

# London Luton Airport Expansion

## Buckinghamshire Council Response to the Applicant's Response to Deadline 9 Submissions (REP10-045)

PINS REFERENCE: TR020001

---

February 2024

Directorate for Planning, Growth & Sustainability

Planning & Environment

Buckinghamshire Council

King George V House, King George V Road

Amersham, Buckinghamshire, HP6 5AW



## Contents

DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER .....	3
EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING STRATEGY .....	5
SECTION 106 AGREEMENT.....	6
SURFACE ACCESS.....	7

## DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER

I.D	Reference	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	Buckinghamshire Council's Response
8	[REP9-060] section. 2.3 page. 5	<p>This submission has been reviewed. The Council acknowledges the amendments made by the Applicant in relation to requirements 5 (Phasing of authorised development), 14 (Construction traffic management), 15 (Construction workers), 30 (Offsite highway works) and 31 (Travel plans) and welcomes its establishment as a named consultee in relation to the discharge of these matters.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above the Council would also reiterate its support for other amendments proposed by the Examining Authority's proposed to the draft Development Consent Order, in particular the inclusion of a requirement securing the Employment and training strategy and the establishment of consultation periods within the discharge process. This is of particular relevance to Buckinghamshire Council as it is not a co-signatory of the s106 agreement.</p>	<p>The Applicant remains of the view that the <b>Employment and Training Strategy (ETS) [REP8-020]</b> will be secured through the section 106 agreement which it is seeking to complete and submit at Deadline 11.</p> <p>However, the Applicant is cognisant of the fact that it cannot guarantee completion of the section 106 agreement by this date. At Deadline 9, it therefore submitted <b>Alternative Mechanisms to the Section 106 Agreement [REP9-056]</b> which set out alternative methods of securing the obligations contained in the section 106 agreement. In relation to the ETS, the alternative that the Applicant has set out is a new requirement in Schedule 2 to the draft DCO. In this eventuality the Applicant will request of the ExA, at Deadline 11, that its recommended form of DCO to the Secretary of State includes the proposed ETS requirement.</p> <p>However, the Applicant does not anticipate that this will be required as it considers that the section 106 agreement will be completed before the end of the Examination period. In either case, the ETS will be legally secured by the end of the Examination.</p> <p>In relation to the establishment of consultation periods, the Applicant refers Buckinghamshire Council to its response at row 36(3) of the <b>Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Commentary on the draft DCO [REP8-036]</b> submitted at Deadline 8.</p>	<p>The Council notes the Applicant's response but maintains its position in relation to the ETS and consultation periods.</p>



## EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING STRATEGY

I.D	Reference	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	Buckinghamshire Council's Response
1	<b>[REP9-061]</b> Table 2, ID 1 page. 6	At the meeting with the Applicant on 15 January 2024 the Council reiterated comments it has made previously regarding the wording within the Mitigation Route Map (AS-047) which is contradictory to the stance the Applicant is taking in the s106. The Applicant has advised that they will look to update the Mitigation Route Map to reflect the current position, however, an updated document is yet to be submitted.	The ETS in its entirety is secured by the section106 agreement. It was never the intention of the Mitigation Route Map to suggest only one part of it was secured. The <b>Mitigation Route Map</b> has been updated to clarify this and submitted at Deadline 10 <b>[TR020001/APP/5.09]</b> .	The Council notes the Applicant's response and the updates to the Mitigation Route Map and can confirm that this addresses the Council's concerns.

## SECTION 106 AGREEMENT

I.D	Reference	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	Buckinghamshire Council's Response
2	<b>[REP9-061]</b> Table 2, ID 1 page. 6	At the meeting with the Applicant on 15 January 2024 the Council reiterated comments it has made previously regarding the wording within the Mitigation Route Map (AS-047) which is contradictory to the stance the Applicant is taking in the s106. The Applicant has advised that they will look to update the Mitigation Route Map to reflect the current position, however, an updated document is yet to be submitted.	The Applicant confirms that an updated <b>Mitigation Route Map</b> is being submitted at Deadline 10 <b>[TR020001/APP/5.09]</b> .	The Council notes the Applicant's response and the updates to the Mitigation Route Map and can confirm that this addresses the Council's concerns.

## SURFACE ACCESS

I.D	Reference	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	Buckinghamshire Council's Response
<b>Modelling</b>				
2	<b>[REP9-061]</b> page. 25	The Council acknowledges the findings of the modelling; however, the Council's concern is not and has not been regarding the capacity of the junction, it is rather a question of the suitability of the B489 for development traffic and the impact of increased traffic on residents in the villages along that route. The impacts of traffic in the early hours will have a greater impact on downstream environmental effects. The change in junction priority that the council seeks therefore aims to protect residents from additional traffic being present on the route and maintaining the signed route as the preferential route between the airport and the A41.	The Applicant considers it is the Council's responsibility for routing traffic through its road network. The Applicant has demonstrated that the forecast additional traffic at this location arising from the Development to be small and it would not be proportionate for the Applicant to change the priority, especially since the Council has accepted the peak hour impact to not be 'severe'.	The Council notes the Applicant's response but maintains its position in relation to the impacts of traffic in the early hours. It should be noted that the peak hour impact does not relate to the early hours, and it is the proportional increase in traffic during this timeframe that is likely to have the greatest impact on residents.
3	<b>[REP9-061]</b> page. 29	The Council refers to its previous comment regarding this junction at item 5 in this table.	Please refer to the Applicant's response provided at ID 5 in <b>Applicant's Response to Deadline 7 Submissions [REP7-080]</b> .	The Council maintains its stance on this matter. Given that the Council's D9 comments postdate the Applicant's D8 submission the Applicant's reference to a previous response fails to progress this matter any further.