the relevant highway filters on this matter. But in particular, just to answer my query that the reports all have a section for the overseeing organisation to add their comments, and agree an action. And I assume that is part of your engagement local have highway authorities, but if you could include that in your summary of how it works going. And when you think that that kind of information will be submitted to the examination.

00:56

A jag reacts for the applicant. Yesterday, we provided an update deadline five in terms of the progress on the road safety audit. So in terms of where we are at the moment, the road safety audits have been completed on all of the local network, but they've also now been completed on junction 10 as well.

01:17

Deadline five we provide you with a designer's response to the Road Safety Audit comments. The next stage of that is to engage with the authorities on the comments to agree responses and actions to be taken forward on those designs. We've already had some engagement with Luton Borough Council on the schemes in Luton. We've had some feedback from Central beds on some of the schemes in central beds and we have a meeting diarized for next week to talk through the actions on on those schemes. We are working on a designer's response on the national highways schemes and that will be shared with them when that is ready. So we're working through the process at the moment and as you correctly identify, as part of doing that process, we will be populating the remaining column columns within the audit responses.

02:16

I think in reality recognising that we're meeting with each and historically separately because they the measures impact on those locations go independently it's likely that before we're able to provide the full completed audit it will be deadline seven

02:36

Okay, so a deadline seven that will be almost the the report submitted with all the columns filled in jaggery out for the applicant Yes That's That's correct. Okay. Thank you. Do any of the local authorities want to make any comment on that before we go into specific locations of offsite highway works

03:00

okay.

03:03

So just want to move on to the proposed highway works to junction one. So junction 10 of them one understand for the latest representation from national highways so examination Library Reference ref 5093. That the proposed offsite highway works at this junction is still to be agreed. National house has proposed two alternative options in relation to works at this junction can the applicant provide a brief update as to how this issue has been progressed and mainly give me confidence that they'll be resolved before the end of the examination?

03:33

Jaggery asked for the applicant I think if I if I start I think with the work to the junction itself so can I just stop you for a moment apparently the live stream isn't working so I just want to before we progress because there are people in line who are trying to watch

03:53

apologist use the time to collect your thoughts

04:06

is it now now working?

04:18

Even we're dealing with junction 10 and national highways are in the room. What we'll do is if you can continue because I'm aware of the time and we will direct as an action point for anyone who didn't watch the live stream for this point to watch it and then put in anything that they wanted deadline six. Okay.

04:37

Thank you jaggery out for the applicant. I think it's probably worth just reflecting on what the proposals for for junction 10 are and then perhaps I can update you in terms of where we are in terms of the work that's ongoing. So, the works to junction 10 comprise of three phases of works which are have been assessed against each of the

05:00

assessment phases. And they build sequentially upon the works within each of the assessment phases. So within assessment, phase one, so I think we can probably pull up the drawing from the transport assessment appendices from appendix A draw in 0009.

05:24

I think the UK we might not be able to draw it up at the moment because of the defeat. But But broadly explain that. In assessment, phase one, we're going to take works to mainly to the junction itself, and they include widening to the northbound slip, widening of the circulatory on the western side, from two lanes to four lanes, changes to some of the white lining to improve the northern circulatory and improvements to the white lining on the northbound on slip. And that packaging mitigation measures addresses the impacts which arise at phase one assessment phase one, I think it's reasonable to say that based on national highways, last response that the mitigation works for assessment phase one or broadly agreed, and the impacts on the junction are broadly agreed.

06:17

assessment phase two a then builds upon the works at phase one, and they include further widening to the

06:27

1881. And the key improvements in assessment phase two a include improvements to the southbound slip and so the merge onto the main line. With regard to that we provide a two lane left turn slip which complemented by changes to the white lining,

06:53

including the the nosing is pulled back by 25 metres and extension to the merge point and

07:01

changes the white lining which enables us to provide essentially a 7.3 metre slipped going down and then we end up with it will effectively be an auxiliary section before we merge down into the main line line, main line. And that's part of our core proposals at phase two.

07:21

So the modelling work to date and are set out in the transport assessment report identified the impacts on the junction and works at phase two A was shown to mitigate our impacts at that stage. I think the point of difference that remains between ourselves and national highways is around the nature of the interface with

07:47

junction 10. And the main line in terms of the progress we're making at this point in time.

07:57

The issues are currently being addressed through the updated modelling, which we're we're undertaking. And to reflect on the previous work we talked about in terms of the rule nine modelling which showed that as a consequence of the updated modelling, there is a reduction in in the demands in the forecasts. Broadly speaking in the future years, that's around sort of 6%.

08:28

And whilst we haven't been able to share this with national highways at this point in time, the changes and the the reductions and volumes around junction 10 are even greater. And that will be the information we'll be sharing with them shortly. So I think where we're at at the moment is that the emerging work from the rule nine modelling would would show that the proposed mitigation works address our impacts on the network. I think we need to continue to work with national highways to look at

09:05

where there is the point of difference around what further works are needed at the merge.

09:11

Thank you. Can I come to national highways for the comments on this please?

09:16

Thank you Madam Howard. bassford on behalf of National Highways

09:22

tried to take things in turn.

09:26

First of all the works to junction 10 as currently provided in the application, we believe that the works to the junction itself are there or thereabouts in terms of being agreed however we do need to see before we can say yes they aren't agreed commitment to providing maintenance Bay and gantries and we don't want to see the gantries as part of the signage strategy for later agreement they are needed so they have to be provided as part of the works and we want

10:00

Want to see that committed upfront, and you'll appreciate that wayfinding on the SRN is critical to safety. So that's why that is important

10:10

in terms of the

10:14

in terms of the additional works, and it's worth considering them, as additionally referred to them as alternatives, when you were making your introductory remarks they called that you will have seen and you'll have seen them called options in some of the earlier paperwork, they are in fact, both needed at the same time. So it's not a choice. That's simply the way they were described there. Now, we now refer to them as interventions internally. So that that confusion is avoided. Now, without said that the modelling will show that those are I think, unnecessary,

10:51

that remains to be seen, there is existing and projected congestion at this location, which would be exacerbated in any event by the by the project, because it will, of course, just provide, as you observed

earlier, more traffic. And so what one usually sees in these circumstances is that the additive consequence has to be addressed, and that you can do that by constraining off the development or by providing for works to be provided, should they be funded. And so our proposal in relation to those matters that are Grampian requirements and the way that you will live that seen before, many times there's enable those to be provided, provides flexibility as to how it's addressed, but protects the public and the network from uncontrolled growth. So that is, that is how we are looking at those. There are sundry other things to bear in mind. For instance, the trimmer provides and we'll come to that no doubt that mitigation might not be provided if it's addressed in another way. But as you all have heard me stated earlier, we look for hard commitments to provide necessary mitigation.

12:03

So that's, that's particularly important. In terms of other things that we'll look at later, I just spoke to my colleagues to see if there's something else for me to do right.

12:13

Now, that's fine. Thank you, Madam Well,

12:16

Miss, Mr. Bloom, Jeremy bloom, Melvin national highways. So having seen the emerging forecaster on the modelling for demand on those south facing slips.

12:31

I think we've refined our position, that phase one of the development, we think that the junction, the impact of further growth is relatively minor and the junction be able to cope with the proposed mitigation.

12:50

But then there's a phased approach. Beyond that the south facing slips, the south on slip merge, we think, required first, and then later on the note will work additional works that are northbound off slip. So there's, you know, based on what we've seen so far, we think that's what's required. Obviously, we await to see any further updates the modelling. Yes, and when is it proposed that you're going to be applicants on national highways to meet to discuss these latest figures

13:24

jaggery out for the applicant. So I think the original club programme had

13:29

further engagement meeting scheduled for for this week. But with the hearings taken priority, we've not been able to arrange for that to happen this week, we would hope to be able to do that in the in the following week, with the intention that this then feeds into our reporting for the middle of December.

13:51

If I'm just add on the couple of points that were raised, as well around gantries and the maintenance Bay, clearly any any infrastructure required for safe delivery of a scheme would be delivered as part of

the scheme. We have shared with national highways, proposals for the maintenance Bay and are discussing obviously the appropriate there are a couple of alternative locations where that can be accommodated. So hopefully providing that confidence that that could also be delivered as part of the scheme.

14:27

Thank you.

14:30

Jeremy Blum national highways. And now we were satisfied that those items can be provided within the redline boundary, which is think's really helpful, but I think national highways needs more certainty around commitment to deliver those aspects because they're not part of the DC application.

14:50

Okay, and if that could be agreed, hopefully at the next your next engagement sessions.

14:56

Thank you

15:01

Okay, I want to move on to the proposed offsite highway works to the three junctions in Hitchin. So that's proposed works. Number six Ei, K and M.

15:11

Thank you for providing the data that I requested for action point eight in the last hearing. This data has given me an understanding of the impact the proposed mitigation will have on each of the three junctions. I understand from the deadline five submission from the Hertfordshire host authorities, which is rep 5068. That they've refused the reviewed the data submitted and they're in discussion with the applicant.

15:34

Can I just ask the half as your host authorities to provide an update as to these discussions? And can you confirm if your issues that you've raised are now being resolved?

15:45

Stephanie Biggs Hertfordshire host authorities.

15:49

So yeah, we are still sort of requesting further engagement to develop alternative designs and costings, to feed into the DCO and provide certainty that appropriate measures will be delivered that those junctions, we provided some detailed comments on the modelling as part of that submission. I think that probably I need to check though, actually, that they have responded to that. But I think overall, we're still not in agreement that they those issues are resolved by their response.

16:27

And yeah, there's just a number of points around them rarely. So

16:33

you know, even sort of the proposals at those Hitchin junctions are inconsistent with the applicant zone, indicative principles for the empty two mitigations, which have a requirement to consider that all works include a commitment to enhance active travel conditions, and they're just not proposing that as part of the empty one. scheduled scheduled one mitigations for Hitchin. So that's, that's the kind of main issue really just in summary, we've got lots of detailed comments, but obviously time, etc. I won't go into those now. Thank you.

17:13

Can the applicant respond to that? I mean, given where we are in the examination, can you give me confidence that there'll be a resolution to these disagreements over the highway mitigation work in Hitchin and can you just detail what you're doing in terms of engagement and the programme for getting these issues resolved?

17:32

Jaggery out for the applicant? I think the comments that were referred to on the junctions were submitted deadline five, so we haven't had a time opportunity yet to formally respond to those. We have reviewed those comments. I think in a number of areas, we would disagree in terms of the impacts which raising concerns, the mitigations have been developed to address the impacts of the scheme in Hitchin in those locations. And the principal impact is related to additional traffic movements. I think the methodologies that we've set out and included within the trimmer does allow for the authorities to bring forward alternative proposals if they believe they are better suited or better aligned with other policy requirements in the area and provide a proportional contribution to be able to deliver those. So we believe today that the mitigations as proposed address the impacts within Hitchin. I'd also add that the emerging modelling which were in the tune for for rule nine also shows a reduction in flows as well and continues should continue to show that the mitigation appropriately addresses the impacts.

18:56

Okay. So I assume you're going to respond to the deadline sixth to the comments put in a deadline five, we will be up okay. And we'll see what comes out of that and where we need to go. Yes.

19:12

Thank you, Madam,

19:14

this does remain a principle area of difference and I just want to set out precisely why that is.

19:21

The non compliance with a local transport plan could be illustrated by the one of the opening paragraphs which says this plan accelerates the transition from previous transport strategy that was largely car based to a more balanced approach which caters for all forms of transport and seeks to

encourage a switch in the private car to sustainable transport wherever possible. And this is this is amplified further DFT policy paper from December 2022 on the strategic road network and delivery of sustainable development, which is referenced by active travel England

19:52

and it's turning those advice on active travel and sustainable development and we can provide this document which is in the public domain

20:00

To the inquiry, but paragraph 15 says the transport decarbonisation plan and the future freight plan also recognise the local planning and highway authorities need help when planning for sustainable transport and developing innovative policies to reduce car dependency. This includes moving away from transport planning based on predicting the future demand to provide capacity predict and provide to planning that sets out sets and outcome communities want to achieve and provide the transport solutions to deliver those outcomes. vision led approaches including vision and validate will decide and provide or monitor and manage. And the point really here is that the green control growth is an attempt to set a vision and validate type approach to the airport's expansion. But then that is abandoned when it comes to the mitigations. It specifically in Hitchin, where its impact to a prediction provide there was the transport growth is treated as a fixture, they're not must be accommodated.

20:58

More specifically, the conflict with our own growth and transport plan, which tries to prioritise cycling and bus.

21:06

Already is developing soil sets sets out and outline some plans for two of the junctions, which we'll put in which we'll use some of the space, the public highway space to provide capacity for active travel and bus priority. If and when that is implemented, if there were invented before these mitigations were implemented, that land would not then be available for expanding capacity for most traffic, even if that were agreed to be the right approach. So fundamentally, we have a problem that what is being proposed is not compatible with policy, and it's probably not actually going to be deliverable. And therefore we are seeking not just an agreement to be able to allocate the budget for those relatively small interventions on other events, but actually to develop together interventions which are appropriate, compliant with our planet plans, our policy and our plans. And that would deliver

22:02

sustainable transport and increase the motor of sustainable transport within Hitchin to free up capacity for what is inevitable in the growth in road transport. So, as I say that that remains a pretty fundamental point of difference, I'm afraid. Thank you. Thank you for that. You mentioned the document began that to travel, if you could submit that into the examination. I'd appreciate it. And deadline six, please. So just just person taking the action points. just clarify the name of that document again, please.

22:33



Yes, sorry. I will leave off transport North Pay option transfer council. So the title of the document is just the DFT policy paper from December 2022. Entitled strategic road network and the delivery of sustainable development. It was referenced perhaps troubling them but that's not necessarily Okay. Thank you. And I'm glad to advise that the livestream is backed up.

22:59

On some of the points made by North Hertfordshire, yes, I'll just pick up

23:05

madam one point which Mr. Out touched on, but is also

23:13

then in a sense bound up with the North hearts

23:17

representation and the acknowledgement that this actually the GCG framework and trimmer and other documents are an attempt to

23:28

move things on from predicting and provide and the point that Mr. rout mentioned, appears in the tremor document. So the latest version is rep 5042.

23:42

And table 3.4, and paragraph 3.3, point 12.

23:49

And table 3.4 says, potential forms of Mt one mitigation type one, the proposed works in sheduled, one of the order and then there's an alternative, which is an alternative solution proposed by the highway authority in the same location. what the text says underneath is are set out in the table were requested by the Highway Authority, the applicant may agree to an alternative solution to the proposed work set out in schedule one to the DCO. If this approach is agree the Applicants contribution to the cost of such works will be limited to the estimate cost of implementing the schedule one proposals and the applicant would need to be satisfied that any alternative would be delivered in a timely fashion it goes on. The point of this is for many of these types of intervention, including in Hitchin, we're talking about interventions which may not actually be needed for a number of years and you know, road transport is a very rapidly evolving area. Now, we have identified the shedule one works on the basis of what is known now and what we have designed.

24:58

But if in a few

25:00

as yours because of changes in vehicle types or autonomous vehicles or whatever, it is decided that actually a different solution is necessary. What has been built in to Trump this is the whole point about this type of approach is the ability for the authority to come to

25:20

asked to the airport to ESG and say, Look, we want to actually do something else, can we take that money that was hypothecated for these works, and use it for a different type of solution now, may not completely meet North hearts aspirations. But that is, again, a long way ahead of anything else that I'm aware of in this field, and is an attempt to go beyond just predict and provide.

25:51

Thank you. So you said that if something there's an alternative in the future that was put forward by the council,

25:58

it would be you'd put in the same amount of schedule one costs, I suppose, can I ask half or two, if they're happy with the amount of schedule one costs for what's being proposed at the moment,

26:09

I would leave North Arts Council was since we haven't seen an estimate for the cost, we can't actually have made that that assessment. But

26:19

in terms of the scale of the interventions, it's unlikely that the cost would cover doing anything particularly ambitious with sustainable transport. And we fundamentally, we don't think that that should be the reference point. And it was the cost of those interventions shouldn't be used as a reference point, because they are not policy and plan compliant. And therefore, we should be looking towards designing co designing interventions, which would be policy and plan compliant. And that would meet the mitigation requirements of the airport. And that should be our baseline, even if we, you know, we're happy to agree that actually what gets implemented should be appropriate in the circumstances at the time. But we don't want to be tied to a baseline of some relatively minor interventions, which, which we can't do what we need to do. That is policy and plan compliant. Thank you.

27:08

I think it is important to note as well, that, you know, the the modelling doesn't indicate North hearts have no evidence to indicate that, that the the changing flows as a result of the airport do impact walking and cycling.

27:27

And that's why we've focused the mitigation on

27:31

what we potentially have an impact ie the functioning of the

27:35

junction, as I've said, if things have moved on, then in you know, some distant point in the future, then there is this mechanism, but the airport.

27:47

You know, in this context, this isn't generally just an opportunity to kind of do stuff in Hitchin or other locations that may be perfectly desirable but aren't actually a consequence of anything that the airport is doing. Can I just ask Have to host authorities are not have sadistic counsel, in terms of what is being proposed for the junction forgiveness? Do you believe they go far enough to mitigate the additional traffic that's going to be put on those junctions as a result of the airport expansion?

28:21

ever leave from North hearts Council?

28:24

We're not sure because actually, the data that we've been provided doesn't give us confidence, even on the basis of the predicted increase, because we're not sure that the baseline level is correct.

28:39

But our point is that we should be looking at the trip demand, not the vehicle demand, otherwise, we should we should be looking to accommodate the increase in trip demand. And simply by meeting that by increasing road capacity at one or two, three junctions

28:55

will have wider ramifications for hitching on the on the villages. And it undermines our attempts to provide a sustainable transport within those within Hitchin itself. So

29:09

the ultimate run by way is no afraid. Thank you, Madam

29:15

is at some point is there going to be sort of a full assessment of the information that was

29:21

supplied in relation to the data given at those junctions and the proposed mitigation, so you can sort of really get some detail and let me know whether you think that what's been proposed this sufficient

29:34

evidence from Northwest console. So I have I have looked in detail, and tabulated all of the data that has been provided. And what hasn't been provided is the actual traffic counts at those junctions. All we've been given is the forecast which is extrapolated on into the future. So it's difficult to know without the data and we have we would request right at the beginning to see that the actual travelling time

30:00

Don't count data that was used for the for the modelling. So without that, we can't really progress further. But it actually comes back to my earlier point about understanding the trip demand geographically spread. So we've looked, we've never seen an actual number for the number of trips that will be expected to originate in re five or five corridor, other than road transporters, which is where assumptions has already been made about the mode model shares. Thank you. And now let's try and get this this issue resolved, could you supply traffic counts to

30:36

not happy to

30:39

jaggery out for the applicants. So, the modelling has been undertaken based on the output from the strategic model, and therefore it doesn't

30:48

apply growth or baseline count to produce those models. What the modelling does show though is on a like for like basis when we put in the model flows with and without a development, the Mitigation Scheme on the on the key routes, which would be on the 602 and the 505, which is where we want to encourage more public transport routes better journey times does reduce queues does also reduce delays as well. So we go back to the original point, though, in the context of the scheme, not only with mitigating our vehicle trips, we are providing that Betterment for public transport for that corridor as well.

31:28

Okay, and I am concerned that this seems to be quite a large issue that does that doesn't resolve and so I'd appreciate if you can ensure engagement happens at the earliest opportunity to try and get this resolved.

31:47

They want to move on to the proposed offsite highway works on Crawley Green Road with my lane and eating Green Road.

31:54

Please could the applicant just show the latest trip distribution plans on the screen again? So that's an examination Library Reference rep five dash oh three seven.

32:05

And if you could show figure 13

32:08

of that

32:10

muffins place

32:21

and can you zoom into the area that shows Crawley Green Road with Marlin and etiam Green Road area?

32:35

Is even anymore just to focus on the area of clogging road involving?

32:42

Thanks.

32:45

So, it is a bit hard to tell due to the poor quality of the background maps. But does the applicant agree that from this it appears in 2043? With the proposed expansion to 80 million passengers per annum? There's little or no vehicle shown to be using Crawley Green Road or eating green world and low numbers forecasts on with more land.

33:08

Yes, that'd be correct. Okay. So in the last hearing in action point eight, I asked for additional data to allow me to explain to the Secretary of State why extensive offsite highway works with proposed in this area, bearing in mind a significant number of relevant representations who raised concerns the applicant issued rep four dash O a two in response, which in relation to these junctions refer back to the transport assessment. So can I just ask, who in Luton excuse me here in Luton Borough Council has reviewed the offsite highway works and the proposals and what comments that they have in respect to the justification for the scale of the works in this area?

34:01

Fancy swift Luneburg council.

34:06

So, offset high works have been reviewed by myself my colleague, Chris Gordon. And with respect to eating green road

34:16

that's been discussed and assessed by us as the highway authorities being reasonable.

34:25

Though, because obviously, it's quite extensive works. I've driven around there again this morning, all the roundabouts, the change in signalised junctions. And for the look of the local interest distribution plan. There's no traffic really on those roads related to the airports. So I'm just not sure how I can justify to the secretary of state that this works. Go ahead, bearing in mind the number of relevant representations that are concerned about the improvements

34:53

just enhanced by our colleague, David regards to the point there about relevant representations.

35:00

Sorry David Gertler, Luton Borough Council, it might be best if we get back to you. But

35:08

definitely when we we looked at the model and if you go back first of all to the New Century Park scheme which had the similar airport access road, we call it new Central Park access road. All the modelling at that stage showed the junctions to

35:27

prolly Green Road, Eaton Green Road, Wigmore lane, they all tailed back significantly.

35:35

And without E,

35:40

you are getting gridlock in that area. So the access road was proposed to then have the eating green road link in it, which does ease it, but there was still the need for enhancements to the junction. But in terms of the DCO, I'll have to get back to you on that.

35:59

Okay, would you be able to do that facts for deadline six plays?

36:05

We'll try.

36:06

Okay.

36:09

With the absent like to make a response on that yet jaggery app for the applicant, what I would add is that whilst the trip distribution plans show the distribution of the airport trips, what the visit model allows you to do, because it's a dynamic model, it takes account of rerouting of traffic from other corridors as well. So there are other corridors where there may be greater truck trips being added reassigning traffic as well. So it's the mitigation measures address both existing congestion which is in the in the network, at the moment, growth that's occurring, as well as airport trips and redistribution of traffic. But I suppose in relation to this application, I'm concerned about the airport related traffic. Are you saying that the jianxin improvements and just focus on airport related traffic, they're just they're going to do general improvements to traffic congestion and Luton?

37:04

Jaggery for the applicant, they will provide benefits because it'll allow traffic to move better, but it's principally those ensuring that the airport trips can get to to the airport. I mean, if the airport trips are caught up within that general traffic, they're not able to get there.

37:20

I mean, if you could supply me some more information because so far I haven't been given enough to justify why the works are needed. So I know Luton Borough Council are going to have a look they for you could also see if you can supply me some more information on that. Because at the moment based on what I've seen, I can't recommend to the Secretary of State that those improvements are going ahead in relation to the airport

37:46

just want to move on to eating green eating green road link road.

37:52

So I've got a couple of questions. I understand from the applicants response to written question TT 121. That's the examination Library Reference rep 4069. That in relation to the previous plan application that included this link vote. The planning offices committee report concluded that whilst it may have been contrary to the policy, LLP six, there are traffic and transport benefits will arise from its provision.

38:18

So firstly, Keisling Borough Council to just provide me with a brief explanation as to why the provision was there in the first place to ensure that no use was made of eating green road to provide access to Central Park or the airport was originally in LLP six.

38:34

Yes, David Kirkland, Luton Borough Council. You're in one respect you want to refer to document

38:42

rep. 1006 which is the new Central Park report. Paragraphs 2222229 deal with the link road in there.

38:54

I'm assuming you've seen the policy map for the loose and local plan which has one big yellow arrow on it and the new central park development was headed over towards the border with North hearts.

39:09

There wasn't a clear scheme as to how new Central Park would be developed. There was an extent planning permission

39:17

and in dealing with loot loot and rising on the new Central Park scheme,

39:22

it

39:25

the LLP six airport designation covers with more Valley Park covers new Central Park covers the airport and it was

39:33

became clear that it would be better to move the park to move the business park new Central Park over nearer to the airport. less impact on the Greenbelt in enhance the inspector at the examination into the local plan was also concerned. So he just thought there was just one big yellow arrow. He was concerned that it would split the park into

40:00

Who we might end up with a very strange park without adequate access to the southern part, which is the county wildlife site. So

40:09

he, he's in considering that he was then worried about new Central Park being developed over on the right hand side, the the eastern side and access coming off eating Green Road. And he was worried about traffic being channelled in from eating green road or channelled out to eat and Green Road associated with that. So he specifically mentions that in paragraph 320 of the inspectors report back in 2016, or 20. I think it was 2016. Is the inspectors report examination into the local plan. Yes, sorry. Yes, the planning application with new Sophie Park was purely dealt with by Luton Borough Council, it wasn't an inquiry pins or anything like that.

40:56

So

40:58

in terms of the access road, what the transport assessment accompanying the new Central Park application showed, as well as a technical note, and a supplementary TA, showed, I think, as I said earlier, that without access road, and without the link, there was major tailing back from Vauxhall way, which which affected the three roads to the north. So it was then the link road, eases that with the tailbacks was such that within 15 minutes, there were significant tailbacks within 45 minutes, we had gridlock. Yeah. That's useful to know what my question was, actually was. In the in LLP six, it says that no use should be made of eating green roads to provide access to Central Park or the airport. Why was that put in originally? Why was that important to go in the

41:56

LLP six? My recollection is that that got put in during the examination, and the concern was the channelling of traffic onto each and Green Road. Whereas this, what the new Central Park application showed was that actually having the eating green road link, reduced the traffic issues. Okay. So can you just I think I know what the answer is gonna be. But can you just explain whether or not you think this policy, LLP six applies the current application? And the reasons why.

42:29



And if you want to give that to me in writing, that's fine. I'll give you that in writing by deadlines. Sorry, David Gertler, I will give you that in. And obviously we touched on that this morning. So it may be that you want to combine the same results and work. Combine the two responses on that.

42:53

Would the applicant like to respond on that, but just to jaggery out for the applicant, just to if it's if it's helpful, that

43:04

what LBC have set out there is still seen in the current modelling work that we've undertaken. So, there is referenced in our response to the appendices to the environmental statements, which show that with the scheme and with the airport in place, close on eating green road are reduced compared to the future boat compared to baseline conditions. So I think the conditions which were set up LC LPC are still relevant and still apply.

43:37

Okay, thank you for that. Has anyone else got any comments they would like to raise before we move on to this agenda item? Miss Smith. Yes. John Smith, local resident just going back to my earlier my earlier question, the proposed highway works to the junction 10 of the one, where will the traffic be routed or rerouted when that work is going ahead?

44:03

Could the Applicant give a response on that place?

44:07

I'm not sure I'm clear on the question is that during construction that in terms of those works, yes, because I feel that when it's all going on the behold ups and they'll come off and go through happened.

44:21

So most of the works, obviously, will will need to be phased and we deliver the works in advance of the impacts arising for the scheme. So we will need to develop a construction traffic management plan to set out how those works would be done. The intention certainly wouldn't be to have any

44:40

long term or any closures of any of the key infrastructure in Junction 10. So it'd be about insurance phasing is done to minimise any disruptions or traffic.

44:52

Thank you.

44:54

Okay, I'm going to move on to Agenda Item seven now, which is the transport related impact monitoring and mitigation approach?

45:00

Mr.

45:03

At the last hearings, I understood that the trimmer submitted deadline for as a result of action points 16 will not be in outline form.

45:11

But that's not the case. I do appreciate the version that was submitted was an update on the original version. But is it the intention that the trimmer will stay in outline form for this examination?

45:22

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant, yes, the the commitment is that the full trimmer will be produced and approved post consent of the proposed development and but will be

45:35

this will be secured by requirements for the draft consent order, and will be a have to be elderly in line with the outline tremor. So it's the intention that it would be an update to the outline tremor, not the full tremor itself.

45:58

I was going to ask for a brief update, can we make it very brief on the latest version of the trimmer, as was submitted as a reference is rep 5041.

46:13

Yeah, Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant, I'll try and keep it as brief as possible. I mean, the the development of the outline trimmer was to set out the objectives, which were essentially to monitor the impact of traffic growth on parts of the public highway agree the need for in the form of the mitigation as identified in shedule, one of the draft DCO and agree mitigation for residual traffic impacts to be funded by the residual impact fund. So there are obviously different levels of monitoring that are associated with mitigation type one, the locations where the off site highway works have been identified. That starts by monitoring the amount of airport related vehicle trips at the airport sites.

47:00

The second level of monitoring that monitors the amount of airport related vehicle trips at the junctions where the mitigation is proposed. And the third level of monitoring is junction specific monitoring to confirm the need for the mitigation. And the form of the mitigation to be agreed as was, as was mentioned before with the applicable Highway Authority.

47:23

So those monitoring the monitoring level, we'll be threshold placed and agreed with the local authorities. These thresholds will be informed by baseline surveys that will be undertaken every five years. And note that some of the authorities have mentioned camera positions that are shown on the in

the outline tremor, we'd like to say that they were kind of outline, and by no means final, and there will obviously be

47:51

the fine the full tremor will be will be approved by the local highway authorities. And they will have therefore the opportunity to agree both the thresholds that are set for the monitoring and the specifics around the camera locations.

48:06

I would just add that we've had obviously discussions with Hart, North Harper chairs were mentioned earlier

48:13

around alternative forms of mitigation. And they are they are they can be brought forward and approved as part of mitigation type one. For mitigation type two, the residual impact farm will be secured via section 106. And will be and the trimmer steering group will decide on the allocation of the funds after assessing mitigation proposals from its members.

48:41

Minimum I'm sure you remember there was reference there to

48:46

the final term of being approved by the authorities and that's requirement 29.

48:52

Which if you remember it, I think deadline for was amended quite a lot. So it's it's now in an amended form.

49:01

Thank you. So you talked about the location for multiple locations and that locations could be added to

49:10

and you're talking about this being done in the sort of the final chapter. Could this work be done in a updated version of the outline Chima. So there's a bit more confidence for the local authorities that they've got the margin locations that they they fill in required.

49:25

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant so we have had feedback and tried to

49:31

sort of show show an update version based on comments received.

49:37

They will approve the full trimmer and have the opportunity to agree that we will have also been in discussion with national highway specifically around junction 10 accepting that may need a slightly different form of monitoring with regard to the slips that were mentioned earlier and those discussions are ongoing. So I think it's

50:00

In with regard to the outline trimmer, it's really about ensuring the framework is correct. But the full trimmer will allow those those details because there will be sort of specifics around each junction that that may change before that full trimmer is approved.

50:18

So I'm glad to hear that the discussions are going on and you're taking things on board. Will you be going? Are you proposing to update the outline tumour before then the examination to update it with any information gathered from the discussions?

50:33

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant.

50:37

Yeah, I mean, we've received some comments, deadline five that we need to consider with regard to the trimmer. So I think any comments that have been received that we feel need to be reflected in an update updated version of the outline trimmer we will we will take on board and re resubmit.

50:59

And when is it proposed that the outline tool will be resubmitted at what point in the examination? So I think deadline seven would be a sensible deadline given the negotiations are ongoing.

51:23

The outline Chima document explains that there's two types of mitigations you've got type one for proposed work. So the offsite highway works, and type two is mitigation for residual traffic related impacts that may arise for the proposed development. Type Two mitigation would include junction capacity enhancements, traffic calming and parking control. For the cost of the examination to date, there's been significant evidence submitted regarding fly parking. So can the applicant explain if fly parking will be classed as a residual traffic related impact which would require monitoring by the relevant highway authority in order to demonstrate mitigations required

52:03

by three roads on behalf of the applicant? Yes, that's correct.

52:14

Can I go to the local highway authorities for their comments from the chairman please I start with Luton Council

52:25

the Swift Luton Council, we've continued to be supportive of the approach to the tremor and specifically outlined tremor that was issued last month, and it continues to support its development.

52:40

Thank you. The Hertfordshire has Lotus

52:43

definitely begs for the help of your host authorities.

52:48

Yep, just a few points on this. And then I've also got some comments on the residual impacts fund as well. Do you want me to deal with them under a separate? Shall I go through the trimmer? As It Is it? Yeah, do the residual impacts. Okay. Yep. So

53:07

the HeartShare North hearts Council are not in agreement to the applicants proposal to limit the funding of the MT one schemes to the cost of implementing the currently proposed shedule on mitigations. And Hitchin. If they're made more policy compliant, we've already sort of covered that. So I won't go into any more detail on that in relation to the off site carparks monitoring was the applicant confirming under the earlier agenda when I raise this, that when the offsite car parks do expand, that they would then be monitored at that point, in which case the baseline position would be needed. So that was one point. I don't know. Yeah, could the applicant sponsor now please.

53:52

Matthew rose on behalf of the applicant. So monitoring of off site car parks has not been included. There's mitigation type one is about monitoring traffic through the junctions that we are proposing to mitigate as a result of the proposed development. So that that will be picked up by the traffic flows that are travelling through those junctions and that that will include any traffic that the monitoring of airport related trips will be from the airport itself. And that will be that therefore will relate to the amount of vehicle trips that was predicted at the time of the transport assessment.

54:38

Okay, thank you.

54:40

I am conscious of time I do want to finish finished sometime tonight.

54:45

I also know that all the local authorities have submitted comments on the trimmer deadline five which will be responded to a deadline six. That Correct?

54:56

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant yes that's correct at

55:00

I don't think there's any of the authorities who haven't provided comments on the trauma. Okay. So I'm happy for. I still want to hear your comments. But if you could just keep them keep them brief because I have seen everything submitted deadline five. Thank you. Yep. Okay.

55:16

Yeah, I think just ongoing discussions about the

55:20

additional monitoring rate monitoring sites is welcomed not just for North hearts, but also for the other parts of Hartfordshire, as well Harpenden and Bails lane, watery lane, and a few others, which Hartfordshire will be in touch about.

55:36

There was a point in the tremor that that sort of suggested that the

55:45

that there might be a pause in the monitoring at some point. So it was sort of around the proposed development.

55:53

I can't remember the the actual terms of it. But there would be a pause in the monitoring that we consider that the proposed development will still need monitoring of the traffic impacts, even if the expansion of the airport is paused, or there's no works going on. I think until the expansions completed in full, we wouldn't expect there to be a pause in the annual monitoring for any reason.

56:21

So we'd still expect that it would still be monitored annually.

56:28

Yeah, and then I had some points about the residual impacts fund, but don't. So go through those now. Yeah.

56:35

So they're just some queries really about being allocated on max power or authority per year.

56:43

It doesn't necessarily give long term certainty for the authority to be able to implement the potential interventions that they might identify to mitigate the transport impacts, it's sort of better to have a long term certainty of the schemes. So the Hartfordshire host authorities are seeking clarity on the total value of the funding, even if its approximate range at this stage, how the funding is proposed to be distributed, effected by year and by local authority, whether the district authorities will have a funding allocation, or will it only be the highway transport authorities, whether the unspent money would be rolled over in all court or clawed back after each year.

57:32

And whether the

57:35

airport transport format and we'll forum will have the discretion to vary that spending profile, for example, to accommodate a large scheme that requires more than a year's allocation, and quite how that would work. So it's just around some of the mechanics of that residual impact fund. Thank you. Thank you. And I'm sure the applicant will be responding to all those points that deadline six. Can I just move on to get the comments from Buckingham Shipley's?

58:02

Yep, James Duncan Buchinger. Castle.

58:06

First point, I believe we've raised previously.

58:11

And that is

58:14

really the point about the obligation on the local highway authority to fund all the evidence gathering prior to coming to the ATF to access funds through the trimmer with respect to mitigation type to

58:31

the ability of of authority to fund that is going to be extremely limited, if at all possible.

58:39

The concern there being a point of principle of would you actually be able to access mitigation type to as local authority if you cannot access to funds to to find that evidence.

58:52

And the second point sort of links from that and goes back to the earlier conversation regarding great control growth. And when we're discussing fly parking, if a local authority is unable to access its own funds, to carry out the investigation work and evidence gathering, then you wouldn't be able to apply green controlled growth limits, because you wouldn't be able to bring the evidence forwards.

59:16

Yes, now, I know. I said I'd like you to respond deadline six. But if you could just give a better response on that. That point raised.

59:28

I think you know, there comes

59:33

a limit. And we think we've reached the limit on this where it is appropriate for us to fund things we're talking about

59:42

impacts that are not identified in this project.

59:48

And what it's being suggested is that saying 1015 years time, we should have to pay for monitoring by local authority.

1:00:00

To tell us that there might be or might not be an impact from the development. What we have said is if the authority keeps part of its highway functions, normal highway functions of maintaining its network identifies a problem and is able to say to us that this is clearly caused by the apple then come to us and and

1:00:25

mitigation type two would

1:00:29

provide the means whereby we may be able to

1:00:32

assist with that or contribute to that. But

1:00:37

you know, the Apple cannot solve every problem in the local area for every highway authority that they think may or may not occur 1015 20 years into the future. Now, obviously, there's a balance here, but we think we've got the balance of outright on this one.

1:00:54

Thank you. I think the only the only area I'm concerned about is the issue of fly parking, because Has it not been identified in this examination for the number of relevant maps? So should that be something that isn't classed as type two, but that's dealt with differently? Well, you know,

1:01:15

blind parking, if there is fly parking, that will be very clearly understood, you will, you will see cars, and they are, they are five parking, obviously, there is an issue of whether that is fly parking caused by the airport or not by the airport, but I'm not aware in many of the surrounding areas that there are many other

1:01:37

sources of flight bucking. I mean, the maybe I just, I'm not a wearer of that.



1:01:45

But again, you know, if if, if there is this is something that we've indicated the authorities should draw to our attention. The mechanism is, as I've said, there for something to be

1:02:01

done about, done about this. But as I say, I think here we've got the balance.

1:02:09

About right, we will continue, obviously, to talk to the authorities about this sort of thing, but

1:02:16

you know, money money that is available for monitoring on these things will not be available for actually remedying these things. So that's where we think this is about right. Okay, thank you. Moving on to nerf nerf have habita. District councillor, do you want to add anything? Yes, please. I just like to add relief North Arts Council. I just wanted to

1:02:43

clarify this point about next offsite parking, there's three categories of offsite parking, there's commercially run identifiable car parks. And transport assessment identifies six of those with a parking capacity of somewhere in the region of 7000 spaces. There's also informal parking serves people using the offer in their driveways, through companies like just park. And then there's a third category, which is the fire parking, which is which we've already covered. Our concern with the applicant not monitoring those is that it will be difficult to identify to Morris the growth in the provision of offsite parking and the impact of it. So every every journey that ends in a parking space is a trip on on a road. So if the ANPR cameras are set up to only count traffic that terminates at the airport is going to miss all of that traffic. So if there's growth in the provision of offsite parking, or the use of offsite parking, it's not going to be captured, and we're not therefore going to be able to identify or trigger the mitigations. That could be necessary. Thank you, madam.

1:03:49

I assume you've put that in as a deadline five?

1:03:55

Or possibly not in that detail, because it's only become apparent that Applicant does not is made clear that they're not monitoring offsite parking. Yes, I'd be grateful if you could put that in as an action point for deadline six that the applicant can respond to a deadline seven. Thank you. Central beds.

1:04:16

Up Thank you, Madam Chair printer from Central British Council.

1:04:20

I think the majority of the comments that we've made a covered in our deadline five submissions. I won't reiterate those. But there are two. I think just additional points of quick clarification that arisen

from the discussion today. Certainly with regard to the offsite parking, I think remains if you were the council that the responsibility for monitoring is an onerous one with regards to local authorities to pick up and would also require a baseline survey to be undertaken prior to the expansion of the airport in order to have a metric to compare against.

1:04:50

And therefore, we feel that that initial baseline survey should be something if this has to be covered through the drilling process that should be read into that documents.

1:04:59

The second query

1:05:00

With regard to the ML zero, the initial one off monitoring. And going back to the discussion earlier today with regard to the car park fire, and the time period it might take for that car park to be reconstructed is to understand what impact that might have upon that baseline survey, on the basis that there will be a temporary drop in car parking that would get picked up a number of years into the development and make crossover with the development process itself. And at the moment, and I appreciate that's a matter that's outside the applicant control in terms of what has happened. But in terms of the way the document is structured, there is a question over whether ml zero in terms of a baseline would be accurate, so reliable taking into account that temporary loss of car parking, thank you.

1:05:47

I would national highways let's make a point.

1:05:50

Thank you, Madam Howard Basford on behalf of national highways.

1:05:54

A few few quick points to pick up here, if you refer to and I'll try and take you swiftly through this if you refer to the trimmer itself. The point to note is that the mitigation is proposed after impact. So it is very much a case of

1:06:12

monitor see if there's a problem. If there's a problem take actions if you refer to paragraph three of the trimmer, and table 3.13 point 1.2 you'll find there the national highways mitigation at junction 10, which is listed against the schedule one works but since like the red line in passing, in passing, I'll note of course that the southbound slips at

1:06:37

junction 10 are not included in that. So theoretically they are ri F works, even though they might be relatively substantial in terms of their cost. So you have these are the empty one items for which you monitor, you then go through MLO, ml, one, ml two, ml 350 ML three, then you implement the works. Now

1:07:06

that would mean that the impact would have happened and the mitigation works would be undertaken, whilst the impact the deleterious impact was occurring. So that's one of the reasons why we say no, now I may be misunderstanding that. But that appears to be the way the tremor is set up.

1:07:27

If that isn't the intention, then I'm perfectly willing to be put right and perhaps the tremors words could be clarified. The other thing to observe is, of course that this is supposed to march, step by step with green controlled growth and our green controlled growth does not refer to the trimmer on its face the framework. And it deals with mode share, which of course is a component of this, but the two do not do not cross refer and the sanctions in green controlled growth that were directed to by Mr. Humphries don't appear to interact with this. So that has to be monitored as well. And then as I say, we need to make sure that for instance, if if additional works on the main line of the M one were required as a result of ml two, sorry, MT two type mitigation and that bear in mind that national holidays does have good data about what goes on on the main line. If that were to occur, then you need to make sure that this works, really in terms of those sorts of impacts as well. Thank you.

1:08:30

Thank you and the Applicant will be responding at deadline six. Yes.

1:08:37

Matthew wrote on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, just one quick point. It is it's not that the impact would have happened and then the mitigation is introduced, we have set modelling set set predefined thresholds based on

1:08:54

the modelled levels within the transport assessment and those thresholds would be agreed with the highway authorities and with national highways at a level prior to the impact being requiring the mitigation to be introduced and that accepts that take junction 10. For example, there will be time required to go through a detailed design exercise and implement that. We've stated in the document that those thresholds would be agreed in the full tremor with each of the highway authorities. So we'd be happy to discuss our national highways in terms of junction 10, but certainly not. Whilst we'll be monitoring growth in airport trips to understand has there been any growth, which is quite right to do in terms of what triggers the mitigation that comes down to the agreement of those individual thresholds at each location.

1:09:47

Thank you for that. If it's quick. Yes, just very quickly, Mr. Mr. Rogers opened the doors right away and walk through it. The approval requirements were

1:10:00

concerned to ensure that the thresholds are agreed and understood now, and that those are recorded at this stage, because as far as we can tell, you need a Grampian type approach so that a development

phase doesn't go ahead until you know, the mitigation is going to be secured. And that would seem to be a logical and sensible way to deal with this. The other thing is to make sure that national highways is in a, in a position where it does get approval. So yeah, perhaps there's protective provisions or through requirements that it can enforce quiet local authority, simply because it presents too many things go to other groups for approval without national highways, particular position being properly, properly understood. Thank you.

1:10:45

Thank you.

1:10:48

In the interest of time, Mr. Smith, if it's quick, thank you, John Smith, local resident. I've just got a few points and I will be brief. Firstly, when the mitigations and the monitoring are done. Junction nine to 1010 to 11.

1:11:06

You've got to include the accidents. I share a different opinion than Mr. Humphries. Because I think 86 accidents a year is not exceptional 86 accidents last year is a lot that has to be built into the modelling and it has to be monitored. Second point, I understand that passenger surveys have been done. The latest I heard I may be wrong here that only 6000 passenger surveys were done. If that's the case, that's a meaningless sample on representative. It's only about 3% of the current capacity of 18 million, so that cannot be used in any modelling at all. It's not representative. Now, the other point I want to make regarding trains, nobody's mentioned trains at all. Now I've yet to be convinced that the effects of the additional passengers and their luggage on Thames Lynx Thameslink trains have been covered. Those trains, Thameslink particulate are not built for the luggage, they just asked this matter and now I hear your concern. The reason why we haven't covered rail tonight is because they weren't well aren't here and we're waiting for their capacity assessment that's going to come in deadlines. The next I think well I may not be able to call it any more of these so if I can at least make some comments. I mean, I'm gonna be very brief only got one more point after this. And that is Thameslink trains are not built for that I commuted on there for over 30 years I know and I've suffered when passenger come on with but bags and rucksacks smashing into my head and the Luton Airport Express starts in Corby stops at Wheeling, we're a Bedford before arriving at Luton, there's only two an hour I just don't think there's a capacity and particularly not for luggage. So that's the first point I think should be to be covered. The second one is even more important. And I have yet to see anywhere what the contingency plans are for when the whole rail system goes down. And I mean the whole lot East Midlands rail Thameslink and I say I've commuted over 30 years, I breathe, I briefly wrote down how many different types of reasons for holdups cancellations and system failures are, and I've got over 20. And again, this is not exceptional, this has to be built in. So I want to know when the 1000s of passengers are arriving, and they're on the dark to Luton Airport Parkway, and that system goes down and it can be any time of night all day. And sometimes it can be the whole day. What do they do? Where are they going to go? And I think you've probably put this in as a relevant representation in the past. Has it been responded to by the applicant? Well, I haven't seen a decent response to it. If I'm perfectly honest, I don't know what the contingency plans are. When the system goes down for 24 hours. What did they do? Well,

1:13:42

to sort of answer your concerns if you could just put in my team what you've just spoken about tonight, into deadline six, and then the Applicant responded deadline seven. Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

1:13:57

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, I just like to just draw Mr. Smith's attention to rap 5057 which was rarely impacts summary that the applicant submitted.

1:14:12

The bid may not have seen that. But yeah, please do have a look at that document.

1:14:17

Does that met 5057? Correct. Thank you.

1:14:27

Okay, I'm going to move on to the last agenda item which is construction. If I could just take a minute I'm gonna see if I can move some of my questions to written questions. So if I have a moment thanks

1:15:02

Okay, I'll start by talking about the outline construction traffic management plan, this examination library reference a PP one three to Section six of this plan covers monitoring, and states in paragraph six point 1.1 The lead contractor will undertake regular reviews of the effectiveness of the approved ctmp to ensure that the requirements that are out there had been achieved and any revisions undertaken. And can I just ask, was this a thin margin approach that was taken for Project clarium? And if so, what was the outcome?

1:15:38

I'm obviously we would have to go and check what what they did for Project Korea?

1:15:47

Yes, if you could, if you could find out, please and find out what happened with the monitoring that would be appreciated.

1:15:56

Deadline six.

1:16:05

Yeah, so this is, again, with some of these, you know, again, I'm conscious that they're alone, large numbers of actions now. So in accordance with misdoings

1:16:18

suggestion, we may have to sort of kind of prioritise and come back with some a little bit.

1:16:25

A little bit later, we're only on Tuesday.

1:16:30

If I can interject, Mr. Gertler, is normally very helpful with Project Kareem queries. So maybe, between the two of you can come up with a solution, or maybe we could give him that task.

1:16:44

Okay, so there were a number of relevant representations that raise concerns that construction traffic from the proposed development could cause damage to the local roads. Could the applicant confirm if a pre start condition survey will be undertaken with monitoring during the project so that any damage that was identified will be remediated back to the original?

1:17:13

I don't think we know the answer. That's the sort of thing that is a

1:17:18

as Mr. Rose was saying a responsibility of the contractor. I just simply don't know the answer to that, man. So it's quite a, it's quite a standard thing for contractors to do. I was just wondering whether it be possible to add that requirement into the outline construction management plan. So that was there for the contractors, I will take that back and see if that is something that that is appropriate.

1:17:46

Also, in relation to the local road network concern was raised through relevant representations and by the local highway authorities, there are certain roads that they consider would be unsuitable for construction vehicles. Could the applicant confirm if a list of these roads can be added to the outline construction management plan?

1:18:05

Matthew roads on behalf of the applicant. I think if if the roads were sent to us by the relevant highway authorities, then we consider that we just it is not our intention to utilise local road network material supplies. However, at this stage, which we don't want to limit the project because we're, you know, we wouldn't have identified exactly who would be providing those supplies at this stage. I think it may be something that in accordance with the full ctmp would come forward at a later date. But we could certainly consider any roads at this stage. But I think we would just push that to the final cGMP rather than putting that within the outline at this stage. I appreciate that. I think an action point for the local road authorities if there are particular roads that you have particular concerns about that you think should not be used for construction traffic, if you could submit that into the examination and then the app and could take take account of them. Thank you.

1:19:13

Moving on to the construction workers travel plan

1:19:18

in paragraph two point 3.2 of the document. So that's the examination library reference a pp 131. It states a nationally significant infrastructure projects such as this could attract construction workers from over a large area. It says it's a theme that 60% of workers will arrive to site by car and allowances be made for the on site car parking in construction compounds. Can the applicant explain how they determined the figure of 60%? Please?

1:19:51

Again, I think we'll have to

1:19:55

come back on that and just find out. I hope that comes from Yeah, and then the answer

1:20:00

To this, you don't action all day. So yeah, they say I think the answer to this comes from an maybe it's something it's just to help the applicant to go back and look at it. So from the discussions that we had last time around at issues, because if it hearing where we looked at socio economic matters, they construction workers were taken from a isometric drive of an hour from Luton. And I think that memory those figures said that 60% of the construction workforce could therefore come within that one hour drive time. And the reason it was discussed there was because it was looking at the impact on the need for homes. So I think that's a background check. If you could go and check it, that'd be helpful.

1:20:45

Thank you. That's really helpful. Thank you. We will do that and confirm.

1:20:55

And, and I suppose part of that question, which might be a question for Luton Borough Council is the 60% might be useful for major construction projects was that the percentage of project career as well?

1:21:15

David Gertler, Luton Borough Council, I have no idea. It's 2013 was the committee report. I,

1:21:24

I will approach the airport. And I will go back through the documents that we had.

1:21:31

Thank you, Jeffrey cannot that's another another action point.

1:21:37

Though, in phase two, a the number of workers is estimated to peak at 1410. So 60% of these workers travelled by car than the construction compound will need to include room for parking 846 cars, the space for these vehicles been included in the proposal. And if more than 60% choose to travel by car, where would they have to compact them?

1:22:10

Jack reacts the applicant, we will provide more information on that. But within the design within the scheme spaces included. It's obviously also worth noting that not all workers will be travelling in single vehicle occupancy cars that will be coming in some will come in vans, and therefore the number of vehicles will be less, but we'll provide some additional information around that.

1:22:32

But equally, the vans were a lot bigger than the car. So you're still gonna need space for fitting them all in. So is that you're going to include that in the percentage figure action point rather altogether, as well. We'll put it in as

1:22:45

at the same time. Yes, we'll we'll do that, as you will be familiar very often on these projects that contractors use crew vans, which shuttle

1:22:57

people are in accordance with their shift times. But we'll we'll check what the what has been assessed.

1:23:07

Thank you. I have rolled over quite a few of my questions to written questions. Would you prefer them as written questions when they come out on the 15th of December? Would you like me to give them in advance as action points?

1:23:23

I think if you give them in advance that gives us longer to look at them. But if you give them as actions for for the end of the day, I don't think there should be an expectation that they will be done by

1:23:40

deadline six very not much not so. But in the sense the longer we have them, the longer that gives people to give you a proper answer. Okay. Oh, yes, I love them as action points, but I won't put deadlines six for all of them.

1:23:57

And finally, I just want to turn to local authorities to ask if there's any if they've not identified any measurable or reported impacts in relation to construction issues from the project Korean works.

1:24:12

So I'm going to Luton first

1:24:18

Not to my knowledge we

1:24:20

I don't recall there being any any issues. I am going to go back and look at one of the discharge of conditions. I wasn't the planning officer who dealt with everything after the conditions were put in place.



So I will go back and just look on the construction Environmental Management Plan and see what happened after that. But I don't recall there being any problems. We did have one issue with noise, but that's nothing to do with with traffic.

1:24:43

Thank you. And now I've had a heart for Jehovah theatres,

1:24:48

funerals for the Hartfordshire host authorities and without any further comments on this point.

1:24:55

And Buckinghamshire

1:24:57

Mark Weston Smith back in check out so

1:25:00

De

1:25:02

North Hertfordshire.

1:25:05

shabads

1:25:07

Thank you, Jessica from Central Coast Council, I don't believe that there are only but as that project predates my time Centerbridge for sure by a number of years. We will just double check and come back to you in writing. Should there have been anything Thank you.

1:25:23

And Natalie always want to raise anything.

1:25:30

Hi, Mr. Smith, John Smith, local resident just one quick question. I think Luton Borough Council know the answer when a Luton Town gonna rebuild their stadium?

1:25:45

I don't think we can answer that I deal with the airport related matters. And Mr. Swift deals with transport. So I'm not involved in the Luton Town scheme at all. Sorry.

1:25:58

Does anybody else got any comments that they'd like to make on that last agenda item?

1:26:05

Okay, you'd be glad to hear that brings me to the end of my agenda items. I want to thank you all for your time today. It's been really useful.

1:26:13

I'll now move on to any other business. So we're to Dr. Hunt.

1:26:19

We've not been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other business that's relevant to this hearing. But before we close, can I ask if there are any other matters that any parties wish to raise? Either in the room? Mr. Smith?

1:26:34

Yes, this is mainly procedural. In spring or autumn next year, we're going to have the general election, how does that affect timescales for your work?

1:26:47

And it doesn't. The only thing would be that if there's a change in government, we would potentially be re porting to a different secretary of state. So this examination is scheduled to finish on the 10th of February.

1:27:02

If there is a general election court before then, and then the general purdah rules that will come in with regards to any local government election, and or uprising, minor Council will come into effect, but it wouldn't halt the examination, we would still conclude on the 10th of February and we were still report on the 10th of May. It just made me to different Secretary of State.

1:27:30

With any other comments or matters in the room, online.

1:27:39

No, in that case,

1:27:42

we'd normally cover off action points. But I think given the range of action points, rather than go through these now in detail, there'll be published on the Projects page of the national infrastructure website in the next day or two. And if there any other items, if sorry, if there are no other items that are relevant to this hearing, can I just remind you that the timetable for the examination requires at parties provide any post hearing submissions on or before deadline six, which is Friday, the eighth of December 2023. The recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectors website as soon as practicable after this hearing. And the next event for this application will be the issue specific hearing aid, which will examine environmental matters and will be held tomorrow.

1:28:26

The agenda is

1:28:28

the agenda is available on the project page of the national infrastructure website.

1:28:33

Before we close we'd like to thank all of today's participants for their time and assistance during the course of this hearing. We shall consider all of your responses carefully, and they'll inform the examining authorities decision

1:28:44

as to whether any further written questions, or further round of hearings will be necessary. The time is now

1:28:53

659 and this issue specific hearing on traffic and transport for the proposed London Luton Airport Expansion Project is now closed