



**CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL COMMENTS ON DEADLINE 5  
SUBMISSIONS**

**LONDON LUTON AIRPORT EXPANSION DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER**

**Version – FINAL**

## **Introduction**

This document sets out the response of Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC) to various documents submitted at Deadline 5. The comments include input from various technical consultants.

**1. REP5 – 003 Draft Development Consent Order**

Please refer to ISH10 Host Authorities joint response on this document.

**2. REP5 – 007 General Arrangement Drawings**

From a review of the updated plans, it appears that the updates do not apply to elements which effect the CBC highway network, and as such CBC would have no comment to make on these.

**3. REP5-012 ES Chapter 4 – Proposed Development**

Paragraph 4.10.8 indicates that a 2m high noise barrier that would be 132m in length is now included in the Proposed Development as an existing commitment from the extant Green Horizons Park planning permission. The barrier would be installed on the edge of the highway between the Holiday Inn and Preservation House. There is no robust justification for not including this within the LVIA. It is necessary to understand whether this would be visible from any viewpoints in Central Bedfordshire.

**4. REP5 – 020 Green Controlled Growth – Explanatory Note**

Please refer to ISH9 Host Authorities joint response on this document.

**5. REP5 – 024 ESG Terms of Reference**

Please refer to ISH9 Host Authorities joint response on this document.

**6. REP5 – 025 Technical Panels Terms of Reference**

Please refer to ISH9 Host Authorities response on this document.

**7. REP5 – 030 GCG Appendix D – Air Quality Monitoring Plan**

Within CBCs LIR (REP1A-002) concerns was raised that there are no air quality monitoring locations in Central Bedfordshire. The applicant has indicated this is because air quality has not been identified as an issue. The revised document includes details on potential scope to add more monitoring locations at phase 2a. However, this does not provide appropriate safeguards for Central Bedfordshire residents and the position of CBC is as per the LIR. It is the Council's view that monitoring is necessary in Central Bedfordshire and would be expected by local residents and Members.

## **8. REP5 – 032 GCG Surface Access Monitoring Plan**

The updated Surface Access Monitoring plan submitted at Deadline 5 provides a number of minor clarifications and text updates, which do help clarify a number of points, but don't alter the core content of the proposed approach to monitoring. As such the CBC comments previous raised with regards to the limited dataset being drawn upon would still apply. Notwithstanding that, there are a couple of additional matters that CBC would wish to raise and / or ask for the applicant to give consideration to.

Quarterly reporting of CAA data – Para F2.1.4 states that the airport operator receives unvalidated quarterly data from the CAA which 'helps the airport operator to identify any changes in passenger behaviour which may be attributable to circumstances beyond their control.' Whilst is appreciated that this data may be unvalidated, sharing this quarterly data would assist in identifying any quarterly period which might be impacted by such circumstances and allow for data from this period (for example) to be removed from the annual reporting. In the absence of such a measure, there is the potential that any one event throughout the full year period could otherwise be considered as invalidating the data for the purposes of GCG, depending upon the interpretation applied to the current drafting of the Green Controlled Growth requirements within the DCO related to 'circumstances beyond the undertakers control'.

Quarterly reporting would also provide for a more agile and responsive means of monitoring. Reliance upon annual surveys is liable to mean that issues could not be identified and acted upon as efficiently and quickly, whereas quarterly (or better) reporting would feed more closely into the proposed Level 1 and Level 2 Threshold 'early warning' system as currently proposed.

Whilst it appears to be the case that the applicant is proposing to use the full dataset from the CAA, allowing the main, rather than final mode of travel to be reported, it is unclear the degree to which this dataset will be fully available, with the text stating in paragraph F2.1.5 that '*At the time of writing there are significantly fewer survey records for which 'main mode; is captured by the CAA'.* Ensuring that 'Main Mode' is fully captured and reported is considered by CBC to be essential, as this would allow for the identification of the numbers of users parking off-site as well as providing a more accurate indication of sustainable travel mode share.

## **9. REP5-034 Design Principles**

At deadline 4 CBC raised a number of concerns regarding the proposed Design Principles. It is acknowledged that this is a high-level document. The revised document takes into account points raised by CBC, notably in terms of careful consideration of the sensitive receptors to the south and west in terms of Luton Hoo Grade II\* RPG and Someries Castle Scheduled Monument. These heritage assets are now referenced within the Design Principles document and

recognition of the need for careful consideration of material finishes is included. This is welcomed.

Concerns was also raised that the Design Principles did not reference solar panels, which as per the Glint and Glare Study are proposed in several locations across the main application site. The document has been amended to incorporate this.

The updated document also includes details on landscaping, and this is welcomed but further consideration should be given to responding to landform and historic character. No issues are raised with the additional section on the drainage aspects.

However, further information is required in respect to lighting details in respect to reducing impacts on the landscape and historic character of the surrounding area. BIODV.04 seeks detailed lighting design but this is specifically in relation to biodiversity and does not suitably address the points raised in the CBC LIR (REP1A-002). CBC have requested a requirement to secure lighting details, but this has not been put forward by the Applicant. If lighting is to be secured through the Design Principles document, then the document needs to be suitably robust.

The document refers to smoke reduction measures at the FTG and further detail is required. Please see CBC ISH8 response.

## **10.REP5 – 037 Trip Distribution Plans**

CBC provided comments on the updated Trip Distribution Plans at Deadline 5, and as per the comments made by the Joint Host Authorities at Issue Specific Hearing 7, would be seeking further information in terms of either plans with numbers added to the plots, or a supporting table showing flows for the routes within CBC.

## **11.REP5 – 041 Outline TRIMMA**

CBC provided detailed comments on the Outline TRIMMA at Deadline 5, and those comments are still considered to be relevant.

CBC note that the specific concerns raised with regards to the potentially long periods of time when no monitoring would be required under the current proposals within OTRIMMA are supported by the passenger growth projections included in REP5-056 in Figure 3.2, which suggests that, dependent upon the growth assumptions applied, there could be no increase in passenger throughput for the period 2027 to 2036, and therefore no triggering of the need for wider monitoring or assessment under ML1. This was also raised by the joint host authorities in Issue Specific Hearing 7 and within the National Highway submission REP5-091.

In addition to those comments, being mindful of the period of time it was reported it may take to replace the fire damaged car park (as raised in Issue Specific Hearing 2), it may be necessary for the approach to baseline surveys (ML0) to be revisited, to allow for the changes in flows related to the temporary loss of that facility. I.e.: at present ML0 is proposed to be carried out following the issue of notice to grow and is intended to closely represent traffic flows when the extant planning consent capacity is reached, however this is likely to be prior to the reprovision of the lost car parking. As such the reinstatement of the car park, and associated changes in traffic entering the airport estate, would need factoring into any initial baseline survey (unless there is an equivalent temporary facility on site by the time of ML0).

At present the funding for the RIF (Residual Impacts Fund) is yet to be clarified, with details understood to be proposed through the S106. CBC cannot form a final view on the adequacy of such a provision until more details are provided.

## **12.REP5 – 049 Applicant’s Response to CBC**

The applicant’s responses are noted, however as the topics referred to are covered, in a large part, within other documents or areas of the DCO, such as the Statement of Common Ground or subsequent submission of documents at Deadline 5, CBC would make no further specific comment upon REP5-049, considering it most appropriate to make any further comment within the relevant topic area or upon the updated submission documents in question.

## **13.REP5 – 056 Applicant’s Response to ISH4, Action 26 – Sustainable Transport Fund**

The inclusion of a proposed funding methodology is welcomed by CBC and helps to address a number of previously raised areas of concern. It is however noted that the proposals are to be secure through the Section 106, and as such we are keen to see how this is reflected and secured through the S106 drafting. This also highlights the importance of the S106 being completed and secured prior to the conclusion of the DCO, as the funding streams for both the Sustainable Transport Fund and the Residual Impacts Fund (within the OTRIMMA) are proposed to be formalised and secured via this agreement.

CBCs continue to be of the view that there is a need for a mechanism for early funding interventions, such as the pump priming of bus services. Whilst paragraph 3.3.10 of the submitted document refers to this being a matter under consideration, CBC are of the view that this commitment should be made more firmly before the proposals could be supported.

There does remain a degree of uncertainty over how the Sustainable Transport Monies would be assigned, including the relationship with other funding sources. The post hearing submission document ‘Surface Access Controls Relationship

Map', does provide some further information, but CBC would continue to have the following questions:

1. The map would suggest that the funding under Green Controlled Growth would be initially called down in the event that a L2 Plan is required, meaning that, in the case of passengers, public transport mode share had fallen below the L2 Limit. Para. 3.4.2 of the STF document states that 'where a level 2 Threshold or Limit has been breached and additional measures are required as part of a Mitigation Plan or Level 2 Plan, these should not be funded by the STF' It is unclear in these circumstances how it would be possible to disaggregate the impacts of STF funded projects in terms of monitoring and reporting mode share related to the GcG breach.
2. CBC would have some concerns over the potential weighting of funding that could be applied to access and parking provision, with this forming one of the proposed six surface access priority areas, and with up to 80% of funding potentially assigned to a single priority area. As the matter of fly parking is proposed by the applicant team as being addressed within the separate TRIMMA process, it is unclear what types of parking interventions would be covered (and whether parking and access works would sit appropriately within a sustainable transport fund).

#### **14.REP5 – 055 Applicant's Response to ISH4, Action 7 – Updates on Road Safety Audits**

REP5-055 is welcomed, providing the additional Stage 1 Safety Audit information requested, although CBC would have to reiterate that there has been no detailed check against design standards or design review process entered into, and as such the schemes would continue to carry a degree of risk in terms of both layout and cost.

Notwithstanding the above, as Overseeing Authority for two of the schemes proposed as 'Offsite Highways Works' at the A1081 / Gipsy Lane junction and the London Road South junction, CBC would make the following comments.

##### **A1081 / Gipsy Lane**

Ref 3.1 – Noted that this is accepted, however it is not clear if the items of street furniture detailed would fall within the working width of the VRS, with the designer's response referring only to a minimum 0.6m offset to street furniture (with a minimum offset of 600mm to the edge of the VRS being required (preferably 1200mm) and with the offset to any street furniture having to be further within the central reserve, clear of the working width of the VRS). CBC would therefore wish to see a cross section of the most constrained area of the revised central reservation detailing the location of VRS, and street furniture located within the VRS protected area to confirm that sufficient widths can be achieved / maintained. In addition, we would be seeking confirmation that the

central reserve would continue to be protected with appropriate VRS as part of the proposed scheme of works.

Ref 3.2 – Noted that this is accepted. We are content that this could be addressed at the detailed design stage, subject to a relevant approvals process being secured through the DCO.

Ref 3.3 – Noted that this accepted. We are content that this could be addressed at the detailed design stage, subject to a relevant approvals process being secured through the DCO.

Ref 3.4 – Noted that this is accepted, although reference is only made to the visibility element of the Safety Audit recommendation. We would be seeking a plan showing forward visibility to the signal heads and confirmation that not only verge clearance, but also slope regrading as necessary will be carried out within detailed design to address the highlighted hazard concern as well as visibility (as per the safety auditor's recommendation).

Ref. 3.5 – The Swept path should allow for two larger vehicles as opposed to one HGV and one car. I.e.: the Design Vehicle in both lanes being a 16.5m HGV please. It is also noted that the HGV left turn onto the A1081 intrudes into the start of the cycle lane, which would not be considered acceptable.

Ref. 3.6 – Noted that this is accepted, however it is not clear if sufficient width is available, and as such a cross section should be provided to confirm this is achievable within the order limits.

Ref. 3.7 – This recommendation is detailed as being 'noted' rather than accepted, however from the more detailed swept path plan provided as Figure 3.2 of the submitted report 8.118 'Applicants response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 7 – Updates on Road Safety Audits', which includes an indicative reprovision of the cycle lane, this makes It clear that widening outside of that associated with the central reservation would be required on both sides of the A1081 (appearing to be beyond that therefore shown on the current indicative off site highways plan ref. LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0005 Rev P01). This would impact both upon the parking bay for the signal controller and also the location of the current VRS on the outer edge of each carriageway. As such we would be looking for the plans to be updated to confirm the re-provision of the cycle lane, the relocation of the parking bay for the controller, and the reprovision of the VRS (both in terms of protection of the central reserve and also for the edges of carriageway), as all these elements would be required as part of the overall scheme.

CBC consider this information necessary to demonstrate whether the works in question can be fully achieved within the red line DCO boundary. Based upon the proximity of the red line boundary to the extents of the proposed scheme,



CBC have relatively significant concerns that the works to relocate the cycle-lane, the Road Restraint Systems, and any related earthworks (with the land appearing to drop away beyond the current Road Restraint Systems) appear likely to extend beyond the redline.

In addition to the matters raised by the Safety Audit, CBC have a further concern that the lane markings proposed on the Gipsy Lane Roundabout encourage the use of the nearside lane for right turns (from Gipsy Lane), which could result in conflict with other vehicle movements through the junction.

### **London Road South**

Ref 3.1 – SSD to nearside primary traffic signal – the recommendation that the regrading of the cutting slope to provide forward visibility has not been accepted within the Designers response, which refers to achievable 90m (desirable minimum) being achievable to the offside signal head, and one step below to the nearside signal head. CD 109 states that relaxations below desirable minimum are not permitted on the immediate approaches to junctions and it is unclear from the response whether 90m visibility to a primary signal can be achieved from each approach lane. We would request a plan detailing achievable visibility from each approach lane is therefore provided.

Ref 3.2 – Noted that this is accepted. We are content this could be addressed at the detailed design and construction stage.

In addition, it is noted that no controller equipment location or engineers parking has been shown on plan, and whilst it is accepted that there should be sufficient land available within the public highway to allow for such provision, CBC would prefer to see this detailed on an updated plan to ensure that the requirement is captured within the DCO.

## **15. REP5 – 057 Rail Impacts Summary**

No specific comments are provided on this document, but CBC seek to ensure that rail capacity for local residents is not impeded by airport growth and demand for rail services. It is understood that Network Rail are assessing network capacity and will be reporting on this at Deadline 7.

## **16. REP5 – 058 Bus and Coach Study**

Colleagues in the CBC public transport team have reviewed and raised the following comments:

For all these proposed improvements, they will take considerable additional resource for bus companies and will need covering by significant subsidy, in particular during early / late or new 24-hour operation, especially in the early stages of implementation, as it is very unlikely that bus operators will extend or improve the services speculatively in the current climate. The most efficient use

of subsidy would be through regular meetings with operators and reporting of patronage figures, as well as heavy incentivisation of public transport usage by staff by the Airport authorities to get staff to leave their cars at home. This could be further offset if subsidised via income from parking charges for staff with a corresponding reduction in bus fares and increase in service levels, meaning that using the bus is a really viable option for the majority of staff. A commitment from the airport authorities, working in partnership with all business stakeholders located on the airport site, to give additional benefits to their staff to choose to use public transport to get to work. This would send a clear message that the airport authority and its stakeholders are committed to promoting sustainable travel.

The wider membership of the ATF including public transport operators as detailed within the Sustainable Transport Fund document (REP5-056) may provide one suitable forum for such discussions to be undertaken.

It would be useful to have an understanding of what the potential high level subsidy costs for the shortlisted priority projects in paragraph 4.3.5 might be, allowing a correlation with the suggested sums detailed within the Sustainable Transport Fund (REP5-056).

It should also be remembered that while active travel may be important, at the very early / late times of day, as well as in winter times, less people will be keen to travel via active means, so public bus services will become even more important at these times for people to access their place of work.

With regards to individual services:

- CBC generally agree with the priority list provided as paragraph 4.3.5, although are of the view that Arriva Service Z, serving many of the estates in Houghton Regis and west Luton should be considered for upgrade on early / late or to 24-hour as there is likely to be significant numbers of staff travelling on a regular basis from there.
- With Services A and Z upgraded and extended to the Airport Bus Station, this would give a robust offering for much of Luton and Dunstable, along with the Service B improvements as proposed.
- It should be noted that Services 366 and 610 are only very infrequent, running 2 to 3 times a day so cannot reasonably be considered as of much use for people travelling to and from the airport.
- Grant Palmer Service 78 / 79 – these are tendered services funded fully by Central Bedfordshire Council so may not run in the same form, or at all, by the time implementation comes.

- Red Eagle X61 – increasing the service to every 3 hours, whilst a benefit, would need to be increased further, to at least hourly to be viable for people to use to commute.
- Arriva Service 321 is a public bus service but is included in the coach services table. It is CBCs view that Arriva 321 should be considered for increased frequency in early / late times or even potential 24-hour as well as extension to the Airport, or Parkway Station.
- CBC would suggest that Service 100, Service MK1 and Service F70 / F77 should be increased to 24-hour a day due to the very early and late starts / finishes worked by a lot of employees to link into Stevenage, Bedford, Leighton and Milton Keynes as employee hotspots.

[End of Document]