

December 2023

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

**8.18 Statement of Common Ground between London
Luton Airport Limited and Buckinghamshire Council**

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.18

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

**London Luton Airport Expansion Development Consent
Order 202x**

**8.18 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN LONDON
LUTON AIRPORT LIMITED (TRADING AS LUTON RISING) AND
BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL**

Deadline:	Deadline 6
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/8.18
Author:	Luton Rising

Version	Date	Status of Version
Issue 1	September 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 2
Revision 1	October 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 3
Revision 2	December 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 6

STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by (1) London Luton Airport Limited (trading as Luton Rising) and (2) Buckinghamshire Council.

Signed on Behalf of LONDON LUTON AIRPORT LIMITED (TRADING AS LUTON RISING)

Signature:

Name:

Position:

Date:

Signed on Behalf of Buckinghamshire Council

Signature:

Name:

Position:

Date:

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction and purpose	1
1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground	1
1.2 Parties to this SoCG	2
1.3 Proposed Development description	2
2 Engagement with Buckinghamshire Council	4
2.1 Summary of engagement	4
3 Matters agreed, ongoing, or not agreed	6
3.1 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases	6
3.2 Surface Access	14
3.3 Noise and Vibration	29
3.4 Air Quality	33
3.5 Green Controlled Growth	40
3.6 Employment, Training and Skills	45
3.7 Economics and Employment	48
3.8 Landscape and Visual	48
3.9 Draft DCO	52
3.10 Airspace change	61
3.11 Health and Community	63

Tables

Table 2-1: Engagement between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council

Table 3-1: Summary of matters between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council (BC)

1 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) relates to an application made by London Luton Airport Limited, trading as Luton Rising (“the Applicant”), to the Secretary of State for Transport under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (“the Act”).
- 1.1.2 The application is for an order granting development consent, known as a Development Consent Order (DCO). The draft DCO is referred to as the London Luton Airport (Expansion) Development Consent Order. The DCO, if granted, would authorise an increase of the permitted capacity of London Luton Airport (“the airport”) to 32 million passengers per annum (mppa) (“the Proposed Development”).
- 1.1.3 This SoCG has been prepared by the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council in respect of the Proposed Development. In particular, this SoCG focuses on:
- a. Climate change and greenhouse gases
 - b. Surface access
 - c. Noise and vibration
 - d. Air quality
 - e. Green Controlled Growth
 - f. Employment Training and Skills
 - g. Economics and employment
 - h. Landscape and visual impact
 - i. Draft DCO
 - j. Airspace change
 - k. Health and Community
- 1.1.4 The purpose and possible content of SoCGs is set out in paragraphs 58-65 of the Department for Communities and Local Government’s guidance entitled “Planning Act 2008: examination of applications for development consent” (26 March 2015). Paragraph 58 of that guidance explains the basic function of SoCGs:

“A statement of common ground is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree. As well as identifying matters which are not in real dispute, it is also useful if a statement identifies those areas where agreement has not been reached. The statement should include references to show where those matters are dealt with in the written representations or other documentary evidence.”

1.1.5 SoCGs are therefore a useful and established means of ensuring that the evidence at the DCO examination phase focuses on the material differences between the main parties, and so aim to help facilitate a more efficient examination process.

1.2 Parties to this SoCG

1.2.1 The Applicant is the owner of the airport and is a private limited company wholly owned by Luton Borough Council (LBC). The airport is managed and operated by London Luton Airport Operations Ltd through a Concession Agreement with the Applicant and LBC. This agreement lasts until 2032.

1.2.2 Buckinghamshire Council is a neighbouring local authority under Section 42(a) of the Act. It is listed as a prescribed consultee in Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 and so has been consulted throughout the course of the development of the Proposed Development. Until April 2020, when Buckinghamshire Council was formed, the Applicant engaged with Buckinghamshire County Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council, and Chiltern District Council as neighbouring authorities.

1.2.3 Having reviewed the application documents and the Relevant Representations, the ExA requested on 13 July 2023 that the Applicant should seek to develop an SoCG with Buckinghamshire Council.

1.2.4 The Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council are collectively referred to in this SoCG as ‘the parties’. The parties have been, and continue to be, in direct communication in respect of the Proposed Development.

1.3 Proposed Development description

1.3.1 The Proposed Development builds on the current operational airport with the construction of a new passenger terminal and additional aircraft stands to the north east of the runway. This will take the overall passenger capacity to 32 mppa¹. In addition to the above and to support the initial increase in demand,

¹ On 1 December 2021, the local planning authority (Luton Borough Council) resolved to grant permission for the current airport operator (LLAOL) to grow the airport up to 19 mppa, from its previous permitted cap of 18 mppa. However, the application was then called-in and referred to the Secretary of State for determination instead of being dealt with by the local planning authority, and an inquiry to consider the called-in application took place between Tuesday 27 September 2022 and Friday 18 November 2022. At the time the application for development consent was submitted, the outcome of the inquiry was still unknown and, therefore, all of the core assessment undertaken for the application used a “baseline” of 18 mppa. The application by LLAOL has however since been approved, with a joint decision to grant planning permission issued by the Secretary of State for Transport and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities on 13 October 2023. In anticipation of this, the Applicant’s environmental assessments included sensitivity analysis of the implications of the permitted cap increasing to 19mppa. As a result, the Applicant believes that the environmental assessments are sufficiently representative of the likely significant effects of expansion, whether the baseline is 18 mppa or 19 mppa. Where the change of the baseline does affect an assessment topic, in most cases it means that the “core” assessments (using an 18 mppa baseline) report a marginally greater change than would be the case with a 19 mppa baseline. The findings of the assessment, including the sensitivity analysis, are presented in the Environmental Statement submitted with the application for development consent.

the existing infrastructure and supporting facilities will be improved in line with the incremental growth in capacity of the airport.

1.3.2 Key elements of the Proposed Development include:

- (i) extension and remodelling of the existing passenger terminal (Terminal 1) to increase the capacity;
- (ii) new passenger terminal building and boarding piers (Terminal 2);
- (iii) earthworks to create an extension to the current airfield platform; the vast majority of materials for these earthworks would be generated on site;
- (iv) airside facilities including new taxiways and aprons, together with relocated engine run-up bay and fire training facility;
- (v) landside facilities, including buildings which support the operational, energy and servicing needs of the airport;
- (vi) enhancement of the existing surface access network, including a new dual carriageway road accessed via a new junction on the existing New Airport Way (A1081) to the new passenger terminal along with the provision of forecourt and car parking facilities;
- (vii) extension of the Luton Direct Air to Rail Transit (Luton DART) with a station serving the new passenger terminal;
- (viii) landscape and ecological improvements, including the replacement of existing open space; and
- (ix) further infrastructure enhancements and initiatives to support the target of achieving zero emission ground operations by 2040², with interventions to support carbon neutrality being delivered sooner including facilities for greater public transport usage, improved thermal efficiency, electric vehicle charging, on-site energy generation and storage, new aircraft fuel pipeline connection and storage facilities and sustainable surface and foul water management installations.

² This is a Government target, for which the precise definition will be subject to further consultation following the *Jet Zero Strategy*, and which will require further mitigations beyond those secured under the DCO.

2 ENGAGEMENT WITH BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL

2.1 Summary of engagement

- 2.1.1 The pre-application statutory consultation carried out by the Applicant, and the way in which it has informed the DCO application, is set out in full in the **Consultation Report [AS-048]**. As a statutory consultee, Buckinghamshire Council was consulted on the proposals as a neighbouring local authority in accordance with Section 42 of the Act and submitted a formal response to the statutory consultation carried out by the Applicant in 2022.
- 2.1.2 The parties continue to be in direct communication in respect of the Proposed Development.
- 2.1.3 This SoCG is based on a programme of consultation and ongoing engagement which are summarised in Table 2-1. This sets out the meetings and substantive correspondence that took place and the topics discussed. Matters under discussion are set out in section 3.

Table 2-1: Engagement between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council

Date	Form of correspondence	Details
18 March 2021	Greenhouse Gas and Climate change working group – meeting no 1.	Meeting to discuss GHG assessment on topics of methodology, assessing the significance of the effects and potential mitigation. Zero Strategy and Green Controlled Growth were also discussed.
04 November 2021	Climate change and greenhouse gas working group – meeting no 2	Preliminary findings of 2022 PEIR presented and update on Green Controlled Growth was provided and discussed.
04 April 2022	Email/letter	Response submitted to the 2022 Statutory Consultation
13 September 2022	Climate change and GHG working group – meeting no 3	Updates to assessment since PEIR outlined, including changes to assessment criteria and UKCP18 projection. Detail provided on how consultation responses have been addressed and overview of assessment findings presented. Comments raised about some of the thresholds in the new likelihood and consequence criteria.
8 June 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss the DCO application, Buckinghamshire Council's role in the DCO process, and key issues related to Highways &

Date	Form of correspondence	Details
		Passenger Transport, Noise, Air Quality, Climate Change and Sustainability.
2 August 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Landscape and Visual Impact, Climate Change and Sustainability, and Cultural Heritage.
3 August 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Transport, Air Quality, Economic Development, and Noise.
8 August 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Transport.
8 August 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Airspace Change and Sustainable Aviation Fuels.
21 September 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (TRIMMA) and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF)
21 September 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's Landscape Architect to discuss landscape and visual impacts on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
2 October 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's highway officers to discuss and progress surface access matters in the SoCG.
15 November 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's highway officers to discuss and progress surface access matters in the SoCG.
16 November 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's officers to discuss Green Controlled Growth and Noise
6 December 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's traffic and transport officers to discuss the OTRIMMIA.

3 MATTERS AGREED, ONGOING, OR NOT AGREED

Table 3-1: Summary of matters between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council (BC)

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.1 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases							
3.1.0	Sustainable Aviation Fuels – modelling scenarios	<p>BC considers that the Applicant places an unwarranted level of confidence in the introduction of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) and next generation aircraft.</p> <p>The Applicant should assess and account for, in a meaningful way, the probability of the delivery of hydrogen/Low Carbon aircraft and sufficient quantities of SAF being available in the future.</p> <p>Sensitivity analysis using uncertainty analysis should be undertaken to reflect the probability of realisation. Graphics should be updated to show this meaningfully and clearly e.g. apply uncertainty bars/probability bars to figures 12.1 and 12.2 of ES Chapter 12.</p> <p>Future legislative targets relating to the introduction of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) and next generation aircraft are presented as “certainties” without accounting for probability of delivery.</p>	<p>Carbon emissions for aviation in the ES are modelled on the Jet Zero Strategy (JZS) High Ambition scenario that represents current UK Government policy on aviation.</p> <p>As such, the assumptions that underpin this scenario are therefore assumed to be an appropriate basis on which to model future GHG emissions from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>There are numerous DCO and other planning application examples where future GHG emissions have assumed to be in line with Government Policy for example Bristol Airport aligns with the JZS with the recently awarded DCO for the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet is reliant on the government’s commitments set out in the Transport Decarbonisation Plan to decarbonise emissions from road transportation.</p> <p>The Climate Chapter in the ES [APP- 038] acknowledges that there is some uncertainty about the speed and mix at which the various technology options, including SAFs and next generation aircraft, will be implemented. The graph presented in Inset 12.4, on page 70, presents the contribution each GHG reduction option makes to overall reduction from aviation emissions. Given the acknowledgement around uncertainty, it is therefore possible to see the relative contributions that the use of SAFs, improvements in efficiencies, and the use of zero emission aircraft make according to the High Ambition Scenario presented in the JZS and to discount each mitigation measure as necessary. But it is not</p>	<p>BC maintains that the Applicant places an unwarranted level of confidence in the introduction of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) and next generation aircraft.</p> <p>BC welcomes the acknowledgement by the Applicant that there is significant uncertainty. BC’s position regarding the need to model these uncertainties remains unchanged.</p> <p>BC does not accept that insufficient data is available; as a minimum, professional judgement should be used to apply uncertainty to the data in Fig. 12.4, e.g., a 40% slower development in each case and subsequently to re-calculate the carbon emissions that would result. This should also be fed into the GHG analysis and the modelling of cost of the carbon etc.</p> <p>By undertaking this exercise, the Applicant will also be able to demonstrate the impacts of the slower development in the decarbonisation of aviation. Where this could be the case, the slower development in SAF and next generation aircraft would result in greater</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should generate scenarios reflecting different probabilities of SAF and next generation aircraft usage.</p> <p>Scenarios should be subject to sensitivity testing.</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>possible, given the existing availability of modelling data, to apply quantitative estimates of uncertainty via the use of error bars or similar means.</p> <p>CORSIA works alongside other measures to offset CO₂ emissions that cannot be reduced through the use of technological improvements, operational improvements, and sustainable aviation fuels (SAF) with emissions units from the carbon market. CORSIA aims to ensure that international aviation's net carbon emissions do not increase from 2020 levels. Participating airlines are required to monitor their emissions and report them to their respective national authorities. These authorities verify the reported emissions and ensure compliance with CORSIA regulations.</p> <p>Currently the scheme is voluntary and serves as a pilot phase. From 2027 onward, all eligible international flights will be required to offset their emissions above the baseline level.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider there to be any specific evidence on the production and take up of SAFs that could be modelled to provide a more 'meaningful way' of modelling emissions from aviation.</p> <p>It remains the Applicant's position that it is reasonable to assume that stated government policy, including on aviation decarbonisation as described in the Jet Zero Strategy, will be implemented in full in order for the UK to remain compliant with carbon budgets and net zero targets.</p> <p>The Applicant's position on sensitivity analysis remains as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [APP-038], specifically paragraphs 12.9.17 to 12.9.19, Table 12.23 and Inset 12.3. The relative contributions to decarbonisation of the aviation mitigation measures described</p>	<p>reliance on the UK Emissions Trading Scheme and CORSIA to offset the resulting GHG emissions from increased passenger number, as well as the BAU emissions. With the increased need for offsetting, this could impact on the Right to Fly at low-cost aspect put forward by the DCO, with the cost of offsetting passed through to the customer by airlines and potentially resulting in reduced passenger numbers due to affordability.</p> <p>BC's position on this matter remains unchanged.</p>			

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>in the Jet Zero Strategy are shown graphically in Inset 12.4.</p> <p>It should be noted that the demand forecasts already take into account the costs of carbon, including the costs of ETS permits, CORSIA or of abatement as set out in the Need Case [AS-125], Section 6.3. Hence, the level of demand growth has already been moderated to reflect the higher future costs associated with meeting carbon reduction targets.</p>				
3.1.1b	Sustainable Aviation Fuels – efficiency savings	<p>Historically, efficiency improvements are offset by increased use, see Jevons Paradox. Any efficiency gains in future and next generation aircraft are likely to be at least in part or totally offset by an increase in flying. For example, although jet engines are considerably more efficient than in the 1950s, they are also significantly larger and more powerful. Aircraft size is typically increased to accommodate more passengers thus negating the efficiency savings. This must be adequately accounted for and graphically displayed within the conclusions.</p> <p>In addition, “efficiency savings” are presented as pure gains. This has implications for the assessment of greenhouse gas emissions, air quality and noise generated by the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The Applicant recognises that greater efficiencies resulting from improvements in aircraft engines and airspace management could exert a downward pressure on costs that might lead to increased demand (via the Jevons Paradox noted). But this downward pressure will be more than countered by increased costs resulting from market-based measures such as the UK Emissions Trading Scheme (UK ETS) and the Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA) as well as the higher costs associated with the use of SAFs and other new technologies.</p> <p>The JZS envisages that the costs associated with carbon or its abatement through the adoption of SAFS, or other new technologies are expected to increase the costs to airlines.</p> <p>The demand forecasts underpinning the Proposed Development have taken these higher costs, using the same assumptions as used in Jet Zero, into account, so reducing the level of demand growth projected. Ultimately, passenger demand cannot grow beyond the limits imposed by planning authorities, and overall aviation emissions from aviation at Luton Airport will be managed and capped by the UK ETS within the European Economic Area, and CORSIA for all international aviation.</p>	<p>BC disagrees that ‘efficiency savings’ should be presented as pure gains within assessment work.</p> <p>BC’s position remains unchanged – BC’s fundamental concerns have not been addressed.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should do the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make explicit the sensitivity analyses conducted on UK ETS and CORSIA price development within its models. • Show the effect of the above within an update to the GHG assessment TR020001/APP/5.01 [REP3-007]. • Show also how the sensitivity analyses above accounts for failure of any or all of the JZS measures to come forward and show the effect upon both price and cumulative emissions of each or all of these measures not coming forward; Efficiency savings, SAF savings, ZEA savings (see Inset 12.4 within TR020001/APP/5.01 [REP3-007]). <p>The above notwithstanding, BC considers that Table</p>		Not agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>The UK ETS sets an overall, scheme-wide cap on the amount of carbon which may be emitted by operators, including participating airlines. The available allowances place a cap on the total amount of GHG emissions that can be emitted by sectors, including aviation, covered by the UK ETS. This cap will be reduced over time stimulating innovation by participants to increase the carbon efficiency of their operations, or indeed to take steps which would reduce the overall scale of their operations. This effectively puts a binding cap on the amount of GHG emissions the aviation sector can emit. The UK government has made it clear that available allowances under the UK ETS will be aligned with the UK meeting the 6th Carbon Budget and later Carbon Budgets to net zero in 2050.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the inevitable uncertainty around the future cost of compliance with market-based mechanisms such as the UK ETS and CORSIA, and the incidental implications for passenger demand. The coverage of the UK ETS across multiple sectors including aviation means that any projections of future cost of carbon are subject to uncertainty, particularly in combination with the delivery of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Any attempt to model this uncertainty via sensitivity analysis, involving so many different variables, can be of only very limited value to the planning process. The Applicant notes that while improved efficiency of the aviation sector can have an upward pressure on passenger demand, this is not only countered by the impacts of carbon pricing but also constrained by passenger limits imposed at an airport level.</p> <p>It remains the Applicant’s position that the existing qualitative sensitivity analysis as presented in Table 12.23 of Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [APP-038]</p>		<p>12.23 within TR020001/APP/5.01 [REP3-007] should be extended to include sensitivity analyses upon Efficiency savings, SAF savings and ZEA savings not coming forward upon cumulative carbon emissions.</p> <p>The above must demonstrate beyond doubt that the proposed development is robust to the sensitivities inherent within future technological development and that they would not increase GHG emissions to the extent that future governments were unable to meet future carbon budgets.</p>		

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			provides sufficient context for the purposes of the DCO application.				
3.1.1c	Sustainable Aviation Fuels - forecasting	<i>[sub-divided subsequent to this iteration – SoCG ID 1]</i>	<p>As part of the forecasting process, account has been taken of the costs of carbon abatement, i.e. the higher cost of SAFs or of electric or hydrogen aircraft consistent with the assumptions made by Government in JSZ as explained in the Need Case and Appendices [APP-213/214]. Efficiency savings such as from improved airspace design are also taken into account in the demand forecasts to ensure that the forecasts are robust.</p> <p>The Applicant's position on sensitivity analysis remains as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [APP-038], specifically paragraphs 12.9.17 to 12.9.19, Table 12.23 and Inset 12.3. The relative contributions to decarbonisation of the aviation mitigation measures described in the Jet Zero Strategy are shown graphically in Inset 12.4.</p>	<p>As stated by BC in SoCG ID 1, the Applicant should, be able to demonstrate the impacts of the slower developments in SAF and next generation aircraft.</p> <p>If this scenario occurred, it would result in a greater reliance on the UK Emissions Trading Scheme and CORSIA to offset the resulting GHG emissions from increased passenger numbers, as well as existing BAU emissions. With the increased need for offsetting, this could impact on the Right to Fly at low-cost aspect put forward by the DCO, with the cost of offsetting passed through to the customer by airlines and potentially resulting in reduced passenger numbers due to affordability.</p> <p>The Right to Fly cheaply needs to be demonstrated as achievable even if these measures do not come forward, otherwise the need case is undermined.</p> <p>BC does not agree with the forecasting.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should generate scenarios reflecting different probabilities of SAF and next generation aircraft usage.</p> <p>Scenarios should be subject to sensitivity testing.</p>		Not agreed
3.1.1	Forecasting – RCP	BC agrees with the use of 10%, 50% and 90% probability levels, leading to the selection of Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 from UKCP18, commensurate with	Noted.	Unchanged.	Agreed	This was added to BC's Comments on Further Deadline 1	Agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		a global temperature increase of approximately 4.3 degrees centigrade by 2100. This represents an appropriately conservative case to assess climate change resilience against.				Submissions	
3.1.2b	Decommissioning	It is noted that de-commissioning of the proposed development has been scoped out (para 9.3.18 of Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement). BC recommend a Requirement of the DCO to ensure that a separate assessment is required for future de-commissioning.	Decommissioning was scoped out of the ES entirely, not just the Climate Change Resilience assessment, and this was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate in the Scoping Opinion [APP-168] . The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to include any requirement for decommissioning to be subject to further assessment. It is considered that the airport, once operational, will be a permanently functional airport and that the site will not be undertaking activities that pose a long-term risk requiring detailed decommissioning plans or assessment. There are no foreseen elements of the airport which will become redundant during the lifespan of the Proposed Development. No shorter timescale decommissioning has been identified at the point of submission for development consent. Future decommissioning which arises after the consent of the Proposed Development will be subject to appropriate planning and assessment requirements.	Unchanged.	Not agreed – The Applicant should accept and draft a requirement for a separate assessment of climate change resilience with regards to future decommissioning of the site. The decommissioning of a development is an important component of its lifecycle. Consideration should be given to how the site will be used following the decommissioning of the airport, ensuring that the impacts of climate change projected for that time period are assessed and that strategies or actions are formed based on the projected outcomes.		Not agreed
3.1.2	Sensitivity analysis – mitigation measures tested	The Applicant should quantitatively assess the effect upon GHG emissions of the “Faster Growth Scenario” as set out in the (JZS), and should conduct sensitivity analyses with respect to the effects of the different technological development trajectories that are recognised within the JZS. This should include, as a minimum:	The High Ambition Scenario considered in the JZS and Core Planning Case assessed and reported in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [REP3-007] consider the national delivery of three key mitigation measure to reduce aviation emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel efficiency • Sustainable aviation • Zero emission aircraft. measures; fuel; and	BC does not agree with the position provided. The Applicant implies that it is for the public and other interested parties to read off the data from the graph and assess the sensitivities themselves, which is hardly a reasonable approach. The Applicant, at ISH2 mentioned that a Monte Carlo simulation had been	Not agreed. BC asserts that the Applicant should quantitatively assess the effect upon GHG emissions of the “Faster Growth Scenario” as set out in the (JZS) and should conduct sensitivity analyses with respect to the effects of the different technological development trajectories that are recognised within		Not agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>a) What would be the effect upon cumulative emissions of annualised efficiency improvements that still meet the 2% over the whole period, but where the initial improvements are lower and made up for with accelerated development in the 2040s?</p> <p>b) What if sufficient feedstock is not available to supply the required levels of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF)?</p> <p>c) What would be the impact upon cumulative emissions if the zero emission aircraft do not develop at the anticipated rate?</p>	<p>The efficacy in of each of these measures in reducing emissions incrementally during assessment for the Proposed Development is shown in Inset 12.4: The incremental effect of JZS mitigation policies on Aviation emissions of Chapter 12 of the ES [REP3-007]. Therefore, the aviation emissions should each of these measures not be delivered is also shown in Figure 12.4; which in effect provides a quantified sensitivity test should each of these measures not be delivered with the top line being aviation emissions without any of these measures, that is, the 'worst case'; which it is understood is being requested. This is inherent to the Core Planning Case for GHG emissions from aviation and does not need to be included in the section on 'sensitivity tests' which is in response to the process and tests described in Chapter 5 of the ES [AS-075]. Therefore, It is not considered proportionate or appropriate to develop numerous combinations of each of these measures over various timescales and calculate the emissions.</p> <p>The Applicant's position on sensitivity analysis remains as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [APP-038], specifically paragraphs 12.9.17 to 12.9.19, Table 12.23 and Inset 12.3. The relative contributions to decarbonisation of the aviation mitigation measures described in the Jet Zero Strategy are shown graphically in Inset 12.4.</p>	<p>conducted on carbon pricing, which can involve hundreds or even thousands of scenarios to be calculated. Yet for this case, even a single sensitivity analysis is being rejected.</p> <p>Whilst we agree that the assessment must be proportionate, the Applicant's rejection of conducting any sensitivity analysis at all is not a position that we can understand or accept. Note also that the ExA specifically asked about sensitivity studies in ISH2, therefore this is clearly a matter of interest, not only for the BC.</p>	<p>the JZS. This should include, as a minimum:</p> <p>a) What would be the effect upon cumulative emissions of annualised efficiency improvements that still meet the 2% over the whole period, but where the initial improvements are lower and made up for with accelerated development in the 2040s?</p> <p>b) What if sufficient feedstock is not available to supply the required levels of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF)?</p> <p>c) What would be the impact upon cumulative emissions if the zero emission aircraft do not develop at the anticipated rate?</p>		
3.1.3b	Sensitivity analysis – application of guidance	N/A	<p>The assessment of significance of these quantified emissions follows the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) Guide: Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance, 2nd Edition, February 2022. Key to defining significance in this guidance is the degree to which a project mitigates emissions with respect to</p>	<p>BC is not suggesting that national policy mitigation measures, such as the Jet Zero Strategy (JZS) are excluded from scenarios. What we are requesting is for sensitivity analysis to be applied to the JZS High Ambition scenario,</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC directs the Applicant to the resolution suggested for SoCG ID 3.1.2. The Applicant should generate scenarios reflecting different probabilities of SAF and</p>		Not agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>“applicable existing and emerging policy requirements and good practice design standards for projects of this type”. Given that the JZS, and the mitigation measures in it and considered above, are national policy that can be delivered, and not hindered, by the Proposed Development they are considered embedded in the Proposed Development, not additional. Therefore, further assigning of significance to any scenarios where these national policy mitigation measures are not delivered is not considered appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant’s position on sensitivity analysis remains as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [APP-038], specifically paragraphs 12.9.17 to 12.9.19, Table 12.23 and Inset 12.3. The relative contributions to decarbonisation of the aviation mitigation measures described in the Jet Zero Strategy are shown graphically in Inset 12.4.</p>	<p>providing evidence that steps have been taken to look at this in detail, rather than assume that what is demonstrated in this scenario will happen come 2050.</p> <p>BC do not disagree that the IEMA guidance highlighted by the Applicant has not been followed correctly, only that greater depth of modelling and analysis needs to be undertaken to ensure that a range of possible emissions pathways are demonstrated. The above will also provide a view on the impact that offsetting schemes will need to meet the Net Zero Targets, as well as demonstrate the financial impact on the airline industry and potentially passenger numbers if costs are passed through, potentially reducing the requirement for the expansion of Luton Airport.</p> <p>The area of uncertainty is clearly covered in the IEMA guidance, which states that:</p> <p>“Uncertainty can be considered by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing upper and lower limits; • Testing for different inclusions and exclusions;... (p.13)”. <p>As stated by the Applicant in SoCG ID 1, there is uncertainty with regards to the future fleet mix and how</p> 	<p>next generation aircraft usage.</p> <p>Scenarios should be subject to sensitivity testing.</p>		

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
				<p>it will develop, therefore this should be tested to establish the potential range of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from aviation and not rely only on the JZS High Scenario.</p> <p>It is for the Applicant to demonstrate that the Proposed Development does not hinder the delivery of national policy. The sensitivity studies are necessary to show that this is the case and the Applicant has so far failed to do this.</p>			
3.2 Surface Access							
3.2.1	Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – primary vehicular access to Airport	BC accepts that the M1 motorway will provide the primary vehicular access to the airport.	<p>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p>	Unchanged. BC agrees that the majority of the traffic will be served by the M1.	Agreed.	Initial meeting between Buckinghamshire Council and the Applicant on 2 August 2023.	Agreed
3.2.1b	Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – preferential vehicular route through	However, there is a large catchment area to the west of the airport that is not well served by the motorway network and therefore the local road network will continue to provide preferential routes across Buckinghamshire. It is these areas that the Highway Authority seeks to ensure are not impacted in an	<p>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p>	BC has maintained since its Written Representation [REP1-042] paragraph 2.2.6 that the demonstrated long distance commuting route uses the Buckinghamshire network via the B489. The intensification in use of this is shown within the applicants Trip Distribution Plans [REP1-019] .	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> engage with BC to present the work that it has undertaken to support its position. Should the Applicant require access to the count 		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	Buckinghamshire	unacceptable manner as a result of this DCO.	The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.	<p>It is not yet agreed that the impacts on the Buckinghamshire network are not significant. BC is yet to receive information from the Applicant that demonstrates that the impacts are below a level that requires mitigation. From the evidence before BC at present it is not possible to have confidence in the modelling outputs within Buckinghamshire as no validation has taken place within the County.</p> <p>BC maintains that the B488 is the most appropriate route for traffic using the western long-distance commuting route, and has undertaken surveys on the B489 to support its position, and obtain baseline traffic flows on the route.</p>	<p>data obtained by BC, a request should be made.</p> <p>3. Demonstrate that the modelled flows on the B489 are representative of the actual flows on that route.</p> <p>4. Provide a numerical assessment of the additional development traffic expected to use the B489.</p> <p>All information was requested well in advance of D6 to allow proper review of the information.</p>		
3.2.1c	Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – Aylesbury	It is also recognised that the highway network in Aylesbury acts as a route hub for all directions and is therefore very sensitive to congestion and small changes in traffic have a significant impact on the performance of the network.	<p>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p> <p>The Applicant will share what is included in TEMPro, including a list of NTEM7.2 assumptions, and what major developments are included around Aylesbury.</p>	<p>As stated in 3.2.1b, BC has not been provided evidence that the Applicant has considered the impacts of the development adequately through the modelling process within Aylesbury.</p> <p>BC highlighted in the PADSS [AS-053] that the modelling did not clearly set out how growth in Aylesbury has been taken into account, given the sensitivities of Aylesbury to minor disruptions to the network.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC requires a document to be provided showing how growth in Aylesbury has been accounted for within the model.</p> <p>This can be a summary of information already provided.</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.2.1d	Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – rural villages on B488/B489	<p>Additionally, the villages of Pitstone, Marsworth and Ivinghoe are also sensitive to traffic changes, noting they are situated on a direct route to the airport.</p> <p>BC seeks agreement from the Applicant for highway mitigation works at the junction of the B488 and B489 in Ivinghoe to change the junction priority, as required by Policy TRA2 of the 'made' Ivinghoe Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2033. It is acknowledged that the projected peak hour traffic in this area is expected to be low, but the Council considers that this is a major route from Buckinghamshire and Dacorum to the Airport, and the sensitivity of the network in this area is such that small changes would have unacceptable impacts. The continuous nature of the traffic profile is therefore sufficient to justify this mitigation.</p> <p>The Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) for the strategic modelling identifies this as a long distance commuting route and therefore intensification of use of the route is to be expected. It is also noted that based on the information that has been presented to the Council to date, the Applicant is indicating that in the region of an additional 30 movements are expected within the peak hour periods. This would indicate to the</p>	<p>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p> <p>This junction was not identified as requiring mitigation following a comprehensive Transport Assessment. Any proposed mitigation at this junction is the responsibility of the local highway authority.</p> <p>The Strategic Model CBLTM-LTN has been calibrated and validated as per the DfT's TAG guidance. Moreover, the model is considered fit for purpose by all Host Authorities and National Highways.</p> <p>Within Appendix E of the LMVR, several route choice validation analyses were reported, including to and from the airport, and "long distance".</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to liaise with Buckinghamshire County Council on any concerns. However, it is advised that the Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report, Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201] should be considered, as it includes an extensive level of outputs such as traffic flows, link volume to capacity ratios, nodes delays and routing analysis.</p> <p>This should help provide Buckinghamshire County Council with a more detailed insight into the areas of interest.</p> <p>The Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report, Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201] has an extensive level of outputs reported such as traffic</p>	<p>BC remains of the view that the strategic modelling has not been demonstrated to be suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire. (See 3.2.1.b)</p> <p>The Transport Assessment Appendices – Part 2 of 3 [APP-201] contains figures showing additional local plan growth, and it is noted that no local plan growth is considered within Buckinghamshire, and there is no forecast growth presented for the Buckinghamshire area.</p> <p>BC maintains that in the absence of any detailed analysis of the B489 route and the concerns raised with the modelling suitability then mitigation is required to protect the route of concern. BC considers that the information provided within the Deadline 1 submission – 8.30 Trip Distribution Plans [REP4-048] shows that there will be intensification of use of the route and therefore mitigation should be provided.</p> <p>BC has data that has been obtained from ATC surveys commissioned after ISH4 and can be shared with the Applicant (on request) to assist this position.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that route re-prioritisation works at the B488/B489 junction should be included as Off-Site highway works within the DCO.</p> <p>BC wishes a specific requirement/commitment.</p> <p>Regarding traffic impacts due to trip generation along the A41, B489 and B488, the Council requires the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details of link flows for the base year and future years with and without development for the B489, B488 and A41. • Select link analysis of development traffic only for the B489, B488 and A41 links. • Reassessment of the A41/B489/B488 route using the updated and validated traffic model. <p>Matters that BC needs to be explored include junction re-prioritisation at the B488/B489 junction, modal conflict, traffic speeds and safety for all users.</p> <p>BC wishes to be consulted on the findings of the updated modelling work and discussions regarding mitigation and/or enhancement works along the whole of this route.</p> <p>BC is willing to meet with the Applicant to progress</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>Council that this route requires further assessment in order to fully understand the impacts of the Proposed Development, noting the Council does not consider the strategic model to be fit for assessment purposes within Buckinghamshire at present. The Council at present cannot consider this figure to be reliable due to the outstanding work required to demonstrate that the strategic model can be relied upon.</p> <p>The Council considers it necessary to have continued engagement with the Applicant in order to address the concerns regarding the assessment within the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205 and APP-206] and reach an agreement for mitigation on this route to protect the sensitive locations on the B489. The Council reserves its position on the final mitigation measures that may be required to address the impacts on traffic within Buckinghamshire.</p>	<p>flows, link volume to capacity ratios, nodes delays, select link and routing analysis. Moreover, the recently submitted daily airport passenger and staff trip distribution, which was requested by the Examining Authority, adds to the list of outputs.</p> <p>Based on the forecast and impact assessment, the Applicant considers the impact on the mentioned areas to not be significant. This is primarily due to the low level of airport demands travelling to and from Buckinghamshire and/or using its local road network.</p> <p>Whilst the Applicant is willing to continue engagement with Buckinghamshire Council, the Applicant does not consider the volumes of generated traffic associated with the airport expansion sufficient to justify mitigation measures</p> <p>The Applicant has issued (for D4), Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination), 8.99 Applicant’s Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 6: Traffic on B489 Link [REP4-087].</p> <p>The Applicant will provide BC with trip distribution information for the early morning period (5am to 7am), including data assumptions, particularly for Marsworth, Pitstone, and Ivinghoe. As agreed with BC, further engagement will be held around this matter.</p> <p>The Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (TRIMMA) [REP4-085] provides further information on how traffic impacts will be mitigated, including how residual impacts – such as those on the Ivinghoe Junction – may be mitigated.</p> <p>The Applicant will provide information on how BC can have sight of the S106 process, to inform a side agreement with BC on monitoring and mitigation.</p> <p>The Applicant will review Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination),</p>		<p>these matters. However, that meeting was requested to take place prior to Deadline 6.</p>		

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			8.99 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 6: Traffic on B489 Link for greater detail on trip distribution and the Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (TRIMMA) [REP4-085] .				
3.2.2	Technical Concerns with Strategic Model	<p>The Council does not consider that the validation and calibration of the strategic model is of an adequate standard within Buckinghamshire to provide certainty of the traffic impacts within the county.</p> <p>Without the certainty of the quality of the modelling as an assessment tool, the exact nature of the impacts within Buckinghamshire cannot be quantified by the Applicant or the Council, and the Council is unable to agree that the assessment methodology is suitable or appropriate in this location.</p>	<p>The Strategic Model CBLTM-LTN has been calibrated and validated as per the DfT's TAG guidance. Moreover, the model is considered fit for purpose by all Host Authorities and National Highways. The level of detail in the model's geographical coverage was agreed with Host Authorities and National Highways, and was informed by observed Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) data on the distribution of airport passengers / staff.</p> <p>As set out within the Strategic Modelling - Model Specification Report, Appendix B of the Transport Assessment [APP-200], the model is originally based on the CBLTM, following which a more enhanced version was developed to add more network and zoning details within the core area of influence.</p> <p>Areas within Buckinghamshire were included within the model simulation area, although the level of detail decreases the further the distance from the airport. Several routing validation analyses were reported in the model LMVR, including east-west routes.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider how the survey data offered by BC could be incorporated into the strategic modelling.</p>	<p>As set out in the above sections, BC has not been party to the engagement afforded to the host authorities. As yet the Applicant has not collaboratively sought to address the concerns raised by BC regarding the application of the traffic modelling to the BC highway network.</p> <p>BC has obtained data to be able to undertake an exercise of confirmation of the quality of the model for the key links within Buckinghamshire of concern in the absence of the Applicant offering any additional information.</p> <p>The routing analysis published by the Applicant in the Trip Distribution Plans shows that the Buckinghamshire network is affected by the development traffic, and therefore BC considers that this should have been comprehensively assessed, recognising that the Applicant's conclusions to date used an area of the model that was remote from the validation screen lines.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request access to BC's survey data or carry out surveys of the B489. Arrange a presentation of the technical note to BC officers for review for both the base line and development traffic. <p>All information has been requested in advance of D6 to allow other specialists to assess the impacts of the development traffic on their fields.</p>		Ongoing
3.2.3	Traffic impacts	The Council requires the following to address the	The Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report, Appendix F of the Transport	Unchanged –BC maintains that the requested input	Not agreed.		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	within Buckinghamshire – input data for the Traffic modelling	<p>certainty of the traffic impacts within Buckinghamshire, and therefore enable the Council to have confidence in the nature of the traffic impacts of the Scheme within the county:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journey time data to confirm the model's appropriateness for the purposes of assessing development proposals within Buckinghamshire. • Calibration and validation data to confirm the model's appropriateness for the purposes of assessing development proposals within Buckinghamshire. • Confirmation that long stay survey data was included in the Civil Aviation Authority trip rate data. • A Forecasting Report that confirms how growth has been calculated and applied within the model to ensure that growth within Buckinghamshire has been taken into account appropriately. • An updated Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) that addresses the above. 	<p>Assessment [APP-201], has an extensive level of outputs reported.</p> <p>Based on the forecast and impact assessment, the impact on the mentioned areas were considered not significant. This is primarily due to the low level of airport demands travelling to and from Buckinghamshire and/or using its local road network.</p> <p>It is not intended by the Applicant to utilise the local road network for material supplies, however it is expected that the origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p>	data is required for inclusion in re-running of the traffic modelling by the Applicant, once it has been validated in accordance with the suggested resolution to point 3.2.2.	<p>BC asserts that the Applicant should provide a technical note containing the previously requested information;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journey time data to confirm the model's appropriateness for the purposes of assessing development proposals within Buckinghamshire. • Calibration and validation data to confirm the model's appropriateness for the purposes of assessing development proposals within Buckinghamshire. • Confirmation that long stay survey data was included in the Civil Aviation Authority trip rate data. • A Forecasting Report that confirms how growth has been calculated and applied within the model to ensure that growth within Buckinghamshire has been taken into account appropriately. <p>This information was requested prior to D6 to allow full and comprehensive review by all specialists impacted.</p>		
3.2.4	Airport Transport Forum representation	BC welcome the fact that two of the five objectives for the Surface Access Strategy relate to improving public transport mode share, and that there is a focus on bus and coach access specifically. BC note that	The Applicant is committed to working with local stakeholders to improve sustainable transport options including public transport. The 5-yearly Travel Plans will monitor airport travel against the agreed targets and any mitigation required will be subject to consultation before implementation on	Unchanged	Agreed –BC has identified suitable participants for the ATF meetings.	Meeting with BC on 3 August	Agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		there is an Airport Transport Forum which includes many local Councils. <i>BC accepted on 29th September 2023 an invitation to partake in the ATF as a member.</i>	potential initiatives to improve the sustainable mode share and meet targets. The Applicant acknowledges that BC accepted on 29 September 2023 an invitation to partake in the ATF; the Applicant will work with BC and other ATF members to deliver any necessary mitigation.				
3.2.5	Local bus routes in Buckinghamshire – route 61	<p>BC would like to secure the restoration of a local bus route (service 61) connecting Luton and Aylesbury via the communities of Eaton Bray, Edlesborough, Pitstone, Ivinghoe, Marsworth and Cheddington. For the majority of northern Buckinghamshire, Luton Airport will be primarily a destination for leisure/holiday trips. However, it is also a major employer in the region, with this likely to be especially notable in villages close to the border with Central Bedfordshire and Luton Borough Councils. This local bus service should run hourly rather than every 90 minutes and have its operational hours extended as dictated by the operational needs of the airport. A Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) service may also be able to meet the connectivity needs of these communities.</p> <p>The number 61 local service will incorporate a greater number of stops and offer a lower cost alternative to the private car and high speed bus service for local trips and staff commuting to the airport.</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to working with bus operators to support measures for further improving sustainable transport within the area.</p> <p>Improvements to the public transport network are not entirely within the gift of the Applicant and require discussion and negotiation with third parties. In the future, the airport operator will work closely with bus service operators through the Airport Transport Forum and development of future Travel Plans, which will set out measures to improve services in order to meet future mode share Targets.</p> <p>The Bus & Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122], submitted at Deadline 5, identified bus service 61 as a route to be prioritised for implementation. This may be confirmed for funding through processes outlined in the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119], involving consultation with the ATF Steering Group.</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that it now has a seat at the ATF, and this is considered to be progress towards ensuring that Buckinghamshire residents needs will be heard.</p> <p>BC continues to be concerned that the Applicant has not presented any evidence that the suggested funding is sufficient to support the bus services required.</p> <p>BC remains of the position that this service is required in order to fulfil the Applicant's stated aims of connecting the local workforce to the airport, as well as addressing air quality, economic benefits and health and well-being in the area.</p> <p>Without certainty that services will be provided BC considers it unlikely that it will be possible to secure mode shift effectively.</p> <p>BC to share its review of the Bus & Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122] and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119] before providing an updated</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with BC public transport team regarding supporting of extended bus routes. Seek to remove barriers to operators being able to access the airport. Demonstrate that a funding mechanism is in place to support the establishment of services. 		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
				position - this is within BC's Deadline 6 submissions.			
3.2.6	Strategic bus services in Buckinghamshire	<p>BC would like to secure a more strategic express service to Aylesbury and points further west. This would address the existing lack of long-distance fast bus services connecting east and west, or locations within Buckinghamshire with Luton Airport or the M1 corridor and the East Coast mainline, without a requirement to use London interchanges. The express service should be secured explicitly within the Surface Access Strategy as well as detailed within the Travel Plans.</p> <p>This high speed bus will provide a real alternative to the private car on the basis of it offering a high quality, high frequency, high speed service from Aylesbury.</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to working with bus operators to support measures for further improving sustainable transport within the area.</p> <p>Improvements to the public transport network are not entirely within the gift of the Applicant and require discussion and negotiation with third parties. In the future, the airport operator will work closely with bus service operators through the Airport Transport Forum and development of future Travel Plans, which will set out measures to improve services in order to meet future mode share Targets.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted the Bus & Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122] at Deadline 5 which provides more information on bus service provision. The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that it now has a seat at the ATF, and this is considered to be progress towards ensuring that Buckinghamshire residents needs will be heard.</p> <p>BC continues to be concerned that the Applicant has not presented any evidence that the funding being suggested is sufficient to support the bus services required.</p> <p>BC remains of the position that this service is required in order to fulfil the Applicant's stated aims of connecting the local workforce and passengers to the airport, as well as addressing air quality, economic benefits and health and wellbeing in the area.</p> <p>Without certainty that services will be provided, BC considers it unlikely that it will be possible to secure mode shift effectively.</p> <p>This service is required to provide a viable public transport option for those approaching from the west of the airport.</p> <p>BC to share its review of the Bus & Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122] and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119] before providing an updated</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with BC public transport team regarding supporting of extended bus routes. Seek to remove barriers to operators being able to access the airport. Demonstrate that a funding mechanism is in place to support the establishment of services. 		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
				position - this is within BC's Deadline 6 submissions.			
3.2.7	Sustainable Transport Fund – mechanism for identifying eligible projects and funds	<p>The Council has been informed that there is to be a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) created, however, there are currently no clearly defined parameters set for establishing the value of that fund. If the STF is not sufficient to support the services across all parts of the highway network needed to support sustainable transport to serve the Scheme it shall not be able to make the provisions necessary to make the application acceptable. On this basis, the Council considers that there is no certainty that any public transport provision can be secured, nor is there clarity around the process for assessing need and benefit.</p> <p>The Council requests clarify as to how the STF will be calculated.</p>	<p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has developed the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119] to be used to fund measures identified within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131]. The Bus & Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122] identified six bus and coach interventions to be prioritised, which would be funded through the STF if agreed for implementation through the ATF Steering Group.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Council as the proposals are developed, including the size of the fund, the parameters for prioritising measures to be funded by the STF and the legal mechanisms for securing the fund.</p>	<p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] does not reference the funding mechanisms that are proposed to be implemented or the value and timing or availability of those funds.</p> <p>In order for BC to be satisfied that the STF mechanism can achieve its objectives, the Applicant needs to set out the full remit and parameters of the STF, when the monies will become available and who will be the decision makers to determine where that money shall be spent.</p> <p>BC to share its review of the Bus & Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122] and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119] before providing an updated position - this is within BC's Deadline 6 submissions.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should provide a document outlining the fund value, greater detail on when it shall be made available and a full description of the proposed governance of the overseeing body.</p> <p>The documents shall be required to address any lags in funding to ensure that they are available at the correct time to facilitate the measures required in a timely manner.</p>		Ongoing
3.2.8	Sustainable Transport Fund – benchmarking of funding	The Council considers it necessary for the STF to be established on the basis of a robust and locationally specific assessment of Luton Airport and its surrounding areas, rather than benchmarking from other airports within the UK, as has been presented as the	Benchmarking was one component of the approach taken. The Applicant has been progressing and developing more detail around bus and coach routes to demonstrate the range of potential opportunities for improving bus and coach access to and from the airport, mapping gaps in current service provision and frequencies.	The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] does not provide BC with any additional information regarding the funds to be made available for the STF, or the timing or the availability of those monies. It is stated that the toolbox of measures would be funded, however it also	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should set out clearly which measures they intend to deliver and how those measures are to be funded.</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>Applicant's proposed approach.</p> <p>The Council requests certainty of mode shift, linked to specific targets and hold points and embedded in the Sustainable Transport Fund.</p>	<p>These improvements are being developed in tandem with a STF that will set the framework around how these types of improvements, alongside the others listed out within the toolbox of measures within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131], would be funded. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Council as the proposals are developed.</p>	<p>states that not all measures will be needed. It is therefore unclear which measures would be delivered and who would be the decision maker as to which measures are required.</p>			
3.2.9	Sustainable Transport Fund - governance	<p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] is required to be updated to provide certainty of governance of the Sustainable Transport Fund.</p>	<p>The Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119] was submitted at Deadline 5.</p>	<p>Unchanged.</p> <p>BC to share its review of the Bus & Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122] and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119] before providing an updated position - this is within BC's Deadline 6 submissions.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserted that the Applicant should supply an updated copy of the STF sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 for all Interested Parties to have time to provide meaningful comment and for issues to be resolved.</p>		Ongoing
3.2.10	Construction traffic – primary route network	<p>BC welcome the prioritisation of movements of construction traffic via the Primary Route Network and acknowledge that the majority of spoil movements are unlikely to pass through Buckinghamshire.</p>	<p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (Appendix 18.3 of the ES APP-130). This includes a proposal for a Traffic Management Working Group to be formed as a forum for stakeholder engagement during construction (refer to Section 3 of the Outline CTMP). A detailed CTMP, substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP, will be prepared and submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority following approval of the DCO. This is secured by Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO [AS-005].</p>	<p>Unchanged.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	[AS-003]	Agreed
3.2.10 b	Construction traffic – use of local road network	<p>The Council notes that sections of the Major Road Network which may be affected include routes through Buckinghamshire (e.g. A41 via Hemel Hempstead or A418 via</p>	<p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (Appendix 18.3 of the ES [APP-130]). This includes a proposal for a Traffic Management Working Group to be formed</p>	<p>BC considers it necessary to be a part of the Traffic Management Group or a required consultee of the Traffic Management Group to ensure that local routes in Buckinghamshire are not</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <p>1- Confirm if Buckinghamshire sites are required for</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		Leighton Buzzard). A robust Construction Traffic Management Plan will be required, which should include measures that protect rural routes from impacts and BC are happy to work with the Applicant to develop this.	as a forum for stakeholder engagement during construction (refer to Section 3 of the Outline CTMP). A detailed CTMP, substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP, will be prepared and submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority following approval of the DCO. This is secured by Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO [AS-005] . The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.	adversely impacted by construction traffic.	construction materials to be sourced from. 2- If construction trips are required from Buckinghamshire, BC should be part of the TMG. 3- If construction trips are not required to begin or end in Buckinghamshire, BC should be a named consultee of the TMG.		
3.2.10c	Construction traffic – CTMP controls	The CTMP is silent on protections for the Buckinghamshire network from freight operations and lack detail on freight routing strategy. Without strong provision within the CTMP, the Council does not have confidence that there will be suitable control of potential impacts from freight operations in respect of the Buckinghamshire transport network. The Council seeks to secure consultation on these documents where they affect Buckinghamshire's network and residents, and the ability to require changes and/or clarifications and controls within the management strategies be included within the documents. It is acknowledged that some of this detail will not be available until a contractor is involved. It may be possible for the Applicant to set stipulations within the CTMP	An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (Appendix 18.3 of the ES [APP-130]). This includes a proposal for a Traffic Management Working Group to be formed as a forum for stakeholder engagement during construction (refer to Section 3 of the Outline CTMP). A detailed CTMP, substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP, will be prepared and submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority following approval of the DCO. This is secured by Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO [AS-005] . Detailed measures to manage construction traffic impacts would be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which would be developed in detail by the appointed contractor during the detailed design stage, and must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-130] . It is expected that origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.	Please see the response to 3.2.10b. It remains BC's concern that until it is known where construction trips are expected to originate or terminate it is not possible to conclude this position. Should suppliers be based in Buckinghamshire they will be operating under existing permission, however routes may not be suitable for large numbers of trips by certain vehicles, and so BC require involvement to ensure that management strategies are in place to protect routes and communities on any affected routes.	Ongoing. BC asserts that the Applicant should agree to the requirements set out in 3.2.10b. BC request involvement in the CTMP and for the Applicant to establish a mechanism for this.		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		of things that will not be permissible, and this could include certain stipulations regarding the Bucks transport network. This needs to be explored further.	<p>The CTMP outlines the formation of a traffic management working group (TMWG) as a forum for stakeholder engagement prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development. The TMWG would seek representation from the lead contractor, the local highway authorities and National Highways.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider whether construction impacts can be included in the ATF Steering Group governance processes, or if it would be appropriate to involve BC in the CTMP process.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>				
3.2.10d	Construction traffic – CTMP and CoCP – compliance to BC Freight Strategy	The Council considers the B488 to be wholly inappropriate for any HGV movements associated with construction of the airport expansion and so should feature as an excluded route within the Code of Construction Practice [APP-049] . This would accord with the Council's Freight Strategy.	<p>Detailed measures to manage construction traffic impacts would be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which would be developed in detail by the appointed contractor during the detailed design stage, and must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-130].</p> <p>It is not intended by the Applicant to utilise the local road network for material supplies however it is expected that the origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p>	<p>The B489 falls within the Ivinghoe HGV strategy area and therefore is required to be protected from airport construction traffic.</p> <p>To do this the Applicant should use an HGV management system, similar to those undertaken for HS2 and EWR. These systems provide certainty that sensitive locations are protected from impacts and require the schemes to use approved routes only.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>The CTMP framework needs to be updated to reflect measures by which the full CTMP shall protect those areas identified by BC policy as sensitive.</p>		Ongoing
3.2.11	Impacts of operational HGV movements on Buckinghamshire	For post-build movements, BC note that the increase in HGVs (rising from 133 currently to a projected 2043 figure of 268) is unlikely to impact upon local roads in Buckinghamshire. A large proportion of the projected HGV flows appear to serve the extended passenger terminal facilities – these do not identify Buckinghamshire as being a generator of these	The Applicant confirms that the forecast increase in HGVs would be minimal on the Buckinghamshire local road network, with negligible traffic originating in Buckinghamshire. However, more information would be provided within the detailed CTMP which will be prepared and submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority following approval of the DCO. This is secured by Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO [AS-005] . Further	<p>The Applicant appears to have misunderstood the nature of this point. This does not relate to the CTMP but rather operational movements.</p> <p>It is stated that the increase would be minimal. BC considers that this is in principle acceptable. However, a protection should be made that should</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake a commitment to secure routing agreements with suppliers serving the airport with more than 10 HGVs a day. 		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>movements, but BC would welcome clarification of this.</p> <p>BC is seeking clarity on how HGV movement will be controlled/excluded from the BC highway network.</p>	<p>engagement can also be arranged once that document has been prepared.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>	<p>an operational trip generator create a number of movements over a threshold (i.e.19/day) a routing agreement should be secured with consultation with the LHAs through which those HGVs would be required to pass.</p>			
3.2.12	Construction Traffic – modal share and worker movements	<p>Regarding construction traffic movements, the Council requires the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation on the further development of the CTMP, which should incorporate specific targets for each mode to expand on the current division between sustainable and unsustainable modes. • The Outline Construction Workers Travel Plan ([APP-131]) is required to be updated to show how the Buckinghamshire network is to be affected; and this should be tested within the updated traffic modelling as appropriate. 	<p>Detailed construction impacts would be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (as secured by Requirement 14 of the draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003]), which would be developed in detail by the appointed contractor during the detailed design stage and must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-130]. It is expected that origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p>	<p>BC appreciates that the Applicant is not yet in a position to provide the clarity sought regarding the movement of construction workers.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, BC views the CTMP as a document that could potentially provide some parameters to control potential impacts from construction worker movements. BC is therefore keen to be kept informed of updates to the CTMP and given the opportunity to have a meaningful influence upon them.</p>	Ongoing.	<p>BC asserts that the Applicant should ensure that BC is afforded the opportunity to review the updated CTMP prior to its finalisation. It is suggested that this could be part of the discussions undertaken through the ATF, noting that the Applicant intends to provide the ToR for the ATF at Deadline 5.</p>	Ongoing
3.2.13	Traffic modelling methodology	<p>The full potential impacts of any change in the traffic modelling data (in line with the request of the Examining Authority in their letters dated 16th May 2023 and 13 June 2023) are not fully known in respect of the following matters: traffic and transport, noise and air quality. In addition, the growth of Aylesbury is not currently</p>	<p>The Applicant agreed the approach to modelling with officers at relevant highway authorities including LBC and National Highways. The approach is consistent with that adopted for the 2019 statutory consultation and no material concerns on the approach were raised at the time. The base models have been developed, calibrated and validated in compliance with TAG guidance with 2016 and 2017 base years. The modelling approach has been agreed with the relevant local and national highway authorities and the base validated</p>	<p>The Applicant has not agreed the modelling with BC officers, and has not engaged with BC regarding the modelling.</p> <p>The Applicant has not made any effort to confirm with BC if the model can be demonstrated to be suitably used for routes within Buckinghamshire.</p>	Not agreed.	<p>BC asserts that the Applicant should engage with BC and agree the validation within Buckinghamshire, with particular reference to the B489.</p>	Not agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>accurately represented within the analysis for the DCO.</p> <p>BC would like to reach agreement with the Applicant as to the appropriate methodology if the traffic modelling data is not re-based. Accurate representation of Aylesbury within the LMVR is also requested.</p>	<p>model reflected operational conditions at the time.</p> <p>Future baseline models have taken account of the changes in demand and mode share as the airport grows in both the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios. The future year projections of airport passenger demands and mode split take account of CAA data and trends. Comprehensive analysis and assessment of the surface access effects and impacts is provided within the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] and the Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and associated Appendices which set out the Local Model Validation Report and Forecasting Note.</p> <p>It is the view of the Applicant that the effects and impact of the scheme that forms part of the application for development consent has been robustly tested and assessed and this has been subject to numerous pre-application discussions with the Host Authorities and their appointed consultants.</p> <p>Further information is provided in the Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 [TR020001/APP/8.98] and Traffic on B489 Link [TR020001/APP/8.99] Technical Notes.</p>				
3.2.14	Scope of transport assessments	<p>BC request to know if any transport assessments have been undertaken which suggest that the airport is or will be a regular attractor of trips from the south of Buckinghamshire, in particular Chesham, Amersham or High Wycombe, for which public transport access is also unavailable.</p> <p>BC request further information is provided with</p>	<p>See response to 3.2.1. Any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206].</p>	<p>BC is content to accept that subject to the supply of distribution information of a satisfactory quality this matter can be considered closed.</p> <p>It is maintained that the assessment in this area is less than the standard that BC would expect, however it is also accepted that in practical terms mitigation would be unlikely to be justified to these locations.</p>	Agreed – closed.	[APP-203], [APP-205].	Agreed – no longer applicable.

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		regards to the scope of the transport assessment and implications for south Buckinghamshire.		BC does however consider that this places a greater responsibility on the Applicant to ensure that provisions are made where they can be, such as to two public transport services that BC has identified.			
3.2.15	Glint and glare assessment	BC await the receipt of the glint and glare assessment to understand if there are any likely impacts upon highway safety as a result of glint and glare.	A Glint and Glare Assessment [AS-146] was submitted to PINS on 9 August.	BC has reviewed the Glint and Glare assessment [AS-146] BC is satisfied that there are no likely adverse impacts on highways in Buckinghamshire.	Agreed	[AS-146]	Agreed
3.2.16	Rule 9 Covid Modelling	BC remain as of the above positions and await the results of the additional modelling work and remain that the Council's position is reserved.	In May 2023 the Examining Authority requested the Applicant to review the transport modelling undertaken for the DCO in light of DfT interim advice, dated April 2023, regarding the treatment of the COVID-19 pandemic in transport modelling. The ExA stated it "has made a Procedural Decision to request that the Applicant reviews its transport modelling considering the recently published guidance. The ExA also requests that the Applicant engages with stakeholders, including National Highways and the Local Highway Authorities, at the earliest possible opportunity with a view to gaining agreement as to the appropriate methodology if the model is not re-based.'. The proposed approach set forward by the Applicant considers the size and complexity of the strategic transport model and the timescale for the DCO examination though will include (1) analysis of recent local and national trends in travel demand (2) updating the future year forecasts using the latest DfT projections case scenario (NTEM8 & NRTP22) and (3) an assessment of the risks associated with the updated forecasts and determination of any necessary adjustment factors that may arise from the analysis of recent trends.	BC remains of the position that until the modelling work has been completed that it is unable to conclude this matter. The model has not been validated well within Buckinghamshire. As has been stated in previous documents and through ISH4. Validation is required within Buckinghamshire to confirm that the model results are reliable within Buckinghamshire.	Ongoing. BC asserts that the Applicant should provide calibration information within Buckinghamshire, and provide BC with modelling results well in advance of D6.		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>The VISSIM model will follow a similar approach to the base year update and the forecasts will update committed developments and take growth from the strategic model as an input. For the M1 motorway and Vauxhall Way - the M1 motorway approach, considering the Governments pause of 'smart motorways' will (1) retain the motorway widening as a core scenario and for the Demand Scenario 2043 (32mppa) assume Phase 2 J10 improvements. For Vauxhall Way dualling was assumed to be delivered by LBC by 2027, this delivery is now expected in 2028 and so the revised modelling will remove dualling from the 2027 modelling scenario.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>				
<p>3.3 Noise and Vibration</p>							
3.3.1	Operational air noise impacts on Buckinghamshire residents	BC consider that an increase in operational air noise may be noticed by some Buckinghamshire residents. This is because despite the whole of the Buckinghamshire administrative area falling outside the predicted lower observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) contours, although ES assessments indicate the final phase night-time contour could extend just across the Buckinghamshire border), the 92-day summer average day and night noise (as measured by the LOAEL) doesn't reflect the noise generated by individual overflights or at periods of peak activity. It is these events that generally lead to complaints. Areas most likely to be affected are	<p>The assessment has shown that Buckinghamshire is outside of the Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL), even for the final phase night-time contour. Below the LOAEL, Planning Practice Guidance – Noise (Department for Communities and Local Government (2019), Planning Practice Guidance: Noise) notes that noise may be “present and not intrusive” and that the outcome is that “Noise can be heard, but does not cause any change in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response. Can slightly affect the acoustic character of the area but not such that there is a change in the quality of life.” This is consistent with the conclusions of the assessment presented in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP1-003].</p> <p>However, additional context for the noise assessment is provided using N65, N60 and overflight metrics, which provides information on noise generated by individual overflights over Buckinghamshire. For example, see</p>	BC's position remains unchanged – clarity is required on the interaction of Buckinghamshire and the final phase night-time contour; and the exclusion of noise generated by individual overflights and peak activity.	Ongoing. Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC's deadline 6 response includes updated comments on this and will be the basis for further discussions.		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		Dagnall, Pitstone and a section of BC to the east of Aylesbury, including Wendover, which is also overflowed by low level northbound traffic from Heathrow.	<p>Figures 16.21 – 16.26 (assessment phase 1), Figures 16.45 – 16.50 (assessment phase 2a) and Figures 16.69 – 16.74 (assessment phase 2b) of the ES [AS-106; AS-107; AS-110; AS-111; AS-114].</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>				
3.3.2	Air noise impacts on the Chilterns AONB	<p>Part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Chilterns AONB) lies within the Council's administrative area. The Council will resist any changes which have a permanent significant noise effect on the Chilterns AONB. The NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should 'identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value'. As set out in section 3.2(e) of the Air Navigation Guidance 2017, where practicable, it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 feet should seek to avoid flying over AONBs and National Parks. The Council seeks better protection than this. In line with CAA expectations the impact must be considered more carefully by the applicant during the remainder of the DCO process.</p>	<p>The approach to the assessment of noise and tranquillity in line with the NPPF is set out in Section 16.5 of Chapter 16 of the ES [REP1-003].</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of noise (amongst other factors including overflight below 7,000 ft) on the Chilterns AONB is presented in Chapter 14 of the ES [AS-088].</p> <p>As is made clear in Paragraph 3.2 and 3.3 of the Air Navigation Guidance (Ref 1), paragraph 3.3(e) which notes "where practicable, it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 feet should seek to avoid flying over Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and National Parks" is in the context of "requests to change the airspace design" (para 3.3). Changes to airspace and flightpaths are outside the scope of the Proposed Development and any changes, including their impact on AONBs and National Parks, would be assessed as part of the Civil Aviation Authority's environmental assessment process (Ref 2).</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>	<p>BC's position remains unchanged.</p> <p>BC requires further information from the Applicant to convey the confidence that there will not be permanent significant adverse noise effects on the Chilterns AONB and potential areas of extension to the AONB, in Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>BC is seeking stronger controls on the noise experienced within the AONB than that provided in the Air Navigation Guidance 2017, which is advisory, not mandated.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC is seeking a meeting with the Applicant to discuss matters relating to noise that remain within this SoCG as ongoing. Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC's deadline 6 response includes updated comments on this and will be the basis for further discussions.</p>		Ongoing
3.3.3	Overflight of the Chilterns AONB – mechanism for	<p>The Council wishes to see overflight of the Chilterns AONB included within the Terms of Reference for the NEDG, and secured appropriately through the DCO, as the Noise Envelope</p>	<p>The work of the Noise Envelope Design (NEDG) group has concluded and the NEDG issued their final report in October 2022. The purpose of the NEDG was to provide advice and recommendations of the design of the Noise Envelope, with no intention that the NEDG would have an</p>	<p>BC's position is largely unchanged.</p> <p>BC understands and accepts that the NEDG work is concluded and that the point raised previously</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	assessment and control	<p>is developed further. In addition, the Council is seeking a guarantee that the Noise Envelope review process will provide certainty that any future airspace changes will ensure that noise impacts are no greater than those relied upon should the DCO be granted.</p>	<p>ongoing role post consent. See the NEDG terms of reference appended to the NEDG Final Report in Annex A of Appendix 16.2 of the ES [APP-111].</p> <p>Ongoing oversight and technical review of Green Controlled Growth and the Noise Envelope will be undertaken by the Noise Technical Panel and Environmental Scrutiny Group. See Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015].</p> <p>In line with the NEDG recommendations, the Noise Envelope contains a defined framework to review the Noise Envelope Limits in response to airspace change (see paragraph 3.2.27 onwards of Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015]).</p> <p>The Noise Limit Review process (see paragraph 3.2.27 onwards of Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015]) sets out the process through which the Noise Limits will be reviewed, and where possible reduced, following an approved airspace change.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.4 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework [REP3-017] states “There will be no ability to change any of the Level 1, Level 2 Thresholds or Limits to permit materially worse environmental effects than those identified in the ES.”</p> <p>Assessment of changes to airspace and flightpaths (and their impacts on the Chilterns AONB) are outside the scope of the Proposed Development. Any changes to future flight paths are the subject of a future airspace change process being sponsored by the UK Government and will be subject to a separate assessment (which explicitly requires the consideration of overflight of AONBs) and consultation exercise by the airport operator in accordance with Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) procedure (CAP1616).</p>	<p>regarding NEDG ToR is no longer relevant.</p> <p>However, a number of issues remain ongoing – BC has queries relating to the GCG and NE oversight being via the Noise Technical Panel and ESG, particularly while the Applicant continues to resist representation of BC on the ESG and Technical Panels. BC also has queries regarding the potential efficacy of the GCG in practice.</p> <p>BC’s position regarding the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015] is set out within BC’s deadline 4 submissions. A further set of comments is included on GCG in BC’s Deadline 6 submissions.</p>	<p>membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC’s deadline 6 response includes updated comments on this and will be the basis for further discussions.</p>		

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.3.3	Noise Envelope reviews	In order to ensure the correct application and efficacy of the Noise Envelope, the Council is seeking reassurance that the Noise Envelope will be subject to timely review at such time as changes in airspace are proposed (i.e. through FASI-S). In addition to this, the Council wishes to see a review one year after operation and a mechanism to trigger intervening reviews more frequently than the five years currently proposed within the Terms of Reference for the NEDG, secured appropriately through the DCO.	In line with the NEDG recommendations, the Noise Envelope contains a defined framework to review the Noise Envelope Limits in response to either the ICAO publishing a new 'noise chapter' for the Next-Gen, low carbon, aircraft (i.e. the next 'Chapter' following on from the current 'Chapter 14') or the approval of an Airspace Change Proposal such as FASI-S (see paragraph 3.2.27 onwards of Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015]). This mechanism would be triggered by these operational changes, rather than being time limited as suggested. See response to paragraph 3.4.8 on timing of the review cycle.	BC acknowledges that the Applicant published additional information on this matter at Deadline 3. BC's position regarding the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015] is set out within BC's deadline 4 submissions. A further set of comments is included on GCG in BC's Deadline 6 submissions. BC continues to assert that the review cycle proposed for the NE is not optimal.	Ongoing. Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC's deadline 6 response includes updated comments on this and will be the basis for further discussions.		Ongoing.
3.3.4	NEDG role outside of the ESG	The NEDG should continue to operate as an independent entity from the ESG, with this independence secured through appropriate means as part of the DCO.	The work of the Noise Envelope Design (NEDG) group has concluded and the NEDG issued their final report in October 2022. The purpose of the NEDG was to provide advice and recommendations of the design of the Noise Envelope, with no intention that the NEDG would have an ongoing role post consent. See the NEDG terms of reference appended to the NEDG Final Report in Annex A of Appendix 16.2 of the ES [APP-111] . Ongoing oversight and technical review of Green Controlled Growth and the Noise Envelope will be undertaken by the Noise Technical Panel and Environmental Scrutiny Group. See Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015] .	BC understands and accepts that the NEDG work is concluded and that the point raised here is no longer relevant.	Closed – N/A		Agreed – no longer relevant
3.3.5	WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines	To protect residents from local impacts and as far as reasonably practicable, the Council asks that the promoter should work towards compliance with <i>WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines 2018 for the</i>	The Government response on the WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines 2018 is as follows: "The government is considering the recent new environmental noise guidelines for the European region published by the World Health Organization (WHO). It agrees with the ambition to reduce noise and to minimise	Whilst BC would still encourage the Applicant to comply with WHO Guidelines, it is acknowledged that these are aspirational and that there is no policy requirement to do this.	Agreed.		Agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<i>European Region 10</i> . It is acknowledged that the guidelines are not adopted UK policy and the ask is aspirational.	adverse health effects, but it wants policy to be underpinned by the most robust evidence on these effects, including the total cost of action and recent UK specific evidence which the WHO report did not assess.” Although the dose-response relationship in the new WHO Guidelines is not currently adopted in UK policy, sensitivity testing using the relevant updated relationships in the WHO guidelines has been undertaken and is presented in Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [AS-078] .				
3.3.6	Construction noise impacts	The Council requests confirmation of the noise impacts of the scheme construction on receptors in Buckinghamshire, and seeks clarity on the controls that will be incorporated within the CTMP as it is developed.	Detailed construction impacts would be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (as secured by Requirement 14 of the draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003]), which would be developed in detail by the appointed contractor during the detailed design stage. It is expected that origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes. The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) outlines the formation of a traffic management working group (TMWG) as a forum for stakeholder engagement prior to the	BC acknowledges that there is an outline CTMP and that Requirement 14 of the draft DCO secures its implementation. Notwithstanding this, BC is concerned that the CTMP is not sufficiently rigid in establishing a framework of protection for the Buckinghamshire highway network, meaning that there remains too much flexibility in the development of the detailed CTMP for BC to be certain that unexpected adverse effects will not manifest within Buckinghamshire. Suggestions for additional controls are presented in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.9, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.	This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts that are to be controlled through the CTMP process. The resolution is directly connected to BC suggestions at 3.2.9, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.		Ongoing
3.4	Air Quality						
3.4.1	Air quality assessment study area	It is noted that the study area for the air quality assessment completed as part of the ES does not cover any area within Buckinghamshire	This is noted by the Applicant.	Unchanged	Agreed	BC's relevant representation submitted	Agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		Council. The study area has been discussed and developed with stakeholders in the air quality working group, of which Buckinghamshire Council is a member.				to PINS on 30 June	
3.4.2	Air quality assessment methodology and baseline data	The approach to the air quality assessment and baseline data used is generally considered acceptable.	This is noted by the Applicant.	Unhanged	Agreed	BC's relevant representation submitted to PINS on 30 June	Agreed
3.4.3	Air quality assessments	BC believe that there is the potential for the villages within the north of Buckinghamshire to be negatively impacted by changes in traffic from the proposed development. If the revised traffic data shows that the screening thresholds, as outlined within the Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance document 'Guidance on land-use planning and development control: Planning for air quality', are exceeded then there may be a requirement to conduct an additional air quality assessment that makes use of the updated transport modelling	This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter. The EPUK/IAQM criteria referenced will be used in the air quality review of the updated traffic data and the outcome will be reported following the timeline indicated in the Applicant response to the Rule 9 letter [AS-064] .	BC's position is unchanged. BC is seeking confirmation from the Applicant that it accepts the referenced IAQM document as containing appropriate triggers to screen the need for additional air quality assessment work. Resultant actions from this will then be dependent upon the way in which the Applicant chooses to address points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.	This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant. The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC's suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d. The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs against the IAQM triggers to determine whether further air quality assessment is needed. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to be written up in the air quality chapter of the ES, as well as inform a review of the health		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
					and community assessment findings in the ES. BC requested that this is programmed sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by the Council and other Interested Parties, as appropriate.		
3.4.4	Automatic monitoring station data	<p>Section 7.5.6 of Chapter 7 of the ES states that an automatic monitoring station has been installed at the airport and that the data is published near to real time. It is noted in the exceedance summary monitoring data for PM10 and PM2.5 (particulate matter) in 2023 that there is limited data and what data is available is at very low capture rates (between 10 and 60%). It is therefore recommended that the automatic monitor is inspected to understand why this pollutant is no longer being measured as the data could prove to be very important to understanding the impact the proposed development may have on the local air quality.</p> <p>BC wishes to see the evidence supporting the Applicant's assertion that the data gap does not impact the baseline.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant and has been investigated. Data loss occurred due to repairs required on the GRIMM monitor. This has now been fixed and is back in operation, it does not impact any of the data used in the ES to inform the baseline. The Applicant is happy to discuss any additional queries and will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>	BC accepts the Applicant's response.	Agreed	BC's review of SoCG 19 October	Agreed
3.4.5	Air quality baseline data	BC agrees with the baseline data collection and presentation of future baseline information	The Applicant considers that the baseline data collection and future baseline information, as detailed in Appendix 7.2 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [APP-062] , are robust. These were discussed	Unchanged	Agreed – no requirement for further Applicant engagement on this matter.	APP-062	Agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.				
3.4.6	Air quality assessment study area	<p>BC agrees with the study area, however the Council's Strategic Environmental Protection Team would seek to ensure that the Stole Road, Friarage Road and Tring Road AQMAs are not negatively impacted by the DCO Application. This is especially as air quality monitoring data collected by the council in 2022 found exceedances of the National Air Quality Objectives within the Friarage Road AQMA. The results of the air quality monitoring can be found within the 2023 Annual Status Report.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the study area, as detailed in sections 7.3.5 to 7.3.9 in Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076], is appropriate and robust. This was discussed and agreed during the EIA Scoping Meeting and Air Quality TWG meetings. However, it is acknowledged that this cannot be confirmed until such time that the updated traffic modelling has been finalised.</p> <p>The three mentioned AQMAs (Stoke Road AQMA, Friarage Road AQMA, and Tring Road AQMA) located on routes that the Council anticipates will experience increases or changes in traffic, are all over 19km from the affected road network. No significant impacts are predicted to occur within the study area. No significant air quality effects would occur outside of the study area, which would include the above-mentioned Buckinghamshire AQMAs.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p> <p>The updated traffic data will be reviewed with regards to the resulting air quality effects and the outcome will be reported following the timeline indicated in the Applicant response to the Rule 9 letter [AS-064]. Consideration will be given to the AQMAs in Aylesbury referenced by BC.</p>	<p>Unchanged. BC reserves its position pending receipt of the updated traffic modelling.</p>	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC awaits the results of the updated traffic modelling in relation to the impact from COVID-19 pandemic and wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to the updated traffic modelling and the Council's suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs against the IAQM triggers to determine whether further air quality assessment is needed. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to be written up in the air quality chapter of the ES, as well as inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>BC requested that the Applicant should ensure that this is programmed sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
					comment by BC other Interested Parties, as appropriate.		
3.4.7	Air quality assessment – construction dust methodology, results and mitigation	BC agrees with the construction dust assessment methodology and findings, including mitigation included in the code of construction practice which follows best practice.	The Applicant considers that the construction dust methodology is robust and the findings, including mitigation which is included in the code of construction practice follows best practice. The construction dust assessment methodology is detailed in section 2 in Appendix 7.1 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076] . The construction dust results are detailed in section 2.2 in Appendix 7.3 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076] . The construction dust mitigation included in the code of construction practice is detailed in section 8 of Chapter 4 The Proposed Development of the ES [AS-074] . These have been discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2020 to 2022	Agreed
3.4.8	Air quality assessment modelling methodology	BC agrees with the modelling methodology including data sources, model set up including use of ADMS, receptor locations selected, assessment years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects, and verification methodology.	The Applicant considers the modelling methodology including the data sources, model setup including use of the Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS), modelled receptor locations, assessment years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects and verification methodology to be robust. The modelling methodology is detailed in section 3 in Appendix 7.1. of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076] . The modelling methodology was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2020 to 2022	Agreed
3.4.9	Air quality assessment significance criteria	BC agrees with the significance criteria used in the assessment.	The Applicant considers the significance criteria used in the assessment, as detailed in section 4 in Appendix 7.1 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076] , to be appropriate and robust. The significance criteria used in the assessment was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2020 to 2022	Agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.4.10	Air quality assessment – odour impact methodology	BC agrees with the odour impact methodology and results and requests additional information on odour report methodology.	The Applicant considers the odour impact methodology, as detailed in section 5 in Appendix 7.1 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076] , to be robust. The odour impact methodology was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	BC's relevant representation submitted to PINS on 30 June	Agreed
3.4.10 b	Air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases	BC agrees with the air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases.	<p>The Applicant considers the air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases to be robust. The air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases are detailed in 7.9 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076] and Appendix 7.3 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076]. The results were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings. However, it is acknowledged that this cannot be confirmed until such time that the updated traffic modelling has been finalised.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p> <p>The updated traffic data will be reviewed with regards to the resulting air quality effects and the outcome will be reported following the timeline indicated in the Applicant response to the Rule 9 letter [AS-064].</p>	<p>BC is in agreement that the findings presented to date by the Applicant accord with the current traffic modelling. However, as set out within the Surface Access topic of this SoCG, BC has reservations regarding the validity of this underlying data. In turn, this affects the validity of the conclusions drawn in downstream analysis including the air quality assessment.</p> <p>The points made re: 3.4.3 are relevant in resolving this matter.</p>	Ongoing. BC asserts that the Applicant should address the suggested resolutions to the Surface Access topic and then explore the need for additional air quality assessment, as per the approach proposed in 3.4.3 and 3.4.6.		Ongoing
3.4.11	Air quality good practice mitigation for operational phase	BC agrees with the good practice mitigation identified for the operational phase.	The Applicant considers the good practice mitigation identified for the operational phase, as detailed in Appendix 7.5 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076] , to be appropriate. The mitigation identified were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2020 to 2022	Agreed
3.4.12	Air quality assessments including sensitive receptors	The Council request updated air quality assessment, on a quantitative basis, for Aylesbury and sensitive receptors along the A41, B488, B489. Also,	The air quality assessment (Chapter 7 of the ES [AS-076]) has provided an assessment of air quality following the methodology and study area agreed with the local Councils. The study area is considered appropriate and takes into	The Trip Distribution Plans [REP1-019] appear to highlight increases in traffic along the routes cited by the Council as being of concern. Quantitative data	Ongoing. The Applicant should provide the quantitative air quality assessment data requested for the routes of concern for		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>confirmation of any additional locations on the Buckinghamshire transport network where changes in traffic flows significantly affect air quality.</p>	<p>account the affected road network using the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) guidance. It is noted that Aylesbury is not within the study area. Aylesbury is located over 19km from the study area, no significant air quality effects would occur outside of the study area.</p> <p>The trip distribution of the airport traffic was based on observed CAA passenger survey data. Within Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201], airport distribution figures were included. The Applicant also submitted daily airport passengers and staff distribution figures (Trip Distribution Plans) [REP1-019] as was requested by the Examining Authority. The distribution shows relatively low volumes of traffic heading towards Aylesbury.</p> <p>Access routes for construction traffic will be limited, as far as reasonably practicable, to the trunk road network and main roads on the local road network. It is not intended by the Applicant to utilise the local road network for material supplies however it is expected that the origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p> <p>The updated traffic data will be reviewed with regards to the resulting air quality effects and the outcome will be reported following the timeline indicated in the Applicant response to the Rule 9 letter [AS-064]. Consideration will be given to Aylesbury and the specific roads mentioned by BC.</p>	<p>has been requested for these routes, both by the ExA through the ISH process and by BC in its various responses to Deadline 2 documents. The Applicant has also yet to fulfil the request for quantitative data on the existing air quality assessment reported in AS-076.</p> <p>BC reserves its position regarding the potential downstream impacts, including on air quality, that may arise from changes in traffic identified through updated traffic modelling. BC cites the IAQM guidance as containing appropriate thresholds for determining whether additional air quality assessment is required, as set out in point 3.4.3.</p> <p>Resultant actions relating to this matter will then be dependent upon the way in which the Applicant chooses to address points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p>	<p>BC, underpinning the reporting in AS-076.</p> <p>Further resolution of this matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs against the IAQM triggers to determine whether further air quality assessment is needed. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to be written up in the air quality chapter of the ES, as well as inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant should ensure that this is programmed sufficient in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC and other Interested Parties, as appropriate.</p>		

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
<p>3.5 Green Controlled Growth</p>							
<p>3.5.1</p>	<p>Environmental Scrutiny Group membership</p>	<p>The applicant proposes to use a “Noise Envelope” to control the expansion and as part of the Green Controlled Growth (GCG) principle. This will impose a series of ‘thresholds’, ‘stops’ and ‘limits’ on the size of average summer daytime and night-time noise contours, based on an agreed noise envelope design group approach. The applicant claims that GCG provides a more robust and transparent approach to noise monitoring and enforcement than the current planning controls. This GCG framework will only be effective if the body managing it is truly independent and includes BC as a party to the Environmental Scrutiny Group. This should therefore be established early with clear terms of reference set out.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Green Controlled Growth Framework, as outlined within the DCO, will place controls on air quality. This framework will only be effective if the body managing it is truly independent and includes BC as a party to the Environmental Scrutiny Group.</p>	<p>It is agreed that independent, effective scrutiny and review of the environmental effects of the expanding airport, combined with robust governance, is fundamental in making the GCG Framework [REP3-017] effective. Section 2.4 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015] sets out proposals for the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) that is proposed to oversee the operation of Green Controlled Growth, with clear Terms of Reference provided at Appendix A of the Green Controlled Growth Framework [REP3-017]. Requirement 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003] sets out the required timing for the establishment of the ESG.</p> <p>It is considered important that the ESG includes representatives of local authorities to ensure that the views of those authorities that are impacted across the whole range of environmental topics within the scope of GCG are captured. However, it is important to strike an appropriate balance between the need to capture a diversity of views, the relevance of views to the impacts arising from expansion that may be experienced around the airport and the need for membership of ESG to be focused in support of its decision-making role and in the interests of managing the costs of administering GCG (both for the airport operator and for local authorities). It is on this basis that the membership of ESG reflects those local authorities that are forecast to experience environmental impacts at the level upon which the Limits and Thresholds included within GCG are based.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.4.19 to 2.4.24 of the GCG Explanatory Note set out the forecast distribution of environmental impacts within the scope of GCG. Specifically for aircraft</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that the Applicant updated the ToR for the ESG at Deadline 3 and has provided comment on this.</p> <p>Matters relating to the way in which the GCG and NE thresholds and limits are applied and reviewed are set out in a separate Council response – 3.3.5.</p> <p>BC does not agree with the rationale presented by the Applicant regarding the membership of the ESG. BC maintains that it should be included as an ESG member.</p>	<p>Not agreed. The Applicant should invite BC to be a member of the ESG. This is also required as a resolution to matters raised in 3.3.5.</p>		<p>Not agreed</p>

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>noise, the baseline and forecast daytime and night-time noise contours used to inform the GCG noise Limits / Noise Envelope are shown in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP1-003] as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Baseline noise contours for day-time and night-time 2019 actuals are Figure 16.5 and 16.6 [AS-104] b. Phase 1 forecast noise contours for the Faster Growth scenario are Figure 16.91 and 16.92 [AS-117] c. Phase 2a forecast noise contours are Figure 16.41 and 16.42 [AS-109] d. Phase 2b forecast noise contours are Figure 16.65 and 16.66 [AS-113] <p>In all of the above figures, the 54 dBL_{Aeq,16h} (daytime) and 48 dBL_{Aeq,8h} (night-time) noise contours, used as the basis for the GCG Limits, do not extend into Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>On this basis, a role for Buckinghamshire Council on the ESG (or the Noise Technical Panel) is not considered proportionate or relevant.</p>				
3.5.2	Environmental Scrutiny Group – terms of reference for air quality	The ESG remit and governance should be established early with clear terms of reference set out – this should include controls on air quality.	It is agreed that independent, effective scrutiny and review of the environmental effects of the expanding airport, combined with robust governance, is fundamental in making the GCG Framework [REP3-017] effective. Section 2.4 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015] sets out proposals for the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) that is proposed to oversee the operation of Green Controlled Growth, with clear Terms of Reference provided at Appendix A of the Green Controlled Growth Framework [REP3-017] . Requirement 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003] sets out the required timing for the establishment of the ESG.	<p>BC acknowledges that the Applicant updated the ToR for the ESG at Deadline 3 and has provided comment on this.</p> <p>BC does not agree with the rationale presented by the Applicant regarding the membership of the ESG. BC maintains that it should be included as an ESG member.</p>	Not agreed. The Applicant should invite BC to be a member of the ESG.		Not agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>It is considered important that the ESG includes representatives of local authorities to ensure that the views of those authorities that are impacted across the whole range of environmental topics within the scope of GCG are captured. However, it is important to strike an appropriate balance between the need to capture a diversity of views, the relevance of views to the impacts arising from expansion that may be experienced around the airport and the need for membership of ESG to be focused in support of its decision-making role and in the interests of managing the costs of administering GCG (both for the airport operator and for local authorities). It is on this basis that the membership of ESG reflects those local authorities that are forecast to experience environmental impacts at the level upon which the Limits and Thresholds included within GCG are based.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.4.19 to 2.4.24 of the GCG Explanatory Note [APP-217] set out the forecast distribution of environmental impacts within the scope of GCG. Specifically for air quality, Figure 3.8 of the GCG Explanatory Note shows proposed air quality monitoring locations, which have been derived based on an assessment of those locations that are forecast to experience the greatest air quality impact as a result of expansion. These are located across the administrative areas of Luton, Central Bedfordshire and North Hertfordshire, concentrated on the area immediately around the airport with some additional locations in Hitchin and to the west of Luton / east of Dunstable.</p> <p>There are no locations in Buckinghamshire, and on this basis, it is not considered relevant or appropriate for Buckinghamshire Council to have a role on the Environmental Scrutiny Group (or the Air Quality Technical Panel) on the basis of air quality impacts.</p>				

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.5.2b	Controlling air quality – community first fund	BC would also welcome if the community first fund proposed also supported schemes to help improve air quality in local communities within Buckinghamshire.	During the first 5 year period of Community First the Applicant believes that this fund should reflect both national and local agendas of decarbonisation and levelling up. The 5 yearly reviews of the fund present the opportunity for the funding themes to change in the future.	The Council has made separate comments regarding the need for annual reviews of measures intended to mitigate emerging impacts of the airport expansion. BC's position is that improving air quality aligns with key priorities and should be a focus for the Community First Fund from the outset.	Not agreed. The Applicant should amend the Community First Fund to include annual reviews, at least within the initial 5 years of operation. Air quality improvement should be a priority for schemes that could be supported by the Community First Fund		Not Agreed
3.5.3	Environmental Scrutiny Group conflicts of interest	The enforcement arrangements proposed by the Applicant would involve the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG), which includes Luton Borough Council, recommending the undertaking of enforcement action by the relevant planning authority – also Luton Borough Council. It is observed that Luton Borough Council is also the airport owner, and it is unclear that this potential conflict of interest has been adequately addressed.	At present, the airport is operating under a planning consent granted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA), with planning reference 12/01400/FUL, as amended by 15/00950/VARCON and 21/00031/VARCON. Under the TCPA, only the local planning authority can bring enforcement action against the airport operator for breach of a condition in planning permission and there are limited requirements for transparency around the enforcement process. As set out in Section 2.4 of the Green Controlled Growth (GCG) Explanatory Note [APP-217] it is proposed that governance of GCG will be through a new body established through the DCO, the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG). Section 2.4 sets out the proposed functions and membership of the ESG, enshrined through Terms of Reference included at Appendix A of the Green Controlled Growth Framework [REP3-017] . The ESG will be chaired independently and include independent experts. The GCG process is designed to be self-enforcing in respect of mitigating environmental effects above Limits, with the process designed to require action by	BC's position is unchanged. It is noted also that the ExA has posed a question to the Applicant on this matter within its First Written Questions, citing similar concerns raised by other Interested Parties. BC will review its position on reviewing the Applicant's response to the ExA's question.	Not agreed.		Not agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>the airport operator to address any exceedances of the Limits. However, it is acknowledged that circumstances where the processes set out in the GCG Framework are not followed also need to be considered, and this is set out in Section 2.7 of the GCG Explanatory Note.</p> <p>In addition to the GCG process, and as outlined in Section 2.7, the statutory enforcement regime for DCOs is set out in the Planning Act 2008. This defines the ‘relevant planning authority’ for the purposes of enforcement action as the planning authority for the area in which the development is situated. This means the ‘relevant planning authority’ for most of the Proposed Development must be Luton Borough Council. However, Section 2.7 also sets out ways in which other local authorities could bring action under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>In summary therefore, the GGC proposals are considered to include independent and transparent oversight and scrutiny in response to concerns around the potential conflict of interest of LBC and represent a significant improvement from current processes.</p> <p>The Applicant would also draw BC’s attention to Paragraphs IR8.109 to IR8.114 of the P19 decision which state that LBC have “followed an entirely orthodox, proportionate and lawful approach of responding to the breaches” and that “far from there being any basis for suggesting any improper or less than exacting process of scrutiny of the Airport, the whole history has been characterised by exactly the opposite”.</p>				
3.5.4	Technical Panel membership	The Council wishes to have representation of suitably qualified and experienced technical officers on each of	No significant adverse effects for each of the environmental topics within GCG have been identified within the boundary of Buckinghamshire Council. It is therefore the Applicant’s position that it is not relevant or appropriate for	BC views the Technical Panels (and ESG) as important forums in the ongoing monitoring and response to effects of the proposed scheme both in	Not agreed. The Applicant should invite BC to be members on all four of the Technical Panels. The		Not agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		the four Technical Panels being proposed.	Buckinghamshire Council to have a role on the Environmental Scrutiny Group or any of the Technical Panels.	construction and operation, including those that may not currently be anticipated. Insofar as they have a role in defining mitigation that may be developed in the future, BC does not accept the Applicant's rationale for excluding authorities that are not <i>currently</i> predicted to experience significant effects. BC's position is unchanged – it requests representation on the four technical panels (and the ESG – see 3.3.5).	resolutions at 3.3.5 is also relevant.		
3.5.5	ESG membership	Although broadly in agreement with the role of the ESG, the Council is further concerned that the ESG may not be fully independent. This is because (according to the Green Controlled Growth Framework Explanatory Note [APP-217]) the independent chair will initially be nominated by the airport operator, following consultation with the London Luton Airport operator. The Council suggests the initial appointment be reviewed by all ESG members within the first year of operation and this this continues on a rolling basis	<p>Whilst the airport operator will identify the proposed chairperson of the ESG, ultimately the appointment of that Chairperson is decided by an independent third party (the Secretary of State).</p> <p>As set out in the ESG Terms of Reference included as Appendix A of the Green Controlled Growth Framework [REP3-017], it is proposed that the independent chairperson serves a three-year term. Any subsequent appointments of a chairperson would be subject to consultation with all members of the ESG.</p> <p>As set out in Section 2.3 of the Green Controlled Growth Framework [REP3-017], it is also proposed that the airport operator carries out a review of all GCG processes within 12 months of the end of the Transition Period. The findings of this review will be submitted to the ESG for comment. Subsequently, a similar review will be carried out every five years.</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that the Applicant published additional information that relates to this matter at Deadline 3. BC's position regarding the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015] is set out within BC's deadline 4 submissions and will be updated within BC's deadline 6 submissions.</p> <p>BC continues to have concerns about the membership and independence of the ESG.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC is seeking a meeting with the Applicant to discuss matters relating to noise that remain within this SoCG as ongoing.</p>		Not agreed.
3.6 Employment, Training and Skills							
3.6.1	Airport access – public	Whilst BC welcomes the activities outlined in the Employment and Training	This is noted by the Applicant. The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] , and future Travel Plans to be produced every	BC is of the opinion that the Applicant needs to provide a firm commitment to the	Ongoing.		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	transport accessibility from Buckinghamshire	<p>Strategy and supports a focus on some of the more deprived areas within Buckinghamshire, it is vital that accessibility to the airport is addressed. As noted above in relation to surface access transport, at present there are no realistic public transport connections between Buckinghamshire and Luton Airport which could be utilised by potential employees of the airport. Without significant improvements in accessibility the prospect of Buckinghamshire residents taking up employment at London Luton Airport are limited and will undermine the aims of the Employment and Training Strategy.</p>	<p>5-years in accordance with Requirement 30 of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003] will seek to deliver improved public transport connectivity to the airport, including towards Buckinghamshire, which will support the aims of the Employment and Training Strategy.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to working with bus operators to support measures for further improving sustainable transport within the area.</p> <p>Improvements to the public transport network are not entirely within the gift of the Applicant and require discussion and negotiation with third parties. In the future, the airport operator will work closely with bus service operators through the Airport Transport Forum and development of future Travel Plans, which will set out measures to improve services in order to meet future mode share Targets.</p> <p>The Applicant disagrees with BC's second request ("<i>Revise the approach to travel planning, as described in the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] such that it focuses on predictive provision, rather than reactive provision (i.e. providing interventions to deliver choice, rather than delaying interventions until modal targets are at risk of being missed).</i>") as such a 'predictive provision' would not align with the evidence-based monitoring approach which is described in the FTP. The Applicant's commitment to funding for sustainable transport through the STF demonstrates its clear intention to deliver transport improvements to benefit sustainable surface access to and from the airport.</p>	<p>delivery of specific public transport proposals to serve the residents of Buckinghamshire as an intrinsic part of ensuring accessibility of opportunity for all parts of the prospective workforce (in construction and operation) as well as delivering modal choice for passengers (addressed in Surface Access). Furthermore, for such proposals to be effective in promoting sustainable travel behaviours, they will be required from the outset of construction activities – this approach is considered the best way to maximise the economic benefits (as well as supporting mental health and wellbeing).</p> <p>BC does not accept that the Framework Travel plan is a sufficiently prescriptive means to ensure that the specific services sought by BC will be delivered. BC does not support the embedded reactive approach of actions being triggered by potential breaches of mode share Targets – BC seeks a proactive approach of providing realistic accessible choices from the outset.</p>	<p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make a firm commitment to specific public transport measures that will provide accessibility to the airport for Buckinghamshire residents (as per Surface Transport – route 61 and strategic transport to Aylesbury) • Revise the approach to travel planning, as described in the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] such that it focuses on predictive provision, rather than reactive provision (i.e. providing interventions to deliver choice, rather than delaying interventions until modal targets are at risk of being missed). 		
3.6.2	Local Economic Development Working	The Employment and Training Strategy helpfully covers both the construction and operation phases. It references engagement with	This is noted by the Applicant – Buckinghamshire Council are welcome to join the Local Economic Development Working Group when this is set up.	BC welcomes the invitation to join LEDWG and confirms it has suitable representation to attend.	Ongoing.		Ongoing.

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	Group membership	local government and the creation of a Local Economic Development Working Group. BC would welcome involvement in this working group.	It is envisaged that the Employment and Training Strategy would be secured through an S106 agreement as outlined in the Applicant's responses to Deadline 4.	BC is concerned that there is no certainty on how the Employment Training Strategy and in turn the LEDWG can be secured, which has been raised in Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 submissions by BC.			
3.6.3	Local employment benefits	The Employment and Training Strategy includes an initiative to "Encourage local employment and local businesses (Construction and Operation)" which talks of continuing to prioritise utilising local businesses within their supply chain. There is scope to include more information around this and other ideas that could be considered, e.g. 'meet the buyer' type events, training/information sessions for interested businesses covering how they apply, requirements etc. BC would welcome initiatives to support local procurement during both construction and operational phases, which would also target the ten priority wards listed in the 'Opportunity Bucks' programme.	<p>This is noted by the Applicant, consideration will be given to adding further detail where appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that BC would be an active member of the Local Economic Development Working Group. The Proposed ETS [APP-215] sets out the proposed ETS study area, which includes BC. The Proposed ETS [APP-215] does set out a series of firm initiatives in relation to supply chain preparedness and support to local procurement through all phases of the Proposed Scheme. Details on how initiatives are delivered in specific areas and specific commitments will be established once DCO consent has been granted.</p>	BC is seeking a firm commitment on this matter from the Applicant. BC is seeking the inclusion of the ten priority wards listed in the Opportunity Bucks programme within the ETS, with targeted activities to residents in Aylesbury and Chesham Opportunity Bucks wards; and the Council wishes to see specific commitments in relation to supply chain preparedness and supporting local procurement throughout the project lifecycle.	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC would like involvement within the Working Group to shape activities and ensure these activities align with what else is going on in Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>BC would like the Applicant to commit to continued engagement on this matter, through the LEDWG and other means as appropriate.</p>		Ongoing
3.6.4	Maximising beneficial economic impacts	The Council wishes to partner with appropriate organisations, such as Bucks Business First, to work with the Applicant on supply chain readiness and accessibility of local businesses to suitable supply chain opportunities.	As outlined in the Employment and Training Strategy [APP-215] during the construction phase, the existing procurement process will support, the development of standard procurement materials, easy-to-understand requirements, and provide support to ensure procurement opportunities are inclusive and accessible to various types and sizes of businesses.	BC welcomes the Applicant's recognition of the issue of supply chain preparedness; however, BC maintains the position that the Applicant should expressly commit to partnering with knowledgeable local organisations, including Bucks First. This is seen as	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>The Applicant should provide a firm commitment to partnering with Bucks First and other suitable knowledgeable local organisations to provide suitably tailored activities to support local supply chain preparedness.</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			The Proposed ETS [APP-215] sets out initiatives to work with local organisations including Initiative 1.1. The details of partners have not yet been confirmed and will be confirmed and defined once DCO consent is granted. The Applicant acknowledges the request to include Bucks First in engagement and will endeavour to include this organisations in engagement once partners are defined and identified once DCO consent is granted.	an essential means of maximising the employment benefits of the Proposed Development at the local level.			
3.7 Economics and Employment							
3.7.1	Inbound tourism benefits for Buckinghamshire	BC welcomes the positive impact expansion will have on inbound tourism and the visitor economy. BC would welcome the opportunity to explore ways to maximise the positive impacts across the county, by promoting Buckinghamshire to those arriving at London Luton Airport, to increase visits and overnight stays.	This is noted by the Applicant and will be discussed with BC in future engagement.	Unchanged	Ongoing.		Ongoing
3.7.2	Jobs and Gross Domestic Product forecast	At this stage BC reserves judgement on the number of jobs and Gross Domestic Product forecast to be created until it has had opportunity to interrogate the underpinning assumptions in more detail.	The full details of the estimation of employment and GDP impacts are given in Appendix 11.1 to the ES [APP-079] .	BC trusts the statistics as presented and did not intend to challenge them.	Agreed.	8.37 Applicant's comments on Local Impact Reports (BC) Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.37	Agreed.
3.8 Landscape and Visual							
3.8.1	Tranquillity impacts on the	BC notes the Applicant's conclusions in respect of landscape and visual impacts, particularly the	Noted. A draft report assessing the Special Qualities of the AONB, including tranquillity, was submitted to Natural England and other stakeholders for review	It is agreed between the Council and the Applicant that the proposals will give rise to significant adverse	Ongoing. The Applicant should continue to engage with the Council to determine suitable and		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	Chilterns AONB	<p>deterioration to the aesthetic and perceptual characteristics of the Chilterns AONB, including impacts on certain views, as well as its tranquillity.</p> <p>However, it is unclear from the submitted LVIA and accompanying information as to which parts of the Chilterns AONB and wider Buckinghamshire are anticipated to be affected.</p> <p>BC requests that the areas of effect are clearly identified. Whilst it may be anticipated that the response is that only those areas within the 'study area' are being identified, it is noted that the applicant has identified a viewpoint at Ivinghoe Beacon (Viewpoint 45) that is outside of the study area and that this along with the ambiguous nature of the assessment description within the LVIA leads to ambiguity.</p> <p>The applicant should be specific as to the extent of the AONB adversely affected during both the construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>on 23 October 2023. A meeting with NE and other stakeholders was held on 30 October 2023 to discuss the draft assessment. The Applicant is currently considering comments raised on the report and preparing an updated version of the assessment.</p> <p>To address the ambiguity issue raised, the Study Area extends 5km from the perimeter of the Main Application Site. It also includes the full extent of any character areas that may be affected within that 5km envelope and additional land within the AONB where aircraft would be below 7,000ft to consider effects on tranquillity. Figures 14.14-14.17 of Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual of the ES [AS-079] illustrate the number of Overflights per day as well as the extent of the AONB (including Buckinghamshire) potentially affected in relation to tranquillity, i.e. the extended study area as set out above.</p> <p>It is agreed that the proposals will give rise to significant adverse landscape character effects as a result of impacts on tranquillity (including noise and lighting from aircraft in dark skies) within the areas of the Chilterns AONB in Buckinghamshire that lie beneath the identified 7000ft noise contours (as identified in Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual Figures 14.14 – 14.17)</p> <p>Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual of the ES [AS-079] concludes no physical impact on land within the AONB (within Buckinghamshire). The aesthetic or perceptual qualities of the AONB, i.e. tranquillity (one of the AONB's Special Qualities) within the identified part of the AONB within Buckinghamshire will, however, be affected. From assessment Phase 2b onwards, it concludes that there will be a noticeable deterioration to the aesthetic and perceptual characteristics of the AONB in this part of Buckinghamshire, the effect on this receptor is assessed to</p>	<p>landscape character effects as a result of impacts on tranquillity (including noise and lighting from aircraft in dark skies) within the areas of the Chilterns AONB in Buckinghamshire that lie beneath the identified 7000ft noise contours (as identified in Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual Figures 14.14 – 14.17) [AS-102].</p> <p>The Council wishes to continue engagement with the Applicant to determine suitable and effective mitigation.</p>	effective mitigation of the agreed significant adverse effects.		

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>be moderate adverse which is significant.</p> <p>Figure 14.8 Assessment Viewpoint Locations identifies the Viewpoints as well as the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). View 45 (Ivinghoe Beacon) is identified as view 45 on an inset plan (15km away from the order limits and not within the ZTV). Ivinghoe Beacon was added in as a viewpoint following a direct request in the 2018 Non-Statutory Consultation and is recorded in the Non-Statutory Consultation Feedback Report [APP-174]. Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual of the ES [AS-079] concludes that the Airport is not visible from this location and anticipates only that there may be more aircraft visible in the sky.</p> <p>In response to clarification on the impact to Dark Skies raised on 2 August 2023 - The LVIA references A Light Obtrusion Assessment and is provided as Appendix 5.2 of the ES [APP-052 and APP-053]. The LVIA cannot address visibility of Aircraft Lighting.</p> <p>Section 14.4.6 of Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual of the ES [AS-079] confirms that lighting and night time effects within the LVIA were discussed and agreed with the LVIA Working Group (the working group was created and met four times pre-2019 consultation and contained relevant <u>officers from the following Host Authorities</u>: LBC, NHDC, HCC and CBC. Buckinghamshire Council weren't part of this group as they are not a Host Authority).</p> <p>There are no landscape measures available to mitigate the adverse effects on the perceptual and aesthetic characteristics of the AONB in this part of Buckinghamshire .</p>				
3.8.2	Glint and glare	There is an absence of information to address	A Glint and Glare assessment was submitted to PINS on 9 August.	BC has reviewed the glint and glare assessment and	Agreed	Glint and glare	Agreed

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	impacts on the Chilterns AONB	possible glint and glare impact upon the Chilterns AONB. The Applicant should prepare a glint and glare assessment and assess any lighting impacts.		is in agreement with the findings of the Applicant.		assessment	
3.8.3	Construction landscape and visual impacts	BC request that construction landscape and visual impacts should be scoped into the ES (particularly in the AONB). BC is seeking additional clarity on the controls that will be incorporated within the CTMP as it is developed. Ideally this will include controls preventing mass haul and lorry routes and construction compounds or other sites supporting construction (e.g. spoil disposal) being sited within Buckinghamshire.	<p>The Affected Road Network (ARN) is determined by the strategic model and includes the roads from which likely significant effects may potentially occur and is therefore the study area for traffic related environmental effects. The ARN is shown in Figure 7.1 [AS-098] and [Figure 16.1 [AS-103] of the ES for air quality and noise respectively. Receptors within the ARN determined study areas are included in the assessments and effects assessed and reported in the ES. Roads and receptors outside of the ARN, which includes most of Buckinghamshire and the rural roads mentioned, are not likely to experience significant environmental effects and are therefore not assessed. This approach is widely accepted, included in relevant guidance, and best practice for assessment of environmental effects from highway related impacts.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-130] provides the principles to and measures to be developed in the full CTMP by the appointed contactor which, as secured by Requirement 14 of the draft DCO [AS-067] must be substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP. As described in Section 4.2 of the Outline CTMP “A <i>principal consideration when identifying designated routes will be the minimisation of travel along any road that does not form part of the Primary Route Network (PRN)</i>” and “<i>it is envisaged the great majority of construction vehicles will approach the Site using the M1 and the A1081 (New Airport Way)</i>”.</p>	BC’s position is unchanged. BC has set out requirements in relation to specific controls sought in relation to the CTMP within the matters associated with Surface Access. Resultant actions from this will then be dependent upon the way in which the Applicant chooses to address points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC’s suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs against the potentially sensitive receptors within Buckinghamshire. If required, further assessment of potential visual impacts should be undertaken and the analysis will need to be written up in the landscape chapter of the ES, as well as inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant should ensure that this is programmed sufficient in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC and other</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>Given that the areas of concern raised are the west of the M1 very little construction traffic is expected on that part of the network. There are no construction activities or compounds proposed in Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>There are no construction activities or compounds proposed in Buckinghamshire.</p>		Interested Parties, as appropriate.		
<p>3.9 Draft DCO</p>							
3.9.1	Draft DCO requirements	<p>'Limits of Works', Article 6, sub-paragraph 3, does not stipulate consultation outside of the relevant planning authority for works in excess of the limits.</p> <p>Given the broad parameters to which this article could apply, BC is concerned that its wording does not stipulate consultation outside of the relevant planning authority for works in excess of the limits. It is suggested that neither the Applicant nor the relevant planning authority could rule out, at this stage, works outside the limits that would have potential impacts requiring input from external consultees into the decision-making process.</p> <p>Given the unknowns associated with works being undertaken outside the limits of works there are concerns over the ability to certify such a change without the requirement to consult key external consultees, where relevant.</p> <p>BC would expect sub-paragraph 3 to make provision for the relevant</p>	<p>Article 6(3) stipulates that any variation to the limits of deviation must not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects.</p> <p>This stipulation, therefore, provides a significant control on the Applicant's ability to vary the limits of deviation, and accordingly the provision is considered appropriate in limiting any 'unknowns' that may be associated with works undertaken outside of the limits of deviation.</p> <p>The relevant local planning authority, who has pre-existing knowledge of and experience with the project design and planning matters, is competent to authorise such variations. Nevertheless, the draft Development Consent Order has been amended to provide a mechanism for the discharging local authority, at its discretion, to consult specified parties on any application article 6(3) should relevant conditions be met. See further article 6(4) of the draft Order and Part 5 of Schedule 2. This change was made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>Article 6(3) is necessary to provide the proportionate flexibility required to ensure that the delivery of this nationally significant infrastructure project is not unnecessarily impeded or delayed by a requirement to make minor variations to the limits of deviation.</p>	BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.	Agreed.		Agreed.

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		planning authority to undertake appropriate consultation on any works in excess of the limits.					
3.9.2	Amendments to approved details	<p>Paragraph 2, sub-paragraph 1, of Part 1, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO allows the undertaker to apply to the relevant planning authority for approval to amend the parameters specified in paragraph 6, of Part 2, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO. Subparagraph 3 limits any approval to one where it can be demonstrated that it would not give rise to any materially new or materially different effects to those reported in the ES and sub-paragraph 4 limits consultation on such an application to those consultees specified within the requirements contained in Part 2 and Part 4 of the dDCO.</p> <p>As paragraph 6 of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO is a compliance requirement Buckinghamshire Council would have concerns regarding an absence of consultee specification to inform paragraph 2(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO. It is suggested that the Applicant should make provision for the relevant planning authority to undertake consultation on any changes to the parameters specified in paragraph 6.</p>	<p>This requirement stipulates that any variation to the parameters of authorised development must not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects.</p> <p>It is the Applicant's view that this provides a significant control on the Applicant's ability to vary the limits of deviation, and accordingly the provision is considered appropriate in limiting any 'unknowns' that may be associated with works undertaken outside of the limits of deviation.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the relevant local planning authority is competent to approve such variations and does not need to consult on any proposed changes. Nevertheless, the draft Development Consent Order has been amended to provide a mechanism for the discharging local authority, at its discretion, to consult specified parties on any application article paragraph 2 should relevant conditions be met. This change was made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.	Agreed.		Agreed.

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.9.3	Code of Construction Practice	<p>Paragraph 8, sub-paragraphs 1-2, of Part 2, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO makes provision for the Code of Construction Practice and its associated management plans to be approved by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with the relevant highway authority on matters related to its functions. Whilst this may not apply to all management plans Buckinghamshire Council has concerns that some management plans could be approved without consultation with the appropriate technical authority.</p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council would suggest that paragraph 8, sub-paragraphs 1-2 of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO should make provision for the relevant planning authority to undertake wider consultation on management plans that require the input of external consultees.</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the relevant planning authority is competent to approve such variations to the Code of Construction Practice and its associated management plans. Requirements 34-35 of the draft DCO make provision for the relevant planning authority to elect to consult with other parties (where not already specified by a requirement (if the relevant conditions in requirement 35 are met. This change was made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.</p>	Agreed.		Agreed.
3.9.4	Draft DCO requirements	<p>BC has concerns regarding requirement/paragraph 10 of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO and the approval of Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plans without requiring consultation with external consultees such as Natural England.</p>	<p>The Applicant would draw BC's attention to the fact that the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan (LBMP), to be approved by the relevant planning authority, must be substantially in accordance the Outline LBMP [AS-029].</p> <p>This Outline LBMP been produced as part of the environmental impact assessment process, and has been subject to consultation. The Outline LBMP will be subject to further scrutiny by the ExA and interested parties during the examination.</p> <p>The Applicant does not believe, therefore that the final LBMP [AS-029] requires additional consultation with other external</p>	<p>BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.</p>	Agreed.		Agreed.

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>consultees such as Natural England as the relevant local planning authority is competent to approve such a plan.</p> <p>Requirements 34-35 of the draft DCO make provision for the relevant planning authority to elect to consult with other parties (where not already specified by a requirement) if the relevant conditions in requirement 35 are met. This change was made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p>				
3.9.5	ESG membership	<p>Given the remit of the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG), particularly in relation to any approved increase in the Night quota cap (requirement/paragraph 27 of Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO) and when considering the current uncertainty regarding the submitted traffic data, BC would request its inclusion in the ESG moving forward in order to allow it to represent its communities' best interests effectively.</p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council suggests that the Applicant makes provision within Paragraph 20, sub paragraph 2, of Part 3, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO for the inclusion of Buckinghamshire Council, and any other neighbouring authority, where air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; noise or surface access impacts are identified as being experienced within their administrative boundaries.</p>	<p>It is considered important that the ESG includes representatives of local authorities to ensure that the views of those authorities that are impacted across the whole range of environmental topics within the scope of GCG are captured. However, it is important to strike an appropriate balance between the need to capture a diversity of views, the relevance of views to the impacts arising from expansion that may be experienced around the airport and the need for membership of ESG to be focused in support of its decision-making role and in the interests of managing the costs of administering GCG (both for the airport operator and for local authorities). It is on this basis that the membership of ESG reflects those local authorities that are forecast to experience environmental impacts at the level upon which the Limits and Thresholds included within GCG are based.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.4.21 to 2.4.27 of the GCG Explanatory Note [REP5-020] set out the forecast distribution of environmental impacts within the scope of GCG. Specifically for aircraft noise, the baseline and forecast daytime and night-time noise contours used to inform the GCG noise Limits are shown in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP1-003] as follows:</p>	<p>Whilst BC acknowledges the Applicant's inclusion of a requirement to add local authorities to the Noise Technical Panel, where the shape of the relevant noise contour changes in the future, the Council maintains its position that the analysis of traffic survey data at its key junctions against baseline traffic flows may present implications for further traffic, noise, air quality and health impact effects. These potential impacts support BC's case for inclusion in the ESG moving forward.</p>	Ongoing		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline noise contours for day-time and night-time 2019 actuals are Figure 16.5 and 16.6 [AS-098] • Phase 1 forecast noise contours for the Faster Growth scenario are Figure 16.91 and 16.92 [AS-075] • Phase 2a forecast noise contours are Figure 16.41 and 16.42 [AS-087] • Phase 2b forecast noise contours are Figure 16.65 and 16.66 [AS-094] <p>In all of the above figures, the 54 dBL_{Aeq,16h} (daytime) and 48 dBL_{Aeq,8h} (night-time) noise contours, used as the basis for the GCG Limits, do not extend into Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>Similarly, Appendix A to the Transport Assessment [APP-200] shows the locations of proposed off-site highway mitigation measures on the basis that these are the locations where transport impacts are potentially significant enough to require mitigation. Again, these are focused on Luton and North Hertfordshire, and include works to the Strategic Road Network, which is owned and operated by National Highways. There are no such locations in Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>On this basis, a role for Buckinghamshire Council on the ESG is not considered proportionate or relevant.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments made and is considering these further.</p>				
3.9.6	Schedule 2, Part 4	Paragraphs 26 and 27, of Part 4, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO make provision for the relevant planning authority to approve variations to the passenger cap for the authorised development and the night quota cap, respectively. As currently drafted, BC is of the opinion	<p>The Applicant understands that, following amendments made the draft Development Consent Order, BC’s comment now refers to paragraphs 25 and 26 of the current draft of the Development Consent Order (as submitted at Deadline 5).</p> <p>Should the DCO be granted, the passenger cap for the airport would increase to 32 million passengers per</p>	BC reserves its position in relation to the night quota cap until such time that the Applicant sets out its final position on this matter.	Ongoing		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>that these requirements do not adequately deal with the phased approach to increasing passenger numbers to the cap. This places the Requirements at odds with the GCGF proposed by the Applicant and BC wishes to see this amended to address the inconsistency.</p>	<p>annum. This cap is set by paragraph 25 of Schedule 2. Paragraph 25 makes no provision for that passenger cap to be varied by the LPA. Growth up to that passenger cap could take place provided that the limits set by the Green Controlled Growth framework are being met. Hence the two provisions are entirely aligned in this respect, and not at odds as suggested. Phasing of physical growth is dealt with by paragraph 5 of Schedule 2.</p> <p>As foreshadowed in the Applicant's submissions at Deadline 5, the mechanism for securing the night quota cap (currently paragraph 26) is being reviewed in conjunction with an increase in the noise conditions being "carried across" to the DCO from the Noise Management Plan accompanying the P19 planning consent. It is anticipated that the P19 measures (including the night quota cap) will be set out in a management plan secured by a Schedule 2 requirement.</p>				
3.9.7	Draft DCO requirements	<p>BC would query whether requirements/paragraphs 31, 32 and 33 of Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO should require consultation with the ESG as a minimum due to the broader, regional implications of the associated plans.</p>	<p>Under the terms of the dDCO, the ESG may not have been constituted prior to the undertaker seeking to discharge requirements 31, 32 and 33 of Part 4 of Schedule 2, so could not be consulted with. Furthermore, even when constituted the ESG only meets annually (within 28 days of receipt of the annual monitoring report) and so it would not be reasonable or practicable to have to await its sitting before these requirements could be progressed / discharged</p> <p>In any event:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As regards Requirements 31 and 32, the Applicant considers that the relevant planning authority is competent to discharge these matters without consulting with the ESG. The ESG will ultimately monitor air quality and greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with its remit, and should further remedial 	<p>It is understood that the Applicant's stated position within this draft DCO section of the SoCG has not been updated pending resolution of the ExAs written questions, and may need to be updated again in due course ahead of Deadline 6. On this basis, BC reserves its position on this matter.</p>	Ongoing		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>action be necessary (i.e. additional to the operational air quality and greenhouse gas action plans), this will emerge through the GCG process with the ESG's oversight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement 33 does not pertain to the scope and remit of the ESG, and so the issue of consultation with the ESG is not considered to be relevant in this context. 				
3.9.8	ESG right of appeal to the Secretary of State (SoS)	Within the GCG Framework the ESG Terms of Reference (paragraph A2.3.3) [APP219] and the dDCO [AS-067] has identified that Airport Operator has a right of appeal to the SoS for Transport. BC recommends that, in addition to BC being admitted to the ESG, each of the (then) five Local Authorities sitting within the ESG are additionally given a right of appeal to the SoS.	It is not clear why it would be necessary for the ESG to have a right of appeal to the SoS, as the ESG is the only decision-making body in the GCG process. Section 2.7 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP3-015] sets out the possible enforcement approaches where the GCG Framework has not been complied with. This includes the option for any local authority to take enforcement action pursuant to Section 161 of the Planning Act 2008, including those where land under the application for development consent is not within their jurisdiction.	The Council has given further consideration to this matter and is in agreement with the Applicant's latest position.	Agreed.		Agreed.
3.9.9	Schedule 2 Part 3	The dDCO Schedule 2 Part 3, paragraph 24 should set out the maximum timescales for delivery of any actions.	<p>The Applicant understands this comment now relates to paragraph 23 of the latest version of the draft Development Consent Order (as submitted at Deadline 5). That paragraph is headed "exceedance of a limit".</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it appropriate for paragraph 24 to set out maximum timescales for taking action – this is a matter to be considered by the ESG in reaching a decision under this paragraph and it is not considered appropriate to fetter the ESGs discretion in this respect. The drafting of paragraph 23 allows the ESG to refuse the Mitigation Plan if they are not satisfied that it will address the exceedance of the Limit as soon as is reasonably practicable.</p>	Following further consideration of this matter the Council considers that paragraph 23 and the requirement for the undertake to implement a relevant mitigation plan, as approved, should provide adequate control over the implementation of any actions.	Agreed.		Agreed.

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.9.10	Monitoring findings of the GCG Framework and Framework Travel Plan	A list should be included in the draft DCO to indicate which bodies are responsible for monitoring the findings of the GCG Framework and the FTP, including the data collection and authorisation of changes to in order to address any failures to meet targets.	Proposals for monitoring surface access performance under the GCG Framework are set out in Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix F – Surface Access Monitoring Plan [REP3-017] . Governance arrangements for the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] are set out in Section 7.4 of that document, compliance with which is secured through Requirement 30 of the DCO. The requirements within the Framework Travel Plan do not therefore need to be transposed in the DCO itself.	BC reserves its position on this matter subject to further discussions with the Applicant.	Ongoing		Ongoing
3.9.11	Economic benefits	How economic benefits associated with the expansion will be secured should be reflected in the draft DCO.	The Applicant notes the comments made. Whilst the Applicant's case is that the development for which consent is sought would generate significant economic benefits, these cannot nor should not be "secured" in some way by the DCO. It would highly novel and unusual to attempt to do so. The Applicant has developed an employment and training strategy which is currently proposed to be secured by a s106 agreement.	BC reserves its position on this matter. The Council has raised comments previously on the securing of the whole of the ETS within a s106 agreement and its need to have sight of the draft s106 agreement in order to draft its own side agreement with the Applicant.	Ongoing		Ongoing
3.9.12	Schedule 2, Part 2	Schedule 2, Part 2 (1) references 'the' relevant planning authority (singular entity). However, some of the matters to be considered have trans-boundary implications. It is suggested that this should be broadened to state 'all relevant authorities' (plural). This change should be implemented throughout the draft DCO to include Buckinghamshire Council as a Relevant Authority.	The Applicant considers that the definition of the relevant planning authority is appropriate as the definition refers to both '... the area in which the provision relates is situated' and 'for the matter to which that provision relates' so already refers to the part of the Authorised Development. The relevant planning authority will therefore be determined according to the geographic area in which work is located, or in which a power is being exercised. For the 'relevant highway authority' the definition refers to the highway authority being the authority for the 'highway to which the provision relates'. Again, there will be only one "relevant highway authority" with respect to any particular highway that is being worked on. No works are taking place in Buckinghamshire Council's administrative	The Council accepts the Applicant's stance regarding the definitions of relevant planning / highway authorities and welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.	Agreed.		Agreed.

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			area, which is outside of the Order Limits. Accordingly, the Council does not qualify as a relevant authority under the DCO. The approach taken by the Applicant is consistent with other made DCOs.				
3.9.13	Schedule 2, Part 2, 8	Schedule 2, Part 2, 8 (2) - BC agrees that these plans need to be developed pre-commencement, but there should also be reference in the requirement to them being 'implemented' pre-commencement. In the context of the health and community assessment, the specific rationale here is 8 (2) (e) Community Engagement Plan, which BC would expect to include pre-commencement activities, for example, to ensure that affected communities are fully aware of the impacts and potential effects that they will experience and able to feel supported and heard, should any adverse effects arise once construction is underway.	<p>The Applicant notes that this is now at paragraph 7 in the latest version of the draft Development Consent Order (Deadline 5).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the control plans secured by paragraph 7 already achieve the ends referred to by BC.</p> <p>Paragraph 7 requires the Applicant to comply with the CoCP, including the various plans secured under it which must be approved by the relevant planning authority prior to works commencing.</p> <p>Section 4 of the CoCP requires that the Community Engagement Plan must include procedures to communicate with affected communities <u>prior to</u> the commencement of the relevant construction operations about how the effects of construction activities will be managed and, where appropriate, mitigated (paragraph 4.1.2(b)).</p> <p>Furthermore, paragraph 4.2.2 continues: <i>"Wherever possible, the lead contractor will notify occupiers of nearby or affected properties, businesses, adjacent or affected parish councils, and other elected representatives at least four weeks in advance, and again at least two weeks in advance, of the nature and anticipated duration of planned construction works that may affect them, including both principal and ancillary works"</i>.</p>	Following further consideration the Council accepts the Applicant's stance on this matter.	Agreed.		Agreed.
3.9.14	Procedure for discharge of Requirements	BC has concerns regarding the implications of paragraph 36 (3) of Part 5 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO on consultation. Paragraph 36(3) would	Requirements 34-35 of the draft DCO now make provision for the relevant planning authority to elect to consult with other parties (where not already specified by a requirement) if the relevant conditions in	BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers	Agreed.		Agreed.

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		appear to limit consultation on the discharge of DCO requirements to those consultees specified within a requirement itself. Given the wording of this requirement BC would emphasise the need to ensure that relevant consultees are stated within the wording of each requirement, where considered necessary, to ensure that an appropriate assessment of the associated impacts is made.	requirement 35 are met. This change was made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.	that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.			
3.9.15	Schedule 2, Part 5	Whilst Buckinghamshire Council recognises that there are prescribed consultees stipulated in relevant requirements the Council would expect paragraph 35, of Part 5, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO to make provision for a minimum consultation period for applications made under requirements, akin to the 21 days defined in Paragraph 18, of Part 3, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO. The Applicant should also ensure that an appropriate mechanism is included within the dDCO for extending this consultation period should further issues arise or if insufficient information is made available to the consultee.	The Applicant has not prescribed a specific period for consultation on a requirement, but has instead specified a period of 8 weeks for determining an application under the requirements. It is considered that this allows for an appropriate period of consultation, to be determined by the discharging authority depending on the subject matter. Furthermore in this context it should also be noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the period of 8 weeks "re-starts" if a request for further information is made in accordance with the process in the requirements; - the period of 8 weeks can be extended by agreement with the undertaker; and - provision has been made to allow the undertaker to carry out the necessary consultation prior to submission of the application to the discharging authority. 	The Council maintains its stance that the procedure for discharging the DCO requirements should include a minimum consultation period that would be standard procedure under other consenting regimes.	Ongoing		Ongoing
3.10 Airspace change							
3.10.1	Airspace change - impacts on heritage assets due	BC requests an explanation of how the Applicant intends to integrate the CAA's CAP1616 and the airport expansion whilst mitigating noise impacts. Consideration	The process of airspace change across the South East of England is a separate process being sponsored by the Department of Transport and the CAA, with the ultimate acceptability of any proposed change resting with the CAA. This	BC addresses this matter within the noise section of the SoCG. This includes reference to the downstream analysis that is required should the	Ongoing as a sub-set of noise matters. Refer to the resolutions within the Noise section.		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	to noise and vibration	of how airspace change will impact local communities with possible implications for the area's heritage assets is required.	requires complex coordination of the requirements of each of the airports. The DCO does not directly require an airspace change, so it does not form part of the application. Some sensitivity analysis has been undertaken of the potential implications of air space change on the noise envelope and this suggests that the noise implications are unlikely to be greater than assessed. Decisions on future airspace change will be taken in accordance with the CAA's process as set out in <i>CAP1616: Airspace change: Guidance on the regulatory process for changing the notified airspace design and planned and permanent redistribution of air traffic, and on providing airspace information.</i>	Applicant identify changes to the noise climate (e.g. for heritage assets and health and well-being). BC considers these matters to be linked and this additional aspect may be removed from separate consideration.			
3.10.2	Airspace change	Change is needed to allocate more airspace for safe departures and arrivals across the southeast airports to allow expansion. It is acknowledged that this will be subject to a separate regulatory process to the DCO, however, there is a degree of uncertainty over how these changes will impact residents. Change to airspace and in combination effects with Heathrow should be reflected in the DCO.	A sensitivity test is presented in Chapter 16 of the ES to assess the potential implications of airspace change at Luton based on the options consulted on by the airport operator. As there is no information currently regarding potential options for airspace change associated with London Heathrow Airport, it is not possible at this stage to consider in combination effects.	BC accepts the Applicant's position – it is agreed that there will be insufficient information regarding airspace change at the strategic scale, delivered through the separate regulatory process, to enable this aspect of the CEA to be delivered in a meaningful manner.	Agreed	SoCG (19 Oct 2023)	Agreed
3.10.3	Consideration of airspace change in the cumulative effects assessment	The cumulative effects assessment does not consider the cumulative interactions from the expansion of airspace on residents in Buckinghamshire. BC is concerned that there is no consideration of the potential cumulative impacts of aircraft noise for residents under	Changes to airspace and flightpaths and their cumulative effects are outside the scope of the Proposed Development. Any changes to future flight paths are the subject of a future airspace change process being sponsored by the UK Government and will be subject to a separate assessment and consultation exercise by the airport operator in accordance with Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) procedure (CAP1616), in due	BC is not in agreement with the Applicant. To clarify, BC asserts that the Applicant needs to consider the inter-project cumulative interactions between the levels of growth that will be necessitated by the proposed development in achieving the growth in mmpa against a trend of	Ongoing. The Applicant should ensure that the CEA includes consideration of the inter-project effects of the planned growth at Luton Airport (as set out within the proposed scheme) against a projected future baseline trend of growth along the known flightpaths for the other south east England		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>Heathrow, Stansted and Luton flight paths. BC also has concerns surrounding the change required to allocate more airspace for safe departures and arrivals across the south-east of England airports to allow expansion. There is a need for the ES to consider how these changes will impact residents and review whether there are potentially significant cumulative effects that would then require mitigation.</p>	<p>course. A note explaining the relationship between the two processes was submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-028].</p>	<p>growth associated with the existing flightpaths for the other south east airports. This will be possible on a qualitative basis since the existing receptors subject to impacts from intersecting flightpaths are known.</p> <p>Furthermore, BC is of the opinion that the Applicant should consider ways in which the likely exacerbation of in-combination noise and disturbance cumulative effects may be monitored and, if necessary, mitigated.</p> <p>This aspect of inter-project cumulative effects should be included in the scope of the ES.</p>	<p>airports. The focus should be on receptors that already experience intersection of flight paths from Luton plus at least one other airport.</p> <p>Qualitative commentary should be provided and, if appropriate, potential monitoring and mitigation approaches should be proposed by the Applicant.</p>		
<p>3.11 Health and Community</p>							
<p>3.11.1</p>	<p>Traffic related health and community impacts</p>	<p>BC requests expansion of the study area for traffic related health and community impacts to include Buckinghamshire County highway network, and the application of traffic modelling for the Buckinghamshire County highway network, to the satisfaction of technical officers in relation to relevant third-party developments and validation.</p>	<p>The trip distribution of the airport traffic was based on observed CAA data. Within Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201], airport distribution figures were included. The Applicant also submitted daily airport passengers and staff distribution figures as was requested by the Examining Authority at Deadline 1 which showed relatively low volumes of traffic through Buckinghamshire [REP1-016].</p> <p>The traffic data used in the health assessment, Chapter 13 Health and Community [APP-039], was provided by the Strategic Model CBLTM-LTN which has been calibrated and validated as per the DfT's TAG guidance. Moreover, the model was considered fit for purpose by all Host Authorities and National Highways. The level of detail in the model's geographical coverage was agreed with</p>	<p>BC's position is unchanged. BC has concerns regarding the validity of the traffic modelling undertaken by the Applicant in respect of the impacts on the Buckinghamshire network, which in turn means that the conclusions of the downstream analysis of health and community impacts is not currently considered robust.</p> <p>BC has set out its requirements in relation to addressing this in points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p>	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC's suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs in the context of potential</p>		<p>Ongoing</p>

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>Host Authorities and National Highways, and was informed by observed CAA data on the distribution of airport passengers / staff.</p> <p>As such, and taking into account the low volumes of airport-related traffic passing through Buckinghamshire, it is not considered necessary to undertake any further assessment of the impacts within Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>As there are no significant traffic effects in Buckinghamshire, it is not considered necessary to undertake a health assessment of traffic increases in this area.</p>	<p>BC reserves its position on this downstream analytical matter, pending the provision of traffic modelling outputs that are considered robust by BC's relevant technical officers.</p> <p>BC raised a number of matters relating to health in ISH8 that will be set out in writing within the D6 submission – these matters will need to be discussed further with the Applicant.</p>	<p>community and health impacts and resultant effects. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant was asked by BC to ensure that this is programmed sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC and other Interested Parties, as appropriate.</p>		
3.11.2	Analysis of health implications	The noise and air quality assessments will need to be updated based on the updated traffic modelling, which should include qualitative analysis of potential health implications of all changes of greater than 1dB in noise and changes in particulates, to reflect the increasing scrutiny of this matter within health assessment.	As there are no significant traffic effects in Buckinghamshire, it is not considered necessary to undertake a health assessment of traffic increases in this area.	<p>BC's position is unchanged. BC has concerns regarding the validity of the traffic modelling undertaken by the Applicant in respect of the impacts on the Buckinghamshire network, which in turn means that the conclusions of the downstream analysis of health and community impacts is not currently considered robust.</p> <p>BC has set out its requirements in relation to addressing this in points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>BC reserves its position on this downstream analytical matter, pending the provision of traffic modelling outputs that are considered robust by BC's relevant technical officers.</p>	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC's suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs in the context of potential community and health impacts and resultant effects. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to inform a review of the health</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
				BC raised a number of matters relating to health in ISH8 that will be set out in writing within the D6 submission – these matters will need to be discussed further with the Applicant.	and community assessment findings in the ES. The Applicant should be asked by BC to ensure that this is programmed sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC and other Interested Parties, as appropriate. BC will continue to work with the Applicant.		
3.11.3	Impacts on Aylesbury	BC requires consideration of the impacts of the Proposed Development on Aylesbury. This relates both to the proposals for traffic movement on the highway network in and around Aylesbury and specifically in relation to the impacts on the AQMAs, which are not reported within the health and communities chapter of the ES [AS-078] . An update to the assessment is sought and should any significant adverse effects be identified, BC would wish to be directly involved in developing proposals for mitigation, from the perspective of avoiding adverse effects on health and communities.	<p>The change in traffic flows as a result of the Proposed Development were reviewed for the road links in the strategic model, including those in the south of Buckinghamshire, to identify those links that met the magnitude of impact thresholds in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms. The impacts on road links in this area did not meet the thresholds that triggered consideration of significant effects.</p> <p>Any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p>	<p>BC's position is unchanged. BC has concerns regarding the validity of the traffic modelling undertaken by the Applicant in respect of the impacts on the Buckinghamshire network, which in turn means that the conclusions of the downstream analysis of health and community impacts is not currently considered robust.</p> <p>BC has set out its requirements in relation to addressing this in points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>BC reserves its position on this downstream analytical matter, pending the provision of traffic modelling outputs that are considered robust by BC's relevant technical officers.</p> <p>BC raised a number of matters relating to health in ISH8 that will be set out in writing within the D6</p>	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC's suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs in the context of potential community and health impacts and resultant effects. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant was asked by BC to ensure that this is</p>		Ongoing

SoCG ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
				submission – these matters will need to be discussed further with the Applicant.	programmed sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC and other Interested Parties, as appropriate. BC will continue to work with the Applicant.		
3.11.4	Expansion of the health and communities assessment	<p>The health and communities chapter of the ES [AS-078] reports increased aircraft movements and changes in aircraft noise exposure in the population as a moderate adverse permanent effect on health outcomes across the study population. This is considered very generalised and the health and community assessment should be expanded to assess the impacts on tranquillity of affected parts of the Chilterns AONB, as well as any sensitive community receptors that are scoped in following the updates. Should any significant adverse effects be identified, BC would wish to be directly involved in developing proposals for mitigation, from the perspective of avoiding adverse effects on health and communities.</p>	<p>The impact of noise from the Proposed Development on health and quality of life for residential and sensitive community receptors has been assessed and all reasonably practicable measures have been explored to reduce noise impacts. Further details can be found in Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration of the ES [REP1-003].</p> <p>The effects of aircraft noise on the perception of tranquillity by recreational users of landscape receptors, including the Chilterns AONB and rural areas in proximity to the Airport, have been assessed in Chapter 14 of the ES, Landscape and Visual [AS-079].</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of noise on health and communities has been undertaken and reported in Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [APP-039]. This assessment inherently considers impacts and results of the assessment in Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration of the ES [REP1-003].</p>	<p>BC's position is unchanged. BC has concerns regarding the completeness of the noise assessment within Buckinghamshire, and the measures proposed by the Applicant to mitigate noise effects that may manifest as the Proposed Scheme moves to operation. This matter may therefore be considered a downstream sub-set of the matters raised in relation to Noise.</p> <p>BC reserves its position on this downstream analytical matter, pending the resolution of the matters raised in the Noise sub-section.</p> <p>BC raised a number of matters relating to health in ISH8 that will be set out in writing within the D6 submission – these matters will need to be discussed further with the Applicant.</p>	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of noise assessment.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC's suggestions in relation to Noise.</p> <p>The Applicant should address BC's requirements in relation to noise; and then review the outputs in the context of potential community and health impacts and resultant effects. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant was asked by BC to ensure that this is programmed sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC and other Interested Parties, as appropriate. BC will continue to work with the Applicant.</p>		Ongoing

REFERENCES

Ref 1 Department for Transport (2017), Air Navigation Guidance.

Ref 2 Civil Aviation Authority (2021), CAP1616: Airspace change: Guidance on the regulatory process for changing the notified airspace design and planned and permanent redistribution of air traffic, and on providing airspace information, Version 4