

## **SLAE Written Representation Submission for Deadline 11 - Comments on the Applicants Responses to SLAE written representations throughout the examination.**

### **SLAE Comment**

SLAE submitted four written submissions for Deadline 9, however for reasons only known to the applicant, LR have only responded to one. Is this due to cherry picking who to respond to, unavailability of resource, cost avoidance, insufficient knowledge or experience of the subject matter, contempt for opposing community groups or a priority call?

The same is found with each submission, LR choose not to respond, generalise or group them into one response, leaving many unanswered questions when they respond.

It is also noted that although SLAE have identified typographic errors in LR documents, not all are acknowledged or addressed in future revisions, such as the recent TR020001-002894-5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Construction Method Statement and Programme Report.

*4.3.3 The potential satellite site locations are shown in the phasing diagrams in Appendix B and would include the following:*

#### **SLAE comment**

It is not easy to match the drawings in Appendix B to each Construction compound. Another example, paragraph 4.3.3a. describes Construction Compound 1, which is to be located on the Replacement Open Space Wigmore Valley Park for year 1 (drawing on page 125), but the estimated Time Operational in Table 4.1 shows 24 months, and this is not shown on the drawing on page 126. It is also not shown on the drawing in Insert 4.1 on page 21.

and

*5.3.109 The AAR is a new access road linking the A1081 (Airport Way) to T2 and is planned to be built in two sections. The drawing below indicates the proposed road alignment (refer to inset 4.33 and 4.34).*

#### **SLAE Response**

It appears that inset 4.33 and 4.34 are missing and not found elsewhere or in any other document.

And yet when the Examiners find and highlight typographic errors, LR address these in their responses.

Multiple times in multiple submissions, SLAE have challenged the meaning of the word 'local' or 'neighbour' as used by LR, when a better definition would be, 'residents that live in wards adjoining the airport' to separate the airports immediate neighbours to those living elsewhere. In each of the Framework Travel Plan revisions (000845-7.13, 001123-7.13, 002176-7.13, 002905-7.13) this has not been addressed. When reading the descriptions of each measure and intervention, it is confusing to understand and apply the 'Strive to be a good neighbour'. Particularly when applied to Milton Keynes (22.2 miles), Leighton Buzzard (14.2 miles), Stevenage (11.3 miles), Hitchin (9 miles). Puzzling that Aylesbury is not seen to be a good neighbour as it is 21.9 miles away yet Milton Keynes at 22.2 miles away is).

## **SLAE Written Representation Submission for Deadline 11 - Comments on the Applicants Deadline 9 Response**

***TR020001-003121-8.188 Applicant's Response to Deadline 9 Submissions***

*The construction of the authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the CoCP and with the various management plans which sit underneath the CoCP, all of which must be approved by the relevant planning authority. In addition, no part of the authorised development may commence until a final version of the outline CTMP and CWTP has been approved for that part by the relevant planning authority. The Applicant believes that the measures described in these documents are appropriate for the Proposed Development.*

#### **SLAE Comment**

SLAE clearly state in numerous previous responses that residents that live in the wards adjoining the airport that they must have representation on the numerous groups being created or exist. Not be subject to 'fait accompli' decisions, with the only chance to offer feedback to deliberate delay processes.

Here Luton Rising clearly state that there is no place for the input of the residents who live in wards adjoining the airport have 'no say' in Construction matters as described in the following documents.

- 5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.1 Construction Method Statement and Programme Report
- 5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 4.2 Code of Construction Practice
- 5.02 Environmental Statement Appendix 18.4 Outline Construction Workers Travel Plan)
- 5.02 Appendix 18.3 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan

#### *2.9 SURFACE ACCESS. I.D. 1. [REP9-085] Section 2.17 I.D 27*

##### *Luton Rising's Response*

*The Luton DART design was future proofed through careful consideration of the station at the airport and through designing in the ability for future capacity upgrades (which of themselves may require disruptive work but which do not render the system incapable of future extension).*

#### **SLAE Comment**

In LR's response to Peter White, LR have admitted in their response *that 'The Luton DART design was future proofed through careful consideration of the station'* proves that expansion and Sift exercise result was pre-determined and Wigmore Valley Park would be built over for expansion