

January 2024

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

8.163 Applicant's Response to Deadline 6 Submissions
Appendix D - Central Bedfordshire Council

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.163

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

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

**8.163 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO DEADLINE 6 SUBMISSIONS
APPENDIX D – CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL**

Deadline:	Deadline 7
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/8.163
Author:	Luton Rising

Version	Date	Status of Version
Issue 1	January 2024	Additional Submission – Deadline 7

Contents

Page

Appendix D – Central Bedfordshire Council [REP6-089, REP6-090 & REP6-091]	1
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

Tables

Table 1.1 Applicant's response to post hearing submission by Central Bedfordshire Council (ISH7) [REP6-089] at Deadline 6

Table 1.2: Applicant's response by Central Bedfordshire Council (Comments at Deadline 5) [REP6-091] at Deadline 6

Table 1.3: Applicant's response to post hearing submission by Central Bedfordshire Council (Issue Specific hearing ISH8) [REP6-090] at Deadline 6

Appendix D – Central Bedfordshire Council [REP6-089, REP6-090 & REP6-091]

Table 1.1 Applicant's response to post hearing submission by Central Bedfordshire Council (ISH7) [REP6-089] at Deadline 6

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)c	Luton Rising's Response
1	Surface Access	<p>Applicant to provide a brief update regarding the transport modelling in line with Department of Transport guidance including how any outstanding concerns raised by the relevant highway authorities in relation to the transport model</p> <p>The Applicant provided a summary on this point and confirmed that a final report is due to be submitted on 15 December to the ExA (ahead of Deadline 7). CBC agreed with the split of queries between those that are points of clarification and those that are more strategic in nature. CBC have raised queries with both of these aspects in the D5 submission (REP5-066). There is an interrelation between the two and the provision of clarification (particularly around actual numbers rather than bandwidths) would give greater understanding of changes in flow that might occur in the model assumptions applied for the covid modelling and whether or not there is a strategic reassignment of traffic taking place. There appears potential for an increase on the local road network.</p>	<p>Principle areas of outstanding concern relate to matters that were raised in relation to the Core assessments undertaken in the DCO and the approach to modelling for the Rule 9 work.</p> <p>With regard to the Core modelling, the main areas of concern relate to the inclusion of capacity upgrades on the M1 mainline, consistency in demand forecasts between the two main models and assumptions around the East Luton scheme and in particular the operational dates for Vauxhall Way. These matters have all been addressed within the updated modelling undertaken for the Rule 9 report.</p> <p>Matters relating to the approach to the Rule 9 modelling update, and in particular the main points of difference regarding the treatment of any adjustment to local network flows have been addressed within the final Rule 9 report was issued to the ExA on 15 December 2023 in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 2 - Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling Final Report [AS-159].</p> <p>The Applicant remains of the view that the methodology adopted remains robust and in line with Department for Transport TAG guidance considering the risks associated, and have addressed the Rule 9 requirements.</p> <p>The principles and justifications behind the adopted methodology have been reported in Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 2: Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 2 Risk Assessment [REP4-106] and within the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 2 - Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling Final Report [AS-159]. The Applicant continues to discuss with the relevant Highway Authorities, including CBC.</p> <p>Further information with regards to "actual numbers rather than bandwidths" have been addressed and reported in Appendix E of the Rule 9 Final Modelling Report in Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 2 - Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling Final Report [AS-159].</p>
2	Surface Access	<p>Applicant to provide an update on the engagement with bus and coach operators and how that supports the Applicant's Bus and Coach Study [REP5-058] submitted at Deadline (D) 5.</p> <p>CBC raised two queries relating to funding. In terms of the bus and coach study, it would be good to understand the general level of subsidy for bus services that would be required to deliver some of the priority schemes identified. Secondly, further clarification is needed on the point at which the</p>	<p>The Applicant and airport operator have ongoing relationships with public transport operators that provide access to the airport. This includes bus operators, who have been repeatedly engaged on the airport's aspirations to grow through the development of the latest Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) for the five-year period of 2023-2028. Three workshops were held in November 2023, attended by Arriva, which operates the majority of bus routes accessing the airport. These sessions were also attended by relevant local authorities, where aspirations and plans for improved bus connectivity to the airport were raised and discussed in the context of the airport's proposed expansion. In October 2022, the airport operator undertook a market engagement exercise with bus and coach operators, prior to the tendering of new coach</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)c	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>different funding streams would be triggered, particularly if the transport fund would not be called upon if the travel targets in GCG were not achieving targets.</p>	<p>services. This included local operators, including Stagecoach, First Bus and Arriva. Engagement captured where operators envisaged future capacity market growth coming from and how operators may fulfil demand and adopt facilities for next generation vehicles.</p> <p>With regards to the query on bus subsidy, any subsidy would need to be calculated based on a number of factors that affect each individual service including route length and frequency, which will change over time. The Applicant is not defining any specific values at this stage.</p> <p>With regards to the query on funding streams, the Sustainable Transport Fund is not a form of mitigation for impacts associated with the airport's expansion. Instead, it demonstrates the Applicant's additional level of ambition and commitment to work with authorities to deliver sustainable transport interventions as the airport expands. Mitigation measures required to address a breach of a GCG Limit would be funded outside of the STF. Clarity on what comprises mitigation and funding is contained in section 7.5 in the Applicant's Post Hearing Submission – Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH 9) [REP6-067].</p> <p>Funded projects to support sustainable travel (which can include funding for new or amended bus services and bus priority schemes) will help to achieve the Targets of the Travel Plan (and hence enable mode share levels to go beyond the GCG surface access mode share Limits). However, where a Level 2 Threshold or Limit has been breached and additional measures are required as part of a Mitigation Plan or Level 2 Plan, these should not be funded by the Sustainable Transport Fund.</p>
3	Surface Access	<p>Cycling and walking.</p> <p>The Applicant displayed REP4-084 Figure 4.1 showing the cycling and walking catchment for staff. An explanation was provided by the Applicant. CBC referred to the representations made at D5 (REP5-066), and highlighted that the catchment showed demand to the north-west that crosses into Dunstable within Central Bedfordshire. CBC will continue to make representations on this point.</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant also reiterates that the analysis was conducted on the first section of the postcode only due to data input limitations, and the Applicant is aware that the future analysis should seek to use the whole postcode, if possible, to provide a more granular level of geographic detail.</p>
4	Surface Access	<p>Fly-parking' – applicant to provide update on work done since the last hearing regarding this issue including a summary of engagement with the relevant highway authorities.</p> <p>CBC confirmed that discussions have taken place with the Applicant regarding options in the Slip End and Caddington areas. Discussions are ongoing regarding the mechanism for securing this, but CBC have a preference for this to be dealt with outside of the TRIMMA process as this is seen as a foreseeable impact. LBC were asked whether Luton BC can provide any further parking. LBC confirmed that Luton is constrained and there is a parking policy within the local plan, but it was best for the point to be directed at neighbouring authorities. A scheme in Slip End was referenced by LBC, which it indicated was approved despite Luton confirming that it was not needed. For clarification, a temporary permission for airport related parking was granted at a site on Dunstable Road, Caddington (ref. CB/18/04111/FULL). This was a</p>	<p>The Applicant has engaged on fly parking with Central Bedfordshire Council and other authorities as documented in the Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between London Luton Airport Limited and Central Bedfordshire Council [REP6-029].</p> <p>The Applicant has no comment to make on CBC points relating to a historic planning application.</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)c	Luton Rising's Response
		three-year permission that expired in November 2021. A further application was submitted in 2022 (ref. CB/22/03394/FULL) seeking to retain the airport parking but this was refused on the basis that the development was inappropriate development in the Green Belt that would have a detrimental impact on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt and there were no very special circumstances that outweighed the harm. Additionally, it was deemed harmful to the character and appearance of the area. An appeal was subsequently dismissed on 19 October 2023 (ref. APP/P0240/W?23/3317414).	
5	Surface Access	<p>Applicant to provide a brief update in relation to the Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (TRIMMA) [REP5-041].</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that off-site parking would not be monitored in the TRIMMA. CBC confirmed that comments have been provided at D5, but it is necessary to raise two points of clarification, particularly regarding off-site parking. The responsibility of monitoring would be onerous for the local authority and would require a baseline survey to be undertaken prior to the expansion of the airport, thereby providing a metric for comparison. CBC consider that the initial baseline survey should be written into the TRIMMA and funded by the applicant. The second point relates to initial monitoring. The baseline needs to be accurate and consider the temporary loss of car parking as a result of the T2 car park fire in October 2023, which could impact on the accuracy of the baseline data as proposed to be gathered as per ML0 within the OTRIMMA document (REP5-041)</p>	This point is noted and an associated update to how this matter will be addressed will be presented in the updated version of the OTRIMMA to be submitted at Deadline 7 [TR02001/APP/8.97].

Table 1.2: Applicant's response by Central Bedfordshire Council (Comments at Deadline 5) [REP6-091] at Deadline 6

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
1	Surface Access	<p>3. REP5-012 ES Chapter 4 – Proposed Development</p> <p>Paragraph 4.10.8 indicates that a 2m high noise barrier that would be 132m in length is now included in the Proposed Development as an existing commitment from the extant Green Horizons Park planning permission. The barrier would be installed on the edge of the highway between the Holiday Inn and Preservation House. There is no robust justification for not including this within the LVIA. It is necessary to understand whether this would be visible from any viewpoints in Central Bedfordshire.</p>	The 2m high noise barrier between the Holiday Inn and Preservation House would be located on the new bridge over Airport Way to the rear of the proposed bridge parapet as illustrated in Accurate Visual Representations Representative Viewpoint 53 of ES Appendix 14.7 [REP3-014] . The barrier would be visible in proximate views to the north east of the bridge (notably from Airport Way and New Airport Way) and be seen in the urban context of Luton. It is unlikely that the noise barrier would be visible from any Assessment Viewpoints in Central Bedfordshire due to the presence of existing and proposed intervening built form and vegetation. The inclusion of the noise barrier in the location proposed would not affect the findings and conclusions of Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement [AS-079] .
2	Air Quality	7. REP5 – 030 GCG Appendix D – Air Quality Monitoring Plan	The Applicant has outlined the process by which they have determined the shortlist of monitoring locations in Section 3.3 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP5-

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Within CBCs LIR (REP1A-002) concerns was raised that there are no air quality monitoring locations in Central Bedfordshire. The applicant has indicated this is because air quality has not been identified as an issue. The revised document includes details on potential scope to add more monitoring locations at phase 2a. However, this does not provide appropriate safeguards for Central Bedfordshire residents and the position of CBC is as per the LIR. It is the Council's view that monitoring is necessary in Central Bedfordshire and would be expected by local residents and Members</p>	<p>020] as summarised in Figure 3.7. The reason there are no monitoring locations proposed in CBC is that there are not forecast to be any non-negligible impacts as a result of expansion, noting that proposed monitoring location 1 (A505) is on the LBC / CBC boundary. As such there are no requirements for monitoring as part of GCG in the CBC area.</p>
3	Green Controlled Growth	<p>8. REP5 – 032 GCG Surface Access Monitoring Plan The updated Surface Access Monitoring plan submitted at Deadline 5 provides a number of minor clarifications and text updates, which do help clarify a number of points, but don't alter the core content of the proposed approach to monitoring. As such the CBC comments previous raised with regards to the limited dataset being drawn upon would still apply. Notwithstanding that, there are a couple of additional matters that CBC would wish to raise and / or ask for the applicant to give consideration to.</p>	<p>Noted. The Applicant's position regarding the approach to surface access monitoring, including the use of CAA data, has not changed from that set out in previous responses.</p>
4	Green Controlled Growth	<p>Quarterly reporting of CAA data – Para F2.1.4 states that the airport operator receives unvalidated quarterly data from the CAA which 'helps the airport operator to identify any changes in passenger behaviour which may be attributable to circumstances beyond their control.' Whilst is appreciated that this data may be unvalidated, sharing this quarterly data would assist in identifying any quarterly period which might be impacted by such circumstances and allow for data from this period (for example) to be removed from the annual reporting. In the absence of such a measure, there is the potential that any one event throughout the full year period could otherwise be considered as invalidating the data for the purposes of GCG, depending upon the interpretation applied to the current drafting of the Green Controlled Growth requirements within the DCO related to 'circumstances beyond the undertakers control'.</p>	<p>It is not considered necessary or appropriate for unvalidated data to be shared with the ESG or other local authorities. The unvalidated nature of any such data would mean that it would be provisional and subject to change, and could therefore not be used to determine compliance with GCG Limits or Thresholds. It is also anticipated that travel behaviours could change through the year depending on the nature of trips being made and other external factors such as weather or school holidays.</p>
5	Green Controlled Growth	<p>Quarterly reporting would also provide for a more agile and responsive means of monitoring. Reliance upon annual surveys is liable to mean that issues could not be identified and acted upon as efficiently and quickly, whereas quarterly (or better) reporting would feed more closely into the proposed Level 1 and Level 2 Threshold 'early warning' system as currently proposed.</p>	<p>As discussed in relation to the Transition Period, the Limits and Thresholds contained within GCG are (with the exception of noise) based on annualised data, either annual averages (allowing for variations over the year) or cumulative annual totals. Any quarterly data could therefore not be used for the purposes of formal monitoring and reporting as the values reported would not be consistent with the Limits and Thresholds.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the GCG approach will act to incentivise the airport operator to proactively monitor environmental impacts throughout a year, as this will allow them to take early action where the risk of an exceedance of a Level 2 Threshold or Limit is identified. By taking early corrective action, the airport operator would subsequently be able to avoid formally reporting the exceedance of a Level 2 Threshold or Limit, and avoid the constraints on airport growth associated with these exceedances.</p>
6	Green Controlled Growth	<p>Whilst it appears to be the case that the applicant is proposing to use the full dataset from the CAA, allowing the main, rather than final mode of travel to be reported, it is unclear the degree to which this dataset will be fully available,</p>	<p>It should be noted that as per paragraphs F2.1.5 and F2.1.6 the detailed CAA dataset contains a number of records that are not published as part of the freely available summary reports. The detailed dataset includes all forms of transport used by passengers to access the airport - for</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>with the text stating in paragraph F2.1.5 that 'At the time of writing there are significantly fewer survey records for which 'main mode' is captured by the CAA'. Ensuring that 'Main Mode' is fully captured and reported is considered by CBC to be essential, as this would allow for the identification of the numbers of users parking off-site as well as providing a more accurate indication of sustainable travel mode share.</p>	<p>example, where a passenger gets a taxi to their local railway station, the train to Luton Airport Parkway station and then a bus to the airport terminal the detailed dataset will record this as a trip made by taxi, rail and bus. In addition to this, the CAA also record the 'final mode' (in the case above bus), and, from 2017 until the pandemic, the 'main mode' (in the case above rail). The final mode and main mode statistics are summarised in the freely available summary reports .</p> <p>As set out in the Surface Access Monitoring Plan [REP5-032], the detailed dataset will be used to determine the main mode of passengers travelling to the airport. As set out in paragraph F3.1.2 of the Monitoring Plan, the Monitoring Report must include a methodology statement explaining how the CAA datasets have been used, and as per paragraph F3.1.4 the airport operator should make the underlying survey data available on a confidential and anonymised basis at the reasonable request of the ESG or Surface Access Technical Panel where this is permissible under relevant data sharing legislation and licencing restrictions.</p>
7	Design	<p>Concerns was also raised that the Design Principles did not reference solar panels, which as per the Glint and Glare Study are proposed in several locations across the main application site. The document has been amended to incorporate this.</p> <p>The updated document also includes details on landscaping, and this is welcomed but further consideration should be given to responding to landform and historic character. No issues are raised with the additional section on the drainage aspects.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 3 of the Design Principles [REP5-034] signposts the reader to the Strategic Landscape Masterplan [APP-172]. It is intended that Section 3 of the Design Principles should be read in conjunction with the Strategic Landscape Masterplan which provides additional information on the landscape design approach to landform and character.</p>
8	Design	<p>However, further information is required in respect to lighting details in respect to reducing impacts on the landscape and historic character of the surrounding area. BIODV.04 seeks detailed lighting design but this is specifically in relation to biodiversity and does not suitably address the points raised in the CBC LIR (REP1A-002). CBC have requested a requirement to secure lighting details, but this has not been put forward by the Applicant. If lighting is to be secured through the Design Principles document, then the document needs to be suitably robust.</p> <p>The document refers to smoke reduction measures at the FTG and further detail is required. Please see CBC ISH8 response.</p>	<p>Whilst it is noted that BIODV.04 in the Design Principles [REP5-034] is written for the benefit of biodiversity, the design measures listed are practical mitigation measures which will also benefit the landscape and historic character by avoiding obtrusive light effects and light spill beyond the development area.</p> <p>The smoke reduction measures relate to the use of Compartment Fire Behaviour Training units which generate smoke when used for training. These units can be fitted with smoke reduction measures and this has been added as a design principle so that this is picked up at detailed design stage.</p>
9	Surface Access	<p>10. REP5 – 037 Trip Distribution Plans</p> <p>CBC provided comments on the updated Trip Distribution Plans at Deadline 5, and as per the comments made by the Joint Host Authorities at Issue Specific Hearing 7, would be seeking further information in terms of either plans with numbers added to the plots, or a supporting table showing flows for the routes within CBC.</p>	<p>The Applicant re-iterates that the purpose of the daily Trip Distribution Plans is to show the overall airport trip distribution, and do not reflect the peak hours impacts, which also includes traffic re-assignment.</p> <p>Further information with regards to traffic numbers within the CBC road network have been reported in Rule 9 modelling update final report Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 2 - Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling Final Report [AS-159]. Traffic flows on the CBC road network have been added to Chapter four of the report, and further plans showing traffic flows on links were also reported and included in Appendix E.</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
10	Surface Access	11. REP5 – 041 Outline TRIMMA CBC provided detailed comments on the Outline TRIMMA at Deadline 5, and those comments are still considered to be relevant. CBC note that the specific concerns raised with regards to the potentially long periods of time when no monitoring would be required under the current proposals within OTRIMMA are supported by the passenger growth projections included in REP5-056 in Figure 3.2, which suggests that, dependent upon the growth assumptions applied, there could be no increase in passenger throughput for the period 2027 to 2036, and therefore no triggering of the need for wider monitoring or assessment under ML1. This was also raised by the joint host authorities in Issue Specific Hearing 7 and within the National Highway submission REP5-091.	ML1 (measurement of airport traffic at airport locations) is proposed to occur annually until one of the end/pause scenarios are triggered. Using the example provided in the comment (based on Figure 3.2 of the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 26 [REP5-056]), ML1 would occur until monitoring is paused after 2032 (five years after the airport stops/pauses growth, per current proposals). During this period, further monitoring levels may still be triggered as usual. The Applicant considers this appropriate and proportionate, given the zero/negative growth in passenger volumes which would be occurring in this instance.
11	Surface Access	In addition to those comments, being mindful of the period of time it was reported it may take to replace the fire damaged car park (as raised in Issue Specific Hearing 2), it may be necessary for the approach to baseline surveys (ML0) to be revisited, to allow for the changes in flows related to the temporary loss of that facility. I.e.: at present ML0 is proposed to be carried out following the issue of notice to grow and is intended to closely represent traffic flows when the extant planning consent capacity is reached, however this is likely to be prior to the re-provision of the lost car parking. As such the reinstatement of the car park, and associated changes in traffic entering the airport estate, would need factoring into any initial baseline survey (unless there is an equivalent temporary facility on site by the time of ML0).	This comment is noted and will be considered when designing the surveys to ensure an appropriate baseline is set.
12	Surface Access	At present the funding for the RIF (Residual Impacts Fund) is yet to be clarified, with details understood to be proposed through the S106. CBC cannot form a final view on the adequacy of such a provision until more details are provided.	The Applicant has clarified how the RIF will be funded through the Draft Section 106 Agreement [TR020001/APP/8.167] .
13	Surface Access	13. REP5 – 056 Applicant's Response to ISH4, Action 26 – Sustainable Transport Fund The inclusion of a proposed funding methodology is welcomed by CBC and helps to address a number of previously raised areas of concern. It is however noted that the proposals are to be secure through the Section 106, and as such we are keen to see how this is reflected and secured through the S106 drafting. This also highlights the importance of the S106 being completed and secured prior to the conclusion of the DCO, as the funding streams for both the Sustainable Transport Fund and the Residual Impacts Fund (within the OTRIMMA) are proposed to be formalised and secured via this agreement	The Draft Section 106 Agreement [TR020001/APP/8.167] has now been shared with Local Authorities.
14	Surface Access	CBCs continue to be of the view that there is a need for a mechanism for early funding interventions, such as the pump priming of bus services. Whilst paragraph 3.3.10 of the submitted document refers to this being a matter under consideration, CBC are of the view that this commitment should be made more firmly before the proposals could be supported.	A commitment has been added to the Draft Section 106 Agreement [TR020001/APP/8.167] to address the option to pump priming the STF if a need is established.
15	Surface Access	There does remain a degree of uncertainty over how the Sustainable Transport Monies would be assigned, including the relationship with other funding sources. The post hearing submission document 'Surface Access Controls	It is acknowledged that there could potentially be multiple processes working in parallel to achieve increased levels of public transport and active travel mode share, including any Level 2 Plans or Mitigation Plans required under the GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.07] , and

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>Relationship Map', does provide some further information, but CBC would continue to have the following questions:</p> <p>The map would suggest that the funding under Green Controlled Growth would be initially called down in the event that a L2 Plan is required, meaning that, in the case of passengers, public transport mode share had fallen below the L2 Limit. Para. 3.4.2 of the STF document states that 'where a level 2 Threshold or Limit has been breached and additional measures are required as part of a Mitigation Plan or Level 2 Plan, these should not be funded by the STF'</p> <p>It is unclear in these circumstances how it would be possible to disaggregate the impacts of STF funded projects in terms of monitoring and reporting mode share related to the GcG breach.</p>	<p>measures delivered through the Travel Plan process (including those funded by the Sustainable Transport Fund).</p> <p>It is however expected that the impacts of the measures delivered through these processes could be disaggregated, because those relating to GCG would only be required where a Level 2 Threshold or Limit has been breached. Given the Travel Plans targets must strive to be more ambitious than the GCG Limits, a breach of a Limit could only have occurred where those Targets have also not been achieved (i.e. the measures delivered through the Travel Plan process (including those funded by the Sustainable Transport Fund) were not sufficient/effective or have not had time to take full effect).</p> <p>Any Level 2 Plan or Mitigation Plan would therefore need to set out additional measures to be delivered, in order to avoid or prevent (in the case of a Level 2 Plan) or remove (in the case of a Mitigation Plan) exceedances of a Limit as soon as reasonably practicable. Such measures by definition would be new or additional measures beyond those already committed to, and would need to be approved by the ESG Such approval would likely only be forthcoming if the airport operator could provide sufficient certainty that the proposed measures in the Level 2 Plan or Mitigation Plan would be likely to result in the required outcome (in terms of achieving the necessary level of modal shift). In this way, the costs of those measures included in any Level 2 Plan or Mitigation Plan could be isolated from those made elsewhere.</p> <p>It is however acknowledged that measures already approved for funding from the STF or implemented by the ATF Steering Group may contribute towards the avoidance or prevention of exceedances of a Limit.</p> <p>Notwithstanding any of the above, the ATF Steering Group will discuss and agree the use of the STF and will have discretion to decide upon such matters. CBC are a member of that decision making body.</p>
16	Surface Access	<p>CBC would have some concerns over the potential weighting of funding that could be applied to access and parking provision, with this forming one of the proposed six surface access priority areas, and with up to 80% of funding potentially assigned to a single priority area. As the matter of fly parking is proposed by the applicant team as being addressed within the separate TRIMMA process, it is unclear what types of parking interventions would be covered (and whether parking and access works would sit appropriately within a sustainable transport fund).</p>	<p>The weighting of funding has been removed following engagement and comments received. This is reflected in the updated Sustainable Transport Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119] and Draft Section 106 Agreement [TR020001/APP/8.167]. Potential interventions for Vehicle Access, Parking, Private Hire and Taxis are contained in the FTP.</p>
17	Surface Access	<p>14. REP5 – 055 Applicant's Response to ISH4, Action 7 – Updates on Road Safety Audits</p> <p>REP5-055 is welcomed, providing the additional Stage 1 Safety Audit information requested, although CBC would have to reiterate that there has been no detailed check against design standards or design review process</p>	<p>These comments are being addressed as part of the ongoing engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council on the Road Safety Audit Designer's Response documents.</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>entered into, and as such the schemes would continue to carry a degree of risk in terms of both layout and cost.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, as Overseeing Authority for two of the schemes proposed as 'Offsite Highways Works' at the A1081 / Gipsy Lane junction and the London Road South junction, CBC would make the following comments.</p>	
18	Surface Access	<p>A1081 / Gipsy Lane Ref 3.1 – Noted that this is accepted, however it is not clear if the items of street furniture detailed would fall within the working width of the VRS, with the designer's response referring only to a minimum 0.6m offset to street furniture (with a minimum offset of 600mm to the edge of the VRS being required (preferably 1200mm) and with the offset to any street furniture having to be further within the central reserve, clear of the working width of the VRS). CBC would therefore wish to see a cross section of the most constrained area of the revised central reservation detailing the location of VRS, and street furniture located within the VRS protected area to confirm that sufficient widths can be achieved / maintained. In addition, we would be seeking confirmation that the central reserve would continue to be protected with appropriate VRS as part of the proposed scheme of works</p>	<p>These comments are being addressed as part of the ongoing engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council on the Road Safety Audit Designer's Response documents.</p>
19	Surface Access	<p>Ref 3.4 – Noted that this is accepted, although reference is only made to the visibility element of the Safety Audit recommendation. We would be seeking a plan showing forward visibility to the signal heads and confirmation that not only verge clearance, but also slope regrading as necessary will be carried out within detailed design to address the highlighted hazard concern as well as visibility (as per the safety auditor's recommendation).</p>	<p>These comments are being addressed as part of the ongoing engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council on the Road Safety Audit Designer's Response documents.</p>
20	Surface Access	<p>Ref. 3.5 – The Swept path should allow for two larger vehicles as opposed to one HGV and one car. I.e.: the Design Vehicle in both lanes being a 16.5m HGV please. It is also noted that the HGV left turn onto the A1081 intrudes into the start of the cycle lane, which would not be considered acceptable.</p>	<p>These comments are being addressed as part of the ongoing engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council on the Road Safety Audit Designer's Response documents.</p>
21	Surface Access	<p>Ref. 3.6 – Noted that this is accepted, however it is not clear if sufficient width is available, and as such a cross section should be provided to confirm this is achievable within the order limits.</p>	<p>These comments are being addressed as part of the ongoing engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council on the Road Safety Audit Designer's Response documents.</p>
22	Surface Access	<p>Ref. 3.7 – This recommendation is detailed as being 'noted' rather than accepted, however from the more detailed swept path plan provided as Figure 3.2 of the submitted report 8.118 'Applicants response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 7 – Updates on Road Safety Audits', which includes an indicative re-provision of the cycle lane, this makes it clear that widening outside of that associated with the central reservation would be required on both sides of the A1081 (appearing to be beyond that therefore shown on the current indicative off site highways plan ref. LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0005 Rev P01). This would impact both upon the parking bay for the signal controller and also the location of the current VRS on the outer edge of each carriageway. As such we would be looking for the plans to be updated to confirm the re-provision of the cycle lane, the relocation of the parking bay for</p>	<p>These comments are being addressed as part of the ongoing engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council on the Road Safety Audit Designer's Response documents.</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		the controller, and the re-provision of the VRS (both in terms of protection of the central reserve and also for the edges of carriageway), as all these elements would be required as part of the overall scheme.	
23	Surface Access	<p>London Road South</p> <p>Ref 3.1 – SSD to nearside primary traffic signal – the recommendation that the regrading of the cutting slope to provide forward visibility has not been accepted within the Designers response, which refers to achievable 90m (desirable minimum) being achievable to the offside signal head, and one step below to the nearside signal head. CD 109 states that relaxations below desirable minimum are not permitted on the immediate approaches to junctions and it is unclear from the response whether 90m visibility to a primary signal can be achieved from each approach lane. We would request a plan detailing achievable visibility from each approach lane is therefore provided.</p> <p>Ref 3.2 – Noted that this is accepted. We are content this could be addressed at the detailed design and construction stage. In addition, it is noted that no controller equipment location or engineers parking has been shown on plan, and whilst it is accepted that there should be sufficient land available within the public highway to allow for such provision, CBC would prefer to see this detailed on an updated plan to ensure that the requirement is captured within the DCO.</p>	These comments are being addressed as part of the ongoing engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council on the Road Safety Audit Designer's Response documents.
24	Surface Access	<p>16. REP5 – 058 Bus and Coach Study Colleagues in the CBC public transport team have reviewed and raised the following comments: For all these proposed improvements, they will take considerable additional resource for bus companies and will need covering by significant subsidy, in particular during early / late or new 24-hour operation, especially in the early stages of implementation, as it is very unlikely that bus operators will extend or improve the services speculatively in the current climate. The most efficient use of subsidy would be through regular meetings with operators and reporting of patronage figures, as well as heavy incentivisation of public transport usage by staff by the Airport authorities to get staff to leave their cars at home. This could be further offset if subsidised via income from parking charges for staff with a corresponding reduction in bus fares and increase in service levels, meaning that using the bus is a really viable option for the majority of staff. A commitment from the airport authorities, working in partnership with all business stakeholders located on the airport site, to give additional benefits to their staff to choose to use public transport to get to work. This would send a clear message that the airport authority and its stakeholders are committed to promoting sustainable travel.</p>	Noted. The Applicant welcomes suggestions on the most effective use of the STF from CBC, and also recognises that there are challenges in the market that should be understood through regular meetings with bus operators and ongoing review of usage data. Regular engagement with bus operators will take place through the preparation of the Bus and Coach Market Study (as outlined in the Bus and Coach Study [REP5-058]) and the attendance of operators at Airport Transport Forums.
25	Surface Access	It would be useful to have an understanding of what the potential high level subsidy costs for the shortlisted priority projects in paragraph 4.3.5 might be, allowing a correlation with the suggested sums detailed within the Sustainable Transport Fund (REP5-056).	For bus interventions, any subsidy would need to be calculated based on a number of factors that affect each individual service including route length and frequency, which will change over time. The Applicant is not defining any specific values at this stage. However, the increase in the value of the STF and introduction of the opportunity to pump prime interventions has been subsequently added to increase stakeholder confidence in the fund and its ability to achieve the ambitious targets to be set out in future Travel Plans. The updated Sustainable Transport Fund [TR02001/APP/8.119] and the Draft Section 106 Agreement [TR020001/APP/8.167]

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
			provide more information on the revised value and pump priming of the Sustainable Transport Fund.
26	Surface Access	It should also be remembered that while active travel may be important, at the very early / late times of day, as well as in winter times, less people will be keen to travel via active means, so public bus services will become even more important at these times for people to access their place of work.	Noted. The Applicant welcomes suggestions on the most effective use of the STF from CBC, and recognition of seasonal factors on how people travel to the airport.
27	Surface Access	With regards to individual services: • CBC generally agree with the priority list provided as paragraph 4.3.5, although are of the view that Arriva Service Z, serving many of the estates in Houghton Regis and west Luton should be considered for upgrade on early / late or to 24-hour as there is likely to be significant numbers of staff travelling on a regular basis from there.	Noted. Any potential intervention for sustainable transport funding should be submitted to the ATF and ATF SG following notice to grow and will be considered in Bus and Coach Market Study.
28	Surface Access	With Services A and Z upgraded and extended to the Airport Bus Station, this would give a robust offering for much of Luton and Dunstable, along with the Service B improvements as proposed. It should be noted that Services 366 and 610 are only very infrequent, running 2 to 3 times a day so cannot reasonably be considered as of much use for people travelling to and from the airport.	Noted. Any potential intervention for sustainable transport funding should be submitted to the ATF and ATF SG following notice to grow and will be considered in Bus and Coach Market Study.
29	Surface Access	Grant Palmer Service 78 / 79 – these are tendered services funded fully by Central Bedfordshire Council so may not run in the same form, or at all, by the time implementation comes. Red Eagle X61 – increasing the service to every 3 hours, whilst a benefit, would need to be increased further, to at least hourly to be viable for people to use to commute.	Noted. The Applicant would appreciate more information on why CBC will no longer be tendering the 78/79 service and why it will cease operation without funding support.
30	Surface Access	Arriva Service 321 is a public bus service but is included in the coach services table. It is CBCs view that Arriva 321 should be considered for increased frequency in early / late times or even potential 24-hour as well as extension to the Airport, or Parkway Station.	Noted. Any potential intervention for sustainable transport funding should be submitted to the ATF and ATF SG following notice to grow and will be considered in Bus and Coach Market Study.
31	Surface Access	CBC would suggest that Service 100, Service MK1 and Service F70 / F77 should be increased to 24-hour a day due to the very early and late starts / finishes worked by a lot of employees to link into Stevenage, Bedford, Leighton and Milton Keynes as employee hotspots	Noted. Any potential intervention for sustainable transport funding should be submitted to the ATF and ATF SG following notice to grow and will be considered in Bus and Coach Market Study.

Table 1.3: Applicant's response to post hearing submission by Central Bedfordshire Council (Issue Specific hearing ISH8) [REP6-090] at Deadline 6

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
1	Health and Community	<p>Please see the post hearing submission for ISH8 prepared by WSP.</p> <p>The Applicant confirmed that a meeting had taken place with Officers from Central Bedfordshire Council to detail the rationale for determining the local and wider study area for the assessment and the dataset used in each of those study areas. The applicant confirmed that additional information had been sent to the local authorities for review and the Applicant considers they will be agreed in the SoCG at D6. Further justification for the baseline data was provided. Central Bedfordshire confirmed that a meeting was held with the Applicant in October and additional information has been submitted, which is being reviewed along with the latest SoCG.</p> <p>The ExA indicated that within the CBC LIR there was reference to an absence of Index of Multiple Deprivation scores and income deprivation data. CBC were asked whether those issue have been addressed through the current engagement? Or is it still an outstanding matter?</p> <p>CBC advised that this would be responded to at Deadline 6 and was captured as Action Point 14. CBC were also asked about the healthy airports checklist in terms of what this does and what benefit there would be in using the checklist at this particular point. CBC advised that this would be responded to at Deadline 6 and was captured as Action Point 15. The Applicant was asked to provide some comments on the application of the Healthy Airport Checklist.</p>	<p>The Applicant understands the role of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) in assessing current and future health and care needs and informing plans to address those needs. The Applicant also understands the value of IMD data and the links between deprivation and health outcomes as described in CBC's response to Action Point 14. The Applicant awaits CBC's response to the information issued, detailing how relevant datasets have been used to assess the sensitivity of receptor communities in the health assessment. The Applicant will continue this discussion through the SoCG.</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the CHETRE Healthy Airports Checklist and notes that this Australian guidance provides a set of high-level objectives for healthy airport development. The checklist does not provide a framework for assessing the significance of health outcomes associated with these objectives. The Applicant does not consider that the high-level objectives included in this checklist are useful in the context of an assessment of the specific health effects of the Proposed Development. The health assessment in Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement [AS-078] assesses the health effects arising from impacts on the wider environmental, social and economic determinants of health.</p> <p>Further details are provided in the Applicant's response to ISH8 Action Point 15 in the Applicant's Response to November Hearing Actions (Compulsory Acquisition 2 and Issue Specific Hearings 7-10) [TR020001/APP/8.165] submitted at Deadline 7.</p>
2	Landscape and Visual	<p>Proposed Extension to the AONB, the suitability of the Sensitivity Test [APP-107] and weight to be given to the proposed extension in the assessment of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>CBC confirmed that this would be confirmed in writing at Deadline 6.</p> <p>There was discussion regarding the weight to be applied to the extension of the AONB. CBC did not comment at the hearing session but consider that limited weight should be applied. However, appropriate consideration should be included in the LVIA as the AONB could be extended in close proximity to the airport boundary and therefore the assessment of a 'low' magnitude of impact on the qualities of the AONB extension area is not accepted.</p>	<p>The Applicant's Post Hearing Submission - Issue Specific Hearing 8 (ISH8) [REP6-066] explains that no weight should be given to the potential AONB extension as the boundary change plan is at a very early stage akin to the early stages of a Local Plan review.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this position the Applicant has carried out a Sensitivity Test [APP-107] which reviews the conclusions of Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement [AS-079] in the context of a potential extension to the boundary of the Chilterns AONB. Section 2.1 of the Sensitivity Assessment explains that the extension to the boundary of the Chilterns AONB would not typically influence judgements of magnitude of impact resulting from the Proposed Development but may influence judgements on sensitivity of a landscape receptor and in turn the significance of an effect. The exception to this is the aesthetic and perceptual characteristics of the landscape within the Chilterns AONB which is considered to increase the judgement on magnitude of impact during Phase 2a from 'very low' to 'low'. This is because such an extension would occur in the context of an existing airport operating at up to 18 mppa. People undertaking recreational activities within the AONB extension area would already experience diminished tranquillity to some extent.</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
3	Landscape and Visual	<p>Visual effects from buildings and structures on the eastern edge of the development, the fire training ground (Work No. 2d) and the appropriateness of new planting at mitigating effects including in winter.</p> <p>Viewpoint 20 (REP3-011) was displayed by the Applicant (this shows the view from Hyde Footpath 5a). The ExA asked the Applicant to confirm the reason for site selection for the Fire Training Ground and consideration of alternatives. The Applicant confirmed that alternatives were considered but there are key constraints for the FTG, which needs to be airside but a suitable distance from the runway. The Applicant confirmed that when in operation it "can look quite dramatic" and therefore needs to be remote from buildings. An alternative location to the west was considered but discounted as it was in the Green Belt. The current site was therefore selected as it meets the requirements and is not in the Green Belt. In respect to Hyde footpath 5a, it is acknowledged in Appendix 14.5 of the ES (AS-139) that there would be significant effects through the phases and the ExA asked the Applicant whether the additional mitigation (hedgerows) reduce it to not significant?</p>	<p>Appendix 8.2 Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan Revision 1 of the ES [AS-029] sets out the proposed hedgerows – which includes 10% Holly (ilex) and Hornbeam (c10%) has a high leaf retention during winter months. The density of planting which has yet to be specified will also affect the visibility as will the retention of planting protection measures.</p> <p>The Proposed Development form has yet to be concluded through detailed design. The proposals will provide built form that will be akin to the existing airport and its built form. Soft landscape maturation is demonstrated via the illustrative photomontages provided in Appendix 14.7 of the ES [REP3-010, REP3-012, REP3-014].</p> <p>The design evolution of the proposals are conveyed through the Design documents and consultation process, with a wide variety of options explored that provide the operational requirements.</p> <p>Appendix 14.5 Detailed Visual Assessment Rev 2 of the ES [AS-139] confirms that the additional mitigation planting is judged to reduce the effects on views from Hyde footpath 5a to not significant.</p>
4	Landscape and Visual	<p>The applicant confirmed that the visual shown takes a Rochdale approach (parameters) and the FTG would be located within this parameter. The hedgerow mitigation is not shown on the visuals. The Applicant was unable to guarantee that the establishment of mitigation would result in no discernible effects, but it is highly likely to be effective.</p> <p>The ExA referred to CBCs D5 submission which states further information is needed to understand the practical implications of the FTG and asked CBC to confirm what further information would be required.</p>	<p>The Applicant provided 5no. Illustrative views at Appendix 14.7 of the ES [REP3-010, REP3-012, REP3-014] in response to the ExA's specific requests to show mitigation proposals. Viewpoint 20 was not selected by the ExA.</p> <p>Appendix 8.2 Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan Revision 1 of the ES [AS-029] sets out the proposed hedgerows – which includes 10% Holly and Hornbeam (c10%) has a high leaf retention during winter months. The density of planting which has yet to be specified will also affect the visibility as will the retention of planting protection measures.</p>
5	Landscape and Visual	<p>The ExA referred to CBCs D5 submission which states further information is needed to understand the practical implications of the FTG and asked CBC to confirm what further information would be required. CBC confirmed that it was understood that at ISH6 the ExA had requested submission of visuals showing the planting. However, the Applicant has indicated that this did not apply to this location. It is recognised by CBC that planting along the footpath would reduce the visual effects, subject to the planting being suitable, a point raised in paragraph 5.7.13 of the CBC LIR (REP1A-002). However, concern remains</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to the effects of the FTG in the Applicant's Post Hearing Submission - Issue Specific Hearing 8 (ISH8) [REP6-066].</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		regarding the visual and operational effects of the FTG from Someries Castle and the operational effects from Luton Hoo	
6	Landscape and Visual	<p>The Applicant has stated that there would be no landscape mitigation measures from Luton Hoo or Someries Castle. CBC Officers quoted the Applicant who had previously stated that the operation of the FTG “can look quite dramatic” and this is a concern for CBC. Based on the information and visuals provided it is difficult for CBC to understand in real terms the impact of the FTG during operation (i.e., smoke, drifting of smoke, fire). The Design Principles document (REP5-034) indicates in point AF.19 that the ‘new Fire Training Ground will be designed with smoke reducing facilities.’ However, there is no detail as to what these measures are. There is currently lack of clarity and drawing together of information to understand how the FTG would operate during the day and night from Someries Castle and Luton Hoo. Additionally, there is no clarity in respect of any dedicated lighting installations in respect of the FTG facility. The impact of the FTG remains a considerable concern both in landscape and heritage terms for CBC.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to the appearance of the FTG in the Applicant's Post Hearing Submission - Issue Specific Hearing 8 (ISH8) [REP6-066].</p>
7	Landscape and Visual	<p>The ExA advised that on Monday 27 November 2023 PM they witnessed a fire training event from Wigmore Valley Park. It was a standardised test that lasted 15 minutes and flames, smoke, and processes involved were witnessed, which will be considered by the ExA when compiling the recommendation. Since the hearing, the ExA site note has been published (EV1-018) and the Applicant has provided a note regarding the fire training exercise (EV1-017). These documents have been reviewed but CBC welcome a video, as required from the Applicant in Action Point 49. Whilst this point was not raised at the hearing, the airport operators London Luton Airport Operations Limited (LLAOL) have consulted CBC on proposals to construct a solar farm under Schedule 2, Part 8 (Class F) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (CBC ref. 23/03617/OAC). The proposed solar farm would be sited to the south of the runway. The majority of the solar farm would be within the administrative boundary of Luton Borough Council, but a small section would be within Central Bedfordshire. No response has been issued to LLAOL to date either by CBC or LBC, but the proposed solar farm would impact on the scope to relocate the FTG if approved.</p>	<p>Please refer to ID ISH8 – AP49 of the Applicant's Response to November Hearing Actions (CAH2 and ISH7-10) [TR02001/APP/8.165].</p> <p>The solar farm proposed by London Luton Airport Operations Ltd (LLAOL) (as referred to in the question) would be located to the south of the runway however it would not prevent the delivery of the Proposed Development as described and assessed in the DCO application documents. When the fire training ground is to be constructed, the operator will adjust the proposed solar farm development as appropriate.</p>
8	Landscape and Visual	<p>Whether the Lighting Obtrusion Assessment [APP-052] and [APP053] adequately identifies likely significant effects and the need or otherwise for a night-time Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.</p> <p>CBC confirmed that a site visit at Luton Hoo was undertaken on Thursday 23 November 2023 to assess the baseline conditions from Tank Drive (Luton Drive) and the terrace area at the Mansion house. There is concern regarding significant harm in terms of the multi-storey car park P1 when viewed from Luton Hoo, which introduces an urban form that is intrusive to a sensitive part of the RPG. Along with the operational effects of the FTG in the evening. Based on that CBC request a nighttime assessment from this location.</p>	<p>The Applicant has responded to this in the Applicant's Post Hearing Submission - Issue Specific Hearing 8 (ISH8) [REP6-066].</p>

I.D	Topic	Deadline 6 submission (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response
		<p>The applicant confirmed that a lighting assessment was not requested as part of the scoping opinion and as part of the ongoing consultation for the LVIA with the working group that consisted of various members of the host authorities. This point is noted by CBC, but it is considered that further assessment is required to fully appreciate the impact on Luton Hoo RPG</p>	