

December 2023

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

**8.14 Statement of Common Ground between London
Luton Airport Limited and Central Bedfordshire Council
(Tracked Change Version)**

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.14

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

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

**8.14 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND BETWEEN LONDON
LUTON AIRPORT LIMITED (TRADING AS LUTON RISING) AND
CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL (TRACKED CHANGE
VERSION)**

Deadline:	Deadline 6
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/8.14
Author:	Luton Rising

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

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction and purpose	1
1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground	1
1.3 Proposed Development description	2
2 Engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council	4
2.1 Summary of engagement	4
3 Matters agreed, ongoing, or not agreed	5
Appendix 1: Engagement between the Applicant and the host local authorities	194

Tables

[Table 3-1: Summary of 'consultation' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-2: Summary of 'planning' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-3: Summary of 'compensation' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-4: Summary of 'need case' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-5: Summary of 'employment and training' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-6: Summary of 'surface access' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-7: Summary of 'environment' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-8: Summary of 'flightpath' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-9: Summary of 'Green Controlled Growth' matters with CBC](#)

[Table-3-10: Summary of 'Design' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-1: Summary of 'consultation' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-2: Summary of 'planning' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-3-3: Summary of 'compensation' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-3-4: Summary of 'need case' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-3-5: Summary of 'employment and training' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-3-6: Summary of 'surface access' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-3-7: Summary of 'environment' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-3-8: Summary of 'flightpath' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-93-93-10: Summary of 'Green Controlled Growth' matters with CBC](#)

[Table 3-11: Summary of 'Design' matters with CBC](#)

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 Central Bedfordshire Council in respect of the Proposed Development. In particular, this SoCG focuses on:
- a. Planning
 - b. Compensation
 - c. Need Case
 - d. Employment and training
 - e. -Surface access
 - f. Environment
 - g. Flightpath
 - h. Design
 - i. Green Controlled Growth
- 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 Central Bedfordshire Council is a host 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.

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 ~~from 18 mppa~~ to 32 mppa¹. In addition to the above and to support the initial increase in demand, the existing infrastructure and supporting facilities will be improved in line with the incremental growth in capacity of the airport.

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 work was 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 19 mppa. 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. ~~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. Since then, the application was called in and referred to the Secretary of State for determination instead of being dealt with by the local planning authority. The inquiry to consider the called-in application opened on Tuesday 27 September 2022, and closed on Friday 18 November 2022. At the time of submission of the application for development consent the outcome of the inquiry was still unknown and, therefore, all of the assessment work to date has been undertaken using a "baseline" of 18 mppa. Nonetheless, in anticipation of LLAOL's 19 mppa planning application, the Applicant's environmental assessments included sensitivity analysis of the implications of the permitted cap increasing. 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 are presented in the Environmental Statement submitted with the application for development consent.~~

1.3.2 Key elements of the Proposed Development include:

- a. extension and remodelling of the existing passenger terminal (Terminal 1) to increase the capacity;
- b. new passenger terminal building and boarding piers (Terminal 2);
- c. earthworks to create an extension to the current airfield platform; the vast majority of materials for these earthworks would be generated on site;
- d. airside facilities including new taxiways and aprons, together with relocated engine run-up bay and fire training facility;
- e. landside facilities, including buildings which support the operational, energy and servicing needs of the airport;
- f. 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;
- g. extension of the Luton Direct Air to Rail Transit (Luton DART) with a station serving the new passenger terminal;
- h. landscape and ecological improvements, including the replacement of existing open space; and
- i. 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 CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE 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 application for development consent, is set out in full in the **Consultation Report [AS-048]**.
- 2.1.2 As a statutory consultee, Central Bedfordshire Council was consulted on the proposals in accordance with Section 42 of the Act and submitted a formal response to the statutory consultations carried out by the Applicant in 2019 and 2022.
- 2.1.3 The parties continue to be in direct communication in respect of the Proposed Development.
- 2.1.4 This SoCG between the parties is based on an extensive programme of consultation and ongoing engagement which is summarised in **Appendix 1**. This sets out the meetings and substantive correspondence that took place and the topics discussed.
- 2.1.5 The matters under discussion are set out in section 3.

3 MATTERS AGREED, ONGOING, OR NOT AGREED

3.1 Summary of matters with Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC)

Table 3-13-4: Summary of 'consultation' matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
Consultation					
Approach to consultation and engagement					
CBC1	Adequacy of statutory consultation	The Applicant acknowledges the joint and individual statutory consultation responses submitted by the Host Authorities and has had regard to these when finalising the Proposed Development.	CBC agrees that consultation to date has met the requirements of the relevant Sections of the Planning Act, but has raised concerns with regards to the lack of constructive engagement in some areas (as per the CBC adequacy of consultation representation dated 13 th March 2023)	Joint and individual responses to Statutory Consultation in 2019 and 2022	<u>Ongoing Agreed</u>
CBC2	Adequacy of engagement	The Applicant will continue to engage with CBC post submission of the application for development consent.	CBC has been engaged with the Applicant regarding to the Proposed Development throughout the pre-application period, including via the regular Planning Officers Coordination Group (POCG), and topic specific Technical Working Groups (TWG).	Regular POCG and topic specific meetings since 2018 – see Appendix 1	Agreed

Table 3-23-2: Summary of ‘planning’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council’s position	Source of agreement	Status
Planning					
Planning policy					
CBC3	Proposed works in the Green Belt within the Borough.	<p>The Design and Access Statement [AS-049] demonstrates how Green Belt policy was factored into the design development process to minimise impacts. The Planning Statement [AS-122REP5-016] includes a Green Belt Assessment in Appendix B [APP-196].</p> <p>The Applicant is happy to engage further with CBC once its concerns are clarified.</p>	<p><u>CBC to confirm their position in relation to the proposed works in the Green Belt has sought to minimise impacts within the Borough on evidence provided.</u> CBC to confirm their position in relation to the proposed works in the Green Belt within the Borough.</p>	<p><u>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</u> To be discussed at topic specific meeting</p>	Ongoing
CBC4	Compliance of the Proposed Development with relevant planning policy	<p><u>Compliance of the Proposed Development with relevant planning policy as a whole has been demonstrated in the Planning Statement [AS-122REP5-016].</u></p> <p><u>As stated in the applicant Deadline 2a response, the ES reports all effect assessed, both adverse and beneficial, and describes appropriate</u></p>	<p><u>CBC to confirm their position the applicant has demonstrated compliance of the Proposed Development with relevant planning policy as a whole.</u> CBC to confirm their position on the compliance of the Proposed Development with relevant planning policy.</p>	<p><u>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</u> To be discussed at topic specific meeting</p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>measures to avoid, reduce and mitigate adverse effects where reasonably practicable. Therefore, all effects can be considered in the planning balance and decision regarding planning consent. The Applicant believes this assessment and proposed measures are extensive and robust. The Applicant seeks clarity from the CBC with regards to its position on the compliance of the Proposed Development with relevant planning policy, so as to be able to better understand, and respond to, that position.</p>			
<p>CBC5</p>	<p>Consultation was undertaken in relation to the Transport Assessment methodology and associated mitigation measures, in accordance</p>	<p>The Applicant has consulted with CBC in accordance with Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) paragraph 5.10 which states:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant should assess the implications of airport expansion on surface access network capacity using the WebTAG methodology stipulated in the Department for Transport guidance, or any successor to such methodology. The applicant should consult Highways</i></p>	<p>CBC agrees that consultation was undertaken in relation to the Transport Assessment methodology and associated mitigation measures, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.10.</p>	<p>Written reply from CBC to confirm Agreement to be confirmed at topic specific meeting</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
	with ANPS paragraph 5.1	<i>England, Network Rail and highway and transport authorities, as appropriate, on the assessment and proposed mitigation measures. The assessment should distinguish between the construction and operational project stages for the development comprised in the application."</i>			
CBC6	Consultation was undertaken in relation to third party schemes, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.11	<p>The Applicant has consulted with CBC in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.11 which states:</p> <p><i>"The Applicant should also consult with Highways England, Network Rail and relevant highway and transport authorities, and transport operators, to understand the target completion dates of any third party or external schemes included in existing rail, road or other transport investment plans. It will need to assess the effects of the preferred scheme as influenced by such schemes and plans. Such consultation and assessment, both of third-party schemes on which the preferred scheme depends, and others which interact with it, all of</i></p>	CBC agrees that consultation was undertaken in relation to third party schemes, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.11. CBC have raised concerns throughout the process with regards to some of the third party scheme assumptions included within the model forecasting work, in particular the SMART motorways assumptions and those related to the East Luton schemes. This is considered relevant in terms of the need to understand 'planning, funding, and approvals processes' with this not yet being clear within the DCO submissions, although this has been a long standing query raised through both the statutory processes and technical meetings.	<u>Written reply from CBC to confirm. Agreement to be confirmed at topic specific meeting</u>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>which may be subject to their own planning, funding and approval processes, must be understood in terms of implications of the timings for the applicant's own surface access proposals."</i></p>			
<p>CBC7</p>	<p>Pre-application engagement undertaken in relation to land use, particularly replacement open space and works within the Green Belt, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.113</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken pre-application discussions with CBC in relation to land use in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.113 which states:</p> <p><i>"During any pre-application discussions with the Applicant, the local planning authority should identify any concerns it has about the impacts of the application on land use, having regard to the development plan and relevant applications and including, where relevant, whether it agrees with any independent assessment that the land is no longer needed. These are also matters that local authorities may wish to include in their Local Impact Report which can be submitted after an application for</i></p>	<p>CBC agrees that pre-application engagement was undertaken in relation to land use, particularly replacement open space and works within the Green Belt, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.113.</p>	<p><u>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</u> Agreement to be confirmed at topic-specific meeting</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>development consent has been accepted."</i></p> <p>This has included discussion on development within the Green Belt and replacement open space.</p>			
CBC8	Engagement undertaken in relation to flood risk, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.155.	<p>Engagement with the Lead Local Flood Authorities and highway authorities has been undertaken by the Applicant in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.155 which states:</p> <p><i>"Where the preferred scheme may be affected by, or may add to, flood risk, the Applicant is advised to seek early pre-application discussions with the Environment Agency, and, where relevant, other flood risk management bodies such as lead local flood authorities, Internal Drainage Boards, sewerage undertakers, highways authorities and reservoir owners and operators. These discussions can be used to identify the likelihood and possible extent and nature of the flood risk, help scope the flood risk assessment, and identify the</i></p>	CBC agrees that engagement has been undertaken in relation to flood risk, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.155.	<u>Written reply from CBC to confirm. Agreement to be confirmed at topic specific meeting</u>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>information that may be required by the Secretary of State to reach a decision on the application."</i></p> <p>Subsequently, the supporting Flood Risk Assessment has been completed in line with the requirements outlined in this policy and is provided in Appendix 20.1 of the ES [AS-046].</p>			
CBC9	<p>Engagement undertaken in relation to the scope and methodology of the LVIA, in accordance with ANPS paragraphs 5.214-5.216</p>	<p>Engagement between the Applicant, CBC and other relevant stakeholders on the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is set out in Section 148.4 of Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual [AS-079] of the ES. Matters regarding the scope and methodology of the assessment are set out in Sections 148.3 and 148.5 respectively. Accordingly, the Applicant considers that the requirements for the assessment of landscape and visual impacts set out at paragraphs 5.214-5.216 of the ANPS have been satisfied.</p>	<p>CBC agrees that engagement has been undertaken in relation to the scope and methodology of the LVIA, in accordance with ANPS paragraphs 5.214-5.216.</p>	<p>Agreed with LBC, HCC, NHDC and CBC at the LVIA Open Space TWG on 7 June 2022</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC10	Consultation undertaken in accordance with the National Networks National Policy Statement	<p>The Applicant has consulted with CBC in accordance with National Networks National Policy Statement (NNNPS) paragraph 5.204 which states that:</p> <p><i>"Applicants should consult the relevant highway authority, and local planning authority, as appropriate, on the assessment of transport impacts."</i></p> <p>Full details of the engagement has been set out and signposted in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p>	CBC agrees that consultation was undertaken in relation to the Transport Assessment, in accordance with NNNPS paragraph 5.204.	<u>Written reply from CBC to confirm. Agreement to be confirmed at topic-specific meeting</u>	<u>Ongoing Agreement</u>
CBC11	Consultation undertaken in relation to design, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 132.	<p>The Applicant has undertaken engagement regarding the design of the Proposed Development, including with CBC. This is set out in full in the Design and Access Statement [AS-049] and the Consultation Report [AS-048].</p> <p>This accords with NPPF paragraph 132 which states:</p> <p><i>"Design quality should be considered throughout the evolution</i></p>	CBC agrees that consultation was undertaken in relation to design, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 132.	<u>Written reply from CBC to confirm. Agreement to be confirmed at topic-specific meeting</u>	<u>Ongoing Agreement</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>and assessment of individual proposals. Early discussion between applicants, the local planning authority and local community about the design and style of emerging schemes is important for clarifying expectations and reconciling local and commercial interests. Applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposals to evolve designs that take account of the views of the community. Applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot."</i></p>			

Table 3-3-33: Summary of 'compensation' matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	Compensation				

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
Compensation policies and Community First					
CBC12	Compensation Policies, Measures and Community First	The level of funding for Community First was a policy decision, and the split between Luton and neighbouring authorities were policy decisions taken by the Board of Directors of the Applicant. The intended use of Community First funds is identified as tackling areas of social need, and for local decarbonisation projects in line with local and national policy, it is not intended that Community First funds should be used for other purposes.	<p>There is insufficient detail contained within Draft Compensation Policies, Measures and Community First to understand how the split between Luton and other authorities has been determined. The split is based on 60% to Luton and 40% to other authorities has been demonstrated.</p> <p>There is lack of information regarding the operation, distribution and overall effectiveness of the Community First Fund.</p>	To be discussed at topic specific meeting	Ongoing

Table 3-3-44: Summary of ‘need case’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
Need Case					
Aviation Policy					
CBC13	Compliance with Aviation Policy	<p><u>The Applicant considers that national aviation policy is supportive of the Proposed Development, in particular Flightpath to the Future and the Jet Zero Strategy of 2022, which confirm that the relevant policies for the development of airports are contained in the Airports National Policy Statement and in Beyond the Horizon: Making best use of existing runways, with the latter forming the specific policy context for the Proposed Development as set out in the Need Case [AS-125]. The Applicant acknowledges that policy still requires the local environmental impacts to be addressed. The Applicant considers that national aviation policy is supportive of the Proposed Development, in particular Flightpath to the Future and the Jet Zero Strategy of 2022, which confirm</u></p>	<p><u>The HAsCBC agrees that the Application is in line with current Government policies. CBC agrees that national aviation policy, namely the ANPS, APF and MBU, is supportive of airports making the best use of their existing runways. Subsequent Government frameworks and strategies have confirmed support for expansion plans without restrictions upon airport growth.</u></p> <p>CBC to confirm its position on the relevant aviation policy context for the Proposed Development as set out variables and methodology in the Need Case [AS-125], and the forecasting methodology.</p>	<p><u>To be discussed at topic-specific meeting Agreed via email on 05.12.23</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>that the relevant policies for the development of airports are contained in the Airports National Policy Statement and in Beyond the Horizon: Making best use of existing runways, with the latter forming the specific policy context for the Proposed Development as set out in the Need Case [AS-125].</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant acknowledges that policy still requires the local environmental impacts to be addressed.</u> Applicant considers that national aviation policy is supportive of the Proposed Development, in particular Flightpath to the Future and the Jet Zero Strategy of 2022, which confirm that the relevant policies for the development of airports are contained in the Airports National Policy Statement and in Beyond the Horizon: Making best use of existing runways, with the latter forming the specific policy context for the Proposed Development as set out in the Need Case [AS-125].</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
Growth and demand forecasts					
CBC14	<p>Methodology for preparing Passenger Demand Forecasts Position on the variables and methodology for preparing the demand forecasts</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that its passenger demand forecasts, as set out in the Need Case [AS-125], are robust and have been developed using an appropriate methodology and assumptions, including taking into account potential capacity growth at the other London airports, carbon costs and other relevant economic variables. These forecasts, including the Faster and Slower Growth cases set out a reasonable range for the growth and timescale attainable at the airport and are appropriate as the basis for assessing the environmental and other implications, including the benefits, of the Proposed Development. <u>Passenger demand forecasts, as set out in the Need Case [AS-125] are robust and have been developed using an appropriate methodology and assumptions, including taking into account potential capacity growth at the other London airports, carbon</u></p>	<p>CBC to confirm its position on the variables and methodology for preparing the demand forecasts as set in the Need Case [AS-125], including the appropriateness of the sensitivity tests including the use of the Faster and Slower Growth Cases alongside the Core Planning Case as the basis for the assessment of effects. <u>The HAs</u> CBC agrees that the passenger demand forecasts have been developed using an appropriate methodology.</p> <p><u>CBC The Host Authorities considers that there are issues with some of the assumptions used, including economic assumptions, price assumptions, elasticity assumptions and the passenger handling capabilities of Heathrow and Gatwick, that could impact on the rate of growth and the timing of delivery of impacts and benefits. consider that there are issues with some of the assumptions used.</u></p>	<p>To be discussed at topic specific meeting Discussions regarding this matter between CSACL, York Aviation and the host authorities are ongoing</p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>costs and other relevant economic variables.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant considers that the demand forecasts and assessment cases, including the Core Planning Case and Faster and Slower Growth Cases are robust and reflect a reasonable range for the timing within which the airport would reach 32 mppa.</u></p>	<p><u>including economic assumptions, price assumptions, elasticity assumptions and the passenger handling capabilities of Heathrow and Gatwick, that could impact on the rate of growth and the timing of delivery of impacts and benefits.</u></p>		
<p>CBC15</p>	<p>Position on the Demand Forecasts</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the conversion of the passenger demand forecast to detailed projections of aircraft movements and the mix of aircraft types that would be expected to use the airport in future as set out in the Need Case [AS-125], are robust, including the expectation of the transition of the fleet to new generation aircraft and the potential for next generation aircraft, including electric and/or hydrogen powered aircraft to enter the airline fleets from the mid to late 2030s. The Applicant considers that these forecasts are an appropriate basis for <u>assessing the environmental and other implications</u></p>	<p>CBC to confirm its position on the Demand Forecasts. CBC considers that the Tht conversion of passenger demand forecasts to projections of aircraft movement and fleet mix is appropriate, and the outputs reasonable for the Core Development (subject to the reservations noted above about the passenger forecasts) <u>The conversion of passenger demand forecasts to projections of aircraft movement and fleet mix is appropriate, and the outputs reasonable for the Core Development (subject to the reservations noted above about the passenger forecasts).</u></p>	<p>To be discussed at topic specific meeting Agreed via email on 05.12.23</p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>of the Proposed Development. The Applicant considers that conversion of the passenger demand forecast to detailed projections of aircraft movements and the mix of aircraft types that would be expected to use the airport in future as set out in the Need Case [AS-125], are robust, including the expectation of the transition of the fleet to new generation aircraft. The Applicant considers that the conversion of the passenger demand forecast to detailed projections of aircraft movements and the mix of aircraft types that would be expected to use the airport in future as set out in the Need Case [AS-125], are robust, including the expectation of the transition of the fleet to new generation aircraft and the potential for next generation aircraft, including electric and/or hydrogen powered aircraft to enter the airline fleets from the mid to late 2030s.</u></p>			
	<p>Night quota period</p>				

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC16	<p>Appropriateness and realistic profile of flights over day and night Position on the appropriateness of retaining the current restrictions on movements during the night quota period (from 23:30 to 06:00).</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that it has adopted an appropriate and realistic profile of flights over day and night as set out in the Need Case [AS-125], including the assumption that there will continue to be aircraft movements within the night quota period (from 23:30 to 06:00) but no increase in the number or noise quota count of aircraft movements above those currently permitted to operate within that period, and that this profile of demand forms an appropriate basis for the assessment of surface access and noise implications of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>CBC to confirm its position on the appropriateness of the demand profile as the basis for the assessment of surface access and noise implications of the proposed development. CBC agrees that the <u>Need Case sets out a realistic profile of flights for the day and night periods.</u></p> <p><u>CBC supports the retention of the cap of 9,650 annual flights in the night period and would expect the night quota count cap to be included as a requirement and not left to the discretion of the Applicant.</u></p>	<p>To be discussed at topic specific meeting Agreed via email on <u>05.12.23.</u></p>	<p>Agreed Agreed going on</p>

Table 3-3-55: Summary of 'employment and training' matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
--------	--------	--------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------	--------

Employment and Training					
Employment and Training Strategy Governance					
CBC17	Employment and Training Strategy (ETS) to include regular monitoring	Any monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and initiatives outlined within the Employment and Training Strategy (ETS) [APP-215] will be agreed and scoped out once a decision on the DCO has been reached. The Applicant together with the airport operator will regularly monitor and review progress against its own objectives, to ensure their efficiency.	The Employment and Training Strategy (ETS) should include regular monitoring as part of the governance process, which includes Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to demonstrate its success.	Email received 13/07/2023	Agreed
Employment and Training Strategy					
CBC18	Approach and content of the ETS	The ETS [APP-215] aims to use the Proposed Development to support the growth strategies of the Host Authorities, and the Applicant has engaged with the Host Authorities through the Economics and Employment TWG, and will continue to engage post submission of the application for development consent.	CBC is satisfied with the approach and content of the ETS.	Email received 13.07.23	Agreed

Table 3-3-66: Summary of ‘surface access’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
Surface Access					
Monitoring					
CBC19	Future monitoring of the highway network	<p>The approach to monitoring and how this will influence the delivery of improvements to improve sustainable travel modes is set out in the Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044]. The Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] sets out a proposed monitoring programme to ensure that mitigation on the highway network will be delivered as and when required.</p> <p>The emerging Transport Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (TRIMMA) will outline the monitoring methodology, which will include 1) a robust approach for the airport to monitor locations of proposed mitigation and 2) an explanation as</p>	<p>Whilst specific highway interventions are identified within the Proposed Development, future monitoring of the highway network around the airport will be essential, alongside monitoring of the use of sustainable transport modes. It is indicated that proposed improvements will be delivered over the duration of the access strategy, informed by the rate of passenger growth and local monitoring.</p> <p>It currently remains unclear how traffic monitoring will be undertaken, particularly where more remote from the site, including determining the element of traffic growth attributable to the airport (without an extensive and</p>	<p><u>This was discussed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required and 07.12.2023.</u></p> <p><u>This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</u></p>	<u>Ongoing Agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>to how monitoring of residual impacts will be facilitated. An outline of the contents of the TRIMMA are presented in the Outline Transport Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (OTRIMMA) as Appendix I of the Transport Assessment [APP-202].</p> <p><u>The Applicant will provide further information through the updated 'toolbox of measures' in the Framework Travel Plan [APP-229] and the updated future OTRIMMA [REP5-041REP4-085] submitted at Deadline 4.</u></p>	<p>long term ANPR survey-based methodology). <u>CBC seek clarity on ANPR camera locations and how highway monitoring will be captured in the s106 agreement.</u></p> <p>Core mitigation is however necessary that sits outside monitoring. The triggers for some are not necessarily agreed.</p>		
	Assessment				
CBC20	Scope of the traffic and transport assessment	The traffic and transport assessment is related to the extent of impacts on the network capacity and whether significant effects are likely to occur. Certain other specific locations are under discussion with CBC and may be incorporated into the TRIMMA for on-going monitoring.	CBC agree with the overall scope of the traffic and transport assessment, which is related to the extent of impacts on the network capacity and whether significant effects are likely to occur. However, further engagement is required with regards to where a more specific level of assessment is required. <u>CBC seek clarity on ANPR</u>	This was discussed at a <u>meetings</u> on the 27.07.2023, <u>and 02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023</u> with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.	<u>Ongoing Agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>camera locations and the s106 agreement.</u></p>	<p><u>20.10.2023 and 07.12.2023.</u></p>	
<p>CBC21</p>	<p>Assessment years used within the traffic and transport assessment</p>	<p>The assessment has been undertaken for three Assessment Phases for the assessment years of 2027, 2039 and 2043. The Assessment Phases used within the traffic and transport assessment have also informed other environmental topics including the air quality and noise assessments.</p> <p>The uncertainty logs of development and infrastructure to be included in the Rule 9 Accounting for Covid-19 in transport modelling was shared with CBC on the 15 <u>August 20/08/23</u>. No comments were received <u>Comments were received at Deadline 5, and the Applicant will provide a response for Deadline 6 where appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>A meeting between CBC and LBC on the East Luton scheme delivery was held on 16.11.2023 to discuss CBC's queries.</u></p>	<p>CBC agree with the assessment years used within the traffic and transport assessment, and that they are consistent with the air quality assessments. However, further engagement is required. <u>However, further engagement is required.</u></p> <p>CBC have some specific concerns around infrastructure assumptions included in the base on which they are reliant (East of Luton Study – query outstanding regarding the Covid modelling and timings of all of those works, not just Vauxhall Way). A further meeting between CBC and LBC is requested. These queries were discussed with LBC in a meeting on 16.11.2023.</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meetings <u>on the 27.07.2023, and 02.08.2023, and 20.10.2023 and 07.12.23</u> with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	Mitigation				
CBC22	Consultation with National Highways	The Applicant will continue to engage with National Highways post submission of the application for development consent regarding the capacity improvements and network solutions that will enable their support of the Proposed Development.	CBC welcome the ongoing discussions with National Highways regarding the capacity improvements and network solutions that will enable their support of the Proposed Development.	HA's joint 2022 Statutory Consultation response	Agreed
CBC23	Model basis used to inform mitigation measures	<p>The approach to assessment and mitigation is set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]. The Applicant proposes mitigation measures in relation to the impacts of airport expansion on the surface access network capacity in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] and Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044AS-131REP4-044].</p> <p>For junctions that are outside of the VISSIM modelled area, the impact in CBC has been determined using the CBLTM-LTN model as set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p>	<p>CBC have raised queries over the model basis used to inform mitigation measures, including where model outputs have been applied directly to off-site junctions outside of the VISSIM modelled area. It is the view of CBC that model outputs taken directly from a strategic model may not validate well to turning movements and that modelled growth should be added to observed counts to provide a more representative assessment.</p> <p>Extent of mitigation not agreed. Some positive discussions over some specific locations but these have not concluded. Concerns</p>	<p><u>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023 and 07.12.23. To be discussed at topic specific meeting</u></p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Output information, such as traffic demands, Select Link analysis and Volume to Capacity ratios have been provided to CBC for information on impacts, alongside additional standalone junction modelling.</p> <p>As reported in the Highway Local Model Validation Report (LMVR), Appendix E of the in the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206], the validation levels on the screenlines within Central Bedfordshire; Dunstable Cordon, and Dunstable Leighton Buzzard cordon shows acceptable level of validation, and therefore this assessment is considered appropriate to estimate the relative impact of the airport expansion.</p> <p>Discussions on mitigation are on-going and Stage 1 Road Safety Audits can be completed once the scope of mitigation is agreed. An update on safety audits will be provided at Deadline 5 The Updates on Road Safety Audits [REP5-055] was provided at Deadline 5.</p>	<p>over deliverability, including that no Stage 1 RSAs have been undertaken as would normally be the case.</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC24	Phasing of highway mitigation works	<p><u>Whilst the delivery of different highway mitigation measures fall within the relevant assessment phases, as set out in the OTRIMMA (Appendix I of the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206] a monitoring approach is being developed that will allow the Applicant and operator to regularly monitor surface access movements to and from the airport to determine when best to pro-actively design and pro-actively implement relevant agreed mitigation measures.</u></p> <p><u>The concern regarding the delivery of parts of proposed packages of mitigation is acknowledged. However, each proposal is designed to mitigate airport-related traffic and the risk of unforeseen impacts such as traffic redistribution is considered low. When mitigation is re-proposed as a result of monitoring, a period of engagement will be carried out with relevant highway authorities; at this time, any concerns raised will be addressed.</u></p>	<p>CBC are not in agreement with some of the phasing of highways mitigation works proposed (for example the timing of the London Road South mitigation works). CBC would also wish to see scheme dependant highways projects and mitigations identified as 'Core' with fixed triggers for implementation, rather than being delivered via a monitor and manage process (as proposed within the TRIMMA).</p> <p><u>CBC would have significant concerns over the inclusion of mitigation, particularly that related to reasonably foreseeable and identified predicted impacts, being covered within a Monitor and Manage approach, as this would react to issues rather than prevent or mitigate them. The forecast modelling also assumes packages of mitigation without which other impacts may take place at unforeseen locations on the network and which may well fall outside of any proposed monitoring process. CBC have issues with the</u></p>	<p><u>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023 and 07.12.2023.</u></p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>The Applicant notes the comments made regarding the TRIMMA approach and is considering these further. An updated Outline TRIMMA [REP54-04185] was will be provided at Deadline 5. The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>OTRIMMA [-REP5-041] in regards to the thresholds and how a 'reasonable' threshold is identified, the way schemes operate in combination such as with Junction 10 improvements, and how feasible it is for a complex survey review and delivery to be complete by 2027.</p>		
	Public / sustainable transport impacts				
CBC25	<p>Public transport from East to West services</p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to working with local highway authorities and operators to support measures for further improving sustainable transport opportunities, noting that there has been a long-standing lack of strategic east-west public transport connectivity in the region. The Applicant notes that there has been a long-standing lack of strategic east-west public transport connectivity in the region and t The Applicant supports the need to improve such connection however these strategic connections</p>	<p><u>There is significant emphasis on increased public transport services but there is no detail as to what these will entail in terms of new or enhanced bus or coach services and whether the capacity will be sufficient to accommodate predicted demand if the modal shift targets are met. There is also uncertainty as to how maximising the number of rail services calling at Luton Parkway will be achieved. There is particular concern around the lack of good public transport from East to West</u></p>	<p><u>This was discussed at a meeting on the 20.10.2023 and 07.12.2023.</u></p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>are not solely the responsibility of the Applicant to address. However, significant assessment work has been undertaken around demand, capacity and demand distribution for people travelling to and from the airport by rail. This has shown that the rail network will have capacity to deal with the expected increase in passengers and increase in public transport mode share forecasted. This is summarised in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]. The Applicant, through this application for development consent, is improving on-site infrastructure for bus and coach including additional capacity at the existing terminal and a new bus/coach station for the proposed terminal. The Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] name bus and coach as one of the Priority Areas, which are areas identified as priorities for improving sustainable transport to the airport. There are multiple interventions associated with the priority areas, which comprise the</p>	<p><u>and vice versa, both by road and rail, which does not appear to be addressed in the proposals.</u></p> <p><u>Reference to Stansted as a suitable comparator airport ignores that Stansted has a significant sustainable transport fund. There is a lack of commitment in the DCO submission to something similar – e.g. ‘this can include subsidies for bus enhancements’. Should the DCO be granted, there is nothing that requires the Applicant to pursue this. The more ambitious Targets referred to as being included in the Travel Plans are unrelated to the less ambitious targets in GCG for which there are penalties if they are not achieved.</u></p> <p><u>The region lacks good public transport from East to West and vice versa, both by road and rail. The proposals do not appear to address this issue. No additional public transport measures are proposed for East to West travel to Luton, other than by rail and</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Applicant's surface access toolbox. This longlist is contained in the FTP [AS-131REP4-044]. The vision and objectives of the SAS have been identified to capture the surface access Limits and Targets that underpin the strategy. The longlist includes <i>'Engage with bus operators to improve the existing routes and create new and extended routes, better connecting the airport to more places (especially east-west) and in particular urban areas and transport hubs'</i>.</p> <p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has been developing proposals for <u>developed a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056], to be used to fund measures identified within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044]. Additionally, further detail is being provided on implementation and timescales of the 'toolbox of measures', which will be provided at Deadline 4. More information on bus and coach measures will be provided at</u></p>	<p>existing public transport. At present the submission lacks detail as to how additional public transport access to and from the site for staff and passengers will be funded or delivered.</p> <p>Concerns remain around the lack of a sustainable transport fund and reliance on the public transport sector to respond positively to infrastructure delivered on-site. Given the ambitious model split assumptions in the transport modelling, this remains of significant concern. CBC have concerns around how the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056] can provide sufficient early funding to pump-prime public transport services needed to meet sustainable transport Targets.</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Deadline 5 alongside the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF). The Bus & Coach Study [REP5-058] was provided at Deadline 5. 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>CBC26</p>	<p>SNon-sustainable passenger and staff mode share</p>	<p>The Applicant, as a part of the Proposed Development, is seeking to achieve a decrease in the non-sustainable passenger and staff mode share, setting increasingly ambitious Limits through Green Controlled Growth (GCG) in line with airport passenger growth, with additional Targets set over and above these Limits to incentivise even greater ambition for sustainable travel. Mode share Limits are clearly set out in GCG, and mode share Targets will be set at an appropriate level (always further-reaching than GCG Limits) through the development of Travel Plans in future. Encouraging</p>	<p>It is not clear whether there is sufficient capacity to accommodate all of the public transport trips within the proposed networks for rail and bus/coach. The distributional assessment of passenger and employee demand is not clear.</p> <p>Approach to bus and coach travel is not supported. The Applicant was to look further into a Strategy. No further details have been received.</p> <p>The existing public transport links to the airport are recognised in the proposals as being inadequate. Furthermore, it is not</p>	<p><u>This was discussed at a meeting on the 20.10.2023.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>passengers to access the airport by bus and coach is an important part of achieving both Limits and Targets, and as such a new coach station is proposed at Terminal 2. The detailed design for the coach station will be developed at the appropriate time, following grant of development consent.</p> <p>The Applicant has analysed the existing public transport network, including assessing rail capacities and identifying which additional trips could access the airport by public transport.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] has therefore considered the number of people – both passengers and staff – who will be travelling to the airport by public transport as a result of the Proposed Development, and the ability of the rail network to cater for future demand. In summary, the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] concludes that there is expected to be sufficient capacity in the rail network to</p>	<p><u>clear whether there is sufficient capacity to accommodate all of the public transport trips within the proposed networks for rail and bus/coach. The distributional assessment of passenger and employee demand is not clear.</u></p> <p><u>Of the airports in the London region, Luton airport has the lowest level of public transport use (some 25% of journeys). We welcome the recognition of this inadequacy and the wish to address it, but we do not feel the proposals go far enough to delivering this. We consider that there are significant challenges which need to be addressed to achieve that stated modal shift.</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>accommodate demand, taking account of the Proposed Development. It is expected that existing commercial bus and coach operators would increase the frequency of services to support the demand where this was necessary.</p> <p>Whilst Covid-19 has impacted on the rollout of capacity enhancements, it has also reduced pressure on some services as user levels remain below pre-Covid-19 levels. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p> <p>Benchmarking was presented as one component of the approach taken. The Applicant has been developing <u>ing</u> more detail around bus and coach routes <u>in the Bus & Coach Study [REP5-058]</u> 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. These improvements are being developed in tandem with <u>are supported by the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056]</u></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Sustainable Transport Fund that will setsets the framework around how these types of improvements, alongside the others listed out within the toolbox of measures within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044], would be funded. The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. The Applicant provided further detail on implementation and timescales of the 'toolbox of measures' in the Framework Travel Plan [REP4-045] at Deadline 4, and the Bus & Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122] and the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119] at Deadline 5. The Applicant will provided further detail on implementation and timescales of the 'toolbox of measures' in the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] submitted at Deadline 4, and more information on bus and coach measures will be provided at Deadline 5 alongside the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF). Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC27	Public transport services	<p>The Applicant is committed to working with local highway authorities and operators to support measures for further improving sustainable transport opportunities.</p> <p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] sets out a toolbox of measures to enable a flexible approach in adapting and responding to future challenges and uncertainties. The toolbox consists of interventions and measures that can be drawn upon and scaled up or down as and when required, in response to meeting the vision and objectives, changing circumstances, through the results of ongoing monitoring and stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>The granting of development consent would enable the airport to grow and this, in turn, would increase the potential patronage for bus and coach operators. The toolbox approach, underpinned by the monitoring and stakeholder feedback, enables the Applicant to work with stakeholders and</p>	<p>There is significant emphasis on increased public transport services but there is no detail as to what these will entail in terms of new or enhanced bus or coach services and whether the capacity will be sufficient to accommodate predicted demand if the modal shift targets are met. There is also uncertainty as to how maximising the number of rail services calling at Luton Parkway will be achieved.</p> <p>Reference to Stansted as a suitable comparator airport ignores that Stansted has a significant sustainable transport fund. There is a lack of commitment in the DCO submission to something similar— e.g. “this can include subsidies for bus enhancements”. Should the DCO be granted, there is nothing that requires the Applicant to pursue this. The more ambitious Targets referred to as being included in the Travel Plans are unrelated to the less ambitious targets in GCG for which there</p>		Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>operators to develop measures which are effective in responding to demand. As set out in the toolbox, this can include, for example, subsidies for bus enhancements.</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. The completion of DART and extension to the new terminal area should make access by rail more attractive and the Applicant and airport operator will work with train operating companies to maximise the opportunities for trains to call at Luton Parkway Station. In the future, the airport operator will work closely with rail and bus service operators through the Airport Transport Forum and development of future Travel Plans, which will set out measures improve services in order to meet future mode share Targets.</p> <p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has been developing proposals for a Sustainable</p>	<p>are penalties if they are not achieved.</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Transport Fund (STF), to be used to fund measures identified within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044]. The Applicant will continue to engage with the CBC 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 Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>			
<p>CBC27 8</p>	<p>Providing funding for public transport improvements</p>	<p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] sets out a toolbox of measures to enable a flexible approach in adapting and responding to future challenges and uncertainties whilst seek to achieve sustainable mode share Targets. The toolbox consists of interventions and measures that can be drawn upon and scaled up or down as and when required, in response to meeting the vision and objectives of</p>	<p>The Applicant should be more ambitious in relation to setting out how the Travel Plan is to be delivered and for providing funding for public transport improvements, particularly local bus services. <u>It is not clear how the 'toolbox of measures' would be funded and who takes responsibility for them, including how the Applicant will fund, incentivise, market, and monitor</u></p>	<p><u>This was discussed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, and 20.10.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required and 07.12.2023.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>the Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and changing circumstances which will be recognised through the results of ongoing monitoring and stakeholder feedback. Future Travel Plans that follow the structure and requirements set out in the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] will have ambitious Targets that are over and above those set out in the GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022], set in consultation with stakeholders through the Airport Transport Forum. In order to meet these Targets a number of measures will need to be implemented, which could include improvements to local bus services. The operator is committed to funding improvements, as they have done in the recent past. Ultimately, each one of the future Travel Plans would be subject to approval by the relevant planning authority under the process to discharge the requirements of the DCO Application. This process would allow consideration of the appropriateness of the Targets set out and the corresponding measures</p>	<p><u>lift-sharing programmes for airport staff and passengers long-term to maximise the take-up of ridesharing. There is a heavy reliance on third-party schemes/interventions coming forward and third-party buy-in to measures.</u></p> <p><u>CBC seek further information on how the STF aligns with provision of interventions outlined in the 'toolbox of measures', and how it is decided when a sustainable transport intervention is funded through GCG versus the STF.</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>proposed to support the airport in meeting them. The approach to future monitoring of sustainable travel and undertaking of surveys is set out in the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044].</p> <p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has been developing proposals for a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) developed the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056], to be used to fund measures identified within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044], and the Bus & Coach Study [REP5-058] to give further detail on suggested bus and coach improvements. This will be shared at Deadline 5, alongside further information on bus and coach measures. Further detail on the implementation and timescales for the 'toolbox of measures' will also be was provided at Deadline 4. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Council as the proposals are developed, including the size of the fund, the parameters for</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		prioritising measures to be funded by the STF and the legal mechanisms for securing the fund.			
<u>CBC28</u> <u>30</u>	<u>Sustainable transport mode share for both passengers and staff</u>	<u>The Airport has made significant progress in growing its sustainable transport mode share for both passengers and staff as set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206], Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131]. The Covid-19 pandemic has seen a drop-off in sustainable transport however the Applicant is seeking to achieve a decrease in the non-sustainable passenger and staff mode share, setting increasingly stringent Limits through GCG in line with airport passenger growth, with additional Targets set over and above these Limits to incentivise even greater ambition for sustainable travel. Encouraging passengers to access the airport by bus and coach is an important part of achieving both Limits and Targets.</u>	<u>The existing public transport links to the airport are recognised in the proposals as being inadequate. Of the airports in the London region, Luton airport has the lowest level of public transport use (some 25% of journeys). We welcome the recognition of this inadequacy and the wish to address it, but we do not feel the proposals go far enough to delivering this. We consider that there are significant challenges which need to be addressed to achieve that stated modal shift.</u>	<u>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023.</u>	<u>Ongoing</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] sets out a toolbox of measures to enable a flexible approach in adapting and responding to future challenges and uncertainties. The toolbox consists of interventions and measures that can be drawn upon and scaled up or down as and when required, in response to meeting the vision and objectives, changing circumstances, through the results of ongoing monitoring and stakeholder feedback.</u></p>			
<p>CBC29 <u>89</u></p>	<p>Real shifts to public transport</p>	<p>The GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022], Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] set out the governance structure, including the future role of the existing ATF (including for local authorities) and how it will report into the operator and Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) to ensure that the proposed shift to sustainable modes is supported and encouraged.</p> <p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] sets out the</p>	<p>In achieving real shifts to public transport as well as encouraging cycling and walking, the regular reporting and enforcing of Travel Plan targets is clearly essential and the role of the Host Authorities and the proposed Airport Transport Forum (ATF) needs to be developed further, including how any ATF is constituted and funded.</p>	<p><u>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023.</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>proposed governance approach around the Airport Transport Forum and the setting and monitoring of the ambitious targets in the plan. The Airport Transport Forum is an existing group and has mature mechanisms as to how surface access related issues are discussed with interested local stakeholders, including National Highways and the Host Authorities. It is planned to reinvigorate this forum, which will be organised, hosted and managed by the operator, to be effective in its engagement with local and host authorities and key stakeholders such as National Highways, to ensure that the ambition from the Framework Travel Plan [AS-431REP4-044] is realised.</p> <p>It is not intended to discuss the future Travel Plans at the Environmental Scrutiny Group, as this has a singular purpose for the review of the GCG Framework, however there could be opportunities to involve the Technical Panels as a review mechanism for the Travel Plans,</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>which will have their own checks and balances through submission to the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has been developing proposals for developed a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056], to be used to fund measures identified within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044]. 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>			
Public / sustainable transport targets					
CBC30	Sustainable transport mode share for both passengers and staff	<p>The Airport has made significant progress in growing its sustainable transport mode share for both passengers and staff as set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206], Surface Access Strategy [APP-</p>	<p>The existing public transport links to the airport are recognised in the proposals as being inadequate. Of the airports in the London region, Luton airport has the lowest level of public transport use (some 25% of journeys). We</p>		Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>228] and the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044]. The Covid-19 pandemic has seen a drop-off in sustainable transport however the Applicant is seeking to achieve a decrease in the non-sustainable passenger and staff mode share, setting increasingly stringent Limits through GCG in line with airport passenger growth, with additional Targets set over and above these Limits to incentivise even greater ambition for sustainable travel. Encouraging passengers to access the airport by bus and coach is an important part of achieving both Limits and Targets.</p> <p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] sets out a toolbox of measures to enable a flexible approach in adapting and responding to future challenges and uncertainties. The toolbox consists of interventions and measures that can be drawn upon and scaled up or down as and when required, in response to meeting the vision and objectives, changing circumstances, through the results of ongoing</p>	<p>welcome the recognition of this inadequacy and the wish to address it, but we do not feel the proposals go far enough to delivering this. We consider that there are significant challenges which need to be addressed to achieve that stated modal shift.</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		monitoring and stakeholder feedback.			
CBC30 <u>2931</u>	Mode share Limits for staff and passengers	<p>The GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022] sets out mode share Limits for staff and passengers. The Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] set out the approach for setting Targets, which will be further reaching than the GCG Limits for mode share. Future Travel Plans will set Targets for passenger and staff mode share. The Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] are focused on ensuring that the targets are ambitious and aim to directly influence the increase in sustainable surface access modes to and from the airport in the longer term. Therefore, it is proposed that the newly set targets are more ambitious towards sustainable behaviours compared to those achieved in a preceding Travel Plan cycle and the GCG Limits. The level of ambition when setting the percentage change</p>	<p>CBC considers that the Applicant should show greater ambition, with a goal of ensuring that modal shift to non-car modes allows the number of staff working at the airport to increase as forecast whilst resulting in no net increase in traffic generation, taking into account changes in background traffic levels. Would welcome further discussions on this target.</p>	<p>This was discussed and agreed at a <u>meetings</u> on the <u>27.07.2023</u>, and <u>02.08.2023</u> <u>and</u> <u>20.10.2023</u>.</p>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>for targets will be informed by (where applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Striving to go beyond the Limits for passenger and staff mode share. b. Responding to modelling forecasts in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] c. Due regard for recent five-year CAA / staff surveys and trends over the duration of the previous Airport Surface Access Strategy/Travel Plan d. A lookahead to delivery of transport infrastructure delivery in the next five-year period e. Engagement with the Airport Transport Forum and other bodies involved in the governance of the Travel Plans. <p>The airport operator will also set targets for other surface access-related indicators. The diversification of Targets will allow for the collection, analysis and ongoing review of more granular data and an improved understanding of how</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>interventions and measures are performing.</p> <p>As shown previously, baseline data for passenger and staff travel has been subject to considerable variation over recent survey years. Therefore, targets will be set with regard to the latest CAA air passenger travel data and once the first staff survey has been completed post approval of the DCO.</p> <p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] contains the provisional targets for the first future Travel Plan, alongside the headline targets for passenger and staff mode share targets.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to working with the local highway authorities and supporting measures for further improving sustainable transport within the area.</p>			
<p>CBC31 <u>02</u></p>	<p>Non-sustainable mode share</p>	<p>The GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022] sets a 55% Limit of non-sustainable mode share by the time passenger throughput reaches 27 mppa at the Airport. Conversely,</p>	<p>There should be an opportunity to review the future minimum targets if they are exceeded in the early years to ensure there is still a target for continual improvement</p>	<p>This was discussed and agreed at <u>a</u> meeting<u>gsg</u> on the 27.07.2023 <u>and</u>,</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>45% is the minimum acceptable amount of public transport use. This has been set as a Limit through GCG to align with the modelling assumptions used in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]. Notwithstanding this, the public transport work has shown that there is potential to grow passenger modal share beyond 45%. The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] sets out the approach and structure for future Travel Plans, to establish more ambitious Targets for future years.</p>	<p>regarding reducing impacts of private vehicle usage. Having the same target of 45% at 27 mppa and 32 mppa implies that there could be a greater impact on the highway network with the further expansion if the 45% target is achieved in the former year. The targets should therefore perhaps be more ambitious in the final phase.</p>	<p>02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023.</p>	
<p>CBC32 18</p>	<p>Framework Travel Plan scope</p>	<p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] establishes the format and content of future Travel Plans that are to be produced five-yearly. CBC will have the opportunity to comment on future Travel Plans every 5 years. The Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056], which will outline outlines how the FTP will be funded, will be provided was submitted at Deadline 5. Further information on the implementation and timescales of</p>	<p>CBC to confirm its position on the scope of the Framework Travel Plan.</p>	<p>This was discussed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>the 'toolbox of measures' in the FTP was ill-be-provided at for Deadline 4.</u></p>			
	Car parks				
<p>CBC33 <u>23</u></p>	<p>Parking demands, <u>pricing policies and fly parking</u></p>	<p>The Applicant is of the view that the modal shift aspirations are preferable to the inclusion of significant amounts of long-term parking from both an environmental and highway capacity perspective. The ratio of parking spaces per passenger as the airport expands is planned to decrease, although it is acknowledged that the overall number of parking spaces will increase. The potential impact of the increase in passenger numbers all arriving by car would be significant, as such there are Limits and measures in place to maximise access to the airport by public transport.</p> <p>Any future third-party proposals for off-site car parking would require a separate planning application to the relevant local planning authority if and when they come forward, and it would be for the local planning</p>	<p>CBC raise concerns that the parking demands above those predicted could be realised if the mode share targets are not achieved, and that the additional parking demand would be generated at off-site locations. There may be increased pressure for long term parking provisions in the surrounding areas, and the implications of this need to be considered as part of the application for development consent.</p> <p>This concern relates to both formal 'off-site' car parking, which already provides for a large proportion of the existing Airports parking, but which has not been modelled as expanding in line with the increases in all other modes of access, and also informal 'fly-parking' in existing communities, which would be</p>	<p><u>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023 and 07.12.2023.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>authority to consider the potential implications of such proposals through their decision-making processes. The development proposals assume that the mode share for off-site parking will remain broadly as existing; it follows that an increase in demand has been modelled.</p> <p>Fly parking is acknowledged as an issue, but only anecdotal evidence of this practice has been offered. The Applicant is committed to supporting the introduction of on-street parking controls, which are completely within the control of local highway authorities. The Applicant is willing to enter discussions with local authorities with regard to the potential for providing assistance with parking management schemes in their local residential areas where there is a clear demonstration that there are problems related to inappropriate airport related parking. However, it should be noted that it is entirely within the gift of neighbouring local authorities to put planning policies in place as</p>	<p>outside of the host authorities ability to control through the planning system.</p> <p>There has to be an acknowledged balance between parking demand and supply. Simply limiting parking supply will not of its own suppress demand to travel by car.</p> <p>It should not be incumbent on the Host Authorities to demonstrate problems are occurring after the event. The Applicant should be proactive, and consider undertaking baseline surveys at agreed locations where resurveys may identify a problem to be resolved.</p> <p><u>With respect to GCG Limits, how will mode splits be derived? In particular, will someone parking off-site but arriving at the airport by DART, bus or third party car park shuttle bus, be considered to be a car driver or PT user?</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>appropriate to ensure that inappropriate parking is managed.</u></p> <p>The balance between parking supply and demand is acknowledged.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3. <u>notes that additional discussion on fly-parking is required and this will be organised in due course. The OTRIMMA [REP5-041], which was ill be submitted to the ExApproved at Deadline 4, will provides additional information.</u></p> <p><u>Discussions are ongoing regarding implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone and the updated OTRIMMA to be submitted at Deadline 7.the</u></p>			
CBC34	Parking restraint and pricing policies	<p>The Applicant is willing to enter discussions with local authorities with regard to the potential for providing assistance with parking management schemes in their local residential areas where there is a</p>	<p>The Proposed Development, in combination with proposed parking restraint and pricing policies may result in increased demand for off-site parking (both formalised and opportunistic). As</p>	<p>To be discussed at topic specific meeting</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>clear demonstration that there are problems related to inappropriate airport related parking. However, it should be noted that it is entirely within the gift of neighbouring local authorities to put planning policies in place as appropriate to ensure that inappropriate parking is managed.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>such there may be a need to implement parking control areas in areas surrounding the airport.</p> <p>It should not be incumbent on the Host Authorities to demonstrate problems are occurring after the event. The Applicant should be proactive, and consider undertaking baseline surveys at agreed locations where resurveys may identify a problem to be resolved.</p>		
<p>CBC34 <u>35</u></p>	<p>Monitoring and managing the impact of off-site car parks</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes and acknowledges the key role that the LPAs have to play in monitoring and managing the impact of off-site car parks, especially in ensuring that an inappropriate balance of on-and off-site parking does not result in uncontrolled or unmitigated environmental effects which could undermine the ability of the Applicant to meet GCG Targets.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has no control over the operation or potential expansion of these facilities – this is a matter for facility operators and for local</u></p>	<p>The monitoring of third party operated car parks and impacts on localised areas, resulting from the proposed development should not be an additional burden placed upon the host authorities and would need to be funded by the application. At present the Transport Assessment and Surface Access Strategy do not set out an approach to monitoring and mitigation for this area of concern.</p>	<p><u>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>authorities. The Applicant has, however, incorporated forecast traffic associated with these facilities into the design of proposed mitigation. Monitoring proposed in the OTRIMMA accounts for this.</u></p> <p>The Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] and Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] set out the monitoring and mitigation measures proposed. As part of the ongoing review process, the Applicant intends to produce monitoring programs, assess any impacts, and then intervene accordingly if any issues persist as appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. <u>Further engagement on fly parking will be undertaken in due course.</u> Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>			
	<p>Framework Travel Plan</p>				

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC36	Toolbox of travel plan measures	<p>The GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022] includes mode share Limits that will ensure the operator delivers any sustainable travel measures from the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] toolbox that are necessary to stay within the Limits. Failure to stay within the GCG Limits would result in limitations being placed on airport growth; therefore the GCG Limits provide sufficient incentive to the operator to stay within the mode share Limits to ensure that the toolbox of measures will be utilised appropriately. There are ongoing discussions with regards to further clarity on the particular arrangements for funding of surface access related measures and interventions identified in the FTP.</p> <p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has been developing proposals for a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF), to be used to fund measures identified within the Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044]. The Applicant will</p>	<p>It is not clear how the “toolbox of travel plan measure” would be funded and who takes responsibility for them. There is a heavy reliance on third-party schemes/interventions coming forward and third-party buy-in to measures.</p>		Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>continue to engage with the CBC 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>CBC37</p>	<p>Funding, incentivising, marketing and monitoring lift-sharing programmes for airport staff and passengers long-term to maximise the take-up of ride sharing</p>	<p>The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] sets out a toolbox of measures to enable a flexible approach in adapting and responding to future challenges and uncertainties. It includes a commitment to an on-going approach to monitoring which will be important in the success of the future Travel Plans. It also sets out the governance structure to support delivery of these programmes and measures, and the GCG mode share Limits provide the necessary incentive to ensure that the operator will deliver measures necessary to stay within the GCG Limits. Please also refer to the Applicant response in CBC36. There are ongoing discussions with regards to further clarity on the particular arrangements for funding of surface</p>	<p>Query how the Applicant will fund, incentivise, market and monitor lift-sharing programmes for airport staff and passengers long-term to maximise the take-up of ride sharing.</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		access related measures and interventions identified in the FTP.			
CBC38	Framework Travel Plan scope	The Framework Travel Plan [AS-131REP4-044] establishes the format and content of future Travel Plans that are to be produced five-yearly. CBC will have the opportunity to comment on future Travel Plans every 5 years.	CBC to confirm its position on the scope of the Framework Travel Plan.	This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.	Ongoing
	Modelling				
CBC35 <u>49</u>	Model scope <u>and assumptions, coverage and assumptions around the development/transport and highway scheme uncertainty log</u>	The Applicant presented the model scope, coverage and assumptions around the development/transport and highway scheme uncertainty log. The applicant Applicant notes that <u>whilst the public transport mode share for passengers reduced substantially as a result of the pandemic and the restrictions on social mixing, 2022 CAA data shows that there has been a significant</u>	CBC are content with the model scope and coverage, but have raised consistent concerns with regards to the uncertainty log, with regards to both the development assumptions within the core scenario (including the M1 – A6 Link Road but excluding the associated development) and the infrastructure associated with the East Luton Project.	This was discussed at a meetings on the 27.07.2023, 3 and 02.08.2023 <u>and 20.10.2023</u> with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>recovery, with 35% of passengers using public transport. This is approaching the level of public transport use in 2019, when 38% of passengers used public transport. This indicates that the baseline mode share of 40% is in fact reasonable. There is no post pandemic staff travel mode share data currently available.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant notes that there are ongoing discussions with regards to further clarity on the particular arrangements for funding of surface access related measures and interventions identified in the FTP.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3. The Applicant facilitated a meeting between CBC and LBC on the East Luton project on the 16.11.2023. The Applicant will also provide information on whether the 'associated development' was included in the modelling.</u></p>	<p><u>The base mode share assumptions appear to be based upon public transport usage recovering to levels above the 2018 CAA mode share, in which 24% of staff used public transport, but with 2020 levels recorded at 5%. Likewise, the 2018 passenger mode share was recorded as being 33%, with the 2020 survey recording combined public transport mode share of 9%. As such the baseline 2027 level of 40% passenger public transport mode share appears to be similarly optimistic. It is not considered that reliance upon commercial operators to meet demand is an appropriate strategic approach to public transport access or achieving the public transport targets relied upon within the modelling work. In the absence of evidence to substantiate demands for individual route enhancements, it is unclear how or if improvements would be brought forward. Whilst reference is made to a 'toolbox' approach, this is not currently a</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p>funded or defined process, nor is there a mechanism for the prioritisation of investment Taking the example of Stanstead – public transport improvements are partially funded by a passenger transport levy, which contributes circa £600k-£800k per annum to public transport measures. There appear to be no comparable proposals associated with the DCO.</p>		
<p>CBC40 <u>365</u></p>	<p>Approach to the modelling scenarios and the development, calibration and validation of the models</p>	<p>The approach approach to the modelling scenarios was agreed with National Highways in advance of undertaking the model testing. This included an acknowledgement that, due to existing capacity constraints on the M1 corridor between Junction 9 and 10, National Highways would likely need to increase the capacity at some point in the future to address both the existing issues and future growth even in the absence of the Proposed Development. It was also acknowledged that at the present time, there are no capacity enhancement schemes which have been prepared by National</p>	<p>CBC are satisfied they have been engaged in the development, calibration and validation of the models and are happy with the model scope, coverage and assumptions around the development/transport and highway scheme uncertainty log and coverage. However, queries remain with regards to the uncertainty log. In addition the comments above relate purely to the Strategic Level Modelling, with outstanding queries remaining with regards to the</p>	<p>This was discussed and agreed at a meetings on the 27.07.2023, and 02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Highways to address these issues and for modelling purposes only a capacity enhancement scheme which increased the capacity of the M1 between Junction 9 and 10 and associated improvements to M1 J10 were included in the 2043 future baseline.</p> <p>Furthermore, a sensitivity test test has been undertaken at the request of National Highways to understand the effects of no capacity enhancement on M1 in the future baseline. This his test has demonstrated that the works proposed by the Applicant to the Junction 10 in the earlier phases of development continue to mitigate the impacts of the Proposed Development even in the event where no further capacity enhancement is provided to the M1 corridor.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will</p>	<p>calibration and validation of local junction models.</p> <p>TThe highways modelling currently assumes hard shoulder running (or Smart motorway) to be present in all future options. If the present government review comes down on the side of no further Smart motorways, a sensitivity test will be needed to demonstrate that the proposals will not cause an unacceptable impact on the Strategic Road Network.</p> <p>There is an assumption in the assessments that an enhancement scheme will be provided at the M1 between junctions 9 and 10 including hard shoulder running (or Smart Motorway) in all forecast options. If the government review concludes no further Smart Motorways, an an alternative test and/or scheme may be required.</p> <p>It is understood that further modelling will be undertaken as part of the update related to</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>provide a response at Deadline 3. The details of calibration and validation of models are set out in the modelling LMVR reports which have been agreed by both National Highways and the relevant highway authorities.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant continues to engage with CBC with regard to the impacts and assessment for local junctions including the details of any modelling. Local junction models have been prepared based on geometric parameters and provide a comparative performance of the junction without and with development. Where appropriate data is available, consideration has been given to validation of flows and queues.</u></p> <p><u>As part of the Rule 9 response letter of 27th June 2023 on accounting for Covid-19 in transport modelling the Applicant has proposed updating the land use development uncertainty log information. This was shared with CBC on 15 August/08/ 2023 and no comments were received.</u></p>	<p>COVID 19 impacts in which the 'no Smart Motorway' scenario will be treated as 'Core'. However this is yet to be formally issued or reviewed.</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>The Covid-19 modelling update takes account of the smart motorways removal and relevant engagement sessions have been held. Technical Note 1: M1 A6 Routing Analysis [REP4-105] and Technical Note 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 2 Risk Assessment [REP4-046] have been will be issued at Deadline 4, which will provide further information.</u></p>			
<p>CBC37 641</p>	<p>The assumptions for East Luton highway improvement schemes</p>	<p>The assumptions for East Luton highway improvement schemes have been agreed with the relevant highway authority, LBC. LBC consider that it is appropriate to include these improvements in the Do-Minimum scenario due to the reasonable certainty that the schemes will proceed. LBC has already implemented one phase of the works through the upgrades to the Stopsley Way junction area.</p> <p>It is noted that for the 'Accounting for COVID-19 in transport modelling' work, which is currently in progress, in response to the ExA's Rule 9</p>	<p><u>CBC remain concerned over the inclusion of East Luton schemes without a related commitment to their provision being contained as a provision or requirement within the DCO itself.</u></p> <p>East Luton highway improvement schemes being included in the 2027 case may provide an overestimate of traffic capacity at those locations. Noted that some locations require further modification as a result of the airport. Funding for the initial measures is not confirmed.</p>	<p><u>This was discussed in a meeting on 20.10.2023.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Procedural Decision dated 13 June 2023, Vauxhall Way is not included in the 2027 'do-minimum or do-something' models as the responsible highway authority has indicated that the works are unlikely to be completed by 2027. However, it is incorrect to say that the works have been put back to 2039.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3. <u>facilitated a meeting between CBC and LBC on 16.11.2023 to discuss the East Luton highway improvement schemes further.</u></p>	<p>This is also a disparity between scheme descriptions and content between documents in at least one case.</p> <p>Due to delays with scheme delivery, it is understood that the Vauxhall Way scheme will be put back to the 2039 assessment year, albeit still in the test Do Minimum test. This is demonstrative of the lack of control that the Applicant has over these schemes and hence the concern that they are taken as a 'given' in their assessments with no mechanism to secure them via the DCO if they do not materialise.</p>		
CBC42	Inclusion of East Luton highway improvement schemes	<p>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>CBC remain concerned over the inclusion of East Luton schemes without a related committed to their provision being contained as a provision or requirement within the DCO itself.</p>		Ongoing
CBC43	Engagement in the development,	<p>The details of calibration and validation of models are set out in the modelling LMVR reports which</p>	<p>CBC are satisfied they have been engaged in the development, calibration and validation of the</p>		Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	calibration and validation of the models and are happy with the model scope, coverage and assumptions around the development/transport and highway scheme uncertainty	<p>have been agreed by both National Highways and the relevant highway authorities.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p> <p>As part of the Rule 9 response letter of 27th June 2023 on accounting for Covid-19 in transport modelling the Applicant has proposed updating the land use development uncertainty log information. This was shared with CBC on 15/08/2023 and no comments were received</p>	<p>models and are happy with the model scope, coverage and assumptions around the development/transport and highway scheme uncertainty log and coverage. However, queries remain with regards to the uncertainty log. In addition the comments above relate purely to the Strategic Level Modelling, with outstanding queries remaining with regards to the calibration and validation of local junction models.</p> <p>CBC is more comfortable that we are being given the opportunity to revisit this as part of the remodelling exercise that will account for Covid, but CBC must be given sufficient time to consider the outcome of this exercise</p>		
<u>CBC44</u> <u>37</u>	The CBLTM-LTN and VISSIM modelling	The Applicant understands that LBC, the relevant highway authority, remains committed to the delivery of the improvements to the A505 and related junctions proposed by the East Luton Study. LBC has already	The CBLTM-LTN and VISSIM modelling assumes that by 2027 the improvements to the A505 and related junctions proposed by the East Luton Study will have been implemented. Confirmation	<u>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023.</u>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>implemented one phase of the works through the upgrades to the Stopsley Way junction area.</p>	<p>required that funding for delivery of these improvements and whether this a reasonable assumption to make for 2027.</p>		
<p><u>CBC38</u> <u>7</u></p>	<p><u>The development, calibration and validation of the models</u></p>	<p><u>The details of calibration and validation of models are set out in the modelling LMVR reports which have been agreed by both National Highways and the relevant highway authorities.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant continues to engage with CBC with regard to the impacts and assessment for local junctions including the details of any modelling. Local junction models have been prepared based on geometric parameters and provide a comparative performance of the junction without and with development. Where appropriate data is available, consideration has been given to validation of flows and queues.</u></p> <p><u>As part of the Rule 9 response letter of 27 June 2023 on accounting for Covid-19 in transport modelling the Applicant has proposed updating the land use development uncertainty</u></p>	<p><u>CBC are satisfied they have been engaged in the development, calibration and validation of the models and are happy with the model scope, coverage and assumptions around the development/transport and highway scheme uncertainty log and coverage. However, queries remain with regards to the uncertainty log. In addition the comments above relate purely to the Strategic Level Modelling, with outstanding queries remaining with regards to the calibration and validation of local junction models.</u></p> <p><u>CBC is more comfortable that we are being given the opportunity to revisit this as part of the remodelling exercise that will account for Covid, but CBC must be given sufficient time to</u></p>	<p><u>This was discussed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>log information. This was shared with CBC on 15 August 2023 and no comments were received.</p> <p>The Covid-19 modelling update takes account of the smart motorways removal and relevant engagement sessions have been held. Technical Note 1: M1 A6 Routing Analysis [REP4-105] and Technical Note 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 2 Risk Assessment [REP4-046] have been issued at Deadline 4, providing further information.</p>	<p>consider the outcome of this exercise.</p>		
<p>CBC45 3978</p>	<p>All known committed developments and transport infrastructure schemes</p>	<p>All known committed developments and transport infrastructure schemes have been incorporated into the models in accordance with WebTAG guidance and best practice. A Local Transport Plan sensitivity scenario has also been produced. This has included reviewing all planned development against a certainty log and incorporating developments in the relevant scenario.</p> <p>The approach to modelling was agreed with officers at relevant highway authorities including LBC,</p>	<p>There does not appear to be a modelled scenario which isolates the impact of the Proposed Development on the local network. The following scenario is therefore missing:</p> <p>Do Minimum with committed highway schemes and developments and mitigation (to resolve Do Minimum issues).</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>National Highways and officers at CBC and HCC were aware of this approach. The approach is consistent with that adopted for the 2019 statutory consultation and no material concerns on the approach were raised at the time.</p> <p>A written response regarding this is being produced as part of the ISH4 hearing action. A written response was provided as part of the ISH4 Action 8 response, namely Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 8: Off-site Highway Works [REP4-082].</p>			
<p>CBC40 389</p>	<p><u>Highway mitigation works in Central Bedfordshire</u></p>	<p><u>Discussions have been held between the Applicant and Central Bedfordshire Council with regard to the proposed highway mitigation measures which fall within the CBC boundary. A Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been undertaken and a Designer's Response has been prepared and sent to Central Bedfordshire for review.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant will continue to work alongside CBC as the designs</u></p>	<p><u>Whilst the A1081 (New Airport Way) falls predominantly within Luton, elements of the road are within Central Bedfordshire, including locations where highway mitigation works are proposed. These consist of:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• New Airport Way / Gipsy Lane junction – As shown in document TR020001/APP/4.13, plan refs. LLADCO3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0003 rev P01 / LLADCO-3C-</u> 	<p><u>To be discussed</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>progress through to the detailed design and delivery stage.</u></p>	<p><u>ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0005 rev P01.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>• London Road South – As shown in document TR020001/APP/4.13, plan ref. LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0017 rev P01.</u> <p><u>The works proposed at the New Airport Way / M1 Junction 10 are also immediately adjacent to the section of the A1081 within Central Bedfordshire.</u></p> <p><u>In the short term, the need to deliver mitigation works at these locations will require significant traffic management and will therefore impact upon driver journey times and route choices. The ability of the Authority to effectively discharge its traffic management duties could be impacted if sufficient allowance is</u></p> <p><u>not made within the DCO for appropriate liaison to take place with regards to road space booking, traffic management, and</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<u>other Streetworks activities associated with the delivery of highway mitigation works at these traffic sensitive locations.</u>		
Local impact fund					
CBC41 39406	General local highway network fund to cover additional improvements	As set out in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] and Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] , the Applicant proposes to undertake monitoring to enable the impacts of the Proposed Development to be able to be considered during implementation such as airport related traffic on less suitable roads or parking in residential areas. The Applicant and the airport operator will work with the local highway authorities and support appropriate measures in the event that there are impacts which occur as a consequence of the implementation of the Proposed Development. <u>The Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056], which will be provided at Deadline 5, There are ongoing discussions with regards to</u>	There remains a case for a general local highway network fund to cover additional improvements in physical highway infrastructure should future monitoring demonstrate that there is a need for such improvements. Unforeseen or unintended consequences of future growth on the highway network should not be left to the highways authorities to fund in the future. Such interventions would be considered alongside demand management and sustainable transport initiatives in the Sustainable Transport Fund with priority given to reducing highways impacts by modal shift prior to capacity interventions given the environmental benefits that would result.	<u>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023.</u>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>further will provides clarity on the particular arrangements for funding of surface access related measures and interventions identified in the FTP. The OTRIMMA [REP4-085], to be provided at Deadline 4, will provideincludes information on <u>funding highway mitigation commitments.</u> -</p>			
	Order Limits				
<p>CBC42 017</p>	<p>Order Limits to enable delivery of the Proposed Development</p>	<p>The Applicant is confident that enough land has been identified and secured within the Order Limits to enable delivery of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>CBC note that the Order Limits are drawn relatively closely around some of the highways works proposed. As outstanding queries associated with the detailed modelling of the mitigation works proposed remain to be addressed, there also remains the potential that updated modelling could identify further amendments to the proposed mitigation, which could have a greater requirement in terms of land take. Where there is scope for earthworks or other supporting works, including revisions to signage, the limited flexibility</p>	<p>To be discussed during ongoing engagement</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			allowed for within the Order Limits may constrain the extent of the works that could be secured and delivered.		
CBC43 128	Impacts outside of the Order Limits, and a mechanism for securing any works outside of the redline	The Applicant will engage with CBC on a mechanism for securing any actions which may be required as a result of unintended consequences-, outside of the Order Limits.	CBC also note that there are likely to be impacts outside of the Order Limits, and a mechanism for securing any works outside of the redline needs to be agreed.	To be discussed during ongoing engagement	Ongoing
CBC43 239	Planning assumptions	<p>The Applicant confirms that the planning assumption at the time of the modelling was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M1-A6 link has full approval, hence was coded in the TAG-based scenario; • The North of Luton development has 'Reasonably Foreseeable' status. <p>Therefore, the development was excluded from the development from the TAG-based scenario.</p>	CBC are of the view that the ' Locatest Plan Scenario Test' is more representative of the forecast baseline development position. Whilst queries have been raised over a number of developments assumptions, the exclusion of the Luton North allocation from the Core Scenario is of particular concern (with the modelling including the M1-A6 Link Road but excluding the related development).	To be discussed during ongoing engagement	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>As part of the Rule 9 response letter of 27 June 2023 on accounting for Covid-19 in transport modelling the Applicant has proposed updating the land use development uncertainty log information. This was shared with CBC on 15 August/08/ 2023 and no comments were received.</p> <p><u>The Rule 9 modelling has also addressed the comments related to disparate sensitivity tests and no longer includes any capacity upgrade on the M1 and ensure that the demand from the strategic modelling informs the VISSIM modelling.</u></p> <p>The Applicant notes the additional comments made and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The number of disparate sensitivity tests is a concern, e.g. without Smart motorway <u>motorway</u> and LP scenario test. CBC is of the view that these should be combined and provide the Core scenario against which the mitigation strategy is based.</p>		
<p>CBC50 <u>4434</u></p>	<p>Linkages between the various levels of modelling work carried out</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] includes details on the linkages between the various levels of modelling work that have been, and are being, carried out, and these are consistent with the Surface Access</p>	<p>CBC are of the view that further clarity is required with regards to the linkages between the various levels of modelling work carried out. In particular the relationship between the Strategic (CBLTM) and the VISSIM model, and the</p>		<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Emerging Transport Strategy (SAETS) published at the 2022 statutory consultation. Whilst the Strategic (CBLTM-LTN) and the VISSIM model were developed independently, both models are TAG compliant. The Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] also includes sensitivity analysis in which the forecasts traffic growth from CBLTM-LTN model is applied to the base model VISSIM.</p> <p>Local junction modelling has been informed by data from the CBLTM-LTN, the <u>A</u>applicant therefore considers this data to be valid and suitable for use, particularly when compared against the sensitivity modelling exercises – as standard practice.</p>	<p>derivation of flows for the detailed junction models used to develop proposed mitigation schemes. CBC are also of the view that, if there has been a direct application of turning movements from the strategic or microsimulation models to individual junctions, then validation against turning movements in the base year would need to be demonstrated at an individual junction level, if there is to be sufficient confidence in the junction modelling undertaken.</p>		
CBC45 54	Detailed junction modelling	<p>The Applicant and CBC discussed the detailed junction modelling during meetings on the 27.07.23 and 03.08.23. Further modelling outputs <u>e</u>an be provided if required - the Applicant requests a comprehensive list of all outputs required.</p>	<p>CBC have requested sight of the more detailed junction modelling undertaken on a junction-by-junction basis, using LINSIG, JUNCTIONS 9 or other specific junction modelling software, including full model inputs and</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned</p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p>outputs, to allow for an appropriate level of scrutiny and review to be undertaken and for a comparison between scenarios to be possible. In the absence of this more detailed information, it is not possible for CBC to review or fully comment upon the proposed mitigation.</p>	<p>where this can be discussed if required.</p>	
<p>CBC52 <u>4656</u></p>	<p>Highways works in CBC</p>	<p>-The Applicant acknowledges that a number of the proposed highway works fall within CBC's boundaries and is open to having discussions regarding how CBC will continue to be engaged on this. <u>An update on the progress of the Stage 1 Road Safety Audits</u> is provided in the <u>Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 7 - Updates on Road Safety Audits [REP5-055]</u> in response to ISH4 <u>Action 7 will be provided at Deadline 5. Discussions regarding the RSA designer's responses will be undertaken with CBC.</u></p>	<p>A number of the highways works proposed fall within CBC, and the works in question will need to be reviewed by, and agreed with, CBC highways agreements team, including Stage 1 Safety Audits to ensure that the mitigation necessary can be delivered within the confines of the Order limits.</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC53 <u>47</u>	Junction assessment	<p>The Applicant notes tes that the M1 sensitivity test has only been undertaken for the TAG compliant scenario.</p> <p>The Rule 9 modelling will update the uncertainty log and no longer includes an assumption of an M1 capacity upgrade. Local junction modelling undertaken for the Rule 9 response will take consideration of the most appropriate supply and demand assumptions. The updated modelling is expected to be submitted at Deadline 6.</p> <p>Point CBC58 provides further details on additional modelling requested by the ExA as part of the Rule 9 Letter that is being undertaken.</p>	<p>CBC would wish to see a full assessment of the junctions within CBC network based upon the M1 Smart Motorways Sensitivity <u>tey</u> test and utilising the Local Plan Test development assumptions, as this is considered to be the most representative and robust set of assumptions to apply.</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</p>	Ongoing
CBC54 <u>4768</u>	Recently consented Newlands Park development	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that the recently consented Newlands Park development includes works to the junction of the A1081 / Newlands Road junction, and this may need to be taken into account in the</p>	<p>The recently consented Newlands Park development (22/00929/HYBEIA) includes works to the junction of the A1081 / Newlands Road junction, which the application will need to take into account, including modelling</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned</p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>modelling. The Applicant is open to having discussions regarding this.</p>	<p>of the proposed mitigation scheme with the uplift in flows associated with the Proposed Development to determine whether additional mitigation will be required.</p>	<p>where this can be discussed if required.</p>	
<p>CBC55</p>	<p>Phasing of highway mitigation associated with the Surface Access Strategy</p>	<p>Whilst the delivery of different highway mitigation measures fall within the relevant assessment phases, as set out in the OTRIMMA (Appendix I of the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206]) a monitoring approach is being developed that will allow the Applicant and operator to regularly monitor surface access movements to and from the airport to determine when best to pro-actively design and pro-actively implement relevant agreed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The concern regarding the delivery of parts of proposed packages of mitigation is acknowledged. However, each proposal is designed to mitigate airport-related traffic and the risk of unforeseen impacts such as traffic redistribution is considered low. When mitigation is re-proposed</p>	<p>The phasing of highway mitigation associated with the Surface Access Strategy has not been agreed, with some mitigation works (for example the London Road South improvement works) being held back to later phases despite earlier impacts being identified in the modelling work.</p> <p>CBC would have significant concerns over the inclusion of mitigation, particularly that related to reasonably foreseeable and identified predicted impacts, being covered within a Monitor and Manage approach, as this would react to issues rather than prevent or mitigate them. The forecast modelling also assumes packages of mitigation without which other impacts may take place at unforeseen locations on</p>	<p>A meeting will be arranged prior to deadline 3.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>as a result of monitoring, a period of engagement will be carried out with relevant highway authorities; at this time, any concerns raised will be addressed.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments made regarding the TRIMMA approach and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3</p>	<p>the network and which may well fall outside of any proposed monitoring process.</p>		
<p>CBC56 <u>4879</u></p>	<p>The re-routing of trips through Caddington</p>	<p>Details and analysis are included in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] around the re-routing of trips through Caddington and Slip End.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments made regarding Slip End and <u>has provided CBC with further information which shows that the impacts at Slip End are not expected to be materialis considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</u></p>	<p>CBC are concerned over the re-routing of trips through Caddington in the 'with-development' scenario and do not consider this to be an acceptable impact of the Proposed Development. Work is ongoing in terms of proposed mitigation, but this is not yet agreed.</p> <p>Further consideration of the impact upon Slip End is also required.</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC57	Demands for 'fly-parking'	<p>The Proposed Development includes proposals to increase on site car parking, although the need to encourage and promote increased sustainable transport to the airport is recognised. The car parking proposals in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] have been developed on a 'cautious' basis of mode share growth to reduce the risk of vehicles parking in local areas ('fly parking'). The Applicant is willing to enter discussions with local authorities with regard to the potential for providing assistance with parking management schemes in their local residential areas where there is a clear demonstration that there are problems related to inappropriate airport related parking. However, it should be noted that it is entirely within the gift of neighbouring local authorities to put planning policies in place as appropriate to ensure that inappropriate parking is managed.</p> <p>It is noted that the application includes controls such as GCG</p>	<p>CBC are concerned over the potential additional demands for 'fly-parking' in the settlements surrounding the airport, which have not been addressed within the proposals to date.</p> <p>It should not be incumbent on the Host Authorities to demonstrate problems are occurring after the event. The Applicant should be proactive, and consider undertaking baseline surveys at agreed locations where resurveys may identify a problem to be resolved.</p> <p>With respect to GCG Limits, how will mode splits be derived? In particular, will someone parking off-site but arriving at the airport by DART, bus or third party car park shuttle bus, be considered to be a car driver or PT user?</p>	A meeting will be arranged prior to deadline 3.	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>which can limit the ability of the Airport to grow in the event that the Airport is not meeting the Limits set as part of the application. The Applicant and airport operator have the ambition to have sustainable mode share targets which are in excess of these Limits and which should further reduce the risk of parking in local areas.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments made about monitoring of impacts and is considering these further. Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>			
	Modelling				
<p>CBC49 8580</p>	<p>Highway network included in the CBLTM-LTN model</p>	<p>The extent of the highway network included in the CBLTM-LTN model is agreed and considered appropriate to enable assessment of the wider scheme impacts.</p>	<p>CBC agree with the extent of the highway network included in the CBLTM-LTN model.</p>	<p>Agreed during meetings with CBC's Community Services December 2018, 14.03.19 and 22.10.19</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC59	The base mode share assumptions	<p>The Applicant notes that whilst the public transport mode share for passengers reduced substantially as a result of the pandemic and the restrictions on social mixing, 2022 CAA data shows that there has been a significant recovery, with 35% of passengers using public transport. This is approaching the level of public transport use in 2019, when 38% of passengers used public transport. This indicates that the baseline mode share of 40% is in fact reasonable. There is no post pandemic staff travel mode share data currently available.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that there are ongoing discussions with regards to further clarity on the particular arrangements for funding of surface access related measures and interventions identified in the FTP.</p> <p>Where appropriate and/or necessary, the Applicant will provide a response at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>The base mode share assumptions appear to be based upon public transport usage recovering to levels above the 2018 CAA mode share, in which 24% of staff used public transport, but with 2020 levels recorded at 5%. Likewise, the 2018 passenger mode share was recorded as being 33%, with the 2020 survey recording combined public transport mode share of 9%. As such the baseline 2027 level of 40% passenger public transport mode share appears to be similarly optimistic. It is not considered that reliance upon commercial operators to meet demand is an appropriate strategic approach to public transport access or achieving the public transport targets relied upon within the modelling work. In the absence of evidence to substantiate demands for individual route enhancements, it is unclear how or if improvements would be brought forward. Whist reference is made to a 'toolbox'</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023. A further meeting will be arranged prior to deadline 3.</p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p>approach, this is not currently a funded or defined process, nor is there a mechanism for the prioritisation of investment. Taking the example of Stanstead – public transport improvements are partially funded by a passenger transport levy, which contributes circa £600k-£800k per annum to public transport measures. There appear to be no comparable proposals associated with the DCO.</p>		
<p><u>CBC50</u></p>	<p><u>The base mode share assumptions</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant notes that whilst the public transport mode share for passengers reduced substantially as a result of the pandemic and the restrictions on social mixing, 2022 CAA data shows that there has been a significant recovery, with 35% of passengers using public transport. This is approaching the level of public transport use in 2019, when 38% of passengers used public transport. This indicates that the baseline mode share of 40% is in fact reasonable. There is no post</u></p>	<p><u>The base mode share assumptions appear to be based upon public transport usage recovering to levels above the 2018 CAA mode share, in which 24% of staff used public transport, but with 2020 levels recorded at 5%. Likewise, the 2018 passenger mode share was recorded as being 33%, with the 2020 survey recording combined public transport mode share of 9%. As such the baseline 2027 level of 40% passenger public transport mode share appears to be similarly optimistic. It is not</u></p>	<p><u>This was discussed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>pandemic staff travel mode share data currently available.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant notes that there are ongoing discussions with regards to further clarity on the particular arrangements for funding of surface access related measures and interventions identified in the FTP.</u></p>	<p><u>considered that reliance upon commercial operators to meet demand is an appropriate strategic approach to public transport access or achieving the public transport targets relied upon within the modelling work. In the absence of evidence to substantiate demands for individual route enhancements, it is unclear how or if improvements would be brought forward. Whilst reference is made to a ‘toolbox’ approach, this is not currently a funded or defined process, nor is there a mechanism for the prioritisation of investment Taking the example of Stanstead – public transport improvements are partially funded by a passenger transport levy, which contributes circa £600k-£800k per annum to public transport measures. There appear to be no comparable proposals associated with the DCO.</u></p>		
<p>CBC51 495160</p>	<p>Highways works within</p>	<p>The Applicant has continued to engage with stakeholders and additional information has been</p>	<p>CBC have consistently raised concerns that the highways works within Central Bedfordshire have</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	Central Bedfordshire	<p>provided including further details relating to the modelling and will continue to engage with CBC.</p> <p><u>An update on Road Safety Audits is provided in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 7 - Updates on Road Safety Audits [REP5-055] at Deadline 5. Discussions regarding the RSA designer's responses will be undertaken with CBC. An update on the progress of the Stage 1 Road Safety Audits in response to ISH4 Action 7 will be provided at Deadline 5. Discussions regarding the RSA designer's responses will be subsequently undertaken in conjunction with CBC.</u></p>	<p>not been discussed in sufficient detail with the authority, with regards to either the details of the junction modelling informing the designs or the checking of the proposed mitigation schemes, which to date have not been subject to any Technical checks or Safety Audits. Whilst the Applicant team have referred to Safety Audits being undertaken after the conclusion of the DCO process, this is not considered to be appropriate, with GG119 stating that 'Stage 1 RSA should include road safety matters which have a bearing upon land take, licence or easement before the draft orders are published or planning consent is applied for.' As such it is considered that the appropriate point in the process for a Stage 1 RSA to be required is prior to the full consideration of the DCO and related hearings. The proposed DCO wording provides significant powers to the Applicant to deliver the highways works proposed, and therefore there is an associated</p>	<p>27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</p>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p>requirement for the local highway authorities to be satisfied, as far as possible, that the highways works are appropriate, safe and deliverable. At present the level of detail is not considered to be sufficient to allow for this, including potential variations required due to vertical alignment constraints. As outlined above, due to concerns over some of the base modelling, and the lack of technical or safety audits or reviews of the proposed schemes, there remains the potential that the schemes in question could change, with the redline boundary drawn relatively closely to the schemes in question, raising further concerns that there is insufficient flexibility within the redline to accommodate changes</p>		
<p>CBC52 61</p>	<p>Approach applied with regards to accounting for</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>CBC are in agreement with the approach applied with regards to accounting for COVID-19 uncertainty. It is assumed the reference to retaining the Motorway widening as a ‘Core’</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the 02.08.2023</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p>COVID-19 uncertainty</p>	<p>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. The VISSIM model will follow a</p>	<p>Scenario is a typo, as this would not be considered realistic or acceptable. Clarity on the Vauxhall Way Dualling, in terms of delivery by 2028 has not yet been provided.</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 Government's pause of 'smart motorways' will (1) not retain the motorway widening as a core scenario and for the Demand Scenario 2043 (32mppa) assume Phase 2a J10 improvements. For Vauxhall Way dualling was assumed to be delivered by LBC by 2027, LBC has advised that this is unlikely to be completed by 2027 and so the revised modelling will remove dualling from the 2027 modelling scenario.</p>			

Table 3-3-77: Summary of ‘environment’ matters with CBC

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
ENVIRONMENT					
Air quality					
CBC5 20362	<u>Baseline data collection and presentation of future baseline information</u>	<u>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 and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.</u> Air quality	CBC agrees with the baseline data collection and presentation of future baseline information.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed
CBC5 31463	Air quality study area	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.	CBC agrees with the study area.	EIA Scoping Meeting on 12.04.18 Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
CBC5 42564	Construction dust assessment methodology and findings	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-028] . The construction dust results are detailed in section 2.2 in Appendix 7.3 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [APP-063REP4-013] . 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.	CBC agrees with the construction dust assessment methodology and findings, including mitigation included in the code of construction practice which follows best practice.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed
CBC5 53665	Modelling methodology including data	The Applicant considers the modelling methodology including the data sources, model setup including use of the Atmospheric	CBC agrees with the modelling methodology including data sources, model set up including use of ADMS, receptor locations selected, assessment	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
	sources, model set up including use of ADMS, receptor locations selected, assessment years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects, and verification methodology	Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS), 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-028] . The modelling methodology was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects, and verification methodology.		
CBC5 64766	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-028] , to be appropriate and robust. The significance criteria used in the assessment was	CBC agrees with the significance criteria used in the assessment.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
		discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.			
CBC5 75867	Odour impact methodology and results	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-028] , to be robust. The odour impact methodology was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	CBC agrees with the odour impact methodology and results.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed
CBC5 86968	Air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases	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 [APP-063REP4-013] . The results were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	CBC agrees with the air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
CBC69	The air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases	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 [APP-063REP4-013] . The results were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	CBC agrees with the air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed
CBC69	The air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases	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 [APP-063REP4-013] . The results were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	CBC agrees with the air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
CBC6 09705 97	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 [APP-065] , to be appropriate. The mitigation identified were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	CBC agrees with the good practice mitigation identified for the operational phase.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed
CBC6 17016 058	Compliance with published and emerging government guidance	The proposals accord with published and emerging government guidance. For example the PM _{2.5} target 10µg/m ³ to be achieved by 2040 is referenced in table 7.2. The assessment has been carried out against the 10µg/m ³ target in the ES Chapter 7 Air Quality [AS-028] .	CBC queries whether the proposals accord with Government policy and emerging policy.	To be discussed at topic-specific meeting	Ongoing
CBC7 12626 159	Consultation with Natural England	The methodology to assess the air quality effects in relation to ammonia emissions has been agreed with Natural England as evidenced in the draft Statement	CBC request that the Applicant confirms if Natural England have agreed to the methodology used for assessing ammonia emissions on ecological sites.	To be discussed at topic-specific meeting	Ongoing

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
		of Comment Ground between the Applicant and Natural England.			
CBC6 37236 20	Acid erosion impacts at cultural heritage receptors	The Applicant considers that an assessment of acid deposition can be scoped out as SO ₂ will not be a significant pollutant of concern and is not likely to cause exceedances of the relevant standards. The pollutants to be assessed were agreed with PINS and the local authorities, including CBC, at the scoping stage.	CBC note that there is no mention of acid erosion impacts at cultural heritage receptors (Luton Hoo and Someries Castle)	To be discussed at topic-specific meeting	Ongoing
CBC6 47363 4	Predictions of air pollution in the human and ecological environment to be widely scant	The Applicant considers the modelling methodology including modelled receptor locations to be robust. The modelling methodology is detailed in section 3 in Appendix 7.1. of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-028] . Receptors were included at Luton Hoo (C1) and Someries Castle (C2), see table 3.1 in Appendix 7.1. of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-028] . Receptor results, including receptors C1	CBC have raised concerns in the Local Impact Report around discussion of predictions of air pollution in the human and ecological environment to be widely scant, stating it would be useful to include Luton Hoo and Someries Castle.	To be discussed at topic specific meeting	Ongoing

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>and C2, can be found in Appendix 7.3. of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [APP-063REP4-013]. All results at receptors C1 and C2 have negligible impact, and do not exceed air quality standards at any phase.</p>			
	<u>Landscape and Visual Impacts</u>				
<p>CBC6 42657 45</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment methodology</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment methodology as detailed in Appendix 14.1 of Chapter 14 of the ES [AS-036], is robust.</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the methodology used for the LVIA.</p> <p>CBC consider<u>have requested that the Special Qualities Assessment methodology should be updated to take into account comments raised by CBC on the first draft of the Assessment which was sent to them on 23rd October 2023</u> s that numerous clarifications are required and various inconsistencies are noted. Lack of consideration of aesthetic and perceptual qualities contributing to landscape character.</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meetings on 3.03.20, March 2020, 20.04.20 <u>April 2020, 7.10.20, October 2020, 9.12.20 December 2020, 24 March 2021</u> <u>24.03.21, 16 September 2021</u> <u>16.09.21 and, 7 June</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
				<u>2022.06.22</u> <u>and 09.11.23.</u>	
CBC6 67566 53	Engagement on LVIA matters	The Applicant considers that engagement during Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meetings on 3 March 2020, 20 April 2020, 7 October 2020, 9 December 2020, 24 March 2021, 16 September 2021 and 7 June 2022 was adequate.	CBC is satisfied that they have been adequately engaged with regarding the LVIA, through the LVIA TWG meetings.	13/06/23 <u>13.06.23</u>	Agreed
CBC6 64677 67	Significant <u>landscape</u> and visual impacts and proposed appropriate mitigation measures	The Applicant considers that the LVIA identifies all significant landscape and visual effects and proposed mitigation measures for these effects.	CBC is satisfied that the LVIA identifies any significant visual impacts and proposed appropriate mitigation measures for these. <u>CBC have requested that the Special Qualities Assessment (which considers impacts on the Chilterns AONB) should be updated to take into account comments raised by CBC on the first draft of the Assessment which was sent to them on 23rd October 2023</u>	<u>TWG meetings on 3.03.20, 20.04.20, 7.10.20, 9.12.20, 24.03.21, 16.09.21, 7.06.22 and 09.11.23</u> <u>LVIA TWG meetings on 3 March 2020, 20 April 2020, 7 October 2020,</u>	Ongoing

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
				9 December 2020, 24 March 2021, 16 September 2021 and 7 June 2022	
CBC67568778	Considering tranquillity with regards to landscape and visual effects.	The Applicant has set out the approach to considering effects on tranquillity with regards to landscape and visual effects. The methodology included in Appendix 14.1 of Chapter 14 of the ES [AS-036] , is robust. The effects on tranquillity are assessed in Chapter 14 of the ES [AS-079] ,	CBC agrees with the approach to considering tranquillity with regards to landscape and visual effects. CBC sought further clarification at a meeting on 13-June 2023 as to whether tranquillity has been considered in areas to the north of Luton. <u>At the meeting on 9 November 2023 CBC confirmed that the approach is agreed regarding tranquillity effects., however, the AONB special quality work is still ongoing.</u>	<u>TWG meetings on 3.03.20, 20.04.20, 7.10.20, 9.12.20, 24.03.21, 16.09.21, 7.06.22 and 09.11.23</u> LVIA TWG meetings on 20 April 2020 and 9 December 2020 <u>Meeting 13 June 2023</u>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
CBC6 97896 86	Methodology and conclusions of the RVAA	The Applicant has prepared a Residential Visual Amenity Appraisal (RVAA) at Appendix 14.8 of Chapter 14 of the ES [APP-106] . The RVAA concludes that no neighbouring residents would engage the Residential Visual Amenity Threshold.	CBC agrees with the methodology and conclusions of the RVAA.	LVIA TWG meeting on 3.03.20	Agreed
CBC7 09806 97	Presentation of information on the viewpoint photograph sheets	The Applicant has identified Assessment viewpoint locations as part of the ES. These are mapped in Figure 14.8 of the ES [AS-102REP4-037] and information regarding the direction and area covered is recorded beneath each of the viewpoint photographs included in Appendix 14.6 of the ES [AS-088 – AS-094, AS-1405] .	CBC agrees with the presentation of information on the viewpoint photograph sheets.	LVIA TWG meeting on 7.06.22.	Agreed
CBC7 18017 068	Viewpoint locations portrayed in the	The Applicant has prepared several wireline or block model photomontages (or Accurate Visual Representations), included in Appendix 14.7 of this ES [REP3-009AS-037 – REP3-	CBC agrees with the viewpoint locations portrayed in the photomontages. The interchangeable use of wireline and block model photomontages is a concern	LVIA TWG meetings on 3.03.20 and 7.10.20	Ongoing <u>Agreed</u>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	photomontages	<p>013AS-041 to support the LVIA. These photomontages show both the baseline view and the view incorporating the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The photomontages have been produced from viewpoint locations mapped on Figure 14.8 of this ES [APP-106].</p>	<p>and a consistent approach should be adopted.</p>	<p><u>Meeting on 9.11.23</u></p>	
<p>CBC7 28127 169</p>	<p>Growth rates for proposed planting as set out Section 14.8 of the ES</p>	<p>The Applicant has outlined a range of growth rates for proposed planting in Section 14.8 of the ES and summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hedgerows planted with transplants (0.6-0.8m height) are assumed to be maintained at a height of at least 2.1m within 8 years. • Hedgerows planted using 1.5-1.8m feathered trees are assumed to be maintained at a height of 2.1m within 5 years. • Woodland comprising transplants (0.6-0.8m height), feathered trees (circa 1.5-2m height) and light standards 	<p>CBC agrees with the growth rates for proposed planting as set out Section 14.8 of the ES.</p>	<p>LVIA working group TWG meetings on <u>3.03.20-March 2020, and 7.10.20 and 9.11.23.</u></p> <p><u>October 2020</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>(2.5-3.5m height) is assumed to achieve an estimated height of 2-3.5m after 8 years, 4-5.5m after 15 years, 6-7.5m after 20 years and at least 8-10m after 25 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrub vegetation planted with shrubs and transplants (0.3-0.8m height) is assumed to achieve a height of 2-3m within 5-10 years. • Heavy standard trees (3.5-4.25m) are assumed to achieve heights of between 6-7m after 5 years, 8-9m after 10 years and 10m+ after 15 years. • Light standard trees (2.5-3m) are assumed to achieve heights of 5m after 8 years, 7-8m after 15 years, 9-10m after 25 years. 			
CBC73823720	Strategic Landscape Masterplan (SLMP)	The Applicant shared the SLMP with CBC in December 2022.	The current proposals within the Strategic Landscape Masterplan (SLMP) are considered to be constructive in providing a positive impact on the local environment with regards to biodiversity.	Agreed via email on 30.01.23.	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
CBC7 48373 4	Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan	The Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan is consistent with the SLMP and the measures contained therein are consistent with the Applicant's commitment to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG.	CBC agrees that the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan is consistent with the aims of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) delivery, as well as the SLMP.	Discussed in topic specific meeting on 13.06.23 and 09.11.23.	Agreed
CBC8 45	Long-term stewardship of the public open space and landscape	The Applicant will continue to engage with the CBC as the open space and landscape proposals evolve over the course of examination and detailed design stage, following approval of the DCO, if approved.	CBC strongly advise that discussions about the long-term stewardship of the public open space and landscape need to take place at the earliest opportunity, as any decisions could have a fundamental impact upon the strategic landscape masterplan and management strategies. Confirmed at a meeting held on 13 June 2023 with CBC that aspects relating to the open space are not applicable to CBC. It is considered that CBC83 can be removed from the SoCG.	Discussed in topic specific meeting on 13.06.23	Ongoing- Agreed
CBC7 58567 42	Assessment of the Special Qualities of the AONB	The Applicant is currently undertaking an Assessment of the Special Qualities of the AONB. <u>A draft Assessment was submitted to CBC on 23 October 2023, with</u>	<u>CBC have requested that the Special Qualities Assessment should be updated to take into account comments raised by CBC on the first draft of the Assessment which was sent to them on 23rd October</u>	To be discussed at topic specific meeting <u>Meeting</u>	Ongoing

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>the methodology for the assessment having been submitted to Natural England for comment.</p>	<p>2023 Numerous clarifications are required and various inconsistencies are noted. Lack of consideration of aesthetic and perceptual qualities contributing to landscape character. Impacts on the AONB are not fully considered.</p>	<p><u>ng on 30 October 2023</u></p>	
<p>CBC76753</p>	<p><u>Off-site landscape mitigation</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant believes that appropriate and sufficient information in relation to proposed off-site landscaping mitigation has been provided for the potential environmental effects on the public rights of way network and the rural landscape character of the area to the south of the Proposed Development to be assessed and understood.</u></p> <p><u>Detailed landscaping information such as cross sections, boundary treatment details, management/maintenance procedures etc. would be included as part of the information to be provided in relation to Requirement 8 of the draft DCO.</u></p>	<p><u>Off-site landscaping mitigation is proposed along the northern edge of Hyde FP4 (to the east of Someries Castle), Hyde FP5 and Hyde Bridleway 3. As per the draft DCO (Work 5e) this includes soft landscaping and boundary treatment including fencing. There is currently insufficient information to assess the impact of these works on the function of the public rights of way network and the rural landscape character of the area to be assessed CBC would expect the submission of cross sections, boundary treatment details and a plan showing the extent of landscaping to be provided. The proposed hedgerow planting should be native species that respond positively to the context of the area and management/maintenance procedures should be secured. It is currently unclear whether off-site</u></p>	<p><u>To be discussed</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
		<p><u>Off-site hedgerows proposed as part of the Proposed Development are subject to the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan as described in section 5.2 of that document [AS-029].</u></p>	<p><u>hedgerow maintenance is captured in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan. Requirements that secure this information prior to commencement of off-site hedgerow restoration should be included in the DCO.</u></p>		
<p>CBC7 647</p>	<p><u>Lighting strategy</u></p>	<p><u>Within this response the Applicant refers to a design principle in relation to lighting that has been added to Design Principles [REP5-034] issued at Deadline 5. This Design Principle states the following which addresses the concerns raised by CBC:</u></p> <p><u>“The detailed lighting design shall include measures to avoid obtrusive light effects and adverse impacts on biodiversity. Best practice measures for consideration are outlined in Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Note GN01 and GN08 (Ref. 2.8)</u></p>	<p><u>The draft DCO does not contain any requirement for the submission of a full lighting strategy and Schedule 2 Part 2 of the draft DCO is inadequate as it does not contain sufficiently clear references to matters such as the design, height and location of any high mast lighting required within the airport (which is specified in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO).</u></p>	<p><u>To be discussed</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>shall include, but not be limited to the following:</u></p> <p><u>a. Lighting design not to exceed design code recommendations for illuminance and glare and to consider best practice guidance for limiting light obtrusion effects.</u></p> <p><u>b. Use of horizontal cut-off luminaires with zero tilt to avoid direct upward light.</u></p> <p><u>c. Lighting designs to avoid spill light beyond the task area.</u></p> <p><u>d. Luminaire aiming (or main beam angle) not to exceed 70° from nadir.</u></p> <p><u>e. High-mast systems limited to 25m tall.</u></p> <p><u>f. Avoid placing luminaires at the perimeter of decked car parks or other elevated structures.</u></p> <p><u>g. Use of warm white light sources (with limited blue</u></p>			

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
		<p><u>spectrum wavelengths) is preferred.</u></p> <p><u>h. Use of automatic lighting controls to manage the use of lighting according to usage.</u></p> <p><u>The detailed design of external lighting will include directional lighting to limit light spill onto adjacent habitats and neighbourhoods. The design will include baffles, cowls and hoods in appropriate areas to further reduce light spill.”.</u></p>			
	<u>Local communities</u>				
<p>CBC7 75886 7</p>	<p>Quantitative assessment of health outcomes associated with aircraft noise</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the quantitative assessment of health outcomes associated with aircraft noise presented in Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [AS-078], is robust and has been undertaken applying an appropriate methodology and assumptions. This is based on the latest guidance and best practice</p>	<p><u>There are significant concerns regarding the potential impact of the Proposed Development both during construction and operational phases on the public health and wellbeing of local residents, particularly relating to sleep disturbance and air quality. This would be most prevalent in areas that are under the flight path.</u></p>	<p>To be discussed at topic specific meeting</p> <p><u>Discussed at meeting on 23.10.2023</u></p> <p><u>CBC are awaiting advice</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
		<p>from Department for the Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs and the World Health Organisation (WHO).</p> <p>The methodology for the assessment is set out in Appendix 13.4 Methodology for Health and Community Assessment of the ES [APP-086].</p>	<p><u>The impact on health from noise is a significant issue and it is noted that physical and mental health outcomes associated with aircraft noise include annoyance, sleep disturbance, disruption to children's learning, mental health, and cardiovascular health. Increased carbon emissions could also impact on cardiovascular health. CBC's position on this matter is confirmed in the Local Impact Report.</u></p>	<p><u>from their noise consultants Suono. Concerns relate to health effects of noise, rather than the methodology used.</u></p> <p><u>The health effects of air emissions are assessed in Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [AS-078]. This assessment concluded that emissions from the Proposed Development would have no significant effects on health.</u></p>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
<p>CBC7869878</p>	<p>Proposed mitigation to address the significant effect on mental wellbeing due to public concern and uncertainty during the planning and construction stages of the Proposed Development</p>	<p>The health assessment identifies a significant moderate adverse effect on mental wellbeing due to public concern and uncertainty during the planning and construction stages of the Proposed Development. The Applicant considers that the embedded mitigation proposed to respond to this effect is appropriate and sufficient.</p> <p>The embedded mitigation includes a commitment by the lead contractor to prepare a construction-specific community engagement plan for the construction operations of the Proposed Development, as detailed in the CoCP provided as Appendix 4.2 of the ES [APP-049REP4-011]. The plan will provide the overall approach to community engagement and a detailed guide to the enquiries and complaints procedure. The residual effects section of the health and community chapter highlights that people's mental wellbeing within</p>	<p>CBC to confirm its position on the proposed mitigation to address the significant effect on mental wellbeing due to public concern and uncertainty during the planning and construction stages of the Proposed Development.</p> <p><u>Discussed at meeting on 23.10.2023. CBC explained that the Councils would like more information on the approach to community engagement to mitigate the potential effects of the scheme on the mental wellbeing of the affected communities. CBC noted that the Health and Community section of the Code of Construction Practice is light-touch and does not include specific measure to address mental wellbeing. The Community Engagement Plan should include more detail on the approaches to engagement, examples, milestones etc. Co-design of the plan with stakeholders would improve sense of ownership and trust. The aims and objectives of the plan should be made clear.</u></p>	<p>To be discussed at topic specific meeting</p> <p><u>Discussed at meeting on 23.10.2023.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
		<p>the affected communities is likely to continue to be impacted adversely by concerns related to the Proposed Development, however ongoing engagement would provide information which may help to reduce uncertainty and stress relating to the potential effects of the Proposed Development.</p> <p><u>The Applicant notes that the airport operator is responsible for community engagement associated with the operation of the airport and that it actively provides for this via its website. The airport operator will continue to provide for such engagement with the Proposed Development.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant will provide a response to these points.</u></p>		
<p>CBC7 9780</p>	<p><u>Approach to the health and communities assessment</u></p>	<p><u>Embedded mitigation is taken into account in the final health assessment.</u></p> <p><u>Embedded mitigation initiated by the Health and Community topic and other related topics such as Noise, Landscape and Visual,</u></p>	<p><u>The evidence base and methodology that underpins the assessment, and consequently, the conclusions drawn is based on the significant and residual effects identified by other topics and is therefore perceived as a reactive and passive approach to assessment,</u></p>	<p><u>To be discussed</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>Traffic and Transport, is presented in Section 8 of Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [APP-039AS-078].</p> <p>The assessment presented in the Environmental Statement (ES) reports the conclusions of the final assessment of the final scheme. The environmental and social considerations of options and alternatives are reported in Chapter 3 of the ES [AS-026], and two Preliminary Environmental Information Reports were consulted on as the project developed.</p> <p>This shows that shows that environmental and</p> <p>social considerations were given throughout design development.</p>	<p><u>potentially lacking influence on the proposed design.</u></p> <p><u>There is concern that the assessment fails to clearly demonstrate a direct impact on the design of the proposal.</u></p>		
<p>CBC8 07881</p>	<p><u>Consideration of locally produced health assessments</u></p>	<p><u>Detailed health profiles for the Wards within the Local Study Area are presented in the health baseline, Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [APP-</u></p>	<p><u>The assessment has disregarded locally produced health assessment (except for Luton), such Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNA), Health and Wellbeing Strategies (HWB), or Direction of</u></p>	<p><u>To be discussed</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p><u>039AS-078</u>]. The majority of the Central Bedfordshire area falls within the 'wider study area' for the health assessment. Impacts on health determinants in the wider study area are dispersed across the population rather than impacting specific receptors.</p> <p>Detailed health baseline information (such as that included in the JSNA) for the wider study area has not been presented in the baseline as this is not proportionate to the level of assessment undertaken for this area.</p>	<p>Public Health Annual Reports, in favour of national data sets provided by the Office for Health Improvements and Disparities (OHID). As a result, the localised knowledge necessary for proper interpretation and understanding of health data is absent. There is no justification within the assessment for discounting these strategies, despite this point being raised in the statutory consultation response. Nonetheless, the inclusion of OHID/PHE Mental Health JSNAs for all relevant authorities is welcomed.</p>		
<p><u>CBC817982</u></p>	<p>Data considered in the health and communities assessment</p>	<p>Ward-level data on health indicators, including IMD scores, for areas closest to the airport are presented in Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [<u>APP-039AS-078</u>] and have been taken into</p>	<p>IMD scores and Income Deprivation vary across Central Bedfordshire, and our most deprived areas are predominantly located near the airport, specifically in and around Dunstable and Houghton Regis (see Appendix 2 and 3).</p> <p>Once again, this level of detail is absent from the Applicant's assessment, casting doubt on whether the conclusions drawn</p>	<p>To be discussed</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p><u>account in the assessment of receptor sensitivity.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant agrees that variation in the socio-economic and health status of communities is masked by local-authority level data presented for the wider study area.</u></p> <p><u>Health effects in the wider study area are associated with issues such as economic growth and employment, which are distributed throughout the population and not linked to specific locations or communities. Therefore, it is considered proportionate to base this assessment on local-authority level data.</u></p>	<p><u>regarding Central Bedfordshire's population health and the impacts from the proposal have considered this.</u></p>		
	<p><u>Soils and geology</u></p>				
<p>CBC8 20389</p>	<p>Land contamination assessment</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this. Additional engagement with regard to the remediation strategy was undertaken with the Host Authorities and the Environment</p>	<p>CBC is satisfied with the land contamination assessment and engagement on this to date.</p>	<p>CBC's 2022 Statutory Consultation response</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	and engagement	<p>Agency in July 2022 after statutory consultation and publication of the 2022 PEIR. The Outline Remediation Strategy included in Appendix 17.5 in the ES [APP-125] was updated in response to the engagement.</p> <p>The lead contractor will develop a detailed remediation strategy prior to the relevant works. This is secured through Requirement in the DCO and will provide further opportunity for the Host Authorities and Environment Agency to engage on detail of the final Remediation Strategy.</p>	<p>CBCs position on this matter is confirmed in the Local Impact Report. Section 5.10.3 states:</p> <p>'Due to the limited area of the application site within the administrative area of Central Bedfordshire no significant concern has been raised with regard to soils and geology'.</p>		
CBC834990	EIA methodology, specifically the magnitude, probability, duration, reversibility and	The Applicant considers the magnitude, probability, duration (temporary and permanent), reversibility and significance of impacts have been suitably assessed in accordance with guidance and these are reported in the assessment text in Section 17.9 of Chapter 17 Soils and Geology of the ES [APP-043] .	<p>Host Authorities to confirm agreement to the EIA methodology, specifically the magnitude, probability, duration, reversibility and significance of impacts included in the assessment text within the ES.</p> <p>CBC have confirmed they have no issues to raise regarding the methodology as</p>	Discussed in the Contaminated Land Technical Working Group Meetings of 26.07.2021 and 12.07.2022.	Agreed

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	significance of impacts	The methodology is in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Guidance, which has since been superseded by new National Highways guidance.	noted in Section 5.10.3 of their Local Impact Report.	Response by WSP on the PEIR 2022 on behalf of the Host Authorities. CBC Local Impact Report 2023	
CBC8 42590 4	Study area and ZOI for the soils and geology assessment	The Applicant amended the study area for the ES, in line with the Planning Inspectorate's comments on the Scoping Report 2019. This was acknowledged and accepted by the Host Authorities at the Soils and geology TWG meeting on 26 July 2021. The study area and ZOI are reported in Section 17.3 of Chapter 17 Soils and Geology of the ES [APP-043] .	The Host Authorities agree with the study area and ZOI for the soils and geology assessment.	Soils and Geology TWG meeting on 26.07.21.	Agreed

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u>
CBC8 53691 2	Outline Remediation Strategy	The Applicant considers the Outline Remediation Strategy (ORS), provided as Appendix 17.5 to Chapter 17 of the ES [APP-125] , to be comprehensive and addresses the potential and relevant pollutant linkages as identified in the conceptual site model which might be formed from construction works on the former Eaton Green Landfill. The document has been completed to current guidance on addressing risks from land contamination.	Host Authorities to confirm its position on the Outline Remediation Strategy, provided as Appendix 17.5 to Chapter 17 of the ES [APP-125]. CBCs position on this matter is confirmed in the Local Impact Report. Section 5.10.3 states: <i>'Due to the limited area of the application site within the administrative area of Central Bedfordshire no significant concern has been raised with regard to soils and geology'.</i>	CBC Local Impact Report 2023	Agreed
CBC8 64792 3	Inclusion of a geological watching brief relating to the excavation of chalk to the east of the airport	In response to the planning inspectorates Scoping Opinion Report 2019 the Applicant has included a watching brief for the potential features of geological interest relating to the excavation of chalk to the east of the airport in Section 17.3 and Section 17.8 of Chapter 17 Soils and Geology of the ES [APP-043] . This is also included in the Code of Construction Practice	Host Authorities to confirm its position on the inclusion of a geological watching brief relating to the excavation of chalk to the east of the airport. CBCs position on this matter is confirmed in the Local Impact Report. Section 5.10.3 states: <i>'Due to the limited area of the application site within the administrative area of Central Bedfordshire no significant</i>	CBC Local Impact Report 2023	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>(CoCP) in Appendix 4.2 of the ES [APP-049REP4-011]. The CoCP is secured by Requirement 8 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to include groundwater flood risk and monitoring of water related features in the geological watching brief. The information on groundwater flood risk and monitoring of water related features is contained within Chapter 20 Water Resources of the ES [AS-031], the Code of Construction Practice Appendix 4.2 of the ES [APP-049REP4-011], and Drainage Design Statement, Appendix 20.4 of the ES [APP-137REP4-031].</p>	<p><i>concern has been raised with regard to soils and geology'.</i></p>		
<p>CBC875893</p>	<p>Feasible options to control the potential for</p>	<p>The Applicant considers feasible options to control the potential for off-site gas migration have been identified and described in the ES Chapter 17 and accompanying</p>	<p>The Host Authorities request feasible options with regards to gas mitigation measures in regard to potential for off-site mitigation, and request details covering the means to secure these and when they</p>	<p>CBC Local Impact Report 2023</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	off-site gas migration	<p>appendices. The options and the timing of their installation are described in the ORS, Appendix 17.5 of Chapter 17 of the ES [APP-125] and in Section 17.8 embedded mitigation section of Chapter 17 Soils and Geology of the ES [APP-043]. Additional detail has been included on the requirements to be achieved by the adopted measures and included in the ORS. The detailed design of the gas control will be determined as part of the Detailed Remediation Strategy to be produced by the lead contractor post DCO. This is secured by requirement 17 of the draft DCO. The remediation strategy is to be approved by the Local Planning Authority after consultation with the Environment Agency.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the character of the landfill will change once construction commences. The gas monitoring programme for pre, during and post construction phases will be</p>	<p>will be incorporated into construction. Also query whether the gas monitoring frequency is sufficient due to the character of the landfill changing quickly once construction commences.</p> <p>CBCs position on this matter is confirmed in the Local Impact Report. Section 5.10.3 states:</p> <p><i>'Due to the limited area of the application site within the administrative area of Central Bedfordshire no significant concern has been raised with regard to soils and geology'.</i></p>		

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>developed by the lead contractor post DCO to address this issue. The frequency of the monitoring is expected to reflect the potential for the gas regime in the landfill to be subject to rapid change as a result of construction works. This proposal is described in the ORS Appendix 17.5 of Chapter 17 of the ES [APP-125].</p> <p>Consultation with the Environment Agency for the Environmental Permit will also require agreement on the monitoring programme which will form part of the permit conditions. This will secure an appropriate monitoring frequency.</p> <p>The Applicant considers the gas monitoring programme developed post DCO and secured as described will address the likely changes in the gas regime due to construction works and ensure appropriate control measures are in place.</p>			

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
<p>CBC8 86994 5</p>	<p>Land contamination assessment and additional engagement regarding the Outline remediation strategy</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges this. Additional engagement with regard to the remediation strategy was undertaken with the Host Authorities and the Environment Agency in July 2022 after statutory consultation and publication of the 2022 PEIR. The Outline Remediation Strategy included in Appendix 17.5 in the ES [APP-125] was updated in response to the engagement.</p> <p>The lead contractor will develop a detailed remediation strategy prior to the relevant works. This is secured through Requirement in the draft DCO and will provide further opportunity for the Host Authorities and Environment Agency to engage on detail of the final Remediation Strategy.</p>	<p>CBC are satisfied with the land contamination assessment and engagement on this to date.</p> <p>CBCs position on this matter is confirmed in the Local Impact Report. Section 5.10.3 states:</p> <p><i>'Due to the limited area of the application site within the administrative area of Central Bedfordshire no significant concern has been raised with regard to soils and geology'.</i></p>	<p>CBC's 2022 Statutory Consultation response</p> <p>CBC Local Impact Report 2023</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Biodiversity</p>					

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
<p>CBC8 97905 6</p>	<p>Biodiversity survey data</p>	<p>The Applicant seeks agreement from CBC that the survey data is considered sufficient to inform the assessment of potential impacts to biodiversity. Chapter 8 Biodiversity of the ES sets out what surveys have been undertaken, how they comply with best practice, and the outcomes of the surveys and their conclusions.</p>	<p>CBC agrees that the biodiversity survey data is sufficient.</p>	<p>13./06./23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>CBC9 08891 67</p>	<p>10% BNG</p>	<p>Whilst it is still not mandatory for NSIPs such as the Proposed Development, the Applicant has set a voluntary ambition of achieving at least 10% BNG which is consistent with the ultimate intention of the Environment Act 2021.</p> <p>This is detailed within the BNG report in Appendix 8.5 of the ES. BNG will be secured through the extensive landscaping and habitat creation proposals incorporated within the Proposed Development, details of how</p>	<p>CBC accepts the Applicants positions and agree that the 10% BNG target for the project is acceptable.</p>	<p>13./06./23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>these habitats will be created and managed are set out in the Outline LBMP in Appendix 8.2 of the ES. Version 3.1 of the Defra Biodiversity Metric has been used to calculate the amount of habitat creation that needs to be included within the Proposed Development to mitigate the loss of habitats. The Defra metric takes account of the biodiversity value of those habitats lost to the Proposed Development and the time lag between this habitat loss and the establishment of newly created habitats to a level at which they provide an equivalent biodiversity resource. Habitat creation areas are detailed in Landscape Mitigation Plans in Figures 14.11 to 14.13 of the ES [AS-102REP4-037].</p> <p>With regards to targets for BNG within the Oxford-Cambridge Arc, it is understood that an aspiration for 20% net gain has been set out in the 'Shared regional principles</p>			

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
		<p>for protecting, restoring and enhancing the environment in the Oxford-Cambridge Arc' document published in March 2021. However, this document states that for NSIPs a minimum of 10% should be delivered. As such, it is considered that the Applicant's ambition of achieving 10% BNG is proportionate.</p>			
<p>CBC9 18992 78</p>	<p>Pre-construction surveys</p>	<p>The Applicant carried out required surveys. Pre-construction surveys would provide any necessary updates prior to construction.</p>	<p>CBC agrees that the survey effort showed consistent results and that pre-construction surveys would provide any necessary updates prior to construction.</p>	<p>Biodiversity TWG meeting on 12.09.22 and meeting on 13.06.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>CBC9 20389</p>	<p>Sites of ecological value</p>	<p>The Applicant believes that the engagement undertaken with CBC, to ensure accurate information about sites of ecological value was considered in the biodiversity assessment, has been adequate.</p>	<p>CBC agrees that the engagement undertaken with them to ensure accurate information about sites of ecological value is considered in the biodiversity assessment has been adequate.</p>	<p>13.06.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> Central Bedfordshire Council position	<u>Source of agreement</u> Source of agreement	<u>Status</u> Status
Waste and Resources					
CBC949100931	Assessment methodology	The Applicant considers that the impact assessment methodology is robust. The methodology proposed in the Scoping Report and presented in the 2019 PEIR was a bespoke methodology developed in the absence of any sector specific guidance. In March 2020, IEMA published the IEMA Guide to Materials and Waste in Environmental Impact, Guidance for a Proportionate Approach (IEMA Guidance). The methodology employed in the ES assessment and the 2022 PEIR is now aligned to this new guidance. This is a departure from the 2019 Scoping Opinion, which has been discussed with the Host Authorities. The full methodology is outlined in section 19.5 of	CBC agrees with the assessment methodology.	Waste TWG meeting on 27.07.21	Agreed

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		Chapter 19 Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081].			
CBC94251004	Baseline data, including a future baseline for landfill capacity	The Applicant considers that the baseline methodology is robust. The baseline methodology is outlined in section 19.5 (paragraphs 19.5.7-19.5.11) and the baseline is outlined in section 19.7 of Chapter 19 Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081] . The future baseline for landfill capacity is outlined in paragraphs 19.7.34-19.7.44 of Chapter 19 Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081] .	CBC is satisfied with the baseline data, including a future baseline for landfill capacity.	Waste TWG meeting on 2.12.21	Agreed
CBC95361012	Study area for construction materials	The Applicant considers that the study areas are robust. Study Areas have been established in accordance with the IEMA Guidance. The Study Areas are defined in Table 19.6 of Chapter 19 Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081] . For construction resources the study area is national (UK or GB dependent on	<u>CBC agrees with the reduction in study area for materials (national to regional where baseline information is available). The Host Authorities suggest the Applicant considers a smaller study area for construction materials.</u>	<u>Agreed with CBC via email 16 October 2023 CBC 16.10.23 currently reviewing draft SoCG provided 06 June 2023.</u>	<u>Ongoing Agreed</u>

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
		baseline information availability). Where baseline information is available regional data is also considered in the assessment (a smaller study area).			
CBC9 64710 23	Percentages in the criteria for materials in the IEMA Guidance	The Applicant considers that the impact assessment methodology is robust. The full assessment methodology is outlined in section 19.5 of Chapter 19 Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081] . The percentages in the criteria for materials in the IEMA Guidance are deemed to remain appropriate for a smaller study area (regional construction resources).	CBC agrees the percentages in the criteria for materials in the IEMA Guidance are deemed to remain appropriate for a smaller study area (regional construction resources).	Waste TWG meeting on <u>13.06.22</u> June 2022	Agreed
CBC9 75810 3	Material sensitivity within the waste and resources assessment	The Applicant considers that the material sensitivity is robust. Material receptor sensitivity is determined as Medium. On balance, the key materials required for the construction and operation of the Proposed Development are forecast (through trend analysis and other	<u>CBC agrees with the adjustment of material receptor sensitivity from low to medium in light of current issues with supply e.g., concrete. CBC to confirm position on the material sensitivity within the waste and resources assessment.</u>	<u>Agreed with CBC via email 16 October 2023</u> CBC currently 16.10.23 reviewing draft SoCG provided 06 June 2023.	<u>Ongoing</u> Agreed

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>information) to suffer from some potential issues regarding supply and stock and are available comprising some sustainable features and benefits compared to industry-stand materials (e.g. recycled content). Material receptor sensitivity has been changed from low to medium since the 2022 PEIR in discussion with stakeholders with knowledge of material shortages on other large other infrastructure projects within the area (LBC, CBC and HCC) (outlined in paragraph 19.7.45 of Chapter 19 Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081]).</p>			
<p>CBC9 86910 45</p>	<p>Waste and resources assessment methodology</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the assessment methodology is robust. The assessment considers impact by assessment phase and also by year within each assessment phase as outlined in Table 19.41 Estimated construction material and percentage of national consumption by year and Table</p>	<p><u>CBC agrees that the assessment considers impact by assessment phase and also by year within each assessment phase. CBC to confirm position on the waste and resources assessment methodology.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed with CBC via email 16 October 2023 CBC 16.10.23 currently reviewing draft SoCG provided 06 June 2023.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		19.43 Estimated construction material and percentage of regional consumption by year of Chapter 19 Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081] .			
CBC9 97100 56	Scoping out of operational resources	<p>The Applicant considers that the assessment methodology is robust. As outlined in paragraph 19.7.3-19.7.4 of Chapter 19 Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081] assessing resources use during operation of the airport is not possible since:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The exact types and quantity of resource use associated with the operation of the existing airport is currently unknown, since the airport uses a wide variety of resources, in some cases hundreds of different products. b. Data on resource usage is not readily available from the airport operator. c. There is no publicly available information on the national 	CBC agrees with the wording associated with scoping out of operational resources, and agrees with the scope of assessment for maintenance resources.	Feedback provided by CBC and HCC on wording via October 2021 email correspondence with Waste TWG. Text included in PEIR 2022.	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>availability of such resources, so it is not possible to set a national baseline or apply a value or sensitivity to that availability.</p> <p>Resources are used on a day-to-day basis and periodically for maintenance activities e.g., airfield maintenance. Resource use from these maintenance activities during operation is expected to be generally the same in type to that generated by the existing airport; resources would be managed using the established procedures and facilities e.g., storage areas, that are used across the airport.</p> <p>Larger maintenance projects e.g., if resurfacing of the airfield was required, are likely to be covered by a project specific Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP).</p> <p>Some data on resources required to maintain the airfield have been provided by the design team and are outlined in paragraphs 19.9.22 -19.9.24 of Chapter 19</p>			

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
		<p>Waste and Resources of the ES [AS-081].</p>			
	<p>Water Resources and Flood Risk</p>				
<p>CBC1 00984 0167</p>	<p>Drainage design for the airport and off-site highways</p>	<p>The Applicant identifies that the drainage design for the airport and off-site highways is to be further developed at the detailed design stage.</p> <p>The Drainage Design Statement in Appendix 20.4 of the ES [APP-137REP4-031] sets out in Table 8.4 The Design Principles [REP5-034] sets out in section 5 -the design principles to be followed at the detailed design stage. This is secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [REP5-003] also notes that <i>'no part of the authorised development is to commence until for that part written details of the surface and foul water drainage plan, including means of pollution control and</i></p>	<p>On the basis that no part of the authorised development is to commence until the drainage plan is agreed with the relevant planning authority, CBC have no further comments.</p> <p>The drainage implications for this development are noted to be a minimal impact to CBC watercourses and drainage related areas.</p>	<p>Agreed <u>with CBC</u> via email <u>3 August 2023</u> 3.08.23 (3rd Aug 2023)</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p><i>monitoring have been submitted and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority. No part of the authorised development may commence until for that part written details of a surface and foul water drainage plan, including means of pollution control and monitoring, have been submitted and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority following consultation with the Environment Agency, the lead local flood authority and the relevant sewerage undertaker, on matters related to its functions.'</i></p>			
<p>CBC1 01010 389</p>	<p>Hydrogeological Characterisation Report</p>	<p>The Hydrogeological Characterisation Report in Appendix 20.3 of the ES [APP-136REP4-029] summarises the hydrogeological understanding of the site.</p> <p>The report has predicted maximum groundwater levels across the site using site groundwater monitoring data, which has had an uplift</p>	<p>On the basis that no part of the authorised development is to commence until the drainage plan is agreed with the relevant planning authority and design principles are implemented as documented in the Drainage Design Statement, CBC have no further comments.</p> <p>The drainage implications for this development are noted to be a minimal</p>	<p>Agreed with CBC via email 3.08.23 August 2023 (3 Aug 2023)</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>factored applied based on historical data from the Environment Agency's Hertfordshire Groundwater Model and monitoring network.</p> <p>The Drainage Design Statement in Appendix 20.4 of the ES [APP-137REP4-031] sets out in Table 8.1 the design principles The Design Principles [REP5-034] sets out in section 5 the drainage design principles to be followed at the detailed design stage (secured by Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [REP5-003]). This includes item DDS.017 which notes the '<i>detailed design will provide at least 1m clearance between the highest water table and the underside of buried tanks and other underground structures. The drainage design is towill consider the impacts of groundwater mounding, to ensure that the</i></p>	<p>impact to CBC watercourses and drainage related areas.</p>		

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p><i>infiltration tanks do not result in groundwater flooding downstream.'</i></p> <p>The Hydrogeological Risk Assessment: Drainage in Appendix 20.6 of the ES [REP4-035APP-139] outlines the initial assessment of the infiltration to ground from the proposed soakaways. Engagement with the Environment Agency is ongoing regarding the risks to the Principal Aquifer from any discharges to ground. Design principle DDS.0482 of the Drainage Design Statement <u>Design Principles</u> notes that <i>the drainage and water treatment systems will be designed so that all discharges to ground do not intentionally contain hazardous substances, as defined in WFD, and are non-polluting</i> <u><i>If the reserve option is adopted, the drainage and water treatment systems will be designed so that all discharges to ground do not contain hazardous substances, as defined in WFD, and are non-</i></u></p>			

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
		<p><u><i>polluting, due to the underlying chalk being a Principal Aquifer and the infiltration tanks being proposed within a SPZ3"</i></u></p>			
<p>CBC 10278 10299</p>	<p><u>Water Balance Drainage Design Statement</u></p>	<p>The Drainage Design Statement in Appendix 20.4 of the ES [APP-137REP4-031] sets out in Table 8.1 the design principles <u>The Design Principles [REP5-034]</u> sets out in section 5 the <u>drainage design principles</u> to be followed at the detailed design stage. This is secured in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [REP5-003].</p> <p>This includes incorporating water efficiency measures to minimise any net increase in Affinity Water's supply requirements to the Terminals resulting from the operation of the expanded airport, together with measures that maximise water reuse.</p> <p>The development of these measures would be informed by the Water Cycle Strategy</p>	<p>CBC has no further comments on the water use/reuse on the basis that water efficiency measures are implemented to minimise any net increase in Affinity Water's supply to the terminals.</p> <p>The drainage implications for this development are noted to be a minimal impact to CBC watercourses and drainage related areas.</p>	<p><u>Agreed via email (3 Aug 2023). Agreed with CBC via email 3.08.23 August 2023</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>(Appendix 20.5 of the ES [APP-138REP4-033])</p> <p>The Applicant is engaging with Affinity Water on water supply.</p>			
<p>CBC1 03149 10</p>	<p>Flood Risk Assessment</p>	<p>The Flood Risk Assessment in Appendix 20.1 of the ES [AS-046REP4-038] considers the potential impacts of the Proposed Development during construction and operation.</p> <p>Fluvial flood risks are low risk for the Proposed Development due to the majority of works being in Flood Zone 1. Two Off-site Highway Interventions are in proximity to the River Lee, however these works are limited in scope and scale and would not affect the existing channel or floodplain storage.</p> <p>Pluvial flood risks have been identified as a potential flood risk for the Proposed Development. The Drainage Design Statement in Appendix 20.4 of the ES [APP-</p>	<p>On the basis that no part of the authorised development is to commence until the drainage plan is agreed with the relevant planning authority and design principles are implemented as documented in the Drainage Design Statement, CBC have no further comments.</p> <p>The drainage implications for this development are noted to be a minimal impact to CBC watercourses and drainage related areas.</p>	<p>Agreed <u>with CBC</u> via email (3 August 2023)<u>03.08.23</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>137REP4-031 sets out in Table 8.1 the design principles <u>The Design Principles [REP5-034]</u> sets out in section 5 the drainage design principles to be followed at the detailed design stage (secured by Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [REP5-003]). Design principle DDS.021 notes that <i>the detailed design of all drainage attenuation systems shall be designed for a 1 in 100 year storm period plus an increase of 40% in capacity for climate change.</i></p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment identifies the groundwater flood risk downstream of the site as low risk, based on the attenuation of flows.</p> <p>The relevant local authority will be consulted on the drainage design at the Main Application Site and/or Off-site Highway Interventions as secured by Schedule 2 of the draft DCO [REP5-003].</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
<p>CBC1 <u>04251</u> <u>04</u></p>	<p>Design principles to mitigate the impacts on the underlying aquifer and associated receptors</p>	<p>Chapter 20 Water Resources and Flood Risk of the ES [REP4-009AS-031] summarises the measures or design principles to mitigate the impacts on the underlying aquifer and associated receptors. These measures are secured in the CoCP included as Appendix 4.2 to the ES [REP4-011APP-049] and the Drainage Design Strategy Principle included as Appendix 20.4 to the ESes [REP5-034]. With these mitigations in place, there are no significant impacts anticipated to the River Lea CWS.</p>	<p>Within CBC lies the river Lea County Wildlife Site (CWS) and concerns were previously raised over the potential hydrological impacts to the watercourse and that without appropriate mitigation, pollutants could have a significant effect on the watercourse. CBC are pleased that this has been considered and that mitigation has been identified such as oil and sediment separators which will capture pollutants in the surface drainage system. Soakaways at least 1m above the seasonal water table and riverbanks will also protect the river Lea from the input of pollutants from the new development. With the appropriate mitigation measures in place, CBC is satisfied that no significant impacts are anticipated to the river Lea CWS.</p> <p>The drainage implications for this development are noted to be a minimal impact to CBC watercourses and drainage related areas.</p>	<p>Agreed <u>with CBC</u> via email (3rd August 2023) <u>03.08.23</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
CBC1 <u>05364</u> <u>12</u>	Study area for the water resources assessment	Chapter 20 Water Resources and Flood Risk of the ES [REP4-009AS-031] outlines the spatial scope for the water resources assessment as all water resources receptors within 1km radius of the Main Application Site. This spatial scope has been extended to identify all receptors that are hydraulically linked to the Proposed Development	CBC is satisfied with the study area for the water resources assessment.	Agreed at meeting with the Lead Local Flood Authorities on 26 March <u>26.03.18</u>	Agreed
Climate Change					
CBC1 <u>06474</u> <u>23</u>	Definitions of likelihood and severity	The Applicant outlined definitions of likelihood and severity. These are defined in Tables 9.10, 9.11 and 9.12 of Chapter 9 Climate Change Resilience of the ES [APP-035]	CBC agrees with the levels and definitions of likelihood and severity (consequence) which have been amended since the 2022 PEIR, in line with LLAOL's Climate Change Adaptation Report published after completion of the PEIR.	Climate Change and GHG working group	Agreed
CBC1 <u>07584</u> <u>3</u>	Objectives for reducing climate change and	The Applicant considers that the lifecycle greenhouse gas (GHG) impact assessment is robust in terms of its assessment of airport operations and surface access.	<u>Overall, the assessment is considered sufficient and accords with the requirements of Policy CC1. Based on the foregoing, Central Bedfordshire Council</u>	To be discussed at topic specific	<u>Ongoing Agreed</u>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
	greenhouse gas emissions	<p>The GHG assessment has been undertaken in line with the principles for environmental impact assessment and compliance in the Airports National Policy Statement, as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [APP-038]. For airport operations, the GHG assessment concludes that GHG emissions from the Proposed Development represent less than 0.003% of the total emissions in any five-year UK legally binding carbon budget during which they would arise. For surface access, the GHG assessment concludes that GHG emissions from the Proposed Development represent less than 0.08% of the total emissions in any five-year UK legally binding carbon budget during which they would arise. Therefore, it is considered that the GHG emissions impact of the Proposed Development would not have a material impact on the UK Government meeting its legally binding carbon reduction targets</p>	<p><u>consider the impact on Climate Change and Green House Gas emissions to be neutral.</u></p> <p>There is concern that the Proposed Development, resulting from airport operations and surface access would impact on objectives for reducing climate change and greenhouse gas emissions</p>	<p><u>meeting CBC LIR</u></p>	

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u>
		and there will be no significant effects.			
CBC1 08694 45	The calculations for GHG emissions	<p>This advice on the inclusion of departing flights only has been adopted by the DfT and has informed its policy on aviation and climate change. It is also used as the basis for the approach taken in the Airports National Policy Statement for assessing GHG emissions from aviation.</p> <p>The advice of the Committee on Climate Change with regard to aviation and the UK carbon budgets is to consider emissions from departing flights only.</p> <p>Additionally, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change recommends that for carbon accounting, airports only consider departing flights to avoid double counting with other airports.</p>	<p>In the calculations for GHG emissions some of the aviation related emissions are omitted. It appears that the only air traffic movements that are included are the emissions as a result of fuel consumption during take- off and landing cycles including descent and ascent up to 3000ft. as well as emissions from aircraft fuel consumption during the climb, cruise, descent phase of flight (i.e., above 3000ft, includes aircraft departing from the airport only to avoid double counting of emissions with other airports). It is understood that inclusion of emissions from all flights full durations could lead to double counting, but the airport needs to acknowledge the wider picture that increased flights on the scale proposed will lead to increased carbon emissions beyond the calculations in the PEIR and that sustainability of this in relation to climate change on the global scale is a key issue that cannot be glossed over. As a result of this the GHG emissions are significantly under reported in the PEIR</p>		Not agreed

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
			and this issue should be addressed in the ES.		
<u>Cumulative Effects</u>					
CBC1 09710 56	Search area of 500m with regards to the criteria and relevant applications and allocations to be accounted for in the cumulative effects assessment	The Applicant outlined the search areas of 500m with regards to the criteria and relevant applications and allocations to be accounted for in the cumulative effects assessment.	CBC have no objections to the search area of 500m with regards to the criteria and relevant applications and allocations to be accounted for in the cumulative effects assessment.	To be discussed at topic specific meeting	Ongoing
<u>Economics and Employment</u>					
CBC1 10081 167	Methodology for assessing the effects	The Applicant considers that the estimates of the economic benefits of the Proposed Development, as set out in the	CBC agrees with the methodology for assessing the effects on Economics and Employment from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development	Agreed at the Economics and Employment TWG meeting	Agreed

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	<p>on Economics and Employment from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development</p>	<p>Need Case [AS-125] and the Environmental Statement Chapter 11 [APP-037] have been robustly produced using an appropriate methodology, including the effects during construction and operation, and that the economic benefits are significant, specifically that the creation of employment and GVA (gross value added) will contribute significantly to 'levelling up' in Luton and regeneration of the Borough.</p>	<p>and that the benefits would make a material contribution to levelling up in Luton.</p> <p>[CBC has since raised the following point within their PADSS: No assessment of economic effects in relation to the supply chain have been carried out. Supply chain assessment to be undertaken]</p>	<p>on 19 March 2019 <u>19.03.19</u></p> <p>Further discussion needed on this point.</p>	
<p>CBC11</p>	<p>Economic benefits deriving from the additional air connectivity</p>	<p>The wider economic benefits deriving from the additional air connectivity delivered by the Proposed Development, as set out in the Need Case [AS-125], are significant and will make a significant contribution to attracting additional high value economic activities to Luton and the surrounding area.</p>	<p>CBC recognises the importance of the direct and indirect employment and socio-economic benefit to the local and regional economy that the proposed expansion will bring.</p> <p>LBC considers that the socio-economic impact of the proposed development upon Luton as well as the sub-regional impact is wholly positive. The Airport is a vital asset in the region with the Enterprise Zone built around it, and the aviation sector is a key area for growth and recovery post the Covid 19 Pandemic, with the growth of the</p>	<p>Agreed via email on 05.12.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
			Airport being a central pillar to the Council's Strategic Vision.		
CBC1 11091 28	Wider economic benefits deriving from the additional air connectivity delivered by the Proposed Development	The Applicant considers that the wider economic benefits deriving from the additional air connectivity delivered by the Proposed Development, as set out in the Need Case [AS-125] , are significant and will make a significant contribution to attracting additional high-value economic activities to Luton and the surrounding area.	CBC recognise that the proposed development would have economic benefits for the wider area. The key is ensuring these are evenly distributed and not only Luton-centric. CBC view on the wider economic benefits sought.	-To be discussed at topic-specific meeting	Ongoing
CBC1 12038 9	Scoping out of the assessment on the impact of the Proposed Development on tourism deficit.	The Applicant considers that it was correct to scope out from the economic assessment the effects of outbound tourism as set out in the ES Scoping Report and accepted by the Planning Inspectorate in their Scoping Opinion.	The CBC agrees with the scoping out of the assessment on the impact of the Proposed Development on tourism deficit. [CBC has raised in its PADSS and LIR the question as to whether the effect of outbound tourism on local hotels and retail has been taken into account].	Agreed at Economics and Employment TWG meeting on 28 May 2019.05.19 Further discussion needed on this point.	Ongoing

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
<u>Noise policy, legislation and guidance</u>					
CBC1 13149 20	Relevant policy, legislation and guidance	The list of policy, legislation and guidance as set out in Table 16.1 to 16.4 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003] (plus Building Bulletin 93: Acoustic Design of Schools which was mistakenly omitted from Table 16.4) is appropriate to inform the assessment, at the time of writing the submission documents.	CBC agrees these documents to be appropriate.	Relevant representations	OngoingAgreed
CBC1 14252 04	Compliance with aviation noise policy	The Planning Statement [AS-422REP5-016] sets out how the Proposed Development complies with aviation noise policy including the objective in the Aviation Policy Framework “to limit and where possible reduce the number of people in the UK	CBC's summary position is set out in post hearing submission [REP3-094] CBC has received this paper and it is being reviewed.	Relevant representations	OngoingNot agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
		<p>significantly affected by aircraft noise, as part of a policy of sharing benefits of noise reduction with industry".</p> <p>The Government's current Overarching aviation noise policy statement was published after the DCO application and is therefore not referenced in the application documents. The Proposed Development's compliance with the new policy statement has been set out in Commentary on the Overarching Aviation Noise Policy Statement [REP1-012].</p>	<p>PADSS identifies concern that policy assessment is not compliant with aviation noise policy.</p>		
	<p><u>Noise assessment methodology – modelling assessment and criteria</u></p>				
<p>CBC1 15362 12</p>	<p>Approach, methodologies, LOAEL, SOAEL, and UAEL values and assessment periods for the</p>	<p>The Applicant has employed a robust methodology for the construction noise and vibration assessment, with appropriate assessment criteria and assessment periods.</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the approach, methodologies, LOAEL, SOAEL, and UAEL values and assessment periods for the construction noise and vibration assessment.</p>	<p>Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated <u>16.01.23</u> <u>January 2023</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u>
	construction noise and vibration assessment	<p>The methodologies and data applied are as referenced in BS 5228-1 and BS 5228-2.</p> <p>LOAELs, SOAELs and UAELs (for defined day, evening and night time periods) used by the Applicant for the construction noise and vibration assessments are set out in Table 16.11 and Table 16.12 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003].</p>			
CBC1 <u>16472</u> <u>23</u>	Modelling approach, methodologies, LOAEL, SOAEL, and UAEL values and assessment periods, and change criteria for the air noise assessment	<p>The Applicant has employed a robust methodology for the air noise assessment, with appropriate assessment criteria and assessment periods.</p> <p>Noise modelling has been undertaken using Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) software.</p> <p>The primary assessment metrics are the 92-day summer $L_{Aeq,16h}$ and $L_{Aeq,8h}$ sound levels.</p>	CBC agrees with the modelling approach, methodologies, LOAEL, SOAEL, and UAEL values and assessment periods, and change criteria for the air noise assessment.	Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated <u>16.01.23</u> <u>January 2023</u>	Agreed

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
		<p>The LOAELs, SOAELs and UAELs (day and night) used by the Applicant for the air noise assessments are set out in Table 16.13 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003].</p> <p>Change criteria for identifying the magnitude of impact for changes in air and ground noise are set out in Table 16.14 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003].</p>			
CBC1 <u>17582</u> <u>34</u>	Validation of AEDT aircraft noise contour model	The Applicant has undertaken a robust validation exercise of the AEDT aircraft noise model using radar track data and noise monitoring terminal measurements.	CBC are content with the use of the AEDT aircraft noise contour model (including its validation) to calculate noise contours.	Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated <u>16.01.23</u> <u>January 2023</u>	Agreed
CBC1 <u>18692</u> <u>45</u>	Ground noise prediction and assessment	The Applicant has employed a robust methodology for the ground noise assessment, with appropriate assessment criteria and assessment periods.	CBC agrees with the modelling approach, methodologies, LOAEL, SOAEL, and UAEL values and assessment periods, and change criteria for the ground noise assessment.	Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated	Agreed

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	methodology .	<p>Modelling of ground noise has been undertaken in accordance with ISO 9613 and that the assumptions on stand use are documented in the ES.</p> <p>Ground noise change criteria are set out in Table 16.14 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003] and LOAELs, SOAELs and UAELs for the different assessment periods are set out in Table 16.13 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003].</p>		<p>16.01.23 January 2023</p>	
<p>CBC1 19720 56</p>	Methodology for the surface access noise assessment	<p>The Applicant has employed a robust methodology for the surface access noise assessment, with appropriate assessment criteria and assessment periods.</p> <p>This methodology includes the use of the CRTN prediction methodology, and an assumption</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the use of CRTN methodology.</p> <p>CBC agrees with the road selection within the noise assessment.</p> <p>CBC agrees with the assumption that there will be no reduction in noise from electric vehicles.</p> <p>CBC agrees with the LOAELs SOAELs for the surface access noise assessment.</p>	<p>Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated 16.01.23 January 2023</p>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
		<p>that there will be no reduction in noise from electric vehicles.</p> <p>Surface noise LOAEL, SOAEL and UAEL values have been set out in Table 16.16 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003].</p> <p>Change criteria for surface access noise are set out in Table 16.17 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003].</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the surface access noise change criteria.</p>		
<p>CBC1 20182 167</p>	<p>Justification for the setting of surface access noise UAELs</p>	<p>The Applicant has applied an appropriate UAEL for the surface access noise assessment:</p> <p>UAEL: Daytime 74 dB LAe1,16hr and night time 66 dB LAeq,8hr. (Table 16.16 of Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [APP-080REP1-003]).</p> <p>The UAEL has been set with reference to the Association of Noise Consultant's and Institute</p>	<p><u>CBC consider that the daytime UAEL for surface access noise should be 71 dB LAeq,16hr consistent with the Heathrow Airport PEIR.</u></p> <p><u>CBC note that irrespective of whatever value is chosen (within the range 71-74 dB), it is accepted that the assessment outcomes remain unchanged and acceptable.</u></p>	<p><u>Suono submissions on behalf of the Host Authorities at Deadline 3</u> <u>Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated 16 January 2023</u></p>	<p><u>Not Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
		<p>of Acoustics' Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise, and has been accepted as appropriate in the DCO decision for the A14 Cambridge to Huntingdon Improvement Scheme.</p> <p>Further information has been provided in "Surface Access Noise Modelling – Additional Information" Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [APP-080REP1-003].</p>	<p>Further information document is being reviewed by CBC,</p>		
<p>CBC1 <u>21192</u> 278</p>	<p>Validation of the surface access noise model</p>	<p>The Applicant has utilised a robust surface access noise model following the methodology set out in CRTN. Confidence in the model comes from the long-term validation of the core calculation methodology from thousands of measurements over decades and a robust quality assurance procedure for checking the model input data. Differences between the model outputs and spot check measurements are</p>	<p><u>CBC agree with the approach taken and validation of the surface access noise modelling.</u></p> <p>Further information document is being reviewed by CBC,</p>	<p>Relevant representations</p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreement</u></p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>explained in paragraph 16.7.14 of Chapter 16 of the ES [REP1-003]. It is not best practice to adjust the CRTN model to match spot measurements. This is because the CRTN model outputs are based on annual average data over an 18 hour period, which cannot be directly compared to short-term (up to 3 hours on a single day) duration measurements which may have atypical traffic volumes and speed than the annual average data.</p> <p>Further information has been provided "Surface Access Noise Modelling – Additional Information" Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [APP-080REP1-003].</p>			
<p><u>Noise assessment methodology – determining significance</u></p>					
<p>CBC1 22038 9</p>	<p>2019 Actuals baseline</p>	<p>Forecast noise exposure with the development is compared to the future baseline and also to the 'current baseline' which is</p>	<p>CBC do not accept that the 2019 Actuals baseline has been used in the core assessment and believe that the 2019</p>	<p>Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
		<p>considered to be the actual noise levels in 2019, in line with the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (which refers to the baseline scenario as “a description of the relevant aspects of the current state of the environment” in Schedule 4, paragraph 3).</p> <p>However, a sensitivity test using a ‘2019 Consented’ baseline (derived for this purpose by adjusting the fleet mix that occurred in 2019 to reach a modelled noise impact that would sit within the existing 2019 short term Limits) is summarised in Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration of the ES [REP1-003].</p> <p>An assessment against both the 2019 Actuals and 2019 Consented baseline has therefore been undertaken. The conclusions of residual significant effects remain the same for both assessments, as significant</p>	<p>Consented baseline should have been used instead.</p>	<p>dated 16.01.23 16 January 2023</p>	

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
		effects would be avoided through the provision of the full cost of noise insulation.			
<p>CBC1 23112 4930</p>	<p>Future baseline that is compliant with the airport's current consented long term noise limits</p>	<p>The future baseline air noise levels are compliant with the airport's current consented long term noise limits in each assessment year and therefore demonstrates a scenario where the airport is operating within its consented noise limits.</p> <p>The current consented noise limits (calculated using the Integrated Noise Model, INM) are as follows.</p> <p>Short-term limits for 18mppa:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Daytime 57 dB LAeq,16h noise contour - 19.4 km². • Night-time 48 dB LAeq,8h noise contour - 37.2 km². <p>Long-term limits for 18mppa to be achieved by 2028:</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the approach of using a future baseline that is compliant with the airport's current consented long term noise limits.</p>	<p>Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated <u>16.01.23</u> 16 January 2023</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daytime 57 dB LAeq,16h noise contour - 15.2 km². Night-time 48 dB LAeq,8h noise contour - 31.6 km². 			
<p>CBC1 24253 04</p>	<p>Noise monitoring data</p>	<p>Chapter 16 sets of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003] sets out the two types of noise monitoring that have been used in the assessment. At the request of the Examining Authority, further information has been provided in Ambient noise monitoring data and survey sheets [AS-120]. These documents note that the assessment baseline is calculated, rather than measured, and that the ambient noise monitoring does not directly influence the assessment of noise effects.</p>	<p><u>CBC acknowledge that the ambient noise monitoring data would not directly influence the assessment of noise effects. A fully quantified noise environment would have allowed for a greater level of explanation and context to be given when discussing the noise effects, but this is not possible with the presented results. do not consider that the noise monitoring data is sufficient to fully characterise the existing noise environment.</u> noise monitoring data is sufficient to fully characterise the existing noise environment.</p>	<p>Relevant representations Meeting with Suono on behalf of the Local Authorities 21.11.2023</p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> Not agreed <u>Agreed</u></p>
<p><u>Noise mitigation</u></p>					

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
CBC1 25363 12	Introduction appropriateness of the noise insulation scheme	The proposed Noise Insulation Scheme has been set out by the Applicant in Draft Compensation Policies Measures and Community First [AS-128REP4-042] .	CBC agrees with the introduction of the night-time SOAEL eligibility criteria and accepts the appropriateness of the noise insulation scheme in principle.	Relevant representations	Agreed
CBC1 26473 23	The night time quota period movement limit <u>Noise Controls</u>	As noted in the <u>Comparison of Consented and Proposed Operational Noise Controls [REP5-014]</u> , the following noise controls will be included in the DCO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>Noise Envelope, including noise contour area limits and thresholds</u> - <u>Movement Limit of 9,650 in during the night quota period (23:30 – 06:00)</u> - <u>Quota Count Limit of 3,500 during the night quota period (23:30 – 06:00)</u> - <u>Ban on QC2 and above movements during the night period (23:00 – 07:00)</u> - <u>Track Violation Penalties</u> 	CBC agrees with the night time quota period movement limit being retained. <u>inclusion of these controls.</u>	<u>Meeting with Suono on behalf of Host Authorities 21.11.2023</u>	Agreed

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<u>Departure Noise Violation Limits</u>			
<p>CBC1 <u>26725</u> 833</p>	<p>Noise indicators proposed for inclusion within the Noise Envelope</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out noise indicators proposed for inclusion within the Noise Envelope (54dB_{L_{Aeq}16h} and 48dB_{L_{Aeq}8h} noise contour areas).</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the numerical value chosen to represent the noise contour area Limits.</p>	<p>NEDG Final Report</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>CBC1 <u>29345</u></p>	<p>Single noise indicator in the Noise Envelope</p>	<p>There are many different indicators/metrics and methods of measuring and reporting noise. To have a clear and unambiguous measure of compliance with the GCG Noise Envelope, it is necessary to use a single metric for daytime and night-time to compare against the Limit. Other metrics can be usefully used to communicate airport noise to different audiences, provide a wider indication of noise performance indicators and hence provide noise management</p>	<p>CBC disagree with the use of a single noise indicator in the Noise Envelope and consider that other existing control measures should be maintained.</p> <p>CBC disagree with the use of a single noise indicator in the Noise Envelope.</p>	<p>NEDG Final Report</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
		<p>targets but these do not form GGG Limits. The primary indicators used for day and night-time Limits are in line with CAA guidance.</p>			
<p>CBC1 <u>28630</u> 56</p>	<p>Formal review period of five years embedded in the Noise Envelope.</p>	<p>The Applicant has proposed a formal review period of five years embedded in the Noise Envelope.</p> <p>The proposed Noise Envelope has been updated to clarify that a 'material change' (either the ICAO publishing a new 'noise chapter' or the approval of an Airspace Change Proposal) would require the airport operator to update their noise forecasts and undertake a Noise Limit Review identifying whether noise Limits can be reduced and noise benefits can be shared with the community.</p>	<p>CBC supports the proposal that the formal review period should be every five years, aligning with the Airport's obligation to update its Noise Action Plan following the five yearly Noise Mapping required under the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006 (as amended).</p> <p>CBC also supports that the Noise Envelope would be reviewed if there were to be any significant changes to the airport's operations such as the publication of a new ICAO noise chapter or the anticipated modernisation of airspace.</p>	<p>NEDG Final Report</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>CBC1 <u>29831</u> 67</p>	<p><u>Effectiveness of Noise</u></p>	<p>Appendix 16.2 of the Environmental Statement [APP-111REP4-023] sets out how the proposed Noise Envelope</p>	<p><u>CBC note that it appears that through implementation of Local Rules to manage the release of slots, alongside 5-year advanced planning (both of which are</u></p>	<p><u>Meeting with Suono on behalf of Host Authorities</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	Envelope mechanisms	<p>contains mechanisms that should have avoided the noise Limit breaches that occurred at the airport from 2017-2019. This is further elaborated on in the Comparison of consented and proposed operational noise controls document [AS-121REP5-014] which provides a direct comparison between the current and proposed operational noise controls, noting that the Noise Envelope provides several enhancements to the current consented noise controls, such as independent scrutiny and oversight, increased transparency, adaptive mitigation and management plans and noise limit reviews.</p> <p>The Noise Envelope (see Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [APP-217REP5-022]) has been designed to improve upon the existing noise control regime and to effectively prevent breaches from occurring.</p> <p>Appendix 16.2 Operational</p>	<p>proposed), Luton Airport may be able to manage noise so as not to need to reduce capacity. <u>Sensible Local Rules, possibly implemented in step changes as part of or in line with the 5-yearly ESG review period, are an important part of an acceptable noise control strategy.</u> is not satisfied that the Noise Envelope would be effective in controlling breaches of a noise Limit.</p> <p><u>CBC has received the document Noise Envelope – improvements and worked example [REP2-032] and is reviewing its contents.</u></p>	<p><u>21.11.2023</u> <u>Relevant representations and subject to discussions with Suono on 22.11.23.</u></p>	

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>Noise Management (Explanatory Note) of the Environmental Statement [APP-111REP4-023] sets out how the proposed Noise Envelope contains mechanisms that should have avoided the noise Limit breaches that occurred at the airport from 2017-2019. This is further elaborated on in the Comparison of consented and proposed operational noise controls document [AS-121REP5-014] which provides a direct comparison between the current and proposed operational noise controls, noting that the Noise Envelope provides several enhancements to the current consented noise controls that are designed to prevent breaches before they occur, such as independent scrutiny and oversight, increased transparency, adaptive mitigation and management plans and noise Limit reviews.</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>Improvements have been made to the Noise Envelope since submission, and a worked example showing how the improved Noise Envelope controls should have avoided the noise Limit breaches that occurred at the airport from 2017-2019 has been provided in Noise Envelope – improvements and worked example [REP2-032TR020001/APP/8.36].</p>			
<p>CBC1 30293 2</p>	<p><u>Status of the current planning permission noise conditions</u> <u>Status of the current planning permission noise conditions</u></p>	<p><u>As set out in the Comparison of consented and proposed operational noise controls [REP5-014], the current planning permission noise conditions would be replaced with noise controls secured through the DCO.</u></p> <p><u>The principal noise controls secured in the DCO are the Noise Envelope that sits within the Green Controlled Growth Framework [APP-218] and the Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan [REP4-025]. In essence,</u></p>	<p><u>CBC position to be confirmed. have stated their position in ISH9 and have discussed the remaining metrics with the Applicant, including the provision of a note, which it is understood the Applicant will be responding to at D6.</u></p> <p><u>CBC are concerned that all the current planning conditions are not carried forward within the DCO and therefore there is less certainty for the surrounding communities that they will not be exposed to increases in noise.</u></p>	<p><u>Meeting with Suono on behalf of Host Authorities 21.11.2023 To be discussed in ongoing topic specific meetings</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>these noise commitments define the noise environmental outcomes to be achieved, or bettered, rather than pre-defining the specific mitigation mechanisms employed to achieve the outcomes.</p> <p>The Noise Envelope also provides several enhancements to the current consented noise controls, such as independent scrutiny and oversight, increased transparency, adaptive mitigation and management plans and noise limit reviews.</p> <p>In addition, the vast majority of the noise controls in the current consent will be secured in the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant has received a note from the Host Authorities and has submitted a response in Response to Suono's note on Noise Controls [TR020001/APP/8.126]</p> <p>As set out in the Comparison of consented and proposed</p>			

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>operational noise controls [AS-121REP5-014], the current planning permission noise conditions would be replaced with noise controls secured through the DCO.</p> <p>The principal noise controls secured in the DCO are the Noise Envelope that sits within the Green Controlled Growth Framework [APP-218REP5-022] and the Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan [APP-112REP4-025]. In essence, these noise commitments define the noise environmental outcomes to be achieved, or bettered, rather than pre-defining the specific mitigation mechanisms employed to achieve the outcomes. As a result, many of the individual and specific mitigation mechanisms secured in the current planning permission noise conditions would be replaced by the overall Limits and control mechanisms in the Noise Envelope</p>			

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p><u>and the Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan.</u></p> <p><u>Given that the airport expansion is planned over an extended period of time, this approach provides appropriate flexibility for the airport operator to identify and implement the optimum mitigation at the time it may become required and draw on future technology improvement whilst also providing certainty of the outcomes that will result even in the reasonable worst-case scenario.</u></p> <p><u>Details of the planning conditions to be carried forward are provided at Deadline 5 in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 1 Actions 8 and 11: Note on existing/previous S106 planning conditions and obligations [REP5-044].</u></p>			
<p>CBC1 3103</p>	<p>Construction Vibration</p>	<p>The Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [AppPP-049REP4-011] has been updated</p>	<p>CBC <u>agrees</u> with these changes.</p>	<p><u>Meeting between Applicant and</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed Ongoing</u></p>

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
	<p><u>Thresholds in CoCP</u></p> <p><u>SOAELs</u></p>	<p>following <u>ISH3</u> and discussions with the Host Authorities to <u>remove the temporary vibration thresholds</u> and <u>identifies thresholds</u> maintain consistent <u>(Table 14.2)</u> thresholds with <u>Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003]</u>. <u>identifies thresholds (Table 14.2) differing depending on the duration of the works and whether advance notification has been provided to residents/occupants. This approach is consistent with that set out in BS5228-2:2009 +A1 2014.</u></p>		<p><u>Suono</u> <u>18.10.2023</u></p>	
<p><u>CBC1</u> <u>3214</u></p>	<p><u>Fixed Plant Noise Limits</u></p>	<p>Following discussions with the Host Authorities, the <u>aApplicant has agreed that Append-ix 16.3 of the Environmental Statement - Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan [(APP-112REP4-025)] be updated to require that "Fixed plant shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained with the objective</u></p>	<p><u>CBC agree that this is an appropriate criterion for fixed plant noise.</u></p>	<p><u>Meeting between applicant and Suono</u> <u>18.10.2023</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status atus
		<p><u>that the rating level $L_{A,r,T,r}$ of fixed plant under normal operation at the worst affected residential receptor, minus the background sound level ($L_{A90,T}$), is not more than -10 dB, determined in accordance with British Standard 4142". The revised document was submitted at D4 [REP4-025, REP4-026]</u></p>			
<p>CBC1 3325</p>	<p><u>Control of noise and vibration from impact piling</u></p>	<p><u>Following discussions with the Host Authorities, the Applicant proposes to include the following text in the Code of Construction Practice:</u></p> <p><u>"No impact piling shall commence until a piling method statement (detailing the type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to control noise and vibration and measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface water infrastructure, and the programme for the works)</u></p>	<p><u>CBC agrees with this inclusion.</u></p>	<p><u>Meeting between applicant and Suono 18.10.2023</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u></p>

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>atus</u>
		<p><u>has been submitted and approved as part of the Section 61 process. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement." The revised document was submitted at D4 [REP4-011/12]</u></p>			
<p>CBC1 3436</p>	<p><u>GCG</u> <u>Thresholds and Limits –</u> <u>Noise</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant considers that the principle of aligning noise Limits and Thresholds within the GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022] with the Faster Growth sensitivity test is appropriate and will ensure that the environmental impacts of expansion are no worse than the reasonable worst case.</u></p>	<p><u>CBC considers that noise Limits should be to be set by reference to the Core Planning Case.</u></p>	<p><u>Meeting with Suono</u> <u>18.10.2023</u></p>	<p><u>Not agreed</u></p>
<p><u>Cultural Heritage</u></p>					
<p>CBC1 35478</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP)</p>	<p>The Cultural Heritage Management Plan (<u>CHMP</u>) has been updated with the requested additional measures and <u>will be has been</u> resubmitted at Deadline 4.</p>	<p>CBC Conservation Officer requested that additional measures are included in the CHMP in relation to the air quality monitoring at Someries Castle. These measures comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A condition survey of Someries Castle, comprising a site visit, visual 	<p><u>Strategy</u> <u>Agreed</u> at topic specific meeting held <u>12.09.23</u> <u>September</u> <u>2023.</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
			<p>inspection and photographic record, prior to the monitoring to establish its baseline conditions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarification of how the air quality monitoring data would be disseminated and confirmation that it would be shared with the local authority; and <p>Clarification of what measures would be taken by the Applicant should the air quality monitoring demonstrate that air quality levels were worse than predicted and were potentially contributing to the deterioration of the fabric of Someries Castle.</p> <p>CBC Conservation Officer has agreed the updated CHMP via email.</p>	<p>Updated CHMP agreed via email on 30.10.23 October 2023.</p>	
<p>CBC1 36589</p>	<p>Preservation in situ strategy in the CHMP</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees and the preservation in situ strategy in the CHMP [APP-077REP4-020] has been will be amended to include detailed archaeological excavation. The updated CHMP has been resubmitted at Deadline 4.</p>	<p>CBC is not prepared to support the proposal for preservation in situ of the Roman building remains in Area 3 because the remains are already in a fragile state and are likely to be damaged by the proposed earthmoving to protect them. Detailed archaeological excavation is requested instead.</p>	<p>Strategy aAgreed at topic specific meeting held 29.06.23 June 2023.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			CBC have agreed the updated CHMP via email.	Updated CHMP agreed via email on 01.11.23 November 2023.	
CBC1 376940	1km study area for non-designated heritage assets	The Applicant proposes a 1km study area for non-designated heritage assets.	CBC agrees with the 1km study area for non-designated heritage assets.	Agreed during pre-application engagement	Agreed
CBC1 387404	WSI scope and methodology for trial trenching and trial trench evaluation	The WSI scope and methodology for trial trenching and trial trench evaluation was undertaken to inform the ES.	CBC agrees with the WSI scope and methodology for trial trenching and trial trench evaluation undertaken to inform the ES.	Email correspondence with CBC Archaeologist on 14 July 2022 14.07.22	Agreed
CBC1 412398	Archaeological mitigation works will be carried out in advance of	Archaeological mitigation works will be carried out in advance of construction activities in accordance with CHMP.	CBC agree that the majority of archaeological mitigation works would be carried out in advance of construction activities in accordance with CHMP.	Email correspondence with CBC Archaeologist 14. 12.22	Agreed

<u>ID ref</u> <u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u> <u>Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u> <u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u> <u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u> <u>Status</u>
	construction activities			December 2022 – 12.01.23 January 2023	
CBC1 40394 23	Visual representation of the Proposed Development	<p>The Applicant considers that the wirelines submitted provide an accurate visual representation of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Updated Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) include labels of development work orders to aid identification. These were resubmitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>Wirelines rather than block colour have been utilised as it is the maximum design parameters being illustrated. Therefore, wirelines are used for longer distance views to demonstrate how the proposals sit within the landscape. The use of block colour would only reveal a small component of the proposals in these particular views. Refer to Viewpoint^{nt} 17 for the RPG and</p>	<p>CBC believe there is a lack of clarity with the visualisations from Luton Hoo RPG and house and feel there would be greater understanding of the potential impacts if components of the Proposed Development were shown in block colour rather than a dashed outline and were labelled for ease of identification.</p> <p>Awaiting further comments following submission of updated AVRs at Deadline 3.</p>	Agreed at topic specific meeting held 12 September 2023 . 12.09.23	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		Viewpoint 17a for 2nd Floor of Luton Hoo House.			
CBC1 4103	Location of FTG with respect to the visual and environmental impact	<p>The impacts from the FTG have been assessed as detailed in Chapter 7 Air Quality of the Environmental Assessment [AS-076]. Effects from uses of the FTG along with cumulative effects from all airport operations were assessed including at Someries Castle and Luton Hoo Registered Park and Garden and results are presented in table 3.1 in Appendix 7.1 [AS-028]. All impacts from airborne pollutants are predicted to be not significant.</p> <p>Updated AVRs have been resubmitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>CBC express concern over location of FTG with respect to the visual and environmental impact. CBC Conservation Officer believes there is a lack of clarity regarding how airborne pollutants from the FTG would affect the setting of Someries Castle and potentially contribute to the deterioration of its fabric. CBC are also concerned that it would impact on Luton Hoo Registered Park and Garden.</p> <p>Awaiting further comments following submission of updated AVRs at Deadline 3.</p>	Agreement to be confirmed	Ongoing
CBC1 42145	Visibility of some components of the Proposed Development	<p>The Applicant considers that the wirelines submitted provide an accurate visual representation of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Actual Visual Representations have been</p>	<p>CBC Conservation Officer expressed concern over visibility of some components of the Proposed Development from Luton Hoo House. Conservation Officer seeks confirmation that a suitable colour palette will be used for built components of the Proposed</p>	Agreed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.23 September 2023 .	Agreed Ongoing

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	t from Luton Hoo House	modelled to provide maximum parameters of size and location only. The detailed design and appearance of the proposed buildings would be subject to Planning Approval/ Condition Discharge Approval.	Development and would be sympathetic to and not in conflict with the surrounding landscape; particularly in views from Luton Hoo House and RPG.		
CBC1 43256	Impact assessment	<p>The Applicant considers the impact assessment to be accurate and robust and ES Chapter 10 [AS-077] reports on the likely significant effects to cultural heritage resulting from the Proposed Development, in accordance with the requirements of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.</p> <p>A separate Heritage Statement is provided as Appendix D of the Planning Statement [APP-198] that considers potential harm to heritage assets in accordance with the NPPF. This is to enable the planning balance to be undertaken</p>	<p>No assessment in NPPF terms has been undertaken (<u>e.g.e.g.</u>, no harm, less than substantial harm, substantial harm, etc).</p> <p><u>CBC have agreed the information will be provided in the updated Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073], which has been submitted at D4.</u></p>	<p><u>Strategy agreed Agreed at topic specific meeting held 12 September 2023..12.09.23</u></p> <p><u>Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073] has been updated and submitted at Deadline 4.</u></p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
		<p>in weighing harm against public benefit.</p> <p>While there is no direct correlation between the significance of effect in EIA terms and the degree of harm referenced in national planning policy, it is acknowledged that those assets which are identified as experiencing a significant adverse effect are more likely to experience substantial harm. Appendix D of the Planning Statement [APP-198] therefore provides further assessment of those heritage assets where significant effects have been identified in order to understand where on the harm spectrum this impact falls.</p> <p><u>Further to the statement of harm in the Planning Statement [AS-122REP5-016], the Applicant agrees to update has been updated the Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073] (for Deadline 4) to include the</u></p>			

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p><u>assessment of impact and assessment of harm, and to better articulate the rationale for the scoping out of heritage assets from the impact assessment process.</u></p>			
<p>CBC1 44367</p>	<p>The impact of the proposal on Luton Hoo Conservation Area</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the impact assessment to be accurate and robust and which complies with an appropriate and approved methodology.</p> <p>The assessment of Luton Hoo Conservation Area in the ES [AS-077] is included within the assessment of impact to Luton Hoo Registered Park and Garden, which it sits entirely within. This is part of the holistic approach to the assessment of Luton Hoo Registered Park and Garden which was agreed with Historic England, as documented in Table 10.6 of the ES [AS-077].</p> <p><u>The Applicant has agreed with the Conservation Officer for CBC that the impact assessment for Luton</u></p>	<p>There is no consideration of the impact of the proposal on Luton Hoo Conservation Area, which contributes to the significance of the Registered Park and Garden and setting of the mansion. The Conservation Area is noted but there is no specific assessment in Table 10.11.</p> <p><u>CBC have agreed the information will be provided in the updated Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073], which has been submitted at D4.</u></p>	<p><u>Strategy agreed at topic specific meeting held on 12.09.2023 September 2023</u></p> <p><u>Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073] has been updated and submitted at Deadline 4.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed Ongoing</u></p>

ID refID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p><u>Hoo Conservation Area, as an individual heritage asset, will be articulated in the updated Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073], to be which has been submitted at Deadline 4.</u></p>			
<p>CBC1 45478</p>	<p>Cultural heritage assessment on Someries Castle</p>	<p>ES Chapter 10 [AS-077] reports the findings of the cultural heritage assessment on Someries Castle clearly and transparently using assessment methods agreed through formal EIA scoping and engagement with consultees, and further informed by evidence from the air quality assessment [AS-076]. As reiterated in Section 10.9 of ES Chapter 10 [AS-077], the air quality model predicts a negligible change in the concentrations of NO₂ and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) at the site of Someries Castle. As such, it is assessed there would be no impact to the brick fabric of the castle as a</p>	<p>Potential impact and harm arising from the Proposed Development on Someries Castle have not been adequately addressed particularly regarding impact on brick erosion. It is unclear how harm will be mitigated.</p> <p><u>CBC Conservation Officer has agreed the updated CHMP via email.</u></p>	<p><u>Confirmed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.2023 September 2023.</u></p> <p><u>Updated CHMP agreed via email on 30.10.23 October 2023.</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>result of the operational Development.</p> <p>Potential impacts to Someries Castle's fabric from vibration impacts are also assessed in Section 10.9 of ES Chapter 10 [AS-077] which concludes that ground vibration would not be perceptible from Someries Castle, resulting in no impact to the asset.</p> <p>Air quality monitoring measures, to be carried out between 2026 and 2045, have been included in the CHMP [APP-077REP4-020] and the CHMP will be <u>has been</u> updated to confirm that the monitoring results will be shared with the relevant local authority heritage officers.</p> <p>As detailed in the Outline Operational Air Quality Plan [APP-065] reviews, repeated every 5 years, will be carried out to assess if the annual concentrations measured are</p>			

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
		<p>higher than the modelled concentrations. Where necessary, and dependent on the magnitude of any increase, the Operational Air Quality Plan will be reviewed and where reasonably practicable updated to strengthen the mitigation measures to help drive emission reductions.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has agreed with the Conservation Officer for CBC to include air quality monitoring, which has been included in the updated CHMP [APP-077REP4-020] which has been submitted at Deadline 4.</u></p>			
<p>CBC1 46589</p>	<p>The views from Luton Hoo RPG and House</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the wirelines submitted provide an accurate visual representation of the Proposed Development. Updated Representative Viewpoints (AVRs), submitted as <u>[AS-141REP3-010]</u> and <u>[AS-142REP3-011]</u>, include amongst other things, labels of development work orders to aid</p>	<p>Appendix 14.7 with reference to the views from Luton Hoo RPG and House, uses wirelines for some views and block forms for others. A consistent approach should be used. Lack of clarification on representative viewpoint 18 – clarification is required on what elements of the Proposed Development would be visible.</p>	<p>Confirmed at topic specific meeting held <u>12 September 2023</u> <u>12.09.23</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>the identification of elements of the Proposed Development and labels of development work orders to aid identification.</u></p> <p>Wirelines have been utilised for longer distance views to demonstrate how the proposals sit within the landscape, block colour would only reveal a small component of the proposals in these particular views. Refer to Viewpoint 17 for the RPG and Viewpoint 17a for 2nd Floor of Luton Hoo House.</p>	<p><u>Awaiting further comments following submission of updated AVRs at Deadline 3.</u></p>		
<p>CBC1 476950</p>	<p>Visual and environmental impact of the Fire Training Ground on Someries Castle and Luton Hoo Registered Park and Garden</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the wirelines submitted provide an accurate visual representation of the Proposed Development. The AVRs have been modelled to provide the maximum parameters of the size and location of the FTG.</p> <p>As reported in the Cultural Heritage Chapter 10 of the ES [AS-077], Chapter 7 Air Quality [AS-076] predicts a negligible</p>	<p>Lack of information to understand the visual and environmental impact of the Fire Training Ground (FTG) on Someries Castle and Luton Hoo Registered Park and Garden. This is in terms of built form and usage.</p> <p><u>Awaiting further comments following submission of updated AVRs at Deadline 3.</u></p>	<p><u>Environmental impact from the FTG has been agreed. Confirmed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.23 September 2023.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>change in pollutant concentrations of NO₂ and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) at Someries Castle as a result of the operational development, which includes the use of the FTG.</p> <p>Further to this, air quality monitoring measures, to be carried out between 2026 and 2045, have been included in the CHMP [APP-077REP4-020] and <u>as agreed with the local authority heritage officers the CHMP has been updated to confirm that the monitoring results will be shared with the relevant local authority.</u></p> <p><u>Updated visualisations have been submitted to Central Bedfordshire Council showing correct labelling of FTG.</u></p>		<p><u>The visual impact of the FTG is to be confirmed. Updated visualisations have been submitted to Central Bedfordshire Council showing correct labelling of FTG.</u></p>	
<p>CBC1 48750 4</p>	<p>Setting of a non-designated</p>	<p>The Applicant considers it is correct to scope out heritage assets from the ES [AS-077] where they are located outside of the Site and where they would not</p>	<p>As per the NPPF the setting of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account. This has been scoped out of the assessment.</p>	<p><u>Strategy confirmed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.2023</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position Environment	Central Bedfordshire Council position Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement Source of agreement	Status Status
	heritage asset	<p>be physically impacted by the Proposed Development. Heritage assets (designated or non-designated) with the potential for change to their setting that could affect their heritage value are included in the assessment. It is recognised that the majority of heritage assets would experience little change to their setting that would affect their heritage value and would not result in significant effects.</p> <p><u>For clarity, the Applicant agrees with the local authority to has updated the Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073] (for Deadline 4) to include the assessment of impact arising from change to setting (where this occurs), and to better articulate the rationale for the scoping out of heritage assets from the impact assessment process. The document was submitted at Deadline 4.</u></p>	<p><u>CBC have agreed the information will be provided in the updated Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073], which has been submitted at D4.</u></p>	<p><u>September 2023.</u></p> <p><u>Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073] has been updated and submitted at Deadline 4.</u></p>	

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position Environment</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u>
CBC1512	Assessment of historic hedgerows	<p>The Applicant considers that the Hedgerow Regulations do not need to be included in the ES chapter [AS-077] as hedgerows of particular archaeological or historical value are not present in the Site.</p> <p>The Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment [APP-072] reports on the historical loss of hedgerows and how this has affected the character of the historic landscape. The ES [AS-077] reports that the historic landscape has limited heritage value and is not sensitive to change. The assessment of impact of partial hedgerow loss is assessed to result in a negligible effect in the ES.</p>	It is unclear if an assessment has been made of historic hedgerows.		Ongoing

Table 3-3-88: Summary of ‘flightpath’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
Flightpaths					
Use of flightpaths in assessments					
CBC149 85123	Position on the use of existing flightpaths in assessments	The Applicant considers that it was reasonable to base the assessment of the noise effects of the Proposed Development on the existing flightpaths pending any decisions regarding future changes to these flightpaths as part of the Government’s Airspace Modernisation Strategy, as set out in Flightpath to the Future.	-CBC are content on theto confirm its position on the use of existing flightpaths in noise assessments.	To be discussed at topic specific meeting <u>Meeting with Suono on behalf of Host Authorities</u> <u>21.11.2023</u>	<u>Ongoing Agreed</u>

Table 3-93-993-1010: Summary of 'Green Controlled Growth' matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
GREEN CONTROLLED GROWTH					
Green Controlled Growth Framework					
CBC150 495234	Principle of GCG	<u>The Applicant considers that the Green Controlled Growth Framework [REP5-022] represents an innovative, ambitious approach to managing the growth of the airport within definitive environmental limits.</u> The Applicant considers that the Green Controlled Growth Framework [APP-218REP5-022] represents an innovative, ambitious approach to managing the growth of the airport within definitive environmental limits.	The principle of the Green Controlled Growth Framework is supported and is considered to be a significant step forward in reassuring the communities around the airport that the airport operator will deliver on mitigation.	CBC Response to Second Statutory Consultation prepared by Vincent + Goring, <u>4.04.22-April 2022</u>	Agreed
Thresholds and Limits					
CBC151 045	GCG Thresholds and Limits	The Applicant considers that the proposed approach of adopting Level 1 Thresholds, Level 2 Thresholds and Limits for each of	<u>Whilst the principles of GCG are welcomed there is some concern regarding the process, particularly in</u>	To be confirmed at topic specific meeting	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>the environmental topics within the scope of the GCG Framework [REP5-022], GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022], and the processes associated with these Thresholds and Limits, represents a clear and ambitious approach to managing airport growth in the context of environmental impact.</p>	<p>regard to the formal approval process for the ESG for example, in respect to exceedance of Level 1 Thresholds. CBC to confirm its position on processes related to Limits and Thresholds.</p>		
<p>CBC152 1456</p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the principle of aligning Limits and Thresholds within the GCG Framework [REP5-022], GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022] with the Faster Growth sensitivity test (with the exception of Air Quality, see row (CBC165) is appropriate and will ensure that the environmental impacts of expansion are no worse than the reasonable worst case.</p>	<p>CBC does not support the proposals for Limits to be set by reference to the Faster Growth Case rather than the Core Planning Case. CBC support the proposals for Limits to be set by reference to the Faster Growth Case rather than the Core Planning Case, on the basis that it will capture the worst case scenario for the four aspects of GCG.</p>	<p>Email received 27th September 2023 Email 27.09.23 received September 2023 Draft DCO documents review comments – October 2022</p>	<p>Agreed Ongoing</p>
<p>CBC153 2567</p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits – Air Quality</p>	<p>Given the constraints around monitoring of air quality impacts outlined in the GCG Framework [REP5-022], GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022], the Applicant believes it is necessary for the GCG approach to air quality to be different</p>	<p>CBC to confirm its position on this approach, noting queries raised through response to draft DCO documents in October 2022.</p>	<p>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>to the other topics within scope of GCG. As GCG Limits will be aligned to UK Air Quality Objective Levels, it is very unlikely to be the case that the airport is solely responsible for the limit being exceeded (although, if this were to be the case, it is acknowledged that the airport would be solely responsible for mitigating this impact). Instead, it is likely that the airport will be responsible for a proportion of emissions at a given location but that the majority would be from unrelated sources. In that scenario, the Applicant believe it is unreasonable for growth to be constrained at the airport provided that it has made a proportional contribution (relative to its level of impact) to mitigating the identified impacts.</p>			
<p>CBC154 3678</p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits - GHG</p>	<p>Scope 3 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions are by definition outside of the airport operator's control. On this basis, the Applicant considers it appropriate that where any Scope 3 emissions are incorporated into the GCG Framework they should be expressed as a net Limit, inclusive of</p>	<p>CBC to confirm position, noting queries raised through response to draft DCO documents in October 2022.</p>	<p>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>any offsetting that the airport operator may choose to implement.</p> <p>To demonstrate the Applicant's commitment to delivering reductions in surface access GHG emissions, it is proposed to align this Limit with a commitment (through the Applicant's broader corporate Net Zero Strategy) to be carbon neutral for surface access by 2040.</p>			
CBC155 4789	GCG Thresholds and Limits - GHG	The Applicant considers it appropriate to exclude emissions from aviation (LTO and CCD) from the scope of the GCG Framework as the Government has confirmed its position that aviation emissions are best dealt with at a national level, in the context of their Jet Zero strategy and Aviation Strategy: Making Best Use policy.	CBC to confirm its position on exclusion of aviation GHG emissions from GCG Framework.	To be confirmed at topic specific meeting	Ongoing
CBC156 58960	GCG Thresholds and Limits – Surface Access	The Applicant considers that the approach taken with respect to surface access Limits through the GCG Framework is appropriate and proportionate to the consequence of a failure to meet them, whilst allowing for more ambitious surface	CBC to confirm its position on the proposed approach for defining both surface access Limits within the GCG Framework, and additional, more ambitious surface access Targets through future Travel Plans.	To be confirmed at topic specific meeting	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		access Targets to be set through the Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044] . Framework Travel Plan [AS-431REP4-044] .			
CBC157 69604	GCG Thresholds and Limits - Review	The Applicant considers that it is appropriate for the GCG process, Limits and Thresholds to be reviewed in the circumstances set out in the GCG Framework [REP5-022] , GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022] , on the basis that there will be no ability to change any of the Thresholds or Limits to permit materially worse environmental effects than those identified in the Environmental Statement.	CBC to confirm position, noting provisional support for this position expressed in response to draft DCO documents in October 2022.	To be confirmed at topic specific meeting	Ongoing
Monitoring and Reporting					
CBC158 76012	Transition Period	The Applicant considers that the proposed Transition Period is an appropriate response to the novelty of the Green Controlled Growth process (which is believed to be unique for major infrastructure projects) and will allow the process to be reviewed to improve its effectiveness.	CBC to confirm its position on proposed Transition Period.	To be confirmed at topic specific meeting	Ongoing =

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>It is proposed that the transition period will apply for air quality, greenhouse gases and surface access last for the remainder of the calendar year in which notice under Article 44(1) of the Draft Development Consent Order [REP5-003] is served. The GCG process for these environmental topics will apply in full from 1 January following the service of notice under Article 44(1) to allow monitoring to be carried out over a full calendar year for these topics.</u></p> <p><u>No transition period will apply for noise.</u></p>			
<p>CBC159 86123</p>	<p>GCG Monitoring and Reporting - Timings</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the proposed timings for monitoring and reporting of environmental impacts provide an appropriate balance between the time needed to measure and assess impacts, the need to allow for scrutiny of environmental reporting, and the need to align the GCG process with international guidance and national legislation on how growth at airports</p>	<p>CBC to confirm its position on proposed approach to monitoring and reporting. <u>CBC have concerns with the adequacy of the Green Controlled Growth mechanism and their concerns with the timescales related to it.</u></p> <p><u>Given the need to assemble the representatives of the ESG, consider what may be quite considerable submissions and take the necessary technical advice 21</u></p>	<p>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting <u>CBC Response to ExA Written Questions</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>is managed through the Slot Allocation Process.</p> <p><u>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has made changes to this requirement as part of the Draft ESG Terms of Reference [REP5-024] submitted at Deadline 5 to extend the timescales for the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) to approve a Level 2 Plan (and Mitigation Plan) from 21 to 28 days. This has been achieved by reducing the amount of time that the airport operator has to prepare and submit a Level 2 Plan following submission of a Monitoring Report showing the exceedance of a Level 2 Threshold. Note that the overall timescales for preparation and approval of a Level 2 Plan cannot extend beyond the current proposal as this would result in the Green Controlled Growth (GCG) timescales extending beyond the September deadline for the airport to declare its capacity for the following summer season and would therefore not be workable.</u></p>	<p><u>days is too short a determination period. It is suggested that a period of 8 weeks would be appropriate.</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
Environmental Scrutiny Group and Technical Panels					
<p>CBC160 596234</p>	<p>ESG Membership</p>	<p><u>The Applicant considers that it is appropriate to determine local authority involvement on the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) on the basis of those local authorities that experience a broad range of impacts as a result of the Proposed Development. Based on the geographical distribution of impacts forecast in the ES, the four local authorities identified in the Draft ESG Terms of Reference [REP5-024] are those that are likely to experience impacts across the various environmental topics in scope of GCG. Where a local authority is only forecast to be impacted in a single area, the Applicant believes it is more appropriate for them to be offered a role on the relevant Technical Panel, with Terms of Reference and membership set out in the Draft Technical Panel Terms of Reference [REP5-026]. The Applicant considers that it is appropriate to determine local</u></p>	<p>Local Authority involvement is likely to be required from beyond the Host Authorities to other authorities that are impacted by the airport operations.</p>	<p>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>authority involvement on the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) on the basis of those local authorities that experience a broad range of impacts as a result of the Proposed Development. Based on the geographical distribution of impacts forecast in the ES, the four local authorities identified in the Draft ESG Terms of Reference [APP-219] are those that are likely to experience impacts across the various environmental topics in scope of GCG. Where a local authority is only forecast to be impacted in a single area, the Applicant believes it is more appropriate for them to be offered a role on the relevant Technical Panel, with Terms of Reference and membership set out in the Draft Technical Panel Terms of Reference [APP-220].</p>			
<p>CBC161 0345</p>	<p>ESG Membership</p>	<p><u>The Applicant considers that, in addition to local authorities, the proposed independent members of the ESG as set out in the Draft ESG Terms of Reference [REP5-024] will provide the ESG with the</u></p>	<p>CBC to confirm its position on proposed independent members of the ESG.</p>	<p><u>To</u> be confirmed at topic specific meeting</p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>relevant impartial expertise on airport operations and slot allocation to allow the ESG to reach informed decisions when discharging its functions.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant does not consider it appropriate for it, the airport operator, or airlines operating at the airport to have a role on the ESG to preserve its impartiality.</u>The Applicant considers that, in addition to local authorities, the proposed independent members of the ESG as set out in the Draft ESG Terms of Reference [APP-219] will provide the ESG with the relevant impartial expertise on airport operations and slot allocation to allow the ESG to reach informed decisions when discharging its functions.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it appropriate for it, the airport operator, or airlines operating at the airport to have a role on the ESG to preserve its impartiality.</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<p>CBC162 1456</p>	<p>ESG Membership</p>	<p>A key principle of the GCG Framework [REP5-022] is that the <u>ESG can provide effective, independent scrutiny of the impacts of the Proposed Development. According to this principle, the Applicant considers that local authority representatives on ESG should be planning professionals, who will have the relevant experience of considering reports from technical specialists and using these to support a decision-making function through deciding planning proposals, which is similar in concept to the function of the ESG. This will also help ensure that any decisions made by the ESG are made on an impartial, apolitical basis.</u> A key principle of the GCG Framework [APP-218REP5-022] is that the <u>ESG can provide effective, independent scrutiny of the impacts of the Proposed Development. According to this principle, the Applicant considers that local authority representatives on ESG should be planning professionals, who will have the relevant experience of considering reports</u></p>	<p><u>CBC have concerns regarding the limitations of specifying the requirement for local authority representatives on ESG to be “planning professionals” and whether these individuals would have the ability to make decisions on behalf of the local authorities.</u></p> <p><u>CBC have suggested that this be redrafted to outline the requirement for local authority representatives to have the “appropriate professional qualifications” and the ability to make decisions on behalf of their respective local authority. The Host Authorities wish to participate in the ESG but it is unclear why/whether it should have to be a planning officer from planning departments, it should be for the local authorities to determine an appropriate representative.</u></p>	<p><u>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</u> To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>from technical specialists and using these to support a decision-making function through deciding planning proposals, which is similar in concept to the function of the ESG. This will also help ensure that any decisions made by the ESG are made on an impartial, apolitical basis.</p>			
<p>CBC163 2567</p>	<p>ESG - Funding</p>	<p>The airport operator will be responsible for the secretarial and administrative costs associated with the operation of the ESG.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to fund the chair and independent specialist on aviation that sit on the ESG, as well as the independent technical experts that sit on each Technical Panel. This is to ensure that the other organisations (including <u>CBC</u>) can draw upon the advice of this expert, and do not need to procure independent advice separately. These experts would be procured by the ESG, rather than directly by the airport operator.</p> <p>The Applicant also propose to fund local authority involvement with the</p>	<p><u>CBC in principle supports the approach to the funding of the ESG and relevant Technical Panels as outlined.</u></p> <p><u>CBC would like to confirm the rates that should be considered in the development of the annual cap per local authority.</u></p> <p><u>CBC would also like the inclusion of review mechanism to reevaluate the appropriateness of these annual allowances as part of the funding approach.</u>The airport operator should fund reasonable officer or consultant costs, which should include funding local authorities to employ suitably qualified consultants</p>	<p><u>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</u>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>ESG and Technical Panels on the basis of an hourly rate up to a cap. This cap would be different for ESG and Technical Panels to reflect the different roles, and would be index linked.</p> <p>The intention is for this funding to be secured either through the section 106 Agreement or by way of an alternative legal agreement.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to fund the chair and independent specialist on aviation that sit on the ESG, as well as the independent technical experts that sit on each Technical Panel. This is to ensure that the other organisations (including relevant Host Authorities) can draw upon the advice of this expert, and do not need to procure independent advice separately. These experts would be procured by the ESG, rather than directly by the airport operator.</p>	<p>if they do not have the in-house expertise.</p>		
<p>CBC 16436X XX</p>	<p><u>ESG -</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant proposes to establish the ESG as a corporate entity to provide independence from the airport.</u></p>	<p><u>CBC in principle supports the approach to establish ESG as a corporate entity.</u></p>	<p><u>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>CBC will be seeking further legal advice before confirming this position.</u></p>		

Table-3-10: Summary of ‘Design’ matters with CBC

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant’s position</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u>
<u>DESIGN</u>					
<p>CBC165 476</p>	<p><u>Design Principles and Design Code</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicants position is as set out in Dead line 4 Hearing Actions [REP4-070]. The Applicant has engaged with CBC to discuss this position and how the Design Principles document can be refined as a live document. The Design Principles [REP5-034] has been issued at Deadline 5.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant has added the following design principles to Design Principles [REP5-034] at Deadline 5 to address CBC concerns and will continue to engage on refining these throughout the examination process.</u></p>	<p><u>Refer to [REP4-123] Central Bedfordshire Council response to ISH6 Q31 suitability of Design Principles [REP5-034] which states:</u></p> <p><u>“.....The document is currently high-level and does not provide sufficient detail. Special consideration must be given to the sensitive nature of the land to the south and west that are historic landscapes of significant value, as demonstrated by the designation of Luton Hoo RPG as Grade II*, and subsequently sensitive to change. Particular emphasis needs to be given to</u></p>		<p><u>Ongoing</u></p>

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p><u>“DQ.08 - Having regard to the setting of Luton Hoo and Someries Castle the detailed design of the Proposed Development will be visually appropriate, sensitive to place and responsive to the historic environment through the appropriate choice of materials, colour palette and finishes.”</u></p> <p><u>“BIODV.04 - The detailed lighting design shall include measures to avoid obtrusive light effects and adverse impacts on biodiversity.....”</u> (refer to Design Principles [REP5-034] for full description).</p> <p><u>“ASF.11 - The detailed design of the proposed solar panels will comply with relevant and appropriate standards in place when the detailed design is being carried out (as detailed within Section 2.3, ASF and Glare Assessment [REP4-040]) to avoid unacceptable visual impacts on both ground based and airborne sensitive receptors.”</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant considers that a more prescriptive design code would not</u></p>	<p><u>visually prominent elements that are visible from Luton Hoo RPG and Someries Castle. As highlighted in the CBC LIR, minimising the visual impact is imperative and needs to be sensitive in terms of the colour, material finish of the buildings, reflective nature of materials, treatment of car parks, lighting etc.</u></p> <p><u>The location of solar panels must also be incorporated into the Design Principles document as these could impact on the sensitivity of the landscape, notably with respect to multi-storey Car Park P1 where roof mounted PV panels are proposed (as per the Glint and Glare study [AS-146]). The panels are likely to be south-facing to maximise their efficiency but there is concern this would be inappropriate due to the sensitivities of the landscape around Luton Hoo RPG.</u></p> <p><u>It is acknowledged that this is a working document and CBC welcome opportunities to discuss amendments to the document.</u></p>		

<u>ID ref</u>	<u>Matter</u>	<u>The Applicant's position</u>	<u>Central Bedfordshire Council position</u>	<u>Source of agreement</u>	<u>Status</u>
		<p>be appropriate as set out in <u>[REP4-70] Issue Specific Hearing 6 Action 31.</u></p>	<p><i><u>Additionally, ISH6 Action Point 31 requires the Applicant to consider the need for a Design Code and this response will be provided at Deadline 4. CBC support the provision of a Design Code in principle and welcome the opportunity to engage on this after Deadline 4."</u></i></p>		

Table 3-3-1211: Summary of 'dDCO' matters with CBC Summary of additional matters raised by CBC in their Local Impact Report

Appendix 1: Engagement between the Applicant and the host local authorities

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
26.02.18	LBC, CBC, HCC, Environment Agency	Meeting	The purpose of this meeting was to introduce key environmental stakeholders for EIA scoping.
26.03.18	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting – Luton Town Hall, George Street, Luton, LU1 2BQ	Water TWG meeting - early engagement meeting with the lead local flood authorities to introduce the Proposed Development. Agenda: provide an overview of the key conclusions of the scoping report and agree principles of scoping - outline understanding of potential flood risk issues, and get agreement on the proposed scope of EIA chapter and flood risk assessment.
28.03.18	CBC	Meeting	The aim of the meeting was to provide an overview of the Proposed Development and to discuss with the stakeholders the proposed methodology of the assessment and initial views on potential impacts of the Proposed Development on Cultural Heritage.
06.04.18	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting	Biodiversity TWG. Introduction to the Proposed Development and agreement on details of the proposed scope of habitat and species surveys being undertaken and methodologies used.
09.04.18	CBC, Historic England	Meeting	Heritage EIA scoping.
10.04.18	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting – Hart House,	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG. This meeting

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
		Luton, LU2 0LA	explained the content of the LVIA section of the Scoping Report as drafted at that time and discussed the assessment viewpoint locations that were being considered for inclusion in the LVIA and items proposed to be scoped out.
12.04.18	CBC, NHDC	Meeting	The purpose of this meeting was to discuss EIA scoping with Environmental Health Officers (EHO) from the host local authorities for air quality, noise and contaminated land.
17.07.18	CBC	Meeting	The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Proposed Development and achieve consensus on the requirements for the evaluation of the land impacted within Bedfordshire.
03.10.18	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	Planning Officers Coordination Group (POCG) meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to review the draft Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) circulated to the host local authorities prior to the meeting and to discuss terms of reference and frequency of meetings for future engagement.
18.10.18	LBC, CBC, HCC, Thames Water	Meeting – Luton Town Hall, Luton Borough Council, George Street, Luton, LU1 2BQ	Drainage meeting. Agenda: project updates, landside drainage strategy and foul water discharge.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
14.11.18	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	POCG meeting.
20.11.18	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting	Biodiversity TWG. Discussion on how the design evolved through assessment of design options by environmental disciplines, sharing of the emerging 'preferred option', summary of non-statutory consultation results and survey results and an early indication of likely mitigation measures.
26.11.18	LBC, CBC, NHDC, Buckinghamshire Council	Meeting	Health TWG meeting - communities and health EIA scoping meeting.
18.12.18	CBC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to discuss the scope of the CBLTM-LTM and VISSIM models, review the validation of the models and discuss the contents of the Framework Travel Plan.
11.01.19	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting	Air Quality TWG meeting - Air Quality EHO EIA scoping meeting.
18.01.19	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting	Waste Officers EIA scoping meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an introduction to the Proposed Development and the waste and resources assessment.
14.02.19	CBC	Meeting	Surface access TWG.
20.02.19	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – Hart House,	POCG meeting.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
		Luton, LU2 OLA	
26.02.19	CBC, NHDC, HCC, LBC, Chilterns Conservation Board	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 OLA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG. Provided update on ongoing landscape and ecology assessment work and associated methodologies. Discussion on Preferred Option Draft Layout and engineering requirements. Discussion on non-statutory consultation feedback followed by an accompanied site visit.
05.03.19	NHDC	Meeting	Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to present the EqIA scoping methodology for the Proposed Development and receive input from stakeholders.
12.03.19	CBC	Meeting	EqIA TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to present the EqIA scoping methodology for the Proposed Development and receive input from stakeholders.
14.03.19	CBC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to discuss the scope of the CBLTM-LTM and VISSIM models, review the validation of the models and discuss the contents of the Framework Travel Plan.
14.03.19	LBC, CBC	Meeting	Major accidents and disasters meeting to introduce the Proposed Development.
20.03.19	CBC, NHDC	Meeting – Hart House,	POCG meeting. This meeting focused on the timetable for dealing with the draft SoCC

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
		Luton, LU2 OLA	taking into account the complications faced by the host local authorities due to the upcoming local elections, and recapping the areas of support/information the council could provide within the timescales.
03.2019	CBC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	Economics and Employment TWG meeting. A general overview of the Proposed Development was provided.
25.04.19	LBC, CBC, Thames Water, Environment Agency	Meeting – Luton Town Hall, Luton Borough Council, George Street, Luton, LU1 2BQ	Drainage strategy meeting. Agenda: drainage strategy and changes to existing drainage arrangements and discharge consents.
31.05.19	CBC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Waste TWG meeting The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the future baseline data and assessment findings to date following receipt of the EIA scoping opinion
05.2019	CBC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	Economics and Employment TWG meeting. Preliminary findings and approach to employment, training and skills
07.06.19	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting	Air Quality TWG to discuss the EIA Scoping Report, assessment scenarios and modelling.
24.06.19	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting	Biodiversity TWG. Discussion about Planning Inspectorate responses to the EIA Scoping Report and proposed surveys

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			and assessment to be contained within the ES.
08.07.19	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting	The purpose of the meeting was to inform the conservation officers and archaeologists of the progress of the heritage research and assessment.
07.2019	CBC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	Economics and Employment TWG meeting. Update on employment estimates, best practice on employment, training and skills, wider impacts consultations update.
05.09.19	NHDC, DBC, CBC	Meeting	Noise TWG meeting. The Noise Working Group were asked for feedback on the draft 2019 PEIR, and it was discussed how ongoing work to be undertaken for the ES could be refined for a further assessment.
17.09.19	CBC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	Economics and Employment TWG meeting. Update on statutory consultation, review of airport passenger profile, review of outline employment and training strategy.
07.10.19	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG. Officers were informed about the forthcoming Statutory Consultation and Scoping responses were also discussed.
22.10.19	CBC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to discuss the scope of the CBLTM-LTM and VISSIM models, review the validation of the models and discuss the contents of the Framework Travel Plan.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
08.11.19	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to discuss the strategic modelling, key modal split and rail/coach assumptions, mitigation measures and the Framework Travel Plan and the DCO progress and timetable.
13.11.19	CBC, HCC, NHDC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. The following points were discussed: enforcement regime, noise management controls, NEDG process and management and noise contour predictions.
04.12.19	LBC, CBC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. The following points were discussed: pros and cons of management control, NEDG review periods, enforcement regime and Proposed Development movement forecasts.
17.12.19	CBC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. The Draft Position on Paper on Movement Caps, and the pros and cons of movement caps were discussed.
23.12.19	LBC, HCC, NHDC, CBC	Statutory consultation response	Joint response to statutory consultation submitted via WSP.
08.01.20	CBC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. The following points were discussed: Draft Position on Paper on Noise Violation Limits, and the pros and cons of violation limits.
22.01.20	CBC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. The following points were discussed: Draft Position on Paper on Quota System and the pros and cons of noise violation limits.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
30.01.20	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting	Surface access TWG.
04.02.20	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting	Surface access TWG.
04.02.20	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG. The meeting set out the strategy for responding to comments raised by the Host Authorities in the WSP report prepared on their behalf in response to Statutory Consultation and the ES and sought clarifications on some of the comments.
05.02.20	CBC, HCC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. The following points were discussed: Draft Position Paper on Noise Contours, pros and cons of noise violation limits, LAeq,T contours to be retained, 'number above' contours.
18.02.20	HCC, CBC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	Biodiversity TWG.
03.03.20	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG. The meeting agreed viewpoint and photomontage locations and, based on the layout put forward at statutory consultation, the receptors to be considered in the LVIA.
11.03.20	CBC, NHDC, LBC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. The following topics were discussed: review of noise control measures and alternative measures and enforcement of the Noise Envelope.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
25.03.20	NEDG members	Meeting	NEDG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the noise control measures.
20.04.20	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meeting to discuss a range of matters related to the LVIA proposals and assessments.
08.07.20	HCC, LBC, CBC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. Discussions covered the noise model validation, ‘number above’ contour banding, quota count tolerances, noise monitoring locations, modal split for testing noise contour thresholds and limits, and the review process for noise measures.
17.09.20	HCC, LBC	Meeting	NEDG meeting. Discussions covered the contents of the draft Interim Report, noise model validation and the forward plan for the NEDG.
05.10.20	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access meeting. Agenda: provide an update on the proposals.
07.10.20	LBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meeting. Agenda: advise upon the proposed design changes, explain the rationale for the proposed earthworks and open space changes, put forward new proposals for the replacement open space and embedded mitigation, discuss the inclusion of Century Park Access Road (CPAR) West and its associated landscape mitigation, and review whether previously agreed points

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			would be affected by the proposed design changes.
23.10.20	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Waste TWG meeting. Agenda: provide information on design changes and discuss the issues raised during previous meetings, at scoping and during statutory consultation.
05.11.20	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	The purpose of this meeting was to inform the council of the Proposed Development re-start and to discuss the scope of the proposed trial trenching.
10.11.20	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC	Meeting	Travel Plan Workshop to identify measures that could be incorporated into the Framework Travel Plan, and the monitoring and structure of the group that will oversee progress in achieving targets.
12.11.20	HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	The purpose of this meeting was to inform the council of the Proposed Development re-start, and discuss the scope of the trial trenching.
07.12.20	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Waste TWG meeting. Agenda: discussion regarding the current and future baseline and changes to the assessment.
09.12.20	LBC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meeting. Agenda: review context and provide a response to the identified actions in the minutes dated 20.04.20 and review content of the minutes dated 07.10.22.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
14.12.20	LBC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to discuss the air passenger forecasts and the revised dates for the assessment, and report the initial findings from the re-run of transport models.
17.12.20	HCC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to discuss the air passenger forecasts and the revised dates for the assessment, and report the initial findings from the re-run of transport models.
17.12.20	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the draft engagement plan, consultation with hard-to-reach groups, engagement on the EIA methodology, and provide local authorities with a PPA update.
12.2020	CBC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	Economics and Employment TWG meeting. This included an update on the Proposed Development, revised Economic impact assessment approach discussion, Employment and Training Strategy update, and discussion of the wider economic impacts.
20.01.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to provide the host local authorities with an update on the Proposed Development and to discuss the proposed governance for GCG.
17.02.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: general update, EIA approach, GCG, SoCGs, Works Order 6.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
03.03.21	LBC, CBC, Stevenage Borough Council, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise TWG. Agenda: introductions and working group membership update, engagement next steps, issues from the 2019 statutory consultation, study area, baseline noise monitoring and locations, receptors, assessment methodology, health impacts, noise model validation, in combination assessment/air space changes, noise management plan, noise envelope update, operational noise monitoring proposals, and the Noise Insulation Scheme.
18.03.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, DBC, East Herts District Council, Stevenage Borough Council, Buckinghamshire Council	Meeting – MS Teams	Climate change and GHG TWG meeting. Agenda: discussion of the design changes, EIA, consultation, Net Zero Strategy and GCG.
24.03.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC.	Meeting – MS Teams	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meeting. Agenda: provide an update about the Proposed Development, agree the previous meeting minutes, review the resolution strategy for the host local authorities' statutory consultation comments to confirm agreement about the status of the comments.
21.04.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: Proposed Development review update, summary of key issues within TWGs, GCG, PPA Works Order 6 and the POCG engagement plan.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
26.04.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	Air Quality TWG meeting. Agenda: update on changes to the Proposed Development, GCG, 2019 statutory consultation feedback, timing and engagement schedule and the key issues to be addressed.
04.05.21	CBC	Email	Comments received from CBC Archaeology Advisor on draft WSI for trial trenching.
19.05.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: key issues summary table, GCG engagement documents and the POCG engagement plan.
19.05.21	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on the revised key forecasting assumptions and programme.
09.06.21	HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on the revised key forecasting assumptions and programme.
16.06.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: project team update, minutes and actions of previous meeting, key issues summary table and the approach to statutory consultation.
21.06.21	LBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access TWG meeting. During this meeting an explanation of the Proposed Development status during early and mid-2021 was given, alongside the reasons for

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			carrying out a comprehensive review.
06.07.21	LBC, NHDC, Stevenage Borough Council, St Albans City and District Council, Hertfordshire LEP, SEMLEP	Meeting – MS Teams	Economics and employment TWG meeting. Agenda: update on the Proposed Development, employment and training strategy and wider economic impacts.
13.07.21	NHDC, CBC, HCC, LBC NATS, LADACAN, easyJet, St Albans City & District Council, DHL, Wizz Air, Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise, Buckinghamshire Council	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise Envelope Design Group meeting. Agenda: Proposed Development update, headline passenger forecasts, model validation and GCG.
14.07.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: key issues summary table and POCG feedback on future agenda items, update on the approach to statutory consultation including scope, update on aviation demand forecasts, PPA spend update and engagement with WSP, and the role of TWGs in reaching agreement.
15.07.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC, UK Health Security Agency	Meeting – MS Teams	Health TWG meeting: engagement with health stakeholders on outstanding queries from the PEIR consultation including an update on the Proposed Development, methodology and approach, study area and receptors,

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			Wigmore Valley Park, and monitoring.
26.07.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	Contaminated land TWG meeting: update on the Proposed Development design including changes and discussion of issues including the zone of influence from Proposed Development-justification for distances, assessment methodology, existing baseline conditions-clarification on area it covers, inclusion of Off-site Highway Interventions, settlement in areas of deposited material, exposure of features of geological interest when chalk is excavated, Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid in soils and groundwater in vicinity of fire training facility, risks posed by former Eaton Green Landfill to groundwater, risks from piling former landfill-expose and mobilise contaminants leading to contamination of groundwater and public water supply, and overview of work to date and the key issues .
27.07.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	Waste TWG meeting. Agenda: provide an update on the Proposed Development and recap issues discussed to date, current and future baseline, assessment methodology, waste disposal facilities to be used, cumulative assessment, and proposed mitigation.
04.08.21	NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	EqIA meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to understand the baseline context of the area,

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			<p>in particular whether there are any protected characteristic groups in the local area that may be significantly impacted by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Understanding whether there are specific resources that the project team should be aware of or are near to the scheme. Identifying relevant local groups that should be engaged with.</p>
05.08.21	LBC	Meeting – MS Teams	<p>EqlA meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to understand the baseline context of the area, in particular whether there are any protected characteristic groups in the local area that may be significantly impacted by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Understanding whether there are specific resources that the project team should be aware of or are near to the Proposed Development. Identifying relevant local groups that should be engaged with.</p>
06.08.21	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	<p>EqlA meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to understand the baseline context of the area, in particular whether there are any protected characteristic groups in the local area that may be significantly impacted by the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Understanding whether there are specific resources that the project team should be aware of or are near to the Proposed Development. Identifying relevant local groups that should be engaged with.</p>

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
09.08.21	HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the results of the 21.5 mppa for 2027 scenario.
10.08.21	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the results of the 21.5 mppa for 2027 scenario.
10.08.21	LBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the results of the 21.5 mppa for 2027 scenario.
12.08.21	CBC	Email	Email from CBC Archaeology Advisor confirming that the WSI for trial trenching had been agreed.
18.08.21	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: minutes and actions of previous meeting, key issues summary table and POCG feedback on future topic-specific agenda items, statutory consultation – opportunity for the POCG to seek any clarification/provide early feedback on the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), sign off Works Order 6 (PPA), update on Community First, DCO process and requirements upon the POCG.
08.09.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC, Stevenage Borough Council, St Albans City and District Council, Bedford Borough Council, SEMLEP, Hertfordshire LEP,	Meeting – MS Teams	Economics and employment TWG meeting. Agenda: update regarding the employment and training strategy, EIA update, and discussion of wider economic impacts.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
	Buckinghamshire LEP		
16.09.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meeting. Agenda: Proposed Development update, points of agreement, design changes, adjustments to agreed matters, further matters for agreement, and actions from the meeting.
22.09.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: minutes and actions of previous meeting, key issues summary table and POCG feedback on future topic-specific agenda items, statutory consultation – SoCC feedback, and NEDG update.
29.09.21	Host local authorities and neighbouring local authorities	Meeting – MS Teams	The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update to the host and neighbouring local authorities about the Proposed Development, statutory consultation, surface access, EIA and GCG.
30.09.21	LBC	Meeting	Meeting with the LBC EHO to discuss ongoing and future air quality monitoring locations.
13.10.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC, National Highways	Meeting – MS Teams	Travel Plan Workshop. The purpose of this meeting was to collect ideas and views for promoting sustainable travel at the airport.
14.10.21	LBC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to present the key forecasting assumptions and results of the models for 21.5 mppa 2027, 32 mppa 2043, and 27 mppa 2039 scenarios.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
15.10.21	CBC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to present the key forecasting assumptions and results of the models for 21.5 mppa 2027, 32 mppa 2043, and 27 mppa 2039 scenarios.
15.10.21	HCC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to present the key forecasting assumptions and results of the models for 21.5 mppa 2027, 32 mppa 2043, and 27 mppa 2039 scenarios.
15.10.21	LBC, CBC, Bedfordshire Police	Meeting – MS Teams	The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update on the Proposed Development and statutory consultation, and provide information on the major accidents and disasters methodology and the preliminary assessment results.
20.10.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: minutes and actions of previous meeting, statutory consultation – SoCC feedback and seldom heard strategy, EIA cumulative effects assessment, key issues summary table – POCG confirm whether they agree with updates/POCG feedback on future agenda items.
04.11.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC, Milton Keynes Council, East Herts District Council, Buckinghamshire Council	Meeting – MS Teams	Climate change and GHG TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of changes to the Proposed Development since the last meeting, share the preliminary results of the updated GHG and climate change resilience assessments for the

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			2022 PEIR, and provide an update on GCG.
07.11.21	LBC, NHDC, CBC, HCC, NATS, LADACAN, easyJet, St Albans City & District Council, WizzAir, DHL,	Meeting – MS Teams	NEDG meeting. Agenda: update from the Applicant on the Proposed Development timelines, update on passenger forecast modelling and fleet mix modelling, what has happened since the last meeting, noise footprint.
19.11.21	LBC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to present the key forecasting assumptions and results of the models for 21.5 mppa 2027, 32 mppa 2043, and 27 mppa 2039 scenarios.
15.11.21	HCC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to present the key forecasting assumptions and results of the models for 21.5 mppa 2027, 32 mppa 2043, and 27 mppa 2039 scenarios.
22.11.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	The purpose of this meeting was to discuss plans with the host local authorities for the approach to identifying and engaging seldom heard groups during the consultation.
24.11.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: introductions, minutes and actions of previous meeting, key issues summary table – POCG confirm whether they agree with the updates/POCG feedback on future agenda items, statutory consultation update, Community First update, and GCG update – approach to limits.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
02.12.21	LBC, CBC, HCC, Environment Agency	Meeting – MS Teams	Waste TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to share the preliminary results of the waste and resources assessment for the 2022 PEIR, and provide an update on the waste infrastructure baseline (new Environment Agency data).
07.12.21	LBC, HCC, NHDC, LADACAN, easyJet, St Albans City & District Council, DHL, CBC, WizzAir, Buckinghamshire Council	Meeting – MS Teams	NEDG meeting. Agenda: presentation of suggested metrics against the controls for the Noise Envelope, open session to debate the numbers, update on the use of noise contours as basis of limits for GCG.
16.12.21	CBC, LBC, NHDC, DBC, East Herts District Council, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council, St Albans City & District Council, Buckinghamshire Council, Stevenage Borough Council,	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise TWG: discussion about the aircraft noise assessment that will be submitted in the PEIR for the 2022 statutory consultation.
16.12.21	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	Air Quality TWG meeting: discussion of the PEIR air quality chapter assessments and results, including an overview of the assessment methodology, assessment results and the timing and engagement schedule.
17.12.21	LBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Lead local flood authority engagement. The purpose of this meeting was to present the

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			Proposed Development and the preliminary flood risk assessment.
17.12.21	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, Jacobs (representing National Highways)	Meeting – MS Teams	Travel Plan Workshop. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss potential measures and interventions for reducing private vehicle mode share and increasing sustainable travel mode share to the airport. Existing travel surveys were also detailed along with suggestions for monitoring travel to and from the airport.
25.01.22	LBC	Meeting	Pre-consultation briefing for surface access.
26.01.22	HCC	Meeting	Pre-consultation briefing for surface access.
26.01.22	Host local authorities, neighbouring local authorities, Chilterns Conservation Board	Meeting – MS Teams	Statutory consultation briefing session 1. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update about the upcoming Statutory Consultation and provide information about document architecture and general wayfinding.
27.01.22	CBC	Meeting	Pre-consultation briefing for surface access.
02.02.22	Host local authorities, neighbouring local authorities	Meeting – MS Teams	Statutory consultation briefing session 2. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an overview of the documents which are part of the statutory consultation, and give a tour of the virtual consultation room.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
03.02.22	CBC, LBC, NHDC, DBC, East Herts District Council, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council, St Albans City & District Council, Buckinghamshire Council, Stevenage Borough Council	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise TWG. Agenda: air noise assessment methodology, overview of the PEIR results, noise contours, contour areas and population exposure.
09.02.22	Environment Agency, LBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Contaminated land TWG meeting agenda: update on the timeline for the Proposed Development, proposed ground gas monitoring strategy, proposed groundwater and leachate monitoring strategy, Perfluoroalkyl and PFAS, PFOA, summary and data sharing.
01.03.22	WSP (on behalf of the host local authorities)	Meeting – MS Teams	Interactive/informal discussion to provide WSP with a briefing and update about the consultation, and an overview of the PEIR and its contents.
18.03.22	LBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Discussion regarding the council's consultation response, covering surface access points.
22.03.22	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Discussion regarding the council's consultation response, covering surface access points.
04.04.22	LBC, HCC, NHDC, CBC	Statutory consultation response	Joint response to statutory consultation submitted via WSP.
29.04.22	CBC	Meeting	Discussion regarding the council's consultation response, covering surface access points.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
25.05.22	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: programme overview, update on statutory consultation, relationship with WSP (PPA and Work Order), SoCG process overview.
07.06.22	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meeting. Agenda: review comments provided in WSP feedback following 2022 consultation, set out how the Applicant proposes to address comments raised, agree changes to approach where necessary.
07.06.22	CBC, LBC, HCC, Natural England, Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust, Beds, Cambs & Northants Wildlife Trust	Meeting – MS Teams	Biodiversity TWG: discussion on the validity of baseline data, study areas, BNG, and additional points raised during consultation.
13.06.22	LBC, CBC, HCC, Environment Agency	Meeting – MS Teams	Waste TWG meeting: discussion on the feedback received to the 2022 statutory consultation.
24.06.22	LBC, CBC, HCC, National Highways	Meeting	Surface access meeting to explain the benchmarking approach to the determination of the future public transport mode share for air passengers, rail capacity assumptions, and employee public transport mode share.
29.06.22	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting agenda: review of actions from May POCG meeting, relationship with WSP

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			(PPA and Work Order), SoCG process, AOB.
04.07.22	LBC, CBC, Bedfordshire Luton and Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Group, Office for Health Improvement and Disparities and UK Health Security Agency	Meeting – MS Teams	Health TWG meeting agenda: update on the Proposed Development, outstanding issues from the 2022 statutory consultation including the quantification and monetisation of health effects, community engagement, monitoring, unaccompanied minors, and Covid-19.
07.07.22	LBC, CBC, HCC, Wildlife Trust, Natural England, London Luton Airport Operations Limited	Meeting – MS Teams	Biodiversity TWG meeting. Agenda: refresh of the Proposed Development and future timings, review comments provided in stakeholder feedback following the 2022 statutory consultation, set out how the Applicant proposes to address comments raised, agree changes to approach where necessary, summarise BNG calculations.
08.07.22	LBC, CBC, Buckinghamshire Council, Stevenage Borough Council, St Albans City and District Council, London Luton Airport Operations Limited	Meeting – MS Teams	Air Quality TWG meeting. Agenda: discuss the comments raised following the submission of the PEIR and present updates for discussion.
08.07.22	Lead local flood authorities (LBC, CBC, HCC)	Meeting – MS Teams	Water TWG: discussion of the proposals with the lead local flood authorities including statutory consultation comments.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
12.07.22	NHDC, CBC, Environment Agency, LBC,	Meeting – MS Teams	Contaminated land TWG meeting agenda: update on the programme, review of the 2022 statutory consultation comments and responses, gas mitigation, foundation works risk assessment, reuse of landfill waste, management of materials overview, steps to environmental permit, groundwater monitoring – PFAS.
12.07.22	CBC, LBC, HCC, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	Travel Plan Workshop. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the surface access vision, aims and objectives, and the proposed surface access GCG limits. Details were also given regarding how performance against targets will be monitored and reported, and about governance procedures.
14.07.22	CBC	Email	Email from CBC Archaeology Advisor confirming that the WSI for trial trenching, rescheduled for 2022, had been agreed.
21.07.22	CCB, NHDC, LBC, East Herts District Council, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council, DBC, Stevenage Borough Council, Buckinghamshire Council, St Albans City & District Council	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the contents of the ES which relate to noise, the noise baselines and monitoring, updated validations, aircraft movement forecasts, supplementary noise metrics, sound insulation, mitigation options, committed developments, and the Noise Envelope.
27.07.22	CBC	Meeting	Meeting to test present the results from sensitivity test modelling of

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			the 'no widening scheme on M1' scenario.
03.08.22	LBC, CBC, NHDC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: discuss the POCG activities and scope and discuss the SoCG template.
10.08.22	CBC	Meeting	General update on the future surface access analysis undertaken since statutory consultation.
22.08.22	CBC	Email	Email from CBC Archaeology Officer confirming the trial trenches undertaken to inform the ES were signed-off and trenches could be backfilled.
09.09.22	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	The meeting discussed the Off-Site Highway Interventions proposed near to Junction 10 of the M1 and agreed the inclusion of two additional visual receptors.
12.09.22	LBC, CBC, Bedford Council, Wildlife Trust	Meeting – MS Teams	Biodiversity TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to provide an update of the final design that will be assessed at DCO, summarise the BNG calculations and introduce SoCGs.
13.09.22	CBC, LBC, NHDC	Meeting	Climate Change and GHG TWG meeting. 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.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
14.09.22	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: feedback from the statutory consultation and updates regarding GCG, and a briefing on the high-level structure and content to assist the POCG review of the documents.
14.09.22	LBC, NHDC, CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	NEDG meeting to develop the Noise Envelope and GCG proposals.
23.09.22	CBC	Meeting	Meeting with CBC Conservation Officer to discuss approach to assessment of impact on Someries Castle, scheduled monument.
26.09.22	CBC, LBC, NHDC, HCC, DBC, Buckinghamshire Business First, Bedford Borough Council, Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce, Buckinghamshire Local Enterprise Partnership, East Herts District Council, Hertfordshire Chamber of Commerce, Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership, SEMLEP, St Albans City & District Council, Stevenage Borough Council	Meeting – MS Teams	Economics and Employment TWG. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Employment and Training Strategy and the wider economic benefits that would flow from the DCO.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
05.10.22	LBC, NHDC, CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	This meeting provided an update on design changes made since the 2022 statutory consultation, a summary of the 2022 statutory consultation feedback relevant to the MA&D assessment and an overview of updates made to the MA&D assessment.
10.10.22	LBC, NHDC, CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	This meeting provided an update on design changes made since the 2022 statutory consultation, a summary of the 2022 statutory consultation feedback relevant to the MA&D assessment and an overview of updates made to the MA&D assessment.
12.10.22	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	GCG workshop. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the updated GCG proposals, the ESG, technical panels and community representation, and GCG limits.
12.10.22	CBC, LBC, NHDC, East Herts District Council, Milton Keynes City Council, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council, Buckinghamshire Council, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Climate Change and GHG TWG. During the meeting, information was provided on updates to the GHG assessment since the PEIR, how relevant legislation, policy and guidance has been interpreted and responses to comments received at statutory consultation.
12.10.22	LBC, NHDC, CBC	Meeting	NEDG meeting to discuss the concept of sharing the benefits in aviation noise policy, and the Noise Envelope's role in this.
27.10.22	LBC, CBC, Buckinghamshire Council, Stevenage	Meeting – MS Teams	Air Quality TWG meeting. Agenda: methodology for future backgrounds used, update from the PEIR, and the sifting criteria

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
	Borough Council, St Albans City and District Council, London Luton Airport Operations Limited		for the selection of GCG monitoring locations and the methodology of the GCG process for air quality.
15.11.22	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: summary of previous POCG actions, programme update, document review comments overview, and update on the SoCG process.
21.11.22	LBC, HCC, NHDC, CBC	Meeting	NEDG meeting to discuss the Noise Envelope Final report.
01.12.22	CBC, NHDC, LBC, HCC, DBC East Herts District Council, St Albans City & District Council, Buckinghamshire Council, Stevenage Borough Council, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise TWG meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the matters included within the SoCG, and cover points raised at statutory consultation.
14.12.22 – 12.01.23	CBC	Email	Comments from CBC Archaeologist on the draft CHMP and final Trial Trench Report, Appendix 10.6 and Appendix 10.7 of the ES, respectively, requested that the mitigation proposals for the Late Iron Age/Roman buildings remains (HER 10808) are changed from preservation in situ to detailed excavation.
21.12.22	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	Planning Compliance meeting. Purpose of the meeting was to discuss the planning policies

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			which will be relevant and important to the determination of the application for development consent, to discuss how planning policy compliance will be covered in the application, and to discuss the extent to which the Proposed Development is compliant with planning policy.
12.06.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Biodiversity and landscape & visual impacts topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
29.06.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Cultural Heritage meeting. Archaeology Officer and Conservation Officer provided feedback on ES and CHMP and requested changes. Also raised concern about location of FTG and impact on Someries Castle, and lack of clarity of visualisations from Luton Hoo House and RPG.
20.07.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Air quality topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
26.07.23	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC & DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
02.08.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
04.08.23	LBC, CSACL	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with the host authorities and CSACL (representing all host authorities) to discuss the Demand Forecasts
07.08.23	Suono on behalf of the Host Authorities	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
08.08.23	LBC, CSACL	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with the host authorities and CSACL (representing all host authorities) to discuss the Demand Forecasts
17.08.23	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC & DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Water resources topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
04.09.23	LBC, HCC, CSACL	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with the host authorities and CSACL (representing all host authorities) to discuss the Demand Forecasts
13.09.23	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss matter relating to Green Controlled Growth
15.09.23	Suono on behalf of the Host Authorities	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
19.09.23	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access meeting on the Sustainable Transport Fund and TRIMMA
12.10.23	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Needs Case and Economic matters
18.10.23	Suono on behalf of the Host Authorities	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
20.10.2023	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access SOCG matters
30.10.2023	CBC Conservation Officer	Email	Email confirming agreement of updated CHMP
31.10.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss health and communities matters.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
<u>01.11.2023</u>	<u>CBC Archaeologist</u>	<u>Email</u>	<u>Email confirming agreement of updated CHMP</u>
<u>03.11.2023</u>	<u>CBC, LBC, HCC, NHDC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Design related matters</u>
<u>07.11.2023</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Surface access SOCG matters</u>
<u>09.11.2023</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Landscape and Visual matters</u>
<u>09.11.23</u>	<u>LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss matters related to Green Controlled Growth</u>
<u>13.11.23</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss Health and Communities matters</u>
<u>16.11.2023</u>	<u>CBC, LBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>East Luton development in regards to surface access SOCG matters</u>
<u>21.11.2023</u>	<u>Suono on behalf of the Host Authorities</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Noise topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG</u>
<u>23.11.23</u>	<u>LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss Green Controlled Growth</u>
<u>24.11.23</u>	<u>CBC, LBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the draft DCO and Section 106 Agreement.</u>
<u>05.12.23</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss matter related to Surface Access</u>