

TEXT_LUTON_ISH9_SESSION4_30112023

Fri, Dec 01, 2023 9:19AM • 1:54:55

00:00

Good

00:06

afternoon, everyone. Thank you very much for coming back so promptly. The time is now 315. I'm going to pass over to my colleague, Miss Haynes to deal with matters of surface access.

00:17

Thank you. So first I'm going to start with a few questions related to the staff mode share targets, in the applicants responds to written question TT 1.8. So this examination Library Reference rep 4069. It states the magnitude of mode share assumptions, and consequently, the surface axis motion limits for passengers and staff are based on a comparative analysis of the UK airports. Can the applicant explain why it considers appropriate to compare the surface access assumptions for Luton to Stansted given the difference in proximity to residential areas where staff live?

01:24

marked a on behalf of the applicant, I think that might be one that we are responding to in writing. Anyway, I think it's something that's also been picked up by some of the random comments made by the host local authorities. So if we could respond to that in writing, sort of in one go, that might be the easiest way of dealing with it if that's okay. Yeah, that's fine. Thank you. Thank you.

01:47

The applicants response to written question TT 1.8.

01:53

Second,

01:54

yeah, refers to the public transport strategy Summary Report, which is examination library reference a PP to a to explain how the staff motor targets were determined. There's only a small part of this document is specifically about staff mode share. So paragraphs 8.1 point one and 8.1 point two. Has there been any other work done to determine the staff mode percentages? And if yes, we're in the application? Can I find it? And if no, why not?

02:24

Matthew roads on behalf of the applicant. So yeah, the majority of the explanation of the staff mode share is within Chapter Nine of the transport assessment a pp 205. That sort of sets out the process

whereby we sort of step through the the move from the baseline staff mode share through to the future baseline

02:51

and the mode shift assumptions that are linked with that,

02:56

which essentially assumes a steady increase in the in the public transport mode chair between different phases. So I would point mainly to the section of the TA chapter nine, and the tables within that section, which we've set that out.

03:18

Does that specifically cover the how you've worked out? What percentages of Mojo is that just talking about how the staff numbers go up?

03:25

It does talk about the shift between the different

03:33

targets that have been set for mode share between the different phases, if you may require some further detail on exactly how the numbers were reached. And if that's the case, we'd be happy to come back in writing. Yes, I think that's what what I'm looking for wherever you have determined the percentages that you've that you've got. So I'll have a look at that section, and then I'll put a written question out. Thank you.

04:00

The local authorities got anything they'd like to comment on in respect of Staffordshire

04:05

at funerals for the host authorities and no, we don't know thank you.

04:14

Anyone else want to make comments on that before we move on?

04:20

Okay, so moving on to the benefits supplied by green control growth in relation to service access, the half a host authority's original representations. So that was our Oh 5581119297 raised concerns that the percentages could be masking serious increases in traffic on the surrounding road networks. Can the applicant explain how the mode share percentages relate to traffic on the network and signposts away in the application document this is explained

04:56

marked a on behalf of the applicant so I think it's probably

05:00

Let's just talking about the benefits that green control growth provides sort of generally across the whole application. It's a framework that's been put forward voluntarily by the applicant to provide stakeholders with reassurance and to provide certainty around the long term outcomes for the airport, given the length of the expansion programme and the fact that we are forecasting over quite a significant period of time.

05:23

It's a positive commitment to proactive monitoring and management of environmental impacts. And it's a different approach to what's been done in any other major infrastructure project that we're aware of.

05:35

And fundamentally, as well, it also includes that explicit commitment to link performance to growth. So if impacts, including mode, shares, and respect of surface access aren't where we think they should be, then growth of the airport will stop. So green controlled growth in the round, we think provides a significant benefit in terms of providing that certainty and that reassurance both to the local authorities and to residents around the airport.

06:01

In respect of sort of the more specific comments about the difference between controls on mode share, and what that then means in terms of highways impacts at specific locations, we do acknowledge the green control growth is only trying to control mode share at that high level. The reason for that is because there is a separate mechanism, which is looking to control transport impacts and highways impacts at specific locations. So that is tremor. Within the trimmer submission that was put in at deadline five, which apologists off the top of my head, I don't have the reference number four was sort of set out the the approach for trim up the two different types of mitigation and how that would work in terms of both managing the anticipated highways impacts and the monitoring locations where we're anticipating needing to provide junction mitigation, but also in terms of managing unforeseen impacts in terms of type two mitigation. So we do believe that green control growth provides a benefit in respect of surface access. But we'd also stressed that it isn't the only management mechanism in respect of surface access. And we think it sits alongside a number of other mechanisms, which are taken as a whole provide that sort of certainty and reassurance that the host authorities in the hearts authorities are looking for.

07:18

And with the half she has thought is like to comment on this.

07:25

Definitely bids for the Hartfordshire host authorities. And yeah, so that early submission was probably before there was more detailed information received around the trimmer, and also their framework travel planned measures as well.

07:42

So I think we're still sort of waiting for that clarification a bit later in the agenda around how it all hangs together to be able to come to a view on that one. Thank you.

07:54

Thank you. And anyone else like to make comments on that? I see Mr. Basford, you put your hand up.

08:04

Thank you, Madam handbasket on national highways. So we have tremor that Mr. didn't of course answer your question about the relationship to traffic. But that's quite important. So if the trimmer mitigation

08:23

is predicated on modelling, which relies upon assumed Moche as, which come from Green controlled growth,

08:32

I've checked my notes. And in fact that transcript from Tuesday, Mr. Mr. Humphrey said that ECG is the route to everything.

08:42

If the

08:45

if there was a reliance on the assumed Moche, and the mode share isn't being achieved, then there is an interrelationship between between the traffic and the mode share percentages, how is that controlled? And how is that supposed to operate? And I think there's a need for people like national highways to be involved in at because this ultimately knocks on to the physical impacts on the SRM and DLR.

09:15

Thank you, could the applicant respond on that point, please.

09:19

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant. So the highway modelling that underpins the transport assessment,

09:27

basically took the reasonable worst case view of traffic on the network. That was obviously assessed and impacts that were deemed to require mitigation. The mitigation proposals are included within sheduled, one of the DCO and that that that part of the tremor is different to be the type two mitigation which is effectively the type that Mark de was explaining with regards to unforeseen impacts. So it's the view of the applicant that we

10:00

have mitigated through the mitigation proposals the impact of the scheme based on the mode shares at a reasonable worst case level and the trimmer, type two mitigation is there to pick up unforeseen impacts that are not known at this stage.

10:20

Thank you, Mr. Barasa. Would you like to come back on that point?

10:26

Thank you on mute.

10:28

Sorry, I put myself on mute so that I didn't cough too much all over the proceedings.

10:34

So that still doesn't quite answer the question. We know that we know from Mr. Rhoades now that there is a reasonable worst case assumed in the transport modelling and tremor, just what she said. The question is whether the reasonable worst case relates to the limit values or some different values, which are not contained in the GC G.

11:00

framework. So is it a different set of assumptions to those which are in the GC G? Or is it in fact, the ones at the GC G and it is assumed that when reasonable worst case met cases that they are not met?

11:14

Thank you again, could the applicant respond to that point?

11:18

Mark day on behalf of the applicants this sort of as we've discussed, I suppose in a couple of points on the agenda today. The purpose of green control growth is I think exactly what Mr. basswood is saying that it

11:30

puts a limit in place that that seeks to ensure that that reasonable worst case is not exceeded that aligns with the assessment that's been carried out in the transport assessment in the environmental statement. So apologies, Mr. Bass, but you're breaking up slightly. But

11:45

I think what you're saying is is correct in that the mode share limits that are secured through the green controlled growth framework are the mode share assumptions that are fed into the traffic modelling, and then into sort of looking at impacts on specific junctions. I think that is the point that I would make in terms of national highways role, but what GCG is seeking to do is to control mode share at that high level across the whole of the area around the airport,

12:12

we then have a separate mechanism with its own separate governance processes, which is seeking to control impacts at specific locations. That is the trimmer. And certainly I think the conversation we previously had with national highways around roles on ESG surface access technical panels atfx in respect of tremor was that

12:31

if national highways concern is specifically around them, one junction 10 GCG is quite a blunt instrument to be able to control that we feel that tremor, we have developed tremor to be that more focused, targeted mechanism for controlling impacts at that specific location. And so we feel that tremor is probably the the mechanism that national highway should have that more in depth role in in terms of them being able to make sure that junction 10 operates effectively.

13:03

Thank you. Thank you for that. Mr. Basford. You still got your hand up?

13:09

Yes. So So again, not quite clear there. And what I'm understanding from Mr. What I'm understanding from Mr. De that, from what he's just said, is that the thresholds in the

13:26

in the GCG are the reasonable worst case scenario. Therefore, it is envisaged that a scenario worse than the reasonable worst case might occur. Because it follows if we are mitigating things that go beyond the reasonable worst case, we must have exceeded the reasonable worst case.

13:50

So that we're actually looking at something beyond the reasonable worst case.

13:57

And then, in terms of the trimmer, you will recall my submissions yesterday, not yesterday on Tuesday, that national highways doesn't get

14:07

anything other than sort of a say, doesn't get approval in relation to the mitigation.

14:14

And then the other thing to point out is that having raised the type to mitigation, which is reliant upon the local authorities identifying a problem and then brings up before this that if the local authorities are not able to identify the problem, then then potentially there are impacts on the SRM because they can't identify it therefore it cannot be mitigated therefore it knocks onto the SRM so that there is a sort of joining up here and you'll recall I suggested some sort of decision tree that enables us to identify what is covered by what, the route to decisions.

14:55

Yes, thank you and I have a point just further down the agenda item to just

15:00

I'll try and explore a bit more about whole, how they'll, how they all things fit together in terms of the trimmer and the sustainable transport fund and greenhouse green control growth.

15:11

Yeah, thank you. Thank you very much for that, as the Applicantn ones say anything from that point before we move on, I don't think we need to really

15:20

Heathrow's proposals for environmentally managed growth, so referred to by Dr. Hunter Liu in this nice hearing included percentage targets. But it also has specific targets began in actual numbers of daily staff car trips, which which should not be exceeded and must reduce over time has the applicant considered at a similar target, using actual numbers of care tips for staff further green controlled growth

15:49

marked a on behalf of the applicant. Obviously, the heat road surface access strategy and environmentally managed growth proposals were put forward in the context of their own expansion proposals. And there are separate requirements within the airport's national policy statement around what Heathrow has to be able to demonstrate you can achieve in terms of being able to get development consent for the second runway. So that's

16:15

titled target, I guess, in terms of the number of cars was specifically included within the NPS. And that was the reasoning for that being brought into the the surface access strategy for Heathrow, we feel that mode share is probably more appropriate way of monitoring airlines with the way that the passenger target is working, it means we're not monitoring and measuring against two separate metrics, which we felt would be quite confusing. And so we took the view that we should be using Moesha across both of those pieces.

16:47

I was involved in the service access strategy for Heathrow and it got quite complex in terms of being able to monitor the precise number of trips in and out of the airport that were being made by staff.

16:59

Thank you for that clarification. going to move on now to the level of confidence that the applicant has that the surface access mode shares will remain within the limits for each of the phases as this was an issue that was raised a number of the relevant representations. And would it be possible to share table 6.1 of that 5022 I think you shared tables 5.1 earlier for greenhouse gases.

17:53

It's the table that sets out the green shoe and Crow green control grass limits and specials for surface access.

18:08

Yep, that's great. Thanks.

18:10

So in response to written question TT 109 The applicant provided the 2022 figures for passengers and staff travelling by nonsustainable means in 2022. The percentage of passengers travelling by nonsustainable means was 65%. But as you can see from this table, the phase one limit is 62%. So it's already breached in the limit by 3%. The 2022 figures for staff travelling by nonsustainable means was 76%, but the phase one limit is 70%. So again, reaching the limit by some 6%.

18:46

Both these figures are over the Phase One limits. Can the applicant explain how confident they are that these 2022 percentages will reduce to a point where they will not be exceeding the phase one limit?

18:59

Matthew roads on behalf of the applicant. I think firstly, the fact that GCG explicitly links the limits to ongoing growth. So if the MO chairs do not remain within the limits, the airport can't grow.

19:14

So on that basis if we're confident these these can be achieved. It has been acknowledged in a number of our responses to representations around the the impact of COVID on

19:28

the mode shares. But there is a recovering trend when the the work was undertaken. We were at the 2019

19:42

sort of levels of public transport use. So I think we we have confidence that we are seeing a recovering trend and that that is expected to continue. There were there was a study undertaken that is summarised in a pen

20:00

Next H of the transport assessment into into public transport. And that, that looked at the, the the achievable public transport mode share that could be expected with certain interventions being introduced and showed that 50% target was was achievable. And we have confidence that as the rail network continues to return to normal operating levels that the rail operators will seek to introduce some of the measures that were previously being looked at to deal with growth on the network such as the

20:43

the Thameslink future timetabling, which would increase capacity significantly. We also have that in place now, which has significant benefits to travel. So, I think,

20:57

overall, we are still in a recovering position. And the annual monitoring that is committed to through GCG. But also, the framework travel plan really gives us lots of very granular information around how that trend will continue over the next period. So I think overall, we think that the limits whilst you know, we are not we're behind that point at this point in time, they're reasonable. And as we move through the various development phases, and we start to introduce new infrastructure into the airport, such as increased bus and coach facilities, and obviously, the expansion of the dart into the new terminal that will further help to move us towards increased PT mo chairs and with the travel plan to setting targets or go beyond these limits that we will really be able to push for for high PT mo chairs in the future.

22:01

So just just interested to know, Are you are you considering? Are you confident that you'll get below the limit? Do you think you'll get into the region of you know, level one and level two? Or do you think you're just going to mostly getting below the limit?

22:20

Yeah,

22:22

we are confident, we're obviously, you know, we're, we're we're, we think that the Phase One targets, from where we are now to where we're seeking to get to, there's still a period of time that we need to go through. And I think all the national trends show that the recovery is, is going forward. quite quick pace now. So I think we're very confident that by the start of the phase one of the development that will be above those limits, not meeting those limits. And you supplied the 2022 figures to me, at what point will you get the 2023 figures for pasand, staff and staff.

23:06

So my colleagues just informed me that we have three quarters of 2023 now. So shortly we'll we'll have a full picture of 2023. That will be an update on but we could update on the information we have now zoom. due east London for the applicant, we probably won't get final validated data for 2023 until after the end of the examination. But I have got a provisional data set from the CAA for the first three quarters of 23. We would always put a health warning on those early provisional datasets because they're not fully validated in terms of waiting.

23:43

Could I have it as an action point them for you to supply that information for me? I'm doing the analysis now. So we'll have it fairly quickly. Thank you.

23:54

Doing it the local authorities have any comments on that point?

24:00

You're gonna ask for the host authorities. No further comments on this.

24:06

Anybody else online?

24:10

Thanks. Okay, I'm gonna move on to monitoring. Can the applicant briefly explain how the monitoring surface access will be done in practice for both passengers and staff?

24:21

I understand that. You're going to be using the CAA surveys and staff surveys. But I'm interested in the sort of the size of the dataset that you predict you'll be getting, and whether that whether you believe there's a large enough data set

24:37

in terms of the CIA survey, I'm going to call it the 2019 figure because I think it's more representative of the COVID recovery period in terms of sample size. There were 11,052 interviews carried out, but of course it goes through a very complex and detailed waiting process that is available on the CAA website where they actually wait to

25:00

Individual flight destinations that they, they take it take each batch of interviews and waited in a very complex way to try and be as near as possible, replicating the population, just check. So what percentage of the total passengers is it that the car is picking it is a relatively low percentage, but the percentage at Luton is consistent with the surveys they do at other airports. And indeed, smaller airports that sample sizes can be lower than Lutens. But the Luton sample sizes is broadly consistent with that across other airports, in terms of its proportionality to total throughput.

25:34

And in terms of the staff surveys, how does that relate to how many staff are you actually serving? What percentage of people replying? Do you believe you get enough data?

25:45

mile day on behalf of the applicant? So the approach to staff surveys is set out in Section F 2.2 of appendix F to the green controlled growth framework, which is a pee pee. Sorry, I've lost the number. I will confirm that at the end of the answer.

26:06

What we have set out is that we are proposing to build upon the current approach of surveying staff. So at the moment, those surveys are only carried out every other year we are proposing they'll be carried out every year. It will be done by the on behalf of the operator by an independent survey company. And we're trying to make the the approach to the surveys reflect sort of changes that have happened to the airport recently. So for example, working patterns are likely to a change for a number of people post COVID. So we're trying to be a bit more explicit about the questions people are asked about how they travel over a typical working week. So that we can get a weighted average

26:41

within appendix F to the GCG framework, we have said that at paragraph F, two point 2.3 to the travel survey has to be open to responses for a minimum of 28 days, which we think is a reasonable time period given the need to avoid periods like Easter and Christmas where you may get atypical travel patterns. F two point 2.5 states that the airport operator needs to use reason endeavours to ensure that all active airport Id pass holders are surveyed and that they should consider extend the survey period if it's considered necessary to obtain a suitable response rate.

27:18

Obviously, there are there are always difficulties in surveying staff and getting a response rate. But we feel like we've built in safeguards into appendix f the surface access monitoring plan to try and ensure that the widest possible population of staff are surveyed and respond and can just ask in terms of the survey, is it a server where you say to where their staff have asked, How did you tell to work today? Or is it how do you normally travel to work

27:45

on behalf of the applicant? And just to confirm these I didn't in my previous answer, Appendix f IS rep 5032.

27:53

So what we have said is that survey has to include questions that relate to shift patterns. First of all, so we understand how people's travel patterns are related to shifts. And then F two point 2.6 We have said that staff will be asked how they travel to work across a typical working week. So that's so that we can understand firstly, how many days a week they are working at the airport, you know, acknowledging that people are working from home more now post COVID, but also so that we can understand how many days they typically drive to work are driven to work by someone else. Use taxis etc or use public transport.

28:33

Thank you,

28:35

though, unless there's any questions on that I'll move on.

28:40

Moving on to the relationship between green control growth and things like the trimmer sustainable transport fund framework travel plan. We touched on this topic and it's just specific here in seven. But can the applicant briefly describe how these various systems work together? In fact test? Yes, madam in

29:01

the surface access strategy at figure 1.1. The was

29:07

a diagram that sought to do that as a result of your

29:13

questions and their discussion earlier in the week. We've

29:17

produced an updated plan. It is not an examination document. But I think it might be quite helpful if we are able to put it up and then I can invite

29:29

Mr. Day and Mr. Rhoades to talk through it and I think it might actually help them facilitate the discussion and obviously we can put this one in at the next deadline if that would be acceptable. Thank you would

29:44

go

30:02

So Mark Day on behalf of the applicant, I think the way that we'll deal with this is I will take the top line around green controlled growth, and then I will hand over to Mr. Rhodes to talk through some of the documents that sit underneath that. So in response to some of the questions raised, for example, by Mr. Bassford. Earlier, we talked about green controlled growth, and the green control growth framework being the sort of headline control mechanism. So the mechanism that seeks to control overall levels of mode share,

30:36

we have that that framework document appendix F to the framework document would be approved through the development consent order, and that sets out the the monitoring plan the monitoring approach for green controlled growth.

30:50

Post consent, there would then be the requirement of the airport operator to undertake its reporting. So we've talked about the use of CEA departing passenger survey data, and also staff travel surveys. Those are compiled into an annual management report, and they are submitted to the surface access technical panel and the environmental scrutiny group. In turn, there is a requirement for either level two plans or mitigation plans, those will be approved through the ESG. And any mitigation that is required to be provided through those plans will be funded separately by the airport operator, there's a requirement within green controlled growth, that those plans are able to demonstrate that they will reduce impacts below the limit as soon as reasonably practicable. And they will need to be brought forward on that basis. I will hand over to Mr. Rosner.

31:44

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant. So yeah, marks obviously taking you through the top line.

31:52

As you can see, right at the top, we sort of set out some sort of swim lanes around whether documents are pre consent or pre expansion or whether they're recurring activities, and then the funding streams to the right. So just focusing on the sustainable transport the middle blue section of the diagram. So the the surface access strategy

32:17

feeds into the framework travel plan.

32:21

And that as we've discussed at the transport issue specific hearing has a toolbox of measures within it that can be deployed.

32:32

We've also made reference to the bus and coach study that was submitted at deadline five

32:40

pre expansion the first travel plan will be produced that will set out the specific interventions and targets for surface access for the next five years. That document has to be approved by Luton Borough Council and as part of Luton Barrett borough Council's role in approving that document they also have to seek the

33:03

the the views of the other authorities before they approve the travel plan. So within that first travel plan, there will be targets set of will go beyond the GC G limits. They those travel plans are then revisited on a on a five yearly cycle.

33:25

And we will also be undertaking a five yearly bus and coach market study that will inform that around the the to ensure that the bus and coach measures are the most appropriate.

33:37

The ATF steering group is the group that will agree the measures from the travel plan that are to be funded.

33:46

That will be informed by annual monitoring report which will give information that will show the take up of measures that have been introduced at previous travel plans and obviously the overall picture around mode share travelled to the airport. And then the funding for the measures will be funded from the sustainable transport fund which is a levy on car park drove carpark transactions and drop off transactions. So that that sets out the middle line. The bottom line the green line is around highway mitigation. So the transport assessment has set out the impacts of the scheme and set the highway mitigation proposals to be secured through the DCO.

34:43

We've submitted into the examination the outline and update of the outline trimer transport related impact monitoring and mitigation approach. Pre expansion the final trimmer will be produced

34:59

and

35:00

We'll just noted in between that, and the first travel plan will be the establishment of the ATS steering group. And including terms of use for the there is stainable transport Fund and the residual Impact Fund, which is moving through on the trimmer. There'll be an annual monitoring report for mitigation type one, the mitigation that's already been established through the TAA.

35:24

And if the various thresholds are met through the trimmer, then there'll be ongoing discussion with the highway authority about when to deploy the mitigation and the and the form of that mitigation, whether there may be a change to that as time goes by, and there's a wish to do something slightly different at a particular empty one location. And the funding for those empty one schemes is committed through the DCO by the applicant and secured through the DCO.

35:59

The second line of tremor is mitigation type two, which is unforeseen impacts, those are

36:10

brought forward to the steering group by the relevant highway authorities. And if agreed the steering group mitigated through the residual Impact Fund, which will be a capped amount that will be secured through the section 106 agreement.

36:28

The that would also include fly parking, measures to tackle fie parking such as control parking zones, as well as junction improvement schemes where there is a junction impact. So those are funded through the residual impact fund. So

36:48

yeah, there's obviously a lot of information on that diagram. But hopefully that sets out how the different funding mechanisms are deployed across the different types of surface access.

37:03

Thank you. Yes, it's it's good see all in one place, can ask the local authorities would like to make any comments on this.

37:11

at funerals for the host authorities, it's been helpful to have the clarification and we will review what's provided at deadline six and respond to thank you.

37:23

Mr. Westerman Smith, Buckner co counsel. Likewise, I think we need to digest this.

37:32

What we do note is that there's no particular link in the recurring activity documents between those at the G. Green control growth level and those at the sustainable transport level. And that sounds in a concern that we've had and I'm going to ask James Duncan, just to illustrate that or expand on it.

38:02

Jamestown comes back and council.

38:06

Yes, the concern is that green control growth is supposed to

38:12

be limited in part by surface access, the diagram

38:21

allows for the

38:24

travel plans and the

38:27

mitigation type to to take place.

38:32

When reading the travel plan, and the funding for the the sustainable travel fund, there is no certainty that at any given time sufficient funds will be available in the sustainable tramp transport fund. Should the green control growth limits not be met? If existing commitments in that travel plan period have been committed to there's a maximum spend per year. So how would this this arrangement

39:06

have funds? or would there be a separate fund available to deal with a breach of the green control growth limits in any given year?

39:17

I think we did briefly cover funding but if you'd like to just re answer that question, please. Absolutely. Mark de on behalf of the applicant and apologies I probably shouldn't have used peach. It's quite a difficult box to read in the top bright. But But what that does say is that where funding is required for mitigation in order for GCG to meet limits, that will be funded by the airport operator through sort of business as usual funding we're not anticipating the sustainable transport fund would be used to sort of directly fund those GCG mitigation measures.

39:52

The definition of a mitigation plan within GCG is that it demonstrates that the effects can be reduced below the limit

40:00

As soon as reasonably practicable. And we don't think the airport operators saying, well, there's there's insufficient funding in the STF. And so we can't do anything this year would would meet those criteria.

40:12

Thank you. I see I have a couple of hands upon line, I just want to ask one quick question. And you're not shown a link between the framework travel plan the green control growth, but the same travel plan does say that its targets will be

40:26

no lower than green control growth. So there is a link there.

40:30

monta on behalf the outcome? Yes, we probably could make that clear. I think that's what we were trying to do with the arrows coming up from the transport assessments in the bottom left. So essentially, the merge shares that have been used in the transit assessment are those that are then used in green controlled growth, and also act as the sort of starting point for the stretch targets that will be secured by the FTP.

40:54

Thank you. I'll go to Mr. Basler. Firstly, yes.

41:01

Thank you, madam. And

41:04

thank you, Mr. Rhodes have battled on behalf of national highways. So we of course, like the combined authorities will also

41:12

make submissions at the next deadline.

41:17

This is helpful. My concern remains that there are interrelationships here, there are alliances between the different

41:27

horizontal swim lanes, as opposed to the vertical swim lanes, which which are very important. And I think I think what is being said to you is that growth will not happen if thresholds are exceeded. But that

means that thresholds are exceeded there is a beyond reasonable, worst case impact. So at some point growth will have occurred. But this is applying the mind to the horse after the doors

42:02

were truly open, we need to make sure that there are triggers that are clear enough to ensure that action is taken

42:12

at the network level before the network is affected, not just wait to apply best practicable or reasonable practice as soon as reasonably practicable solutions if there's going to be a continued adverse impact in the interim.

42:31

Because you're you're dealing with the problem after the fact there.

42:38

But the Applicantn lights come back on that pipe. If I go to Mr. Panther, please, Mark day on behalf of the applicant. I mean, I think this this gets to the purpose of green controlled growth, we've set it up in a way to try and ensure as far as we can, that those limits are not exceeded. Obviously, we cannot give a cast iron guarantee that they will never be exceeded. But through introducing thresholds for incentivizing or requiring the airport operators to take early action at thresholds before those limits are exceeded. We've set up the process in a way to make sure that we are taking that early action and that the limits are not exceeded. If they are exceeded, then absolutely there is a requirement to mitigate that impact and to bring most shear back down below that limit. But the purpose of GCG is to avoid that scenario that Mr. Basket is outlining.

43:29

Okay, thank you. Can I miss the punter please online?

43:34

Thanks, right. I'm Jess repenter from Central Bedfordshire Council. As with the other representations, I think the summary information is helpful. And we will comment further at deadlines six. But one initial point of clarity that I think might help

43:49

with regard to the local authority responses just with regard to the sequencing of funding

43:55

base based upon both the diagram and I think the content of the text associated with the standard transport fund, it's my understanding that the same transport fund should not be applied to measures required to produce a mitigation or level to plan. And so therefore, the query is would it be the case that up until the point of which the targets within table 6.1 of the green controlled growth document are reached, then all funding to achieve those would be separate to the sustainable transport Fund and the sustainable transport front therefore could not be applied until those targets have been reached?

44:32

At that that'd be a useful clarification point for the applicant if they're able to do that place.

44:37

Yes, thank you. Could the applicant clarify that please.

44:45

Matthew wrote on behalf of the applicant, I think the distinction here is that the framework travel plan is a you know is refreshed every five years and that the targets within that will be beyond the limits. So I don't think

45:00

And that that would put a stop on the sustainable transport fund being used if you breached your GCG limits, because you'd be striving to implement measures, maybe over a longer timeframe or that were to do with achieving targets over over five years. Obviously, there is a benefit if you are using the sustainable transport fund. And you are successful in deploying measures that reach those targets by their very nature, you're going to help to stay above the GCG limits. But I think there may be some control on what you could spend the sustainable transport fund on at that time if you had reached your limits. And maybe that's something that we would consider within the terms of reference of the sustainable transport fund. But I think there's some nuance to that spending.

45:57

Thank you, Mr. Basford. Online.

46:04

Thank you, Madam Ambassador off on behalf of national highways. I'm trying to

46:12

see how the the various

46:15

swim lanes work together. And perhaps Mr. De Mr. Rose could help

46:20

in that, reflecting here, the green controlled growth factor strategy. And if I if I look at table 6.1, in the outline framework requires that for

46:36

in order to reach the limit,

46:39

to enable phase one to go ahead, they have to reduce air passenger non sustainable travel mode share to between 58 and 62% or below 58, preferably definitely below 62%. So, they have, so in fact, the peach colour

47:00

should be to the left of this diagram. So you have to do all of that, in order to throw a sixth start the game, then, as you come forward into the implementation itself, you have surface access strategy, framework travel plan, and you start to implement the works under the DCO or alternate works using the MT one approach. I think that is actually how it works. But if you take it back to that, then the monitoring that we talked about before this morning,

47:36

you need us round about the time of the notice. So that you know you're hitting your thresholds

47:43

at the relevant commencement date. So so it suggests you need to get on with your monitoring in order to show that you can start to implement phase one. I think that's what what is being said in which case, there might be some adjustment that's needed.

48:03

Thank you. Yes. Could the applicant just answer that question? Mr. bassford?

48:11

Madam, yes, I don't think that characterization is quite right. And I'm just discussing with Mr. Day, how best one might describe this. And so I'll have a go and Mr. De may explain it. In

48:32

a normal, large project, you wouldn't have the GCG line. So imagine a large project and there's no peach line.

48:43

You would have a framework travel plan, you would have travel plans, you would fund those travel plans and work would come forward to try to achieve certain public transport mo chairs, if you didn't achieve them. There is no real

48:58

enforcement or anything else that happens but you have a travel plan where you try to achieve things a lot of large developments have that

49:11

what we've tried to do here is insert a layer of can't be complete guarantee but a high degree of certainty that what we have assessed in the transport assessment

49:30

that things will not be worse than that. So the mode share percentage is the input to the transport assessment so that the percentage that is surface excess traffic, that's what's modelled that those percentages are in green controlled growth. So in the blue line, we go along we do things and we fund various things like like any other development, but if there comes a point

50:00

where it is clear that we are approaching a limit value. So we've gone through a threshold one, we've gone into a threshold true. So we're into a plan where we're having to now take remedial action to make sure we don't exceed a limit. It's that point where the top right hand peach

50:24

box kicks in. And as Mr. De said, because those measures would be have to be taken as soon as reasonably practicable. It would be for the airport operator to do whatever it takes at that point, to deliver that level to plan. So to the extent that monies are already being spent through the sustainable transport Fund, and the travel plans, yes, of course, in a sense, they are, they are meeting those transport.

51:00

Motor targets, because they're trying to exceed them. So they're actually trying to be higher, if they fail, though. Whereas in a normal development, nothing, nothing would happen. In this, we introduced a form of insurance mechanism, whereby the developer or the airport has to produce plans and if necessary, fund that to make sure

51:26

that things do not fall below what we had assessed in the transport assessment. And that's the way that's the way it works. So it's not quite safe, right to say that orange sort of should be moved to the left and comes before it. It doesn't it's it's a it's a mechanism for making sure we don't fall below a certain level. Thank you.

51:52

I think what I'm, what I'm concerned about is I think on Tuesday, they were understood it was that

51:59

green control growth would be funded. And then things like the the work needed for the tremor would be the add ons. But the way you describe it now sounds like the other way around

52:14

to see

52:16

the tremor has the two different parts, the the the empty one, part of the things that we've

52:28

currently assessed, are needed in the road network. Anyway, they're included in the DCO. And,

52:37

again, sort of high level, and I'm sure Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Day will will comment on this if necessary. What trimmer is doing through the monitoring is assisting us to make sure that those things are brought forward at the right time, because the operational period is so extended and they're not needed at the beginning. The mitigation type one is really just to pick up the unknown on knowns, things that we we just don't know about. And then as I think I said, on Tuesday, in an ordinary development, there just wouldn't be anything for this, it would just be something unknown happened. Here, we've we've actually introduced a mechanism to to, to try and deal with that. Obviously, that doesn't really reflect the very high level marches.

53:29

That's dealing much more with a sort of distribution point or something emerging at a particular location. And just just want to clarify that Mr. Rhodes just had something.

53:44

Matthew Rhodes on behalf of the applicant. Yeah, just very, very quickly to add. Yeah, the timing of Chima mitigation type one interventions is effectively adaptive. So it can come forward or back in time depending on the the thresholds within the trimmer. And when the monitoring says it's required. So it isn't really linked to GCG. In that way. It's linked to the performance of the junctions based on that level of airport growth. As as the airport is growing, when you hit a certain level that mitigation will be brought forward. Likewise, with the type two mitigation that that is, that's actually brought to the ATF steering group by the highway authorities that they've recognised as a problem on the network. So his funding stream is separate from GCG in that way, thank you. Yes, I appreciate that. On this plan, it does show it's got annual monitoring report gargling control growth and annual monitoring report for the highway mitigation. And they wanted the same. Is it the same monitoring the same timescale is it completely different than they are so Matthew rose on behalf of the applicant? They are different? I think Mr. Day set

55:00

out the the annual monitoring report for the tremor, the annual monitoring of the travel plan will be slightly slightly different. There is some overlap, but in terms of they will both be looking at the kind of performance of the network and how many people are using public transport. But then it may also be specifically aimed at looking at some of the interventions that have been brought forward in earlier travel plans to see whether they are being successful. Thank you. Mr. bassford. Thank you for waiting.

55:37

Thank you, Madam Ambassador on behalf of national highways.

55:41

Two points. First point, taking what Mr. Rhodes has just said and looking at the empty one and adaptive approach, and we appreciate that this is adaptive Environmental Management applied to the transport sphere.

55:57

What I think Mr. Rhodes is saying is that if you see after some while that mitigation is required, at point yet to be specified, because your score still got to have the final tremor, and the thresholds that that will specify, then that mitigation will be will be applied, I think what we will look at make submissions to on is the hard deadlines as opposed to some

56:22

putative future deadline when they might be required, where we we understand it is necessary for those to be provided. And I think that's where national house is going to end where we're likely to make a submission that works our requirements more susceptible, perhaps to a Grampian type requirement than the use of the tremor. So that's the first point. The second point taking Mr. Humphreys submissions, and I appreciate that. Mr. Humphries and his, his consultant team and client are working with us to

56:52

enhance our understanding of the of the way the mitigation works together. As I understand it, what what we're looking at is one could approach when could give them the article 44 Notice with for instance, pathogen non sustainable transport their travel mode share in excess of 65% of that is today with unsustainable non sustainable modes, and get going and build. What you would then do afterwards is if you could not bring your nonsustainable mode chair down sufficiently as you would constrain off the development. And that is what slot controls or other electrician there could be other mitigation would do. So the objective then is that even if you built it, you can't use it until it comes down to control.

57:47

Thank you very much for that.

57:51

I think we've probably done enough on this one lesson unless it's got any points that they'd like to raise.

57:58

If you want to just keep that up just for a minute longer. I just have one last question.

58:03

Regarding a couple of questions about mitigation

58:07

by the green control growth.

58:10

In the level two plans, it states that level two plans should include proposals for additional interventions on mitigation, including timescales for delivery to ensure that a limit will not be exceeded.

58:21

But there's nothing in the document that explains exactly what these interventions are mitigations would be in relation to surface access. Are they going to be similar to the items in the toolbox of innovations in the framework travel plan or something different?

58:37

Mark day on behalf of the applicant? Firstly, yes, that's a deliberate decision to not try to prescribe what mitigation might be taken. I mean, we have a reasonable idea of what we might do if we were in that position today. But we don't know what it would be in 1020 years time. Greed and drug growth is intended to survive for the life of the airport. So we need to preserve that flexibility in terms of what mitigation is brought forward.

59:02

I think you are also correct that the mitigation toolbox if we can call it that for for GCG is very similar to the toolbox as outlined in the framework travel plan, they are essentially seeking to do very similar things in terms of encouraging people to travel by sustainable modes to and from the airport. I suppose the difference would be you know, you have those levers that you can pull.

59:25

It'll be a question of which levers you pull and how hard and in which order, which sort of probably would be the point of difference between actions that you might take under GCG versus the travel plan.

59:38

Thank you. Thank you for that if you just give me one minute.

59:43

So if I can just clarify. I've got an action point that this documents that's currently mean displays showing the relationship between transport documents is going to hopefully be submitted at deadline six but I'm very aware we're very close to the end of the examination.

1:00:00

And and it would just be useful if we could get the relevant local authorities and national highways common app, maybe deadlines six, is there any way we could get this document in earlier? Madam, I was thinking exactly the same thing. And several of the authorities said or will comment on this deadline six, and they will have only seen that image. So what? It's, I think it's a PowerPoint slide, isn't it? We can send it around, we can.

1:00:27

You can send something to the case team, and then we can get you up and publish. That'd be really helpful. Thank you. Perfect. We will do that today. Okay, and I'll mentor the action point accordingly.

1:00:37

Thank you very much. That's all the questions I had on service access measures. Anyone else got anything else on surface access before we move on?

1:00:46

I see no hands online in the room. Great. I'll now pass back to Dr. Hunt. So he continue with the noise agenda item. Thank you.

1:00:55

Thank you, Mr. Holmes, I'll just allow knowing for people to reorganise?

1:01:46

Thank you

1:02:00

first of all, thank you to anyone who would hope to have cleared the noise section and been away by now.

1:02:06

So,

1:02:09

we have been discussing whether previous controls should be carried across to the green control growth framework from the existing consents. I think we pretty much wrapped up to that item. But can I just double check that there were no other matters that people felt needed to be carried across?

1:02:27

Now, in that case, I think we'll move on.

1:02:30

The current permission restricts movements in the early morning period, which would be removed by the proposed developments. And given the substantial predicted increase in the early morning period. Can the applicant provide any comfort that sheduled movements would be banned or avoided during other periods at nighttime to compensate?

1:02:54

Dr sharp for the applicant.

1:02:57

In terms of movement controls, I think we've set out our position on that and the fact that they are a week noise control. So in terms of other periods of the night, as you know, we have the all eight hour noise contrary limit and the associated quota account budgets that go along with that. Within the night quota periods were the more you know, the the 1130 to 6am period, we have a movement limit, we have a quota count limit, we have also a ban on the QC over the whole year it would be satisfied with a no as a response to the question if that's the answer that you're giving me.

1:03:37

Didn't think it was as simple as a no, but perhaps

1:03:40

I suppose the question I'm asking is Is there given that you are uncapping? The mourning period which is particularly sensitive, and there is a health implication for residents? Is there any quid pro quo in terms of other periods of night which are also known to be sensitive? For example, we often hear reference to cargo flights at four o'clock in the morning. Is there any attempt to reduce or

1:04:09

two away with those kinds of flights to compensate for the fact that there is a significant increase in flights at other points during the night?

1:04:16

Data sharp for the applicant? Not in a way that is as simple as that? I think it's a combination of the total controls which protect the overall adverse impacts during the night.

1:04:27

Thank you

1:04:32

for can move on, sorry, were there any comments on that point?

1:04:42

And

1:04:43

if we can move on to

1:04:46

the clarification regarding summer, non summer

1:04:51

day noise controls, so the Applicantns proposed noise contours are based on the 92 day summer period. The Applicantns explained that quote accounts will apply

1:05:00

to Luton Airport outside the 92 day summer period, should any other form of noise control apply during the winter period.

1:05:10

Sharp for the applicants I think, as we've long discussed, it's standard practice and policy and guidance that the best way to understand the impacts of noises during the summer and the best way to control it, as you know, that's because that's when

1:05:24

aviation noise is at its busiest. It's when the impacts are greatest when people are outdoors, the most more likely to have their windows open. So it's very standard practice to

1:05:34

assess and control noise during the summer period.

1:05:38

There are no non summer daytime noise controls in the current permissions, either the 2017 permission or the P 19. permission. And that's not planned to be changed by development can send order controls, we do have the annual quote account limit and annual movement limit in the night period which cover the winter period but for the nighttime,

1:06:04

to just in relation to the quote count.

1:06:09

Obviously, we had some discussion about quote accounts earlier today.

1:06:13

Given that the noise contours are set out for all phases, would it be possible to express the quote accounts that derive from those for the future?

1:06:24

Dr. Sharpe for the applicant, we certainly can provide indicative current account as we discussed earlier, it will depend on that correlation that is undertaken on a regular basis to

1:06:35

determine what the appropriate court account is for that noise. controversy limit, they do also change over time and obviously, liquid account calibration changes. But yes, we can provide it, I suppose what I'd be particularly interested to understand is a benchmarking exercise to see what those quote accounts look like in relation to other airports of equivalent sort of size and scale. And so if it's possible to set out the quote accounts, and then some form of equivalent data, for example, around ATM console limits, and quote, campaign limits

1:07:11

are short for the applicant. I think in terms we certainly can provide that data in terms of benchmarking, I'm not aware of any airport that has full eight hour and 16 hour day or night quota count budgets. I think they're only for the night quarter period for other designated airports. So we won't be able to play that, that benchmarking comparison, this is a new control that the applicant is proposing. Colton Thank you.

1:07:39

Coach Campoy limits for noise control at UK airports typically provided for well certainly for the designated airports typically provided for the summer and the winter periods. To reflect the different

levels of traffic during these periods and to ensure year round noise controls and small for the local authorities. The local authorities consider that summer and winter quote accounts, quote account at point limits should be set for the anvil.

1:08:07

And Holcomb for the house authorities, the

1:08:14

EU have different ways of setting overall noise envelopes, you can move bits of the jigsaw around and have different things, Pillai at different times.

1:08:23

The any DG or noise envelope design group recommendations are based around having an annual movements limit and then certain summer periods. And it was it was on that basis that you would need a winter supply if there's no

1:08:42

if the annual movements limits aren't aren't going to be proposed, and we might be looking at asking for other things such as a winter QC period to to alleviate that concern in that through that route. So

1:08:57

I guess it's a secondary ask. If we're not getting a Can we have B?

1:09:08

Would you like to respond at that point?

1:09:12

Don't show up for the applicant. I think there's a there is a link in the court account budgets and the biannual slot allocation process which is done on a summer and winter basis. So the the, you know, the QC for planning piece that we've we've talked about quite a bit paragraph 3.17 of the GCG framework document talks about using those current account budgets, although they will be derived from the newest country limits because those are based on 92 day summer, there will be a need to sort of convert those into an equivalent

1:09:43

always account budget for scheduling purposes. And that set out in that in that process in paragraph 3.17. So would you see any benefits in having a clearly defined Summer and Winter quote account for the airport

1:10:10

But short for the Applicantn, I think this is one where it sort of complicated with a slight allocation process and

1:10:16

the biannual process, perhaps we can clarify that in a note in terms of how that how we would see that working. Yeah, please.

1:10:24

Defining that would be a deadline to seven narrative. Okay. Yep. Yes. And Mr. Holcomb, so I was gonna say that I think one of the problems with

1:10:34

winter is we don't have obviously winter contours, they'd be smaller, obviously.

1:10:41

And the effects would be less. And that's why one kind of looks back through all the the reports going along way back that

1:10:53

settled on the 90 day summer period was

1:10:58

the period of control because all other periods would be quieter, then and that, and there's no reason to believe that that has changed. All government policy talks about the la que 16 hour for the 92 day, summer period. So there are no winter contours, as far as I'm aware.

1:11:20

And therefore, you know, in in overall policy terms, there's nothing that I'm aware of in government policy, that indicates we should be trying to

1:11:31

come control other periods of the year because they will be less than the worst case either 90 to lay some period.

1:11:40

So I'm not sure to what extent in a meaningful way we can produce a lot of the data for the winter into period.

1:11:51

And there's certainly no comparison with other airports, because because it's never produced so far as I'm aware. I mean, I might be wrong, but I've never heard of it. I mean, obviously, there are winters and some equator count point limits for designated airports. So that control does exist and is put in place rather than night there are for the night, there are a night.

1:12:16

So

1:12:18

I suppose there is a there is a control. In certain circumstances, I suppose I'm concerned, given the time horizon for the proposal. There is the potential for spreading and movements outside of the some horizon summer period, we have talked about sort of effects of climate change with increasing heating in continental Europe, you can imagine sort of movement shifting out of the summer period into shoulder periods, and other points in the year. So I'm just trying to understand whether there is any basis or need for controlling outside of that summer window if he comes. Okay, so Well, I think we're going to produce

1:12:58

something to try and assist on this. Thank you. Thank you,

1:13:02

Mr. Holcomb, and Holcomb for the host authorities, just on the QC summer winter split. That is, again, an internal tool for the airport to use those that's not a control over their noise output. So I would be a concern again, if it wasn't

1:13:22

duplicated,

1:13:24

so to speak.

1:13:26

And then yes, I would also agree, if the designated airports have summer and winter controls, that's clear reason why loosen should also be looking at those that

1:13:39

just because there's no

1:13:42

Well, that's a clear indication that this is something we should be looking at. And noise in other periods of the year is something that needs consideration. I think if you flip it on its head, why wouldn't you put a cap on it? Is a very fair question.

1:13:59

Thank you. And Miss Lambert.

1:14:02

Thank you, sorry, under level of logic, and this is one of the concerns of communities about certainty or the lack of it. And I note that one of the natural constraints for throughput is the capacity of the terminal at the busiest times of year.

1:14:19

And obviously, if, as the applicant has indeed said in its documentation, there may well be a spread of travelling outside of the peaks of a period,

1:14:31

then that could provide a mechanism for peak traffic to be spread into a wider band, and that then reduces certainty. So in the note that's going to be produced, maybe it would be helpful if the applicant could indicate what information it may have about the possible spread of travelling and whether it's kind of

1:14:55

people shifting from travelling in the summer to the winter or earlier in the summer.

1:15:00

or later in the autumn, and that might inform this discussion. Thank you.

1:15:07

Can I just ask whether the applicant would be able to provide commentary on that particular point, we've said Louise Condren for the applicant, we've set out our assumptions about the shift and seasonality within the need case. I was just desperately trying to look at the paragraph reference, but it is in Section six of the new case.

1:15:34

Would it be possible to provide at least what happens in in the document that you're going to produce to that particular piece of information?

1:15:44

Certainly, so we can probably do it within the the note that we put in a D six, because it's just a reference gap. Thank you.

1:15:56

Were there any more comments on that particular point?

1:16:06

And I had an item on dispensation. On the agenda. I think for the sake of time, I'm going to roll that over to written questions,

1:16:17

unless anyone has any particular observations or to make on dispensations at this point in time.

1:16:26

In that case, if we can move on to monitoring

1:16:30

the aircraft noise monitoring plan, as Appendix C of the green control growth framework suggests that the criteria for updating noise monitoring terminals would be based on ca standards. And host authorities have suggested that this means the criteria for updating the terminals includes an increase of over 100,000 people into the low consoles.

1:16:52

is such an increase likely? And if not, is this a meaningful commitment in terms of upgrading the monitors?

1:17:01

Dr. Sharpe for the applicant, I'm sure you'll want to go to the her store. She's after us. But we've had subsequent discussions with the host authorities just to clarify the additional monitors. That's in particular, those comments were about if we were to add,

1:17:18

I think we needed to add any monitors in addition to those already committed. But there are additional monitors committed within the aircraft noise monitoring plan in line with an EDD recommendations to instal monitors two and a half and six kilometres from the end of runway. And we now understand from discussions I'll pass on, but I understand that's now understood to be acceptable in terms of the proposals.

1:17:45

Sorry, before last year, I didn't ask your question today about the CA proposals, it probably is not unlikely, I think it is in terms of that increase of the number of population to move it into another category.

1:18:00

But we are aware that there are aspects of that guidance document which are planned to be updated and continually updated. If the Civil Aviation Authority were to reissue guidance, which suggests that they think that monitoring should be done in a different way or update that guidance, then that would be the trigger. But I think it's I think it's relevant to note that the monitoring terminals are fully compliant with the CAA guidance on noise modelling now. So other than those already committed, we don't see a need. So are you anticipating an update from the CAA? They there is an aspect of the document which says they're going to update categories DNA, I think they've left blank, and they haven't actually come back with that. So there is perhaps an expectation that they may they may update it, but we haven't seen anything further on that.

1:18:48

They recently updated the airspace change guidance document, and I wonder if that might then trigger a change to the monitoring document, but I don't have any intelligence on that. Thank you. Can local authorities respond? And Holcom for the host authorities? Yes, the discussion has moved on. The text was clarified and and the local authorities now content that once the airspace changes are known, additional monitors will be going in and that will be sufficient.

1:19:22

Also, just to add, I'd be highly surprised if the changes to the guidance actually affected anything at Luton, it seems to be around other modelling but smaller airports.

1:19:36

Thank you. That's helpful. And just in relation to the monitoring that you mentioned it

1:19:43

two and a half kilometres and six and a half kilometres.

1:19:49

The you've suggested that the monitoring would be delayed until any aspects changed VT had taken place.

1:19:58

Given that the monitors

1:20:00

Two and a half kilometres presumably are on a fairly straight alignment from the from the runway due to proximity is there the possibility of delivering that delivering the monitors at two and a half kilometres in advance for the monitors six and a half kilometres, which might be more subject to change.

1:20:19

Dr. Sharpe for the applicant, I think we'd have to take that away and look at it in the context of the current airspace designs and whether there are any implications even at that distance. I think on departure, there could still be some potential changes potentially. Okay. Thank you.

1:20:40

There any more comments on monitoring?

1:21:07

The next item was whether green control growth should consider impacts on the Children's National Landscape I still can't quite get used to that,

1:21:16

or impacts arising from airspace change. So Buckingham Shearer suggested that the GCG framework should be extended to consider effects on children's national landscape, and impacts arising from airspace change. My understanding of the framework is the airspace change would be addressed through the review process if and when it occurs. So I don't intend to discuss that any further. However, can I ask Buckingham share to expand on his comments on the need considered the national landscape and the potential need for monitoring within the national landscape?

1:21:51

Stephen Braun from Buckinghamshire Council.

1:21:54

Yes, it would be Akeem she would welcome some attention to the newly formed national landscape which was this John Zeo and be

1:22:06

in to try and protect some of the the tranquillity apart which has to do with noise. And what we would look for is some something explicit in the green controlled growth framework, which is currently at rep five oh 23.2, which will direct any future review of noise limits and thresholds to take into consideration the importance of the health and quality

1:22:40

effects, the benefits of having a landscape not disturbed any further.

1:22:46

I'm fully aware that the fatty South may work to the benefit of the CLMV worker also work to the detriment depending on the things that South Applicantns control. But bearing in mind the presumption in policy that the

1:23:04

use the air navigation guidance 2014 says that

1:23:10

areas of AMB should be protected, where possible, where practicable. I'd like to see that reflected in the green controlled growth, a framework in which to protect the national landscape in the children's and some of the host authority as well.

1:23:29

Thank you, thank you, Shawn, would you most respond?

1:23:34

Dr. Sharpe for the applicant.

1:23:37

So the overall principles of the green control growth in the noise envelope, as we've discussed is to limit and control the overall impact so there is no single receptor or area that is specifically controlled or protected over and above any other receptor.

1:23:54

This is in line with with government policy and you know the overall objective to limit and where possible reduce the total adverse impacts on health and quality of life. And we do consider that health and quality of life includes the experience of people in areas such as

1:24:10

the national landscape.

1:24:13

This is also consistent with government guidance in their navigation guidance. Give me I'll read out a quote paragraph 3.32, which notes that given the finite amount of airspace available, it will not always be possible to avoid overflowing national parks or AONBs. And there are no legislative requirements to do so. As this would be impracticable. The impractical the government's policy continues to focus on limiting and where possible, reducing the number of number of people in the UK adversely affected by aircraft noise and the impacts of health and quality of life associated with it.

1:24:45

And of course, that doesn't mean that we aren't protecting or don't intend to protect the national landscape. It will benefit from all the noise controls that are in the noise envelope which are aimed at reducing and controlling noise overall.

1:24:58

But there isn't a mechanism that we can see

1:25:00

That would particularly protect a single location a single receptor, such as the children's AONB.

1:25:07

I think where potential impact or benefit as Mr. Brown has noted is probably through through the airspace change. And I think it's notable that a lot of the guidance and methodologies about tranquillity and areas of national beauty are sorry, national landscapes

1:25:23

are to do with airspace change. And there are specific requirements and methodologies within cap 1616 to consider impacts on overflights of AONBs.

1:25:33

And that's actually evidenced by the airport operators initial options appraisal for their airspace change where where every single airspace design option, they look at the impact on on the AONB. And of course, as we know and as you've pointed out, Dr. Hunt, the airspace change must fit within the controls of the noise envelope. So there is an overall protection there there is overall noise control. And we think that's sufficient and appropriate.

1:26:02

Just ask, there is a marked increase in overflights more than doubling over popular recreational and tourist destinations such as Ivinghoe Beacon, and Whipsnade can the outcome explains what extent the impact on these receptors has been addressed in the s.

1:26:20

And given that there's more than a doubling of movements by 2043. Presumably this means there is a three decibel change. So there is a perceptible change in noise for these receptors.

1:26:36

Sharp for the applicant.

1:26:38

There there may be a perceptible change and there will be a change in overflights, but not at a level that we would anticipate there being any adverse effects

1:26:50

that's consistent with with policy and guidance

1:27:00

did the Applicantn just

1:27:02

I think we were talking about and more than a doubling of movements that's that's that's not the case.

1:27:08

For me overflights plans, I thought between the base case and 2043 the increase was double in terms of the number of overflights

1:27:24

per share for the Applicant that might be something we have to clarify the number of movements certainly doesn't double so we'll have to check that and I'll I'll also just check the ceiling that I've not sort of misunderstood the figures so I can go back and give a reference tomorrow morning. Okay, that'd be helpful. Thank you

1:27:40

and the Buckingham share wants to respond.

1:27:45

Stephen blonde for Buckinghamshire Council. Yes, I'd like to talk a little bit about

1:27:51

what the inspectors mentioned, which is the LOL of the long term. Worst case lol 45 DB law which is was drawn in the pier was just over the backing ship and border and now it's been bought back by the remodelling just the other side of it, which shows how sensitive drawing a single line on a map can be.

1:28:14

I'd also like to point out that I believe the contours which had been referred to throughout the day or based on the any TGS

1:28:23

decision which is quite correct. To place the those contour limits somewhere between lol and sob. So I wouldn't want to get confused between significant effects and annoyance, which is where I think the contours have been drawn for the nose envelope design group. And, and and to be fair to the applicant, the drawing of those contours also protects the law. So if you reduce the content of the of the balloon, so to speak, by reducing the the proposed contours and a little contour also comes in, but the opposite can also have an effect. So not to confuse effects based on roles themselves with annoyance. That's my point. Thank you.

1:29:18

Thank you.

1:29:21

The next point I just wanted to touch on is the faster growth position within the green control growth framework. So the Air Force national policy statement and the noise policy statement for England developments to make particular efforts to avoid significant adverse noise effects and noise impacts sorry, Kenny Applicantns explain how the use of green controlled growth noise limits based on faster growth assumptions comply with a national policy. When noise insulation constraints would increase the number of properties experiencing noise in excess of Seoul during phase one.

1:29:59

Or sharp for the

1:30:00

applicant.

1:30:01

I think we discussed this a little bit at issue specific hearing three, and whether we use the core case or the faster growth case, the numbers do slightly change, but the policy requirement and then need to meet that policy requirement is unchanged.

1:30:19

So, the policy requirements and the airport national policy statement is always policy statement for England to avoid significant adverse impacts on health is in the context of sustainable development. So the simple answer in terms of how we meet that policy, is that the rollout is as fast as reasonably practicable, which is another way of saying as as far as in the context of sustainable development, as we discussed the issue, specific hearing three, we talked a little bit about earlier. But of course, you know, we put in that paper about the accelerated delivery programme, rep 4079. And that demonstrates

1:30:55

a very accelerated programme that we think is achievable based on on market research. And, as you noted, it is faster than the current rate of

1:31:06

delivery for the airport. It is also faster than other comparable airports. And I think it's helpful to note that the host authorities have made those same comments in their deadline, five submissions and noted that it is certainly a fast and improved rollout.

1:31:22

So it's still Yeah, it's about rolling out as fast as reasonably practicable, whether it be core case or faster growth case.

1:31:30

Thank you.

1:31:32

Were any other comments on that point, Mr. Holcomb

1:31:36

and I welcome for those authorities, I need to reiterate that through use of the court case, rather than the faster growth case, you would have an opportunity to where possible reduce noise effects, and the highest authorities remain at the opinion of the court should be used regardless of

1:31:55

the scheme. Thank you. That's noted.

1:32:00

I'm

1:32:02

sorry, just shut up. Did you want to come back in

1:32:06

at short for the applicant? I don't think there's much more to add than what we've already responded to in written representations on that point.

1:32:16

And so

1:32:19

the next point I just wanted to touch on was deleting local plan policies. So how does the proposed approach with increased noise levels relative to the 18 or 19 million pasture per annum consents meet the requirements for loose and local plan policies. LLP six, B five, and LLP six, B seven. So B five is to achieve further noise reduction or no material increase in day or night time noise, or otherwise cause excessive noise including ground noise anytime, day or night. And in accordance with the airport's most recent airport noise action plan. And B seven is include proposal proposals that will, over time results in a significant diminution. investments with the effects of aircraft operations on the amenity of local

residents, occupiers and users of sensitive premises in the two measures to be taken secure Fleet Modernization or otherwise.

1:33:15

Sharp for the applicant. I have a response here, this is one where we were going to offer because it is a relatively long response. And there are multiple policy points even within those I was going to offer if you prefer for me to put it in writing it deadline six in the interest of getting through the agenda. I think that might be a helpful idea, unless anyone else objects.

1:33:37

Okay.

1:33:52

Sorry, Mr. Reddington.

1:33:56

Thank you, Michael Ronita. Just a quick question. You've mentioned LLP six, four and seven, but I believe it says four through seven.

1:34:12

Be this specific bits of the policy that I'm particularly concerned about are five and seven. But I'm interested in the response to the whole policies. So we have a response for them all. So I'm rather the points that you've listed. So I'm happy to provide that deadline. Thank you.

1:34:36

The final question I had was around phasing of growth, but we have already touched on several occasions on the issue of phasing and whether there is a need for a phased control on the airport. I think this is one I'm going to roll over to a written question although we may touch on it tomorrow at the DCO hearing. So we'll move on from that point again unless any parts

1:35:00

He's have any comments on

1:35:02

facing requirements for the airport?

1:35:06

No one online. Okay, that draws to close the items on noise.

1:35:13

Unnecessary, Mr. Edison.

1:35:18

Thank you just to one very brief question.

1:35:22

It's about monitoring of ground noise. I understand that it's not going to be monitored. But it will be reviewed. If this is my understanding.

1:35:38

Sharpe ratio for the applicant, it will be reviewed in the context of the ground noise insulation scheme. So it will be modelled on an annual basis and contours produced to determine the eligibility for ground noise insulation.

1:35:54

Thank you.

1:35:59

Ben Holcomb for the house authority site, I want to build on just one comment from something said before lunch, the applicants were

1:36:08

talking about the benefits of future aircraft if they do become quieter, but they do not allow for these in their core case. And if they're not allowed for them in their core case, and I see no reason that they should rely on this or be able to talk about any benefits that may arise if they're not willing to

1:36:25

put pen to paper. And

1:36:29

that would be growth, without noise reduction, as we see it as a policy line. So that's

1:36:36

that's counter to every other airport application really looking at future aircraft noise levels.

1:36:45

Daksha, would you like to respond? Not short for the applicant? It is precisely for that reason that we do not rely on them in the environmental statement. We've made no

1:36:55

quantification of their benefits and their

1:36:59

assumption that they will come into the fleet, where we are

1:37:04

hoping that they will provide benefits through the noise limit review process. But no point do we use that to reduce the impacts that are assessed in the environmental statement.

1:37:15

Miss Concord is only for the applicant. I think it's just important again to note that the overarching aviation noise policy does fussy circumstances where there may be an increase in noise if there are strong economic benefits as we believe there are in this case.

1:37:36

Thank you.

1:37:39

We'll now move on to air quality.

1:37:42

Just give me a moment to.

1:38:17

Well, people arranging themselves. I'm conscious, we are hitting our 90 minute mark where we'd normally have a break. However, there are relatively few items on the agenda. So my preference would be to push on through unless anyone has a specific objection.

1:38:33

Okay.

1:38:37

So

1:38:40

Mr. Humphries, would you like to just welcome at your Yes, sir.

1:38:46

We're joined in a speaking role by Mr. Bellanger.

1:38:53

Who I think you will have heard from before. Yeah, yeah.

1:39:02

And, uh, beyond his sound Bradley, but I don't know whether he's expecting to speak. But just ask him a question. Put him on his metal. Okay. Thank you.

1:39:15

So the first question I handled it well, it covered a number of items that have been

1:39:21

sort of raised within the representations. And there's been some backwards and forwards on but I don't think we have a final resolution. So the points were short term emissions, and the need to assess short term missions,

1:39:34

assessments of ultra fine particulates and monitoring for ultra fine particulates, and the specific requirement to monitor at the airport boundary and I've seen comments from both parties. So can I turn to the applicant initially and just ask whether you've reached any form of agreement on those three matters at this point in time?

1:39:56

James Ballenger on behalf of the applicants, so discussions have been on

1:40:00

Going through the socg process, we actually had a good meeting last week. And in terms of that we're up to is we've agreed to provide the technical notes at deadlines six, which will set out a summary of where we are on each of those items. But in very brief for right now, we've reached agreement in terms of there being no requirements to carry out monitoring for UfP.

1:40:25

And in terms of boundary monitoring, whilst very much separate from the SA from the GCG process,

1:40:33

the operator do have plans to put in place monitoring using continuous monitoring equipment failure to pm 10pm 2.5. Around the airports, including on the boundary. And in terms of short term monitoring,

1:40:51

we are still of the opinion that there's no requirements, bring that into GCG, as demonstrated through the ES chapter seven in the ASC six paragraph 7.7777. Rather, there's no likely exceedances of the short term objectives.

1:41:13

Thank you. That's very helpful update to the local authorities want to respond.

1:41:24

And Auntie Tolworth for the half show combined authorities.

1:41:32

Yes, we've had constructive discussions regarding the short term

1:41:41

threshold.

1:41:44

I would like I would hope we could continue the discussion in relation to environmental management,

1:41:53

which is a related but

1:41:57

not wholly.

1:42:02

specific thing sort of GCG. So

1:42:07

we are planning on having further discussions in the coming weeks to resolve this. And sorry, just say nine glare, could you expand on that point a bit? What exactly are you looking to? We're looking to do? We're looking to keep, we would like the short term

1:42:27

threshold to remain,

1:42:30

you know, put in place

1:42:35

whether it is in the GCG, or in a formal environmental management plan. I think that's to be discussed further.

1:42:51

And in terms of the

1:42:55

in terms of the short term emissions,

1:43:00

if you're putting continuous monitoring in place, Is there potential to look at short term missions for a period of time and then provide absolute confirmation that that's not a requirement?

1:43:15

James boundary on behalf of the applicants, yes, that is potentially feasible, there would be outputs that would allow people to monitor and review concentrations in line with the short term targets. I think the short term target that Hartfordshire authorities, I believe and understand to be referring to would be the WHO short term targets, which we should be clear on aren't part of national policy or legislation. So we'd be there and reviewed for information rather than any sort of legal requirements. But in terms of the short term, UK national targets, again, yes, they would be able to be viewed and reported against

1:43:58

as part of EPA, day to day activity and general monitoring that they carry out.

1:44:07

And is that something that could be

1:44:10

secured in some fashion?

1:44:23

James Ballenger on behalf of the applicants, I would need to confirm with the operator in terms of some of those queries. So we'll come back to in writing on that. Okay. Which turbine is that I six. Okay. Thank you

1:44:43

Mr. Pittman, you have your hand up

1:44:51

Mr. Benton

1:44:57

or come back to Mr. Pittman

1:45:00

Sorry, can you hear me? Yes, we can now Yeah, yeah, I apologise for that. Yeah, I just wanted to emphasise that point that we've made previously, in terms of the actual

1:45:13

equivalence method reference method that's used for the monitoring. We do not accept

1:45:20

the proposal for a cue mesh equivalent monitors. And we do request that any monitors that are installed should meet deafer as reference equivalent criteria. And we've made that comment already directly, but we just wish to emphasise that Thank you.

1:45:43

Thank you. I think, Mr. Valencia, you've already responded in writing on this point.

1:45:48

I can't recall the reference off the top of my head, but

1:45:58

James Behringer, on behalf of the applicant that is correct, we have responded on this on this matter and cetera, et cetera. So else in writing and past

1:46:06

correspondence, we'll get you the reference for that. Okay. Can I just check? There's no change in that in your position? That's correct. There's no change. Thank you.

1:46:18

Were there any other comments from other local authorities?

1:46:25

Andrew, loosely for lingonberry. Counsel, picking up on the comments from Mr. Petland. Although it's not, Luton borough Council's position that we've unnecessarily look for reference equivalent monitoring in every location, what we would look for, and what we've discussed with the applicant previously,

1:46:46

as part of the statement of common grounds discussions, is a clear traceability back to a reference equivalent monitor, using verification, probably as part of the calibration procedure, we do have a slight concern in that the

1:47:04

continuous instrument that's currently used by the applicant, then Wigmore park site isn't actually

1:47:13

you isn't actually certified by M certs for use in the UK. It's rather complex, it's it's acceptable for use in Europe. And it has a European accreditation, but there's also a separate accreditation for UK usage. And the particular unit they have doesn't have that certification. And that's expressly mentioned in the NA QM technical guidance document. So la QM T G. 22 is the current version.

1:47:49

So potentially, that might be an issue for us.

1:47:55

So from an air quality perspective, that would be a minimum standard, is that the isn't what you're saying?

1:48:03

In terms of, and we're probably talking more about particular, because you always have the option of using diffusion tubes for nitrogen dioxide. But when looking at particulate matter for regulatory purposes,

1:48:16

currently, you don't really have a choice when it comes to na QM

1:48:21

responsibilities for, say, local authorities. But to use a reference equivalent technique or a reference technique.

1:48:29

We ourselves have some of what has been described as AQ mesh equivalent devices, we from a different manufacturer.

1:48:37

They're useful and if they're calibrated and managed in a

1:48:43

suitable way, as the science sort of moves on, they're getting more and more reliable, more and more equivalent, potentially, to reference techniques. But currently, Defra only accept reference equivalent data for monitoring purposes. So what we would look for would be, as I say, to have a sort of as a touchstone, it being fully M certs accredited would be our preference.

1:49:11

Would

1:49:13

you like me to balance your lightsaber respond?

1:49:17

James Benadryl on behalf of that because I think mainly just to say that we're happy to continue working on agreeing, suitable and robust QA QC process for the future monitoring. Could you give an indication of when you'd be seeking to finalise that agreement?

1:49:51

It would be aimed for deadlines seven given that we've got the summary note coming out at deadline six it would follow that

1:49:59

Thank you.

1:50:08

My final question related to

1:50:13

Deadline five submissions you submitted a revised review process phase two a to evaluate whether monitors should be in or out of scope.

1:50:21

Given the long term nature of the proposals and potential uncertainties in the forecasts.

1:50:27

Could you explain why this process shouldn't apply in all phases?

1:50:33

marked a on behalf of the applicant, it may before I answer your question be worth me just confirming what we mean by in scope and out of scope just for the benefit of people in the room. So this would be the reference to figure 3.7. In the green control growth explanatory note wins rep five zero to zero.

1:50:50

Essentially, in trying to filter down all of the receptors that were looked at, for the purpose of air quality in the environmental statement, we've sought to come up with a shortlist of monitoring locations. So for each of those receptors, we've looked at the 10 receptors that experienced the greatest impacts as a result of expansion for each forecast year. And for each pollutant, we've then there's some overlap between those receptors. So we've then simplified that to a shortlist of 15 monitoring locations,

1:51:19

we've then looked at whether the airport impact at each of those locations is negligible or not. And where the airport impact is forecast to be negligible. We are saying they are out of scope, we will monitor them, but they can't influence the green control growth process. If there is a non negligible airport impact, then they will be fully in scope for green controlled growth.

1:51:42

So the changes that we made at deadline five followed on from our response to action 16, from issue specific hearing five, so that was rep 4089. And those changes were made specifically in response to questions about no locations, being in scope for phase two, eight. And that paper read 4089 I think needs to be read in the context. And we still have been through this in previous hearings, and then inish five, that we have confidence in our equity forecasts that they've been carried out on a conservative basis. But the reason that there are no locations in scope in phase two A is because there are no non negligible airport impacts. And we were asked to consider how we could strengthen that phase two a and that paper sets out our response. That's not the case for other phases, though there are locations in other phases of airport expansion, which we are forecasting to be in scope on the basis of non negligible airport impacts. And it's on that basis that the proposals have just been put forward for phase two A.

1:52:46

Okay, thank you. Do the local authorities have any comments on the process of identifying whether monitoring locations are in or out of scope?

1:52:58

Or asked for their Hartfordshire? If so, I've read the host authorities, no comments on this. Thank you. Thank you.

1:53:04

In that case, that wraps up my air quality questions. Are there any other questions either from policies in the room on agriculture masters or online?

1:53:20

In that case, I will hand back to my colleague, Mr. Allen.

1:53:26

Thank you very much, Dr. Hunt. We have not been notified that anyone wishes to raise any other business that is relevant to this hearing. But before we close, can I just ask if there are any other matters that any party wishes to raise?

1:53:40

No one in the room. But I was just going to say that. So my apologies. I will not be here tomorrow. No, no discourtesy intended, but Mr. Henderson will be dealing with the DCA stuff. So it's all right, Mr. Humphries, we won't take it personally.

1:53:55

Given the number of action points, rather than go through these in detail now they will be published on the project page of the national infrastructure website in the next day or two. And a recording of his hearing will also be placed on the project pages as soon as practicable. I'll take this opportunity to remind you that the timetable for this examination requires that parties provide any post hearing documents on or before deadline six, which is Friday, the eighth of December 2023. And they say we'll be issuing it secondary questions on Friday the 15th of December 2023. With responses due at deadline seven which is Tuesday the ninth of June 9 of January 2020. For the next hearing is issue specific hearing 10 which will be on the draft event and consent order which is tomorrow which is the first of December starting at 930. So the time is now nine minutes past five and this ninth issue specific hearing for proposed London Luton Airport Expansion Project is now closed