

February 2024

# 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)**

---

<b>Deadline:</b>	Deadline 11
<b>Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:</b>	TR020001
<b>Document Reference:</b>	TR020001/APP/8.14
<b>Author:</b>	Luton Rising

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Status of Version</b>
Issue 1	September 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 2
Revision 1	December 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 6
Revision 2	February 2024	Additional Submission – Deadline 11

## STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND

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

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

Signature:

Name:

Position:

Date:

Signed on Behalf of CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL

Signature:

Name:

Position:

Date:

# Contents

---

	Page
<b>1 Introduction and purpose</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground	1
1.3 Proposed Development description	2
<b>2 Engagement with Central Bedfordshire Council</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Summary of engagement	4
<b>3 Matters agreed, ongoing, or not agreed</b>	<b>5</b>
Appendix 1: Engagement between the Applicant and the host local authorities	225

## 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

# 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. Consultation

~~a.b.~~ Planning

~~b.c.~~ Compensation

~~c.d.~~ Need Case

~~d.e.~~ Employment and training

~~e.f.~~ Surface access

~~f.g.~~ Environment

~~g.h.~~ Flightpaths

~~h.i.~~ Design

~~i.j.~~ 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~~north east of the runway. This will take the overall passenger capacity to 32 mppa<sup>1</sup>. 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.
- 1.3.2 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;

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 19mppa. As a result, the Applicant believes that the environmental assessments are sufficiently representative of the likely significant effects of expansion, whether the baseline is 18 mppa or 19 mppa. Where the change of the baseline does affect an assessment topic, in most cases it means that the “core” assessments (using an 18 mppa baseline) report a marginally greater change than would be the case with a 19 mppa baseline. The findings of the assessment, including the sensitivity analysis, are presented in the Environmental Statement submitted with the application for development consent.

- 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 2040<sup>2</sup>, 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> 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 3-1: Summary of 'consultation' matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CONSULTATION</b>					
<b>Approach to consultation and engagement</b>					
<b>CBC1</b>	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 <sup>th</sup> March 2023)	Joint and individual responses to Statutory Consultation in 2019 and 2022	Agreed
<b>CBC2</b>	<del>Adequacy of engagement</del> <del>Adequacy of non-statutory consultation</del> <del>engagement</del>	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 3-2: Summary of ‘planning’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council’s position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>PLANNING</u></b>					
<b>Planning policy</b>					
<b>CBC3</b>	Proposed works in the Green Belt within the Borough.	The <b>Design and Access Statement Volume I [AS-049]</b> demonstrates how Green Belt policy was factored into the design development process to minimise impacts. The <b>Planning Statement [REP5-016]</b> includes a Green Belt Assessment in <b>Appendix B [APP-196]</b> .	<del>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.</del>  <u>CBC have reviewed the <b>Planning Statement [(REP5-016)]</b>, <b>Design and Access Statement [(AS-049)]</b> and <b>Green Belt Assessment [(APP-196)]</b> and is satisfied with the case put forward by the Applicant in regards to work in the Green Belt in Central Bedfordshire.</u>	<del>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</del> <u>Confirmation received via email on 20.12.23</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u>
<b>CBC4</b>	Compliance of the Proposed Development with relevant planning policy	Compliance of the Proposed Development with relevant planning policy as a whole has been demonstrated in the <b>Planning Statement [REP5-016]</b> .  As stated in the <u>Applicant’s</u> Deadline 2a response, the	<del>CBC to confirm their position the applicant has demonstrated compliance of the Proposed Development with relevant planning policy as a whole.</del> <u>Within CBC’s <b>Local Impact Report [(REP1A-002)]</b> various impacts have been</u>	<del>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</del> <u>Confirmation received via email on 20.12.23</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not Agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>Environmental Statement [(ES)]</u> reports all effects assessed, both adverse and beneficial, and describes appropriate 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.</p>	<p><u>identified, as such it is not agreed that the proposed development complies with relevant planning policy.</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC5</b></p>	<p>Consultation <del>was</del> undertaken in relation to the Transport Assessment methodology and associated mitigation <del>measures, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.1</del></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 England, Network Rail and highway and transport authorities, as appropriate, on the assessment and</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><del>Written reply from CBC to confirm</del> <u>Agreed on 11.01.24</u></p>	<p><del>Ongoing</del> <u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>proposed mitigation measures. The assessment should distinguish between the construction and operational project stages for the development comprised in the application."</i></p>			
<p><b>CBC6</b></p>	<p>Consultation <del>was</del> undertaken in relation to third party schemes, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.11</p>	<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 which may be subject to their own planning, <del>funding</del> <u>ing</u> and approval processes, must be understood in</i></p>	<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.</p>	<p><del>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</del> <u>Agreed on 11.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <del>Agreed</del> <u>reed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>terms of implications of the timings for the applicant's own surface access proposals."</i></p>			
<p><b>CBC7</b></p>	<p>Pre-application engagement undertaken in relation to land use, <del>particularly replacement open space and works within the Green Belt, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.113</del></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 development consent has been accepted."</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><del>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</del> <u>Confirmation received via email on 20.12.23</u></p>	<p><del>Ongoing</del> <u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>This has included discussion on development within the Green Belt and replacement open space.</p>			
<p><b>CBC8</b></p>	<p>Engagement undertaken in relation to flood risk, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.155.</p>	<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 information that may be required by</i></p>	<p>CBC agrees that engagement has been undertaken in relation to flood risk, in accordance with ANPS paragraph 5.155.</p>	<p><del>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</del> <u>Confirmation received via email on 20.12.23</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreement</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>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 <b>Appendix 20.1</b> of the <b>ES [AS-046REP4-038]</b>.</p>			
<b>CBC9</b>	Engagement undertaken in relation to the scope and methodology of the LVIA, in accordance with ANPS paragraphs 5.214-5.216	Engagement between the Applicant, CBC and other relevant stakeholders on the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) is set out in Section 14.4 of <b>Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual [AS-079]</b> of the <b>ES</b> . Matters regarding the scope and methodology of the assessment are set out in Sections 14.3 and 14.5 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.	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.	Agreed with LBC, HCC, NHDC and CBC at the LVIA Open Space TWG on <u>07.06.22-June 2022</u>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
CBC10	<p><del>Consultation undertaken in accordance with the National Networks National Policy Statement Consultation undertaken in relation to the Transport Assessment, in accordance with NNNPS paragraph 5.204.</del></p>	<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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b>.</p>	<p>CBC agrees that consultation was undertaken in relation to the Transport Assessment, in accordance with NNNPS paragraph 5.204.</p>	<p><del>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</del> <u>Agreed during meeting on 11.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>
CBC11	<p>Consultation undertaken in relation to design, in accordance with NPPF</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken engagement regarding the design of the Proposed Development, including with CBC. This is set out in full in the <b>Design and Access Statement Volume I [AS-049]</b> and the <b>Consultation Report [AS-048]</b>.</p>	<p>CBC agrees that consultation was undertaken in relation to design, in accordance with NPPF paragraph <del>432</del><u>137</u>.</p>	<p><del>Written reply from CBC to confirm.</del> <u>Confirmation received via email on 20.12.23</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council's position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p>paragraph <del>132</del><u>137</u>-</p>	<p>This accords with NPPF paragraph <del>132</del><u>137</u> which states:</p> <p><i>"Design quality should be considered throughout the evolution 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: Summary of ‘compensation’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>COMPENSATION</u></b>					
<b>Compensation policies and Community First</b>					
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><u>Further information has been provided by the Applicant during the course of the examination.</u> <del>There is lack of information regarding the operation, distribution and overall effectiveness of the Community First Fund.</del></p>	<p><del>To be discussed at topic-specific meeting</del>  <u>Agreed during meeting on 11.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

Table 3-4: Summary of ‘need case’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>NEED CASE</u></b>					
<b>Aviation Policy</b>					
<b>CBC13</b>	Compliance with <u>National Aviation Policy</u>	<p>-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 <b>Need Case [AS-125]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that policy still requires the local environmental impacts to be addressed.</p>	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.	Agreed via email on 05.12.23	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>Growth and demand forecasts</b>					
<b>CBC14</b>	Methodology for preparing Passenger Demand Forecasts	<p>Passenger demand forecasts, as set out in the <b>Need Case [AS-125]</b>, <del>are robust and</del> have been developed using an appropriate methodology <del>and assumptions, including taking into account potential capacity growth at the other London airports, carbon costs and other relevant economic variables.</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>The Applicant has undertaken the sensitivity testing of the forecasts requested in the ExA's written questions NE.2.1 and 2.2 and a report has been submitted at Deadline 8 [REP8-037]. These sensitivity tests, using these alternative assumptions proposed by</del></p>	<p>CBC agrees that the passenger demand forecasts have been developed using an appropriate methodology.</p> <p><del>CBC consider 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.</del></p>	<p><u>Discussions regarding this matter between CSACL, York Aviation and the host authorities with confirmation in writing on 21.12.2023.</u> Discussions regarding this matter between CSACL, York Aviation and the host authorities are ongoing to be concluded following additional forecast modelling requested by the Examining Authority in</p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreement</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>the Host Authorities, demonstrated that there is no material impact on the Core, Faster and Slower Growth Cases used for the assessment of the impacts and benefits of the Proposed Development.</del></p>		<p>Written Questions NE.2.1 and NE.2.2.</p>	
<p><b><u>CBC-15</u></b></p>	<p><u>Assumptions in Passenger Demand Forecasts</u></p>	<p><u>Assumptions including taking into account potential capacity growth at the other London airports, carbon costs and other relevant economic variables, have been used to develop the Applicant's demand forecasts.</u></p> <p><del>The Applicant considers that the demand forecasts have been developed using appropriate assumptions, including taking into account potential capacity growth at the other London airports, with carbon costs and other relevant economic variables having been used by the Applicant. Assumptions including taking into account potential capacity growth at the other London airports, carbon costs and other relevant economic variables have been used by the Applicant.</del></p>	<p><u>CBC agree that the passenger demand forecasts have used these assumptions.</u></p>	<p><u>Discussions regarding this matter between CSACL, York Aviation and the host authorities with confirmation in writing on 21.12.2023</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>CBC-16</u></b>	<u>Passenger Demand Forecasts</u>	<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>The Applicant has undertaken the sensitivity testing of the forecasts requested in the ExA's written questions NE.2.1 and 2.2 and <b>The Applicant's Response to Written Questions NE.2.1 and NE.2.2 – Demand Forecasts [REP8-037]</b> a <del>report</del> <del>has been</del> submitted at <del>Deadline 8 [REP8-037]</del>. These sensitivity tests, using these alternative assumptions proposed by the Host Authorities, demonstrated that there is no material impact on the Core, Faster and Slower Growth Cases used for the assessment of the impacts and benefits of the Proposed Development. <del>The Applicant notes that this submission has not been reviewed by CBC and so is of the opinion that the concerns</del></u></p>	<p><u>CBC consider that there are issues with a number of the assumptions used, most notably the passenger handling capabilities attributed to Gatwick and Heathrow, both of which could handle larger numbers than attributed to them by the Applicant, which could impact on the rate of growth and the timing of delivery of impacts and benefits at Luton. It is our view that many of the economic, price and elasticity assumptions carry a degree of down-side risk meaning the forecasts are likely to be optimistic thereby further slowing growth at Luton.</u></p>	<p><u>CBC stated their concerns at various stages during the Examination and having reviewed the Applicant's Response to Written Questions NE.2.1 and NE.2.2 – Demand Forecasts, CBC are still not satisfied [REP8-090]. <del>Discussions regarding this matter between CSACL, York Aviation and the host authorities with confirmation in</del></u></p>	<u>Not agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>have been addressed and that there is no remaining down-side risk. 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. are based on appropriate and realistic assumptions, including those relating to potential capacity growth at the other London airports, carbon costs and other relevant economic variables, that the .The Applicant has undertaken the sensitivity testing of the forecasts requested in the ExA's written questions NE.2.1 and 2.2 and a report has been submitted at Deadline 8 [REP8-037]. These sensitivity tests, using these alternative assumptions proposed by the Host Authorities, demonstrated that there is no material impact on the Core, Faster and Slower Growth Cases used for the assessment of the impacts and benefits of the Proposed Development.</del></p>		<p><del>writing on 21.12.2023.</del></p> <p><u>The</u></p>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC17</b> <b>5</b>	Position on the Demand Forecasts	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 <b>Need Case [AS-125]</b> , 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 conversion of passenger demand forecasts to projections of aircraft movement and fleet mix is appropriate, and the outputs reasonable for the Core <u>Development Planning Case</u> (subject to the reservations noted above about the passenger forecasts).	Agreed via email on 05.12.23	Agreed
<b>Night quota period</b>					
<b>CBC18</b> <b>6</b>	Appropriateness and realistic profile of flights over day and night	The Applicant considers that it has adopted an appropriate and realistic profile of flights over day and night as set out in the <b>Need Case [AS-125]</b> , including the assumption that there will continue to be aircraft movements within the night quota	CBC agrees that the Need Case sets out a realistic profile of flights for the day and night periods.  CBC supports the retention of the cap of 9,650 annual flights in the night period and would expect the	Agreed via email on 05.12.23.	Agreed



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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. <u>The night quota period movement cap is secured via the <b>Air Noise Management Plan [REP97-0474]</b>, compliance with which is secured through paragraph 27 of Schedule 2 to the draft DCO.</u></p>	<p>night quota count cap to be included as a requirement and not left to the discretion of the Applicant.</p>		

Table 3-5: Summary of ‘employment and training’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING</u></b>					
<b>Employment and Training Strategy Governance</b>					
<b>CBC197</b>	Employment and Training Strategy (ETS) to include regular monitoring	Any monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and initiatives outlined within the <b>Employment and Training Strategy (ETS) [APP-215REP8-020]</b> 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. <u>Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be set post DCO consent, but the Applicant will continue to engage with the Local Authority to frame the KPIs.</u>	<u>CBC agrees with the Applicant’s position and believes t</u> 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 <u>on</u> 13.10.2023	Agreed
<b>Employment and Training Strategy</b>					

<p><b>CBC2018</b></p>	<p><del>Approach and content of the ETS</del>  <u>Employment and Training Strategy proposals</u></p>	<p>The ETS [REP8-020APP-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.</p>	<p>CBC is satisfied with the approach and content of the ETS.</p>	<p>Email received <u>on</u> 13.07.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
-----------------------	--	---	---	--	---------------

Table 3-6: Summary of ‘surface access’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<del>Surface Access</del> <b>SURFACE ACCESS</b>					
<b>Monitoring</b>					
<p><b>CBC2119</b></p>	<p><u>Future monitoring of the highway network</u> <u>Future monitoring of the highway network around the airport</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant has established an approach to, and scale of, proposed monitoring.</u></p> <p><u>Further detail on the</u> <del>The</del> approach to monitoring and how this will influence the delivery of improvements to improve sustainable travel modes is set out in the <b>Surface Access Strategy [APP-228]</b> and the <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-024X4-XXX044]</b>. The <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> sets out a proposed monitoring programme to ensure that mitigation on the highway network will be delivered as and when required.</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><u>The monitoring proposals outlined in the updated OTRIMMA [(REP8-043REP5-041)] provides some helpful further information, although CBC hasve made representations at Deadline 5 with regards to the extent of ANPR coverage as well- as raising concerns over the expectation</u></p>	<p>This was discussed at meetings on <del>the</del> 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, 20.10.2023, and 07.12.2023, and 15.01.2024.</p>	<p><u>Agreed, subject to signing of the Side Agreement if this is not signed then this point is not agreed.</u> <del>Agreed</del> <del>Not agreed</del> <del>agreed</del></p> <p><u>Subject to OTRIMMA side agreement</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>The 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 to how monitoring of residual impacts will be facilitated.</p> <p>An outline of the contents of the TRIMMA are presented in the <b>Outline Transport Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (OTRIMMA) as Appendix I of the Transport Assessment [APP-202].</b> <del>[TR020001/APP/8.97REP7X-039XXX].</del></p> <p>The Applicant provided further information through the updated 'toolbox of measures' in the <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> <del>[TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044APP-229]</del> and the updated <b>OTRIMMA</b> <del>[TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-043REP5-041REP5-041]</del> submitted at Deadline 4. The OTRIMMA has been further updated at Deadline 7</p>	<p><del>that wider off-site monitoring will be the responsibility of the Local Authorities. It is the view of CBC that some locations, where there is an expectation of impact, should be monitored by the Applicant (and at the Applicant's costs).</del></p> <p><del>Subsequent discussions have been held with regards to the off-site locations in question, and subject to the signing of a proposed side agreement, this matter would be considered to be agreed.</del></p> <p><del>No resolution has been reached and is therefore not agreed.</del></p> <p><del>No resolution has been reached and is therefore not agreed.</del></p> <p><del>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 long term ANPR survey-based methodology). CBC seek clarity</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>OTRIMMA [REP8-043REP7-040REP5-041]</del>; this document responds positively to CBC's position on this matter, as it includes further detail on the monitoring proposal and the responsibility of local authorities.</p> <p><u>Subsequent discussions have been held with regards to the off-site locations in question, and a process has been agreed following the signing of a side agreement.</u></p>	<p><del>on ANPR camera locations and how highway monitoring will be captured in the s106 agreement.</del></p>		
<b>Assessment</b>					
<p><b>CBC22</b> <b>0</b></p>	<p>Scope of the traffic and transport assessment</p>	<p>The traffic and transport assessment, <u>as set out in the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b></u>, 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</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>CBC <u>also understand the route to securing additional seek clarity on</u></p>	<p>This was discussed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, 20.10.2023 and 07.12.2023.</p> <p><u>Engagement ongoing at the moment (ANPR</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>incorporated into the TRIMMA for on-going monitoring.</p>	<p><del>AN</del> NPR camera locations and the s106 agreement, <u>which is agreed.</u></p>	<p><u>camera locations).</u>  <u>Following meeting on 17/11/23 potential for specific additional survey locations to be identified and secured (either via the TRIMMA or a separate agreement)</u></p>	
<p><b>CBC23</b> <b>4</b></p>	<p>Assessment years used within the <del>t</del>Traffic and <del>t</del>Transport <del>a</del>Assessment</p>	<p>The assessment <u>in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</u> 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 <del>and noise</del> assessments.</p>	<p>CBC agree with the assessment years used within the traffic and transport assessment, <del>and that, they are consistent with the air quality assessments. However, further engagement is required.</del></p>	<p>This was discussed at meetings on <del>the</del> 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, 20.10.2023 and 07.12.23, <u>15.01.2024 and 16.01.2024</u>.  <u>Meeting held on 16/11/23 — CBC to</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<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 August 2023. Comments were received at Deadline 5, <del>and the Applicant will provide a response for Deadline 6 where appropriate.</del></p> <p>A meeting between CBC and LBC on the East Luton scheme delivery was held on 16.11.2023 to discuss CBC's queries.</p>		<p><del>comment further at the relevant DCO deadline</del></p>	
<p><b>CBC24</b> <b>3a</b></p>	<p><u>Assessment years used within the Traffic and Transport Assessment – alignment with air quality</u></p>	<p><u>The assessment in the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> 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 assessments.</u></p> <p><u>The uncertainty logs of development and infrastructure to be included in the Rule 9 Accounting for Covid-19 in transport modelling was shared with</u></p>	<p><u>CBC to confirm whether the traffic years utilised are consistent with air quality assessments.</u> <del>CBC to confirm whether the traffic years utilised are consistent with air quality assessments.</del></p>	<p><u>Agreed via email on 07.02.24</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreement</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>CBC on the 15 August 2023. 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><u>This matter is considered agreed.</u></p>			
	<b>Mitigation</b>				
<b>CBC25</b> <u>42</u>	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 <u>are now content and</u> 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
<b>CBC26</b> <u>53</u>	<del>Model basis used to inform mitigation measures</del>	The approach to assessment and mitigation is set out in the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> . The Applicant proposes mitigation measures in relation to the impacts of airport expansion on the surface access	<del>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</del>	This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023, and <u>07.12.23</u>	<u>OngoingAgreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>network capacity in the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> and <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044REP4-044]</b>.</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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b>. 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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-200APP-203 to APP-206]</b>, the validation levels on the <del>screenliness</del><u>screen lines</u> within Central Bedfordshire; Dunstable <del>c</del>Gordon, and Dunstable Leighton Buzzard cordon shows acceptable level of validation, and therefore this assessment is considered</p>	<p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>Extent of mitigation not agreed. Some positive discussions over some specific locations but these have not concluded. Concerns over deliverability, including that no Stage 1 RSAs have been undertaken as would normally be the case.</del></p> <p><u>CBC are now content with the model basis for the proposed highways works, (subject to confirmation of queries raised at Deadline 7 with regards to the updated Rule 9 modelling work) Stage 1 RSAs have now been received, although CBC have concerns over a number of the Designers Responses and will require further clarification or additional information to be submitted to address these.</u></p>	<p><u>and 15.01.2024.-</u></p> <p><u>VISSIM modelling updated and concerns addressed around the two modelling outputs.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant provided an update on Safety Audits at D5</u></p> <p><u>CBC are in receipt of Safety Audits and will comment at D6</u></p>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>appropriate to estimate the relative impact of the airport expansion.</p> <p><del>Discussions on mitigation are ongoing and Stage 1 Road Safety Audits can be completed once the scope of mitigation is agreed. The <b>Updates on Road Safety Audits [REP5-055]</b> was provided at Deadline 5.</del></p>			
<p><b><u>CBC 267</u></b></p>	<p><u>Highway mitigation works – Road Safety Audits Scheme delivery via the DCO</u></p>	<p><del>The updated Designer's Response that seeks to address CBC's concerns was provided at Deadline 8 – see <b>The Updates on Road Safety Audits [REP8-028X5-XXX055]</b> was provided at Deadline 5 and further updates were provided at Deadline 7. Further updates will also be provided at Deadline 8 which seek to address CBC's concerns.</del></p> <p><u>The <b>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-0437-039]</b> contains a mechanism which will allow the delivery of alternative forms of mitigation, should they be proposed by CBC.</u></p> <p><u>The wording within the DCO specifies how land will be acquired to</u></p>	<p><del>Stage 1 RSAs have now been received, although CBC have concerns over a number of the Designer's Responses and will require further clarification or additional information to be submitted to address these. CBC also accept the revised wording in the DCO regarding land acquisition and ability to complete works outside of the DCO red line boundary, subject to the signing of a proposed side agreement.</del></p>	<p><u>Meeting on the 26.01.24</u></p>	<p><del>Ongoing Agreement, subject to the signing of the Side Agreement if this is not signed then this point is not agreed. [subject to DCO wording confirmation]</del></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>undertake the required mitigation works. It also specifies the ability to extend beyond the red line boundary into Highway land to modify the proposed mitigation scheme if require by the local authority. It also allows for highway works to provide a maintenance bay.</u></p> <p><u>The signing of the side agreement has moved this matter to agreed.</u></p>			
<p><b>CBC28</b> <b>26a</b></p>	<p><u>Road Safety Audit and Design - A1081 New Airport Way/London Road (south)</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 updated Designer's Response that seeks to address CBC's concerns was provided at Deadline 8 – see <b>Updates on Road Safety Audits [REP8-028]</b></u></p>	<p><u>Stage 1 RSAs and Designer's Response hasve now been received for the proposed improvements at the <del>These consist of</del>A1081 New Airport Way/London Road (south) junction as shown :</u></p> <p><u>London Road South – As shown in document <b>[AS-023]</b>, plan ref. <u>LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0017 rev P01.</u></u></p> <p><u>CBC accept the design and Designer's Response to the Stage 1 RSA of this scheme.</u></p>	<p><u>Meeting on the 26.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>CBC29</u></b> <b><u>6b</u></b>	<u>Road Safety Audits and Design – A1081 New Airport Way / Gipsy Lane junction</u>	<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 updated Designer's Response that seeks to address CBC's concerns was provided at Deadline 8 – see <b>Updates on Road Safety Audits [REP8-028]</b></u></p> <p><u>The <b>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-043]</b> contains a mechanism which will allow the delivery of alternative forms of mitigation, should they be proposed by CBC.</u></p> <p><u>The signing of the side agreement has moved this matter to agreed.</u></p>	<p><u>Stage 1 RSA and Designer's Response has been received for the proposed improvements at the A1081 Stage 1 RSAs have now been received. These consist of:</u></p> <p><u>New Airport Way / Gipsy Lane junction as shown – As shown in document <b>[AS-023]</b>, plan refs. <u>LLADCO3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0003 rev P01 / LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0005 rev P01</u></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 not made within the DCO for appropriate liaison to take place with regards to road space booking, traffic management, and</u></p>	<u>Agreed via email on 07.02.24</u>	<u>Not agreed/Agreed subject to the signing of the Side Agreement if this is not signed then this point is not agreed.</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>other Streetworks activities associated with the delivery of highway mitigation works at these traffic sensitive locations. CBC have made representations with regards to the need for protective provisions within the DCO to address the above, but are not currently content with the provisions as detailed within the draft document, which fail to give adequate oversight or protection to the Authority and which remove a number of the powers which would otherwise be accounted for within a Section 278 highways agreement.</del></p> <p><del>CBC has concerns about the available corridor width for the A1081 improvements design of plans within the Stage 1 RSA for Gypsy Lane, including the existing on-road cycle lane width. The lane widths for the cycle lanes (shown as 1.2m in the Designer's Response to the Stage 1 RSA), are disputed as being the existing widths.</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>Furthermore, the forward visibility is still considered a concern.</del></p> <p><del>CBC will need to undertake a site visit to check the existing cycle lane widths are consistent with the widths shown in and confirm whether these are reflective of existing conditions.</del> <u>The Designer's Response, and found in places these were currently 1.4m and 1.5m.</u></p> <p><del>Forward visibility on the Gypsy Lane approach to the A1081 is still considered a concern.</del></p> <p><del>CBC are however satisfied that an engineering solution could be identified within highway land, and would therefore consider this matter to be agreed, subject to an appropriate side agreement making provision for such works.</del></p>		
<b>CBC30</b> <b>274</b>	Phasing of highway mitigation works	<del>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</del>	<del>CBC are not in agree agreement with some of</del> <u>with the phasing of the highways mitigation works and how this is delivered and monitored via the</u>	This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023 and 07.12.2023	<del>Ongoing</del> <u>Agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>Assessment [APP-202APP-203 to APP-206]</del> 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>'Core' works as defined by CBC's position will be identified on a case-by-case basis with relevant highway authorities.</u></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 as a result of monitoring, a period of engagement <u>(as part of ML2 as described in the- OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97REP87-04339])</u> will be carried out with relevant highway authorities; at this time, any concerns raised will be addressed.</p>	<p><del>TRIMMA 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).</del></p> <p><del>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 OTRIMMA [REP8-0435-041] in regards to the thresholds and how a 'reasonable' threshold is</del></p>	<p><del>and 15.01.2024 and 16.01.2024 and 26.01.24.</del></p> <p><u>CBC provided further comments at Deadline 5.</u></p>	



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>The TRIMMA will not be reactive; it will be proactive in that thresholds will be set such that mitigation will be delivered before impacts are realised. This is stated in the <b>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-0437-039]</b>.</u></p> <p><del>The Applicant notes the comments made regarding the TRIMMA approach and is considering these further. An updated <b>OTRIMMA [REP5-041]</b> was provided at Deadline 5.</del></p> <p><del>A further updated <b>OTRIMMA [REP7-039]</b> was submitted at Deadline 7.</del></p>	<p><del>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.</del></p>		
<p><b>CBC31</b> <b>28X</b></p>	<p><u>Thresholds for schemes with 2027 delivery</u></p>	<p><u>The TRIMMA will not be reactive; it will be proactive in that thresholds will be set such that mitigation will be delivered before impacts are realised. This is stated in the <b>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-043]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>Works can be delivered early in phase one based on agreeing suitable thresholds with CBC</u> <del>The Applicant will determine whether additional wording can be included</del></p>	<p><u>CBC have issues with the <b>OTRIMMA [REP8-043]</b> 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.</u></p>		<p><u>Status?Not agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>in the <b>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97]</b> to account for early works to allow, as far as reasonably practicable, that works required by 2027 are complete within the set timescales.</del></p> <p><u>to trigger the works.</u></p>			
<b>Public-/sustainable transport impacts</b>					
<b>CBC25</b>	<p><del>Public transport services <u>East-west public transport connectivity</u></del></p>	<p><del>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 supports the need to improve such connection however these strategic connections are not solely the responsibility of the Applicant to address.</del></p> <p><del>However, significant <u>modelling and assessment work</u> has been undertaken <u>performed</u> around demand, capacity and demand</del></p>	<p><del>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 and vice versa, both by road and rail, which does not appear to be addressed in the proposals.</del></p>	<p><del>This was discussed at a meeting on the 20.10.2023 and 07.12.2023.</del></p>	<p><del>Ongoing</del></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b>. The Applicant, through</p> <p><u>Through this application, the Applicant 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 new terminal. The <b>Surface Access Strategy [APP-228]</b> and <b>Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044]</b> 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 Applicant's surface access toolbox. This longlist is contained in the <b>FTP [REP4-044]</b>.</u></p>	<p><del>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’.</del> 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.</p> <p><del>CBC have concerns around how the <b>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056]</b> can provide sufficient early funding to pump-prime public transport services needed to meet sustainable transport Targets.</del></p> <p><u>The <del>Deadline 5</del> document <b>REP5-056 Sustainable Transport Fund</b>, provides some further detail around potential funding sources,</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>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 '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'.</del></p> <p><del>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has developed a <b>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056]</b>, to be used to fund measures identified within the <b>Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044]</b>. Additionally, further detail is being provided on implementation and timescales of the 'toolbox of measures', provided at Deadline 4. The <b>Bus &amp; Coach Study [REP5-058]</b> was provided at Deadline 5.</del></p>	<p><del>which is welcomed, although queries remain with regards to early funding (in terms of pump priming services) and the relationship with other funding streams, including GCG</del></p>		
<p><b>CBC32</b> <b>286</b></p>	<p>Sustainable passenger and staff mode</p>	<p><del>The</del> 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</p>	<p><del>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.</del></p>	<p>This was discussed at a meetings on the 20.10.2023</p>	<p>Ongoing <del>Not agreed</del></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p><del>share</del><u>Public transport capacity</u></p>	<p>ambitious Limits through <del>the</del> <b>Green Controlled Growth (GCG) Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020 REP5-022]</b> 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 <del>further reaching</del><u>further reaching</u> than GCG Limits) through the development of Travel Plans in future. Encouraging 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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> has considered the number of people – both passengers and staff</p>	<p><del>The distributional assessment of passenger and employee demand is not clear.</del></p> <p><del>The existing public transport links to the airport are recognised in the proposals as being inadequate. Furthermore, 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.</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>The Deadline 5 submission REP5-056 (Sustainable Transport</del></p>	<p><del>and</del> <u>15.01.2024.</u></p>	<p><del>Agreed subject to STF</del></p> <p><del>Agreed on the basis of the S106 process completing</del></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>– 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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> concludes that there is expected to be sufficient capacity in the rail network to accommodate demand, taking account of the Proposed Development.</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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has developed more detail around bus and coach routes in the <b>Bus &amp; Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122[REP8-0335-058]</b> 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.</p>	<p><del>Fund) and REP5-058 (Bus and Coach Study) provided further information with regards to potential route enhancements and funding options. CBC are currently reviewing and will provide further comment</del></p> <p><u>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. 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, although CBC consider that there are still 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>The Applicant has also set out how measures will be funded by the <b>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF)</b> [<a href="#">TR020001/APP/8.119REP7-0425-056</a>] that sets the framework around how these types of improvements, alongside the others listed out within the toolbox of measures within the <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> [<a href="#">TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044</a>], would be funded. <u>This would be secured through requirement 32 of the draft via the DCO and is no longer in the s106 agreement.</u></p>	<p><u>Further information submitted by the Applicant with regards to the Sustainable Transport Fund, including a commitment to provide pump priming for early interventions has helped to address CBCs initial concerns on this matter, and as such CBC would consider this matter to be agreed. Although CBCs preference would have been to secure a firmer commitment with regards to the indexation of levies to help ensure future forecast revenues. although this would be reliant upon any final commitments within the section 106 agreement. any final commitments within the sSection 106 agreement.</u></p> <p><u>In the absence of the Ss106 agreement being signed (or an alternative means of confirming and committing funding) then CBC's position would change to Not Agreed. This should include a commitment to the provision of the fund in perpetuity, to ensure</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>the long term revenue support which may be required.</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC33</b> <b>297</b></p>	<p><u>Providing funding for public transport improvements</u> <u>Travel plan delivery</u></p>	<p>The <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044]</b> 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 the <b>Surface Access Strategy [APP-228]</b> and changing circumstances which will be recognised through the results of ongoing monitoring and stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>Future, <u>five-yearly</u> Travel Plans that follow the structure and requirements set out in the <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.1308REP8-024X-XXX4-044]</b> will have ambitious Targets that are over and above those set out in the <b>GCG</b></p>	<p><u>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. 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 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. 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>	<p>This was discussed at meetings on <u>the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, 20.10.2023, 3 and 07.12.2023 and 15.01.2024.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed Not agreed</u> <u>As above</u> <u>Agreed</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><b>Framework</b> - [<del>TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020</del>] – <del>further iterations of which are to be submitted</del> – [<del>REP5-022</del>], set in consultation with stakeholders through the Airport Transport Forum.</p> <p>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 <del>ee</del> <del>appropriateness</del> of the Targets set out and the corresponding measures 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 <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> [<del>TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044</del>].</p>	<p><del>Whilst the submission of additional information with regards to the STF has helped to address some of CBCs concerns on this matter, the relationship between various funding sources, particularly particularly between GcGGCG, the Travel Plan and the STF remains unclear.</del></p> <p><del>Notwithstanding</del> <del>Notwithstanding this, CBC are</del> <del>is broadly content that the increased level of STF funding and commitment to Pump Priming services represents a significant improvement in the sustainable transport offer.</del> <del>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. 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 lift-sharing programmes for airport</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has developed the <b>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF)</b> [<del>TR020001/APP/8.119REP7-0425-056</del>], to be used to fund measures identified within the <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> [<del>TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044</del>], and the <b>Bus &amp; Coach Study</b> [<del>REP8-0335-058</del>] to give further detail on suggested bus and coach improvements. <u>As set out in the <b>Draft Section 106 Agreement</b> [<del>TR020001/APP/8.167REP7-074</del>]draft DCO</u> [<del>TR020001/APP/2.01</del>], £1 million will be made available at the beginning of the Proposed Development to pump prime services. The collection and use of the fund will continue in perpetuity unless the ATF Steering Group recommends to the operator that the levies are reduced or removed. Further detail on the implementation and timescales for the 'toolbox of measures' was provided at Deadline 4.</p>	<p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>The Deadline 5 document REP5-056 Sustainable Transport Fund, provides some further detail around potential funding sources, which is welcomed, although queries remain with regards to early funding (in terms of pump priming services) and the relationship with other funding sources (such as GcG)</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC28</b>	Sustainable transport mode share for both passengers and staff <u>Existing public transport connectivity</u>	<p><del>The Airport has made significant progress in growing its sustainable transport mode share for both passengers and staff as set out in the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b>, <b>Surface Access Strategy [APP-228]</b> and the <b>Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044AS-131]</b>. 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.</del></p> <p><del>The <b>Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044AS-131]</b> sets out a toolbox of measures to enable a flexible approach in adapting and responding to future challenges and</del></p>	<p><del>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.</del></p>	<p><del>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023.</del></p>	<p><del>Ongoing</del></p> <p><u>Agreed on the basis of the S106 process completing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>The Applicant submitted the <b>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056]</b> at Deadline 5.</del></p>			
<p><b>CBC34</b> <b><u>029</u></b></p>	<p>Real shifts to public transport</p>	<p>The <del>Planning Statement GCG Framework [REP5-022]</del> [ <b>TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020</b>], <b>Surface Access Strategy [APP-228]</b> and <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044]</b> 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>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) <del>needs to be developed further</del>; including how any ATF is constituted and funded, <u>is agreed</u>.</p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023 <u>and 15.01.2024</u>.</p>	<p><u>Agreed</u> <u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>The <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> <a href="#">[TR020001/APP/7.13][REP8-024X4-0XX]44</a> sets out the 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 <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> <a href="#">[TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044X-XXX]</a> 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 <b>GCG Framework</b> [</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u><a href="#">TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020</a></u>], however there could be opportunities to involve the Technical Panels as a review mechanism for the Travel Plans, 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 developed a <b>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF)</b> <u><a href="#">[TR020001/APP/8.119REP7-0425-056]</a></u>, to be used to fund measures identified within the <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> <u><a href="#">[TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044]</a></u>.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Terms of reference for the ATF Steering Group will be contained in the final TRIMMA. Outline terms of reference for the ATF Steering Group will be introduced in the OTRIMMA published at Deadline 8 are contained in the Appendix A of the -OTRIMMA</a></u> <u><a href="#">[TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-043XXX]</a></u>. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Council as the</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>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.</del></p>			
<p><b>Public-/sustainable transport</b></p>					
<p><b>CBC35</b> <b><u>10</u></b></p>	<p><del>Mode share Limits for staff and passengers Mode shift</del></p>	<p>The <b>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020-REP5-022]</b> sets out mode share Limits for staff and passengers. The <b>Surface Access Strategy [APP-228]</b> and the <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044]</b> 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 <b>Surface Access Strategy [APP-228]</b> and <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044]</b> 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</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.</p> <p><del>However, based on discussions CBC are satisfied with the route forward to setting these targets through the ATF. Would welcome further discussions on this target.</del></p>	<p>This was discussed and agreed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 for targets will be informed by (where applicable):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>a.</del> <del>a.</del> Striving to go beyond the Limits for passenger and staff mode share.</li> <li>b. Responding to modelling forecasts in the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b></li> <li>c. Due regard for recent five-year CAA / staff surveys and trends over the duration of the previous Airport Surface Access Strategy/Travel Plan</li> <li><del>d.</del> <del>d.</del> A lookahead to delivery of transport infrastructure delivery in the next five-year period</li> </ul>			



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>e. Engagement with the Airport Transport Forum and other bodies involved in the governance of the Travel Plans.</p> <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 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 <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> <del>[TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044]</del> contains the provisional targets for the first future Travel Plan, alongside the headline targets for</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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><b>The Applicant submitted the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056] at Deadline 5. Sustainable Transport Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119REP7-0429-XXX] will provide funding for sustainable transport interventions.</b></p> <p><b>The Applicant will provide has provided more detail clarifying the Limits set out in the GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020REP5-022] against the targets set out in the Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044].</b></p>			
<p><b>CBC36</b> <b>24</b></p>	<p>Non-sustainable mode share</p>	<p>The <b>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020REP5-022]</b> sets a 55% Limit of non-sustainable mode share by the</p>	<p><del>There</del> <b>CBC believe there</b> should be an opportunity to review the future minimum targets if they are exceeded in the early years to</p>	<p>This was discussed and agreed at meetings on</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>time passenger throughput reaches 27 mppa at the Airport. Conversely, 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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b>.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the public transport work has shown that there is potential to grow passenger modal share beyond 45%. The <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-024P4-044]</b> sets out the approach and structure for future Travel Plans, to establish more ambitious Targets for future years.</p> <p><u>The Applicant will has provided more detail clarifying the Limits set out in the <b>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020REP5-022]</b> against the targets set out in the <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044]</b>.</u></p>	<p>ensure there is still a target for continual improvement 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><u>However, based on discussions CBC are satisfied with the route forward to setting these targets through the ATF.</u></p>	<p>the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, and 20.10.2023, <u>15.01.2024 and 16.01.2024.</u></p>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>CBC37</u></b> <b><u>32</u></b>	Framework Travel Plan scope	The <b>Framework Travel Plan [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-0244-044]</b> 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 <b>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [TR020001/APP/8.119]</b> which outlines how the <b>Framework Travel Plan</b> will be funded, <del>was submitted at Deadline 5 and a updated STF was submitted at Deadline 7.</del> Further information on the implementation and timescales of the 'toolbox of measures' in the <b>FTP Framework Travel Plan</b> was provided at Deadline 4.	CBC <del>to confirm its position</del> <u>enagree with</u> the scope of the Framework Travel Plan.	This was discussed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, and 20.10.2023 with <u>ongoing and 16.01.2024.</u> meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.	<u>Not Agreed</u> <u>Agreed</u> <u>Position not confirmed</u> <u>by</u> <u>CBC</u> <u>Ongoing</u>
<b>Car parks</b>					
<b><u>CBC38</u></b> <b><u>43</u></b>	<u>P</u> Off-site car parking <u>d</u> emands <u>moni</u> toring, pricing policies and fly parking	<u>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.</u> <u>The</u>	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	This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023, and 07.12.2023 and <u>16.01.2024.</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Ag</u> <u>reed</u> <u>subject to</u> <u>STF106</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97] and the RIFSTF outlines the approach to monitoring that can be secured via the DCO.</del></p> <p><del>The Applicant acknowledges the key role that the LPAs have to play in monitoring and managing the impact of off-site car parks. a s106 agreement environmental effects which could undermine the ability of the Applicant to meet GCG Targets.</del></p> <p><del>The Applicant has no control over the operation or potential expansion of these facilities — this is a matter for facility operators and for local authorities. The Applicant has, however, incorporated forecast traffic associated with these facilities into the design of proposed mitigation. Monitoring proposed in the OTRIMMA [REP7-040X7-XXX039REP5-0418-043] accounts for this.</del></p> <p><del>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</del></p>	<p>and would need to be funded by the Applicant.</p> <p>CBC accept the submitted information on the <del>RIF STF</del> and the OTRIMMA <del>(now secured via the updated STF)</del> and are happy this addresses <del>d</del> concerns raised, if not CBCs preferred approach.</p> <p><del>CBC have provided a proposed approach and related costs to the applicant and would be seeking this to be secured via the s106 agreement. 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 aApplicantion.</del></p> <p><del>CBC accept the submitted information on the RIF and the OTRIMMA and are happy this addressed concerns raised, if not CBCs preferred approach.</del></p> <p><del>CBC have provided a proposed approach and related costs to the applicant and would be seeking</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>and highway capacity perspective. The ratio of parking spaces per pass@holenger 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 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><u>this to be secured via the s106 agreement.</u></p> <p><u>At present the Transport Assessment and Surface Access Strategy do not set out an approach to monitoring and mitigation for this area of concern.</u></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</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>The balance between parking supply and demand is acknowledged.</del></p> <p><del>The Applicant notes that additional discussion on fly parking is required and this will be organised in due course. The <b>OTRIMMA [REP5-041]</b>, which was submitted to the ExA at Deadline 4, provides additional information.</del></p> <p><del>Discussions are ongoing regarding implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone and the updated OTRIMMA to be submitted at Deadline 7.</del></p>	<p><del>with the increases in all other modes of access, and also informal 'fly parking' in existing communities, which would be outside of the host authorities ability to control through the planning system.</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>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. 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? CBC have provided a proposed approach</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>In the GCG, someone parking off-site would be considered a non-sustainable trip.</u></p>	<p><u>and related costs to the applicant and would be seeking for this to be secured via the Ss106 agreement.</u> CBC have provided a proposed approach and related costs to the applicant and would be seeking for this to be secured via the S106.</p>		
<p><b><u>CBC39</u></b> <b><u>4a</u></b></p>	<p><u>Modelled off-site parking</u></p>	<p><u>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.</u></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 authorities. The Applicant has, however, incorporated forecast traffic associated with these facilities into the design of proposed mitigation. Monitoring proposed in</u></p>	<p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></p>		<p><u>Not agreed</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>the OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97] accounts for this.</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>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 authority to consider the potential implications of such proposals</u></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> <p><u>Subsequent to confirmation that off-site car parking has been modelled as generalised growth, and that this was included in the forecast baseline, rather than development test, CBC's concerns that off-site parking has not been appropriately accounted for within the modelling and associated transport work, remain unaddressed.</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>The baseline peak hour trips to/from the off-site car parks were established using a method similar to that used for the future years as described in section 9.5 of the Transport Assessment [APP-205]. The increase in the off-site car park trips established from applying the traffic modelling growth was compared with the increase in trips forecast for the With Development scenario (using the methodology in section 9.5). The comparison showed that the model growth was a reasonable reflection of the forecast growth in off-site car park trips. The growth in peak hour trips associated with off-site third-party car parks is small and would be dispersed across the network to various locations which are unknown at this stage, as they are not within the control of the Applicant. If the</u></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>growth in off-site car park trips were included in the With Development scenario, the impact would be insignificant. The trips are nevertheless included in the modelling as background traffic and are therefore used to inform the performance of the road network and design of off-site highway mitigation proposals.</u></p> <p><u>Off-site parking within the model (not agreed)</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></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 authorities. The Applicant has,</u></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>however, incorporated forecast traffic associated with these facilities into the design of proposed mitigation. Monitoring proposed in the <b>OTRIMMA</b> <b>TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-0431</b> accounts for this.</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>Any future third-party proposals for off-site car parking would require a</del></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>separate planning application to the relevant local planning authority if and when they come forward, and it would be for the local planning 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.</del></p> <p><del>The balance between parking supply and demand is acknowledged. In the GCG, someone parking off-site would be considered a non-sustainable trip.</del></p>			
<b><u>CBC40354</u></b>	<u>Fly parking</u>	<p>The <u>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97REP7-0398-043]</u> contains an update on this matter – please refer to section 4.2. It includes the following text, which responds positively to CBC's position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>In recognition of the challenging data requirements</u></li> </ul>	<p><u>Whilst the OTRIMMA [(REP5-041REP8-043)] provides some commentary with regards to the matter of Fly parking, this does not address the issue satisfactorily.</u></p> <p><u>It should not be incumbent on the Host Authorities to demonstrate problems are occurring after the event, or to fund and carry out the</u></p>	<p><u>This was discussed in a meeting on 16.01.2024.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not-Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>to establish a baseline to evidence the impact of the Proposed Development on the prevalence of fly-parking, however, baseline information need not be included in proposals by ATF Steering Group members to mitigate this activity.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>If the ATF Steering Group agree to the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone, the RIFSTF would be used to fund the full process of implementation (including the consultation process with residents). This would be the case if the residents reject the scheme following the consultation.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>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</u></p>	<p><u>surveys necessary to demonstrate this.</u></p> <p><u>Whilst is not CBCs preferred approach, it is agreed that the revised STF allows for the funding of works to discourage fly-parking. <del>CBC have provided a proposed approach and related costs to the applicant and would be seeking for this to be secured via the Ss106 agreement.</del></u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>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.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant notes that additional discussion on fly parking is required and this will be organised in due course. The <b>OTRIMMA [REP5-041]</b>, which was submitted to the ExA at Deadline 4, provides additional information.</u></p> <p><u>Discussions are have been ongoing regarding implementation of a Controlled Parking Zone and the updated <b>OTRIMMA [REP7-039]</b> to was be submitted at Deadline 7. The Applicant will not implement not implement a CPZ via a s106 side-agreement.</u></p>			
<b>CBC34</b>	Monitoring and managing the impact of off-site car parks	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	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	This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023.	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>environmental effects which could undermine the ability of the Applicant to meet GCG Targets.</del></p> <p><del>The Applicant has no control over the operation or potential expansion of these facilities — this is a matter for facility operators and for local authorities. The Applicant has, however, incorporated forecast traffic associated with these facilities into the design of proposed mitigation. Monitoring proposed in the <u>OTRIMMA [REP5-041]</u> accounts for this.</del></p>	<p><del>Transport Assessment and Surface Access Strategy do not set out an approach to monitoring and mitigation for this area of concern.</del></p>		
	<b>Modelling</b>				
<b>CBC41</b> <b>365</b>	<p><del>Model scope and assumptions</del> <u>Model scope, coverage and assumptions around the development / transport and highway</u></p>	<p>The Applicant presented the model scope, coverage and assumptions around the development/transport and highway scheme uncertainty log.</p> <p>The Applicant facilitated a meeting between CBC and LBC on the East Luton project on the 16.11.2023.</p> <p><del>The Applicant will also provide information on whether the 'associated development' was</del></p>	<p><del>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.</del></p>	<p>This was discussed at meetings on <del>the</del> 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, <u>16.11.23</u> and <u>20.10.2023</u> with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if</p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p><u>scheme uncertainty log</u></p>	<p><u>included in the modelling. Further information is contained in the NTEM (National Trip End Model Summary) report which has been provided to CBC.</u></p>	<p><u>It was confirmed at Deadline 4 that the updated modelling included the Luton North development, which is welcomed. A meeting was also held on the 16<sup>th</sup> November with LBC to discuss the status of the East of Luton Schemes.</u></p> <p><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.</u></p> <p><u>The update to the modelling work has addressed the queries related to the M1-A6 link Road and associated development, and whilst CBC continue to have concerns over the potential phasing of the East of Luton Schemes, it is understood from</u></p>	<p><u>required and agreed in a meeting on 16.01.2024.</u></p>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>meetings held with Luton BC that they are content with the assumptions. As such CBC would consider this matter to now be agreed.</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC42</b> <b>376</b></p>	<p>Approach to the modelling scenarios</p>	<p>The 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 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</p>	<p><u>The highways modelling initially assumed hard shoulder running (or Smart motorway) to be present in all future options. In the further modelling undertaken as part of the update 70 development related to COVID 19 impacts the 'no Smart Motorway' scenario was treated as 'Core', feeding through to the more detailed VISSIM modelling. As such this matter is now considered to be agreed. 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</u></p>	<p>This was discussed at meetings on <del>the</del> 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023 and 20.10.2023 <u>and agreed in a meeting on 16.01.2024.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u> <u>ong</u> <u>eing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>were included in the 2043 future baseline.</p> <p>Furthermore, a sensitivity 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 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><u>The Applicant refers to CBC to HA to Section 14.3 of the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-206]</b>.</u></p>	<p><del>the Strategic Level Modelling, with outstanding queries remaining with regards to the calibration and validation of local junction models</del></p> <p><del>Further modelling has been undertaken to take account of COVID19 Impacts, reported (partially) at Deadline 5, in which the Smart Motorways Scheme has been removed, however the full updated modelling (including an update to the VISSIM modelling at J10 / A1081) has not yet been seen or reviewed.</del></p> <p><del>The 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</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>proposals will not cause an unacceptable impact on the Strategic Road Network.</del></p> <p><del>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 alternative test and/or scheme may be required.</del></p> <p><del>It is understood that further modelling will be undertaken as part of the update related to 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.</del></p>		
<b>CBC37</b>	East Luton highway improvement schemes	<p><del>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</del></p>	<p><del>CBC remain concerned over the inclusion of East Luton schemes without a related commitment to their provision being contained as</del></p>	<p><del>This was discussed in a meeting on 20.10.2023.</del></p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>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 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.</del></p> <p><del>The Applicant facilitated a meeting between CBC and LBC on 16.11.2023 to discuss the East Luton highway improvement schemes further.</del></p>	<p><del>a provision or requirement within the DCO itself.</del></p> <p><del><u>Whilst CBC continue to have some concerns over the timescales assumed within the modelling for the East of Luton Schemes, and the lack of a specific commitment within the DCO for the delivery of these schemes, this is ultimately considered a matter that sits with LBC. CBC are however keen to ensure that any funding commitments to works within CBC are ring fenced to guarantee delivery as / when required.</u></del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>This is also a disparity between scheme descriptions and content</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>between documents in at least one case.</del></p> <p><del>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 intend 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.</del></p>		
<p><b><u>CBC38</u></b> <b><u>43</u></b></p>	<p><u>Calibration and validation of models</u> <del>The development, calibration and validation of the models</del></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</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 <del>addition</del><u>addition</u>, the comments</p>	<p>This was discussed at meetings on the 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, <del>and</del> 20.10.2023 <u>and resolved following discussions on 16.01.2024.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>geometric parameters and provide a comparative performance of the junction without and with development. Where appropriate data is <del>available</del> <u>development available</u>, consideration has been given to validation of flows and queues.</p> <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 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: <b>M1 A6 Routing Analysis [REP4-105]</b> and Technical Note 2: <b>Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 2 Risk Assessment [REP6-023REP4-046]</b> have been issued at Deadline 4, providing further information.</p>	<p>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, <del>but CBC must be given sufficient time to consider the outcome of this exercise.</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<p><b>CBC39</b> <b><u>44</u></b></p>	<p>All known committed <del>developments</del> <u>D76</u> <del>development</del> 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, 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><u>The modelled scenario compares back to the do-minimum and so there is no need for the following scenario:</u></p>	<p><del>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: CBC are satisfied with the modelled scenarios and do not deem it necessary to include the following scenario:</del></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 <u>and resolved following discussions on 16.01.2024.</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>Do Minimum with committed highway schemes and developments and mitigation.</u></p> <p><u>As such, this scenario has not been run.</u></p> <p>-A written response was provided as part of the ISH4 Action 8 response, namely <b>Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 8: Off-site Highway Works [REP4-082]</b>.</p>			
<b>CBC40</b>	Highway mitigation works in Central Bedfordshire	<p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>The Applicant will continue to work alongside CBC as the designs progress through to the detailed design and delivery stage.</del></p>	<p><del>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:</del></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>New Airport Way / Gipsy Lane junction — As shown in document <u>Off-site Highway Works TR020001/APP/4.13[AS-023]</u>, plan refs. LLADCO3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0003 rev P01 / LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0005 rev P01.</del></li> </ul>	To be discussed	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>London Road South</del> As shown in <del>Off-site Highway Works [AS-023]</del> document TR020001/APP/4.13, plan ref. LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0017 rev P01.</p> <p>The works proposed at the New Airport Way / M1 Junction 10 are also immediately adjacent to the section of the A1081 within Central Bedfordshire.</p> <p>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 not made within the DCO for appropriate liaison to take place with regards to road space booking, traffic management, and other Streetworks activities associated with the delivery of</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>highway mitigation works at these traffic sensitive locations.</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>These consist of: New Airport Way / Gipsy Lane junction — As shown in document TR020001/APP/4.13[AS-023], plan refs. LLADCO3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0003 rev P01 / LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0005 rev P01. London Road South — As shown in document TR020001/APP/4.13[AS-023], plan ref. LLADCO-3C-ARP-SFA-HWM-DR-CE-0017 rev P01.</del></p> <p><del>The works proposed at the New Airport Way / M1 Junction 10 are also immediately adjacent to the section of the A1081 within Central Bedfordshire.</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>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 not made within the DCO for appropriate liaison to take place with regards to road space booking, traffic management, and other Streetworks activities associated with the delivery of highway mitigation works at these traffic sensitive locations. CBC have made representations with regards to the need for protective provisions within the DCO to address the above, but are not currently content with the provisions as detailed within the draft document, which fail to give adequate oversight or protection to the Authority and which remove a number of the powers which would otherwise be accounted for within</del></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>a Section 278 highways agreement. Following receipt of the Stage 1 Safety Audits CBC have a number of comments and concerns that will require addressing via the submission of updated plans.</u></p>		
<b>Local impact fund</b>					
<b>CBC45</b> <u>01</u>	General local highway network fund to cover additional improvements	As set out in the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> and <b>Surface Access Strategy [APP-228]</b> , 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. The <b>Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [-TR020001/APP/8.119REP7-0425-</b>	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	This was discussed at a meeting on 20.10.2023 <u>and 16.01.2024.</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u> <u>subject to</u> <u>STF</u> <u>agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>056]</del>, <del>provided at Deadline 5</del>, provides clarity on the particular arrangements for funding of surface access related measures and interventions identified in the <b>Framework Travel Plan (FTP) [TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-042X-XXX]</b> and any interventions associated with MT2 in the TRIMMA. The <b>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-0435-041REP4-085]</b>, provided at Deadline 4, includes information on funding highway mitigation commitments.</p>	<p>given the environmental benefits that would result.</p> <p><del>The proposed funding available via the STF would help to mitigate this area of concern. Residual Impacts Fund under proposed Residual Impacts Fund under the OTRIMMA would help address this concern, however this would be reliant upon the eventual fund size and governance, which remains to be agreed through the Section 106. The Residual Impacts Fund, as detailed within the Outline TRIMMA may provide the funding stream being sought, however further detail on the level of funding and the associated governance arrangements are required for CBC to form a reasonable view.</del></p>		
	<b>Order Limits</b>				
<b>CBC46</b> <u>12</u>	Order Limits to enable delivery of the	The Applicant is confident that enough land has been identified and secured within the Order Limits to	CBC note that the Order Limits are drawn relatively closely around some of the highways works proposed. As outstanding queries associated with the	<del>To be discussed during ongoing engagement</del> <u>Discussed in a</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <del>Not agreed</del>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	Proposed Development	enable delivery of the Proposed Development.	<p>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 allowed for within the Order Limits may constrain the extent of the works that could be secured and delivered.</p> <p><u>The Safety Audits and Designers responses issued at Deadline 5, and responded to by CBC at Deadline 6 have further reinforced this concern, and whilst CBC are of the view that the works in question can largely be delivered within the public highway and that engineering solutions to address the Safety Audit identified problems are available, CBC have less confidence that these</u></p>	<u>meeting on 16.01.2024.</u>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>can be achieved within the DCO order limits.</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC47</b> <b>23</b></p>	<p>Impacts outside of the Order Limits, and a mechanism for securing any works outside of the redline</p>	<p>The Applicant <del>will</del><u>continues to</u> engage with CBC on a mechanism <u>(via a side agreement)</u> for securing any actions which may be required as a result of unintended consequences, outside of the Order Limits.</p>	<p>CBC <del>also</del> 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.</p> <p><del>Whilst this is a matter discussed at a high level, this is considered to be one that needs urgently addressing, as it is the means by which a large proportion of works within CBC would be secured. At present nor proposals have been forthcoming, and CBC have concerns that this may not be resolved prior to the conclusion of the DCO, resulting in unmitigated and unacceptable impacts.</del></p> <p><del>In the absence of a bespoke agreement CBC would expect these works to be secured under the S106 or a unilateral undertaking. As of 04.01.2024 whilst mitigation works outside of the DCO limits have been discussed and largely agreed,</del></p>	<p><del>Discussed</del><u>Discussed To be discussed during ongoing engagement. At meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> November 11.2023 and 16.01.2024 it was agreed that the applicant would propose a form of agreement to secure offsite works.</u></p> <p><u>CBC are currently awaiting an update on this.</u></p>	<p><del>Not agreed</del><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed subject to signing of the Side Agreement</u> <u>nt if this is not signed then this point is not agreed</u><u>Ongoing</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>there is currently no agreement in place securing these works.</u></p>		
<p><b><u>CBC48</u></b> <b><u>343</u></b></p>	<p>Planning assumptions</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that the planning assumption at the time of the modelling was as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The M1-A6 link has full approval, hence was coded in the TAG-based scenario;</li> <li>• The North of Luton development has 'Reasonably Foreseeable' status.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore, the development was excluded from the development from the TAG-based scenario.</p> <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 2023 and no comments were received.</p> <p>The Rule 9 modelling has also addressed the comments related to disparate sensitivity tests and no</p>	<p>CBC are of the view that the 'test 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).</p> <p>The number of disparate sensitivity tests is a concern, e.g. without Smart motorway 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><u>Updated modelling to take into account COVID19 Impacts, reported (partially) at Deadline 5, in which the Smart Motorways Scheme has been removed and</u></p>	<p><del>To be discussed during ongoing engagement</del> <u>Meeting on 16.01.2024</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u> <del>Ongoing</del></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>longer includes any capacity upgrade on the M1 and ensure that the demand from the strategic modelling informs the VISSIM modelling.</p>	<p><u>with the inclusion of the North of Luton Development, however the full updated modelling (including an update to the VISSIM modelling at J10 / A1081) has not yet been seen or reviewed. The updated Rule 9 Modelling is considered to have addressed these concerns.</u></p>		
<p><b><u>CBC49</u></b> <b><u>454</u></b></p>	<p>Linkages between the various levels of modelling work carried out</p>	<p>The <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> 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 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 <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> also includes sensitivity analysis in which the forecasts traffic growth from CBLTM-</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 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</p>	<p><u>Meeting on 16.01.2024</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreement</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>LTN model is applied to the base model VISSIM.</p> <p>Local junction modelling has been informed by data from the CBLTM-LTN, the 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>would need to be demonstrated at an individual junction level, if there is to be sufficient confidence in the junction modelling undertaken.</p> <p><u>Following the submission of further information and standalone junction models, CBC consider this matter to be agreed.</u></p>		
<b><u>CBC45065</u></b>	Detailed junction modelling	<p>The Applicant and CBC discussed the detailed junction modelling during meetings on the 27.07.23 and 03.08.23. <del>Further modelling outputs can be provided if required – the Applicant requests a comprehensive list of all outputs required.</del></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 outputs, to allow for an appropriate level of scrutiny and review to be undertaken and for a comparison between scenarios to be possible. <del>In the absence of this more detailed information, it is not possible for CBC to review or fully comment upon the proposed mitigation.</del></p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on <del>the 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023</del> <u>with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required. and agreed in a meeting on 16.01.2024.</u></p>	<u>OngoingAgreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>Detailed junction modelling has been provided and has addressed the previous comments raised.</u></p> <p><u>Following the submission of further information and standalone junction models, CBC consider this matter to be agreed.</u></p>		
<b>CBC46</b>	Highways works in CBC	<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. An update on Road Safety Audits is provided in the <b>Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 7- Updates on Road Safety Audits [REP5-055]</b> at Deadline 5. Discussions regarding the RSA designer's responses will be undertaken with CBC.</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><u>Whilst CBC are of the view that the works in question can largely be delivered within the public highway and that engineering solutions to address the Safety Audit identified problems are available, CBC have less confidence that these can be achieved within the DCO order limits. Following receipt of the Stage 1 Safety Audits at Deadline 5 CBC have a number of</u></p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on the <u>27.07.2023</u>, and <u>02.08.2023</u>, <u>07.12.2023</u> and <u>16.01.2024</u>, with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</p> <p><u>Meeting proposed with applicant team on 7<sup>th</sup> December</u></p>	Ongoing

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>comments and concerns that will require addressing via the submission of updated plans.</u></p>	<p><u>2023 to discuss Stage 1 RSA.</u></p>	
<p><b><u>CBC487651</u></b></p>	<p>Recently consented Newlands Park development</p>	<p><u>The Applicant can confirm that the development demands were included, as confirmed by the Uncertainty Log that was shared with CBC. However, in terms of the Newlands Road / A1081 London Road Junction, the recent proposed development mitigation scheme; the signalised proposal was not included. weThe Applicant have looked into the strategic model, and the coding doesn't restrict any demands approaching the junction, hence the assignment would still be considered adequate.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 modelling. The Applicant is open to having discussions regarding this.</u></p> <p><u>Table 5-28 of the Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling</u></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 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><u>Following confirmation from the applicant team that the signal junction was not coded into the forecast model, this area of the modelling cannot be considered as agreed, as the model will not be fully representative of the highway network in the forecast year, and the inclusion of the signal junction on the A1018 London Road could potentially have some effect upon route</u></p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on <del>the</del> 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023 with ongoing meetings also planned where this can be discussed if required.</p> <p><u>CBC awaiting confirmation that the signal scheme and related flows are included within the Forecast Modelling.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing CBC to consider. Not agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>Final Report [AS-15REP7-079] shows a reduction in demand at this junction.</u></p>	<p><u>choice. However, CBC do note the Applicant's comments that there is a predicted reduction in demand at this junction, and as such that the effects may be limited.</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC52</b> <b>4798</b></p>	<p>The re-routing of trips through Caddington</p>	<p>Details and analysis are included in the <b>Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]</b> around the re-routing of trips through Caddington and Slip End.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments made regarding Slip End and has provided CBC with further information which shows that the impacts at Slip End are not expected to be material.</p> <p><u>CBC and the Applicant are currently undergoing discussions regarding a side agreement which may resolve this matter.</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. <del>Work is ongoing in terms of proposed mitigation, but this is not yet agreed.</del></p> <p><del>F</del>Further consideration of the impact upon Slip End <del>and the B653 / West Hyde Road</del> is also required.</p> <p><u>The Applicant has proposed a series of measures which CBC would consider to be acceptable, to be secured via a side agreement of the S106, subject to the signing of this side agreement, this matter would be considered as agreed. however at present no mechanism for</u></p>	<p>This was discussed at a meeting on <del>the</del> 27.07.2023 and 02.08.2023.</p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed Position not confirmed by interested Position not confirmed by interested party</u></p> <p><u>Agreed, subject to the signing of the Sside Agreement if this is not signed then this</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<u>securing the works to address these areas of concern have been agreed.</u>		<u>point is not agreed.</u>
	<b>Modelling</b>				
<b><u>CBC53</u></b> <b><u>485049</u></b>	Highway network included in the CBLTM-LTN model	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.	CBC agree with the extent of the highway network included in the CBLTM-LTN model.	Agreed during meetings with CBC’s Community Services December 2018, 14.03.19 and 22.10.19	Agreed
<b><u>CBC54</u></b> <b><u>49510</u></b>	The base mode share assumptions	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>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</u>	This was discussed at meetings on <del>the</del> 27.07.2023, 02.08.2023, and 20.10.2023 and 16.01.2024.	<u>—Agreed subject to STFS1060 ongoing</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>pandemic staff travel mode share data currently available.</p> <p><del>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.</del></p>	<p><u>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 funded or defined process, nor is there a mechanism for the prioritisation of investment Taking the example of Stansted – public transport improvements are partially funded by a passenger transport levy, which contributes circa £600k-£800k per annum to public transport measures.</u></p> <p><u>Following the submission of details related to the Sustainable Transport Fund, and subject to this being secured through the</u></p>		



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>S106, including an allowance for early intervention 'pump priming' and the longer term funding of the measures, CBC would consider this matter to be agreed. However in the absence of a signed S106 CBCs position would change to Not Agreed.</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</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p>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.</p>		
<p><b><u>CBC5502</u></b></p>	<p><u>Sustainable Transport Fund</u></p>	<p><u>The Sustainable Transport Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119REP7-042X7-XXX042], secured by the ,—and the sSaA TR020001/APP/8.167and the draft DCO[TR020001/APP/2.01], outlines how sustainable transport interventions to meet the Travel Plan Targets will be funded. The levies have been adjusted so the fund size</u></p>	<p><u>CBC request that the collection of the fund continue after the completion of the Proposed Development in order to fund bus and coach services, which have ongoing costs.</u></p>	<p><u>This was discussed in a meeting on 16.01.2024.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing—S106Agreed-subject to STF</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>during the Proposed Development has doubled from £18.5m to £37m, and £1 million will be made available at the beginning of the Proposed Development to enable the pump priming of services. Collection and use of the STF will continue in perpetuity unless the ATF Steering Group recommends to the operator that levies be reduced or removed as appropriate. Funds may be used for highway mitigation measures in line with MT2 outlined in the <b>OTRIMMA [TR020001/APP/8.97REP8-043]</b> as directed in the <b>Sustainable Transport Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119]</b>.<sup>ss</sup></u></p>			
<p><b>CBC524</b></p>	<p>Highways works within Central Bedfordshire</p>	<p>The Applicant has continued to engage with stakeholders and additional information has been provided including further details relating to the modelling and will continue to engage with CBC.</p> <p>An update on Road Safety Audits is provided in the <b>Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 7 – Updates on</b></p>	<p>CBC have consistently raised concerns that the highways works within Central Bedfordshire have 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</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</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>Road Safety Audits [REP5-055] at Deadline 5. Discussions regarding the RSA designer's responses will be undertaken with CBC.</del></p>	<p><del>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 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</del></p>	<p><del>discussed if required.</del></p>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>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.</del></p> <p><u>Following receipt of the Stage 1 Safety Audits at Deadline 5 CBG have a number of comments and concerns that will require addressing via the submission of updated plans.</u></p>		

Table 3-7: Summary of ‘environment’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>ENVIRONMENT</u></b>					
<b>Air quality</b>					
<b><u>CBC56</u></b> <b><u>132</u></b>	Baseline data collection and presentation of future baseline information	The Applicant considers that the baseline data collection and future baseline information, as detailed in <b>Appendix 7.2 of Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [APP-062]</b> , are robust. These were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings <u>and the SoCG meeting with CBC.</u>	CBC agrees with the baseline data collection and presentation of future baseline information.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022  <u>SoCG meeting with CBC</u> <u>20.07.2303.0</u> <u>1.24</u>	Agreed
<b><u>CBC57</u></b> <b><u>243</u></b>	Air quality study area	The Applicant considers that the study area, as detailed in sections 7.3.5 to 7.3.9 in <b>Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [AS-076]</b> , is appropriate and robust. This was discussed and agreed during the EIA Scoping Meeting and Air Quality TWG meetings <u>and the SoCG meeting with CBC.</u>	CBC agrees with the study area.	EIA Scoping Meeting on 12.04.18  Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
				<a href="#">SoCG meeting with CBC 03.01.24</a> <a href="#">SoCG meeting with CBC 20.07.23</a>	
<p><b><u>CBC58</u></b> <b><u>354</u></b></p>	<p>Construction dust assessment methodology and findings</p>	<p>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 <b>Appendix 7.1 of Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [AS-028]</b>. The construction dust results are detailed in section 2.2 in <b>Appendix 7.3 of Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [REP4-013]</b>. The construction dust mitigation <del>included</del> <u>is detailed in section 8 of</u> <del>in the</del> <b>Appendix 4.2 <del>code</del> Code of construction Construction Practice</b> <del>is detailed in section 8 of</del> <b>Appendix 4.2 of the ES [REP86-013003]Chapter 4 The Proposed Development of the ES [AS-074]</b>.</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the construction dust assessment methodology and findings, including mitigation included in the code of construction practice which follows best practice.</p>	<p>Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022</p> <p><a href="#">SoCG meeting with CBC 03.01.24</a>  <a href="#">SoCG meeting with CBC 20.07.23</a></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>These have been discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings <u>and the SoCG meeting with CBC.</u></p>			
<p><b><u>CBC59</u></b> <b><u>465</u></b></p>	<p>Modelling methodology including data sources, <del>model set up including use of ADMS, receptor locations selected, assessment years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects, and verification methodology</del></p>	<p>The Applicant considers the modelling methodology including the data sources, model setup including use of the Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS), <u>modelled receptor locations</u>, assessment years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects and verification methodology to be robust. The modelling methodology is detailed in section 3 <del>of</del> <b>Appendix 7.1. of Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [AS-028]</b>. The modelling methodology was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings <u>and the SoCG meeting with CBC.</u></p>	<p>CBC agrees with the modelling methodology including data sources, model set up including use of ADMS, receptor locations selected, assessment years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects, and verification methodology.</p>	<p>Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022  <u>SoCG meeting with CBC 03.01.24</u> <u>SoCG meeting with CBC 20.07.23</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC60</b> <b>5576</b>	Significance criteria used in the assessment	The Applicant considers the significance criteria used in the assessment, as detailed in section 4 <del>of the</del> <b>Appendix 7.1</b> <del>of Chapter 7</del> <b>Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [AS-028]</b> , to be appropriate and robust. The significance criteria used in the assessment was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings <u>and the SoCG meeting with CBC.</u>	CBC agrees with the significance criteria used in the assessment.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022  <u>SoCG meeting with CBC 03.01.24</u> <u>SoCG meeting with CBC 20.07.23</u>	Agreed
<b>CBC61</b> <b>5687</b>	Odour impact methodology and results	The Applicant considers the odour impact methodology, as detailed in section 5 in <b>Appendix 7.1</b> of <b>Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [AS-028]</b> , to be robust. The odour impact methodology was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings <u>and the SoCG meeting with CBC.</u>	CBC agrees with the odour impact methodology and results.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022  <u>SoCG meeting with CBC 03.01.24</u> <u>SoCG meeting with CBC 20.07.23</u>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>CBC62</u></b> <b><u>7598</u></b>	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 <b>Appendix 7.9 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076]</b> and <b>Appendix 7.3 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [REP4-013]</b> . The results were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings <u>and the SoCG meeting with CBC.</u>	CBC agrees with the air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022  <u>SoCG meeting with CBC 03.01.24 SoCG meeting with CBC 20.07.23</u>	Agreed
<b><u>CBC63</u></b> <b><u>586059</u></b>	Good practice mitigation identified for the operational phase	The Applicant considers the good practice mitigation identified for the operational phase, as detailed in <b>Appendix 7.5 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [APP-065REP9-013]</b> , to be appropriate. The mitigation identified were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings <u>and the SoCG meeting with CBC.</u>	CBC agrees with the good practice mitigation identified for the operational phase.	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2018 to 2022  <u>SoCG meeting with CBC 03.01.24 SoCG meeting with CBC 20.07.23</u>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC64</b> <b><u>59610</u></b>	Compliance with published and emerging government guidance	The proposals accord with published and emerging government guidance. For example, the PM <sub>2.5</sub> target 10µg/m <sup>3</sup> to be achieved by 2040 is referenced in table 7.2. The assessment has been carried out against the 10µg/m <sup>3</sup> target in <del>the</del> <b>ES Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> <u>of the ES [AS-028076]</u> .	CBC <del>queries whether agrees that</del> the proposals accord with Government policy and emerging policy.	<del>To be discussed at topic-specific meeting</del> <u>Agreed via email on 12.01.24</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u>
<b>CBC65</b> <b><u>021</u></b>	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 of Comment Ground between the Applicant and Natural England.	CBC <del>request that the Applicant confirms if agrees that the Applicant and</del> Natural England have agreed to the methodology used for assessing ammonia emissions on ecological sites.	<del>To be discussed at topic-specific meeting</del> <u>Agreed via email on 12.01.24</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u>
<b>CBC66</b> <b><u>132</u></b>	Acid erosion impacts at cultural heritage receptors	The Applicant considers that an assessment of acid deposition can be scoped out as SO <sub>2</sub> 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	CBC note that there is no mention of acid erosion impacts at cultural heritage receptors (Luton Hoo and Someries Castle)  <u>.-Air quality monitoring and a collaborative mechanism to review this monitoring has been included in the CHMP and this is welcomed. It</u>	<del>To be discussed at topic-specific meeting</del> <u>Disagreement confirmed via email on 12.01.24</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>authorities, including CBC, at the scoping stage.</p>	<p><u>remains unclear how airborne pollutants from the FTG would affect the fabric of Someries Castle and what can be done to mitigate it.</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC67</b> <b><u>243</u></b></p>	<p>Predictions of air pollution in the human and ecological environment to be widely scant</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the modelling methodology including modelled receptor locations to be robust. The modelling methodology is detailed in section 3 <del>of</del> <b>Appendix 7.1. of Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [AS-02802876]</b>. Receptors were included at Luton Hoo (C1) and Someries Castle (C2), see table 3.1 <del>of</del> <b>Appendix 7.1. of Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [AS-02802876]</b>. Receptor results, including receptors C1 and C2, can be found in <b>Appendix 7.3. of Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>ES [REP4-013]</b>. All results at receptors C1 and C2 have negligible impact, and do not exceed air quality standards at any phase.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p><u>Regarding the human environment, the applicant states the impacts of air pollution would not be significant at an upper magnitude, and for this technical reason it will not provide prediction information of lower pollution quantities at representative dwellings in Central Bedfordshire. -CBC continues to find its residents are underrepresented in the description of impact the development will have in ranging magnitude of impact and that any</u></p>	<p><del>To be discussed at topic specific meeting</del> <u>Disagreement confirmed via email on 12.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>concern can be assuaged by helpful information provided through the EIA. -CBC considers the provision of this is a small undertaking for the benefit of residents understanding of adverse impacts the development may and may not have, and that the applicant could have easily provided this at an earlier time. Whereas the applicant maintains its view that this information is neither necessary technically nor relevant according to regulations.</u></p>		
<p><b><u>CBC68</u></b> <b><u>31655</u></b></p>	<p><u>GCG Thresholds and Limits – Air Quality</u></p>	<p><u>Given the constraints around monitoring of air quality impacts outlined in the <b>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP9-022REP7-020REP5-022]</b>, the Applicant believes it is necessary for the GCG approach to air quality to be different 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</u></p>	<p><u>As set out in paragraph 5.1.15 of the CBC LIR <del>[(REP1A-002)]</del> there are no locations in the southwestern parishes near to the airport. As such it is not considered appropriate for CBC to agree the thresholds and limitsCBC consider that the thresholds and limits for air quality are acceptable.</u></p>	<p><u>Confirmed via email on 01.02.24</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>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 believes 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.</u></p>	<p><u>However, there is only one location identified within CBC that would be monitored in respect to GCG. As set out in <b>paragraph 5.1.15</b> of the <b>CBC LIR [REP1A-003]</b> there are no locations in the southwestern parishes near to the airport. The lack of monitoring in CBC is unacceptable.</u></p>		
<b>Landscape and Visual Impacts</b>					
<p><b><u>CBC69_84654</u></b></p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) methodology</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment methodology as detailed in <b>Appendix 14.1 of Chapter 14</b> of the <b>ES [AS-036]</b>, is robust.</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the methodology used for the LVIA.</p> <p>CBC <del>have</del> requested that the Special Qualities Assessment methodology should be updated to take into account comments raised by CBC on the first draft of the</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG meetings on <u>03.03.20</u>, <u>20.04.20</u>,</p>	<p><u>Not agreed</u> <u>Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p>Assessment which was sent to them on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2023.</p> <p><u>Whilst the methodology was originally agreed, CBC have concerns that were identified during the examination process, including the need for night-time assessment, consideration of Ash dieback, and operational effects of the FTG.</u></p>	<p><u>07.10.20,</u> <u>09.12.20,</u> <u>24.03.21,</u> <u>16.09.21,</u> <u>07.06.22</u> <del>and,</del> <u>09.11.23</u> <del>and</del> <u>11.01.24</u></p>	
<b><u>CBC70</u></b> <b><u>65765</u></b>	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.	<u>Meeting on</u> 13.06.23	Agreed
<b><u>CBC71</u></b> <b><u>66876</u></b>	Significant landscape 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.	<u>CBC is satisfied that the LVIA identifies any significant visual impacts. However, the proposed mitigation measures are not deemed acceptable as none is proposed for the Fire Training Ground. CBC is satisfied that the LVIA identifies any significant visual impacts and</u>	TWG meetings on <u>03.03.20,</u> <u>20.04.20,</u> <u>07.10.20,</u> <u>09.12.20,</u> <u>24.03.21,</u> <u>16.09.21,</u>	<u>Ongoing</u>  <u>Not agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><del>proposed appropriate mitigation measures for these.</del></p> <p><del>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 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2023.</del></p>	<p><u>07.06.22</u> and <u>09.11.23</u></p>	
<p><b><u>CBC72</u></b> <b><u>67987</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>Considering</u></b> <b><u>Tranquillity</u></b> with regards to landscape and visual effects.</p>	<p>The Applicant has set out the approach to considering effects on tranquillity with regards to landscape and visual effects. The methodology included in <b>Appendix 14.1</b> of <b>Chapter 14</b> of the <b>ES [AS-036]</b>, is robust. The effects on tranquillity are assessed in <b>Chapter 14</b> of the <b>ES [AS-079]</b>.</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the approach to considering tranquillity with regards to landscape and visual effects.</p> <p>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. 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>As per CBC79, CBC are satisfied this has been addressed.</u></p>	<p>TWG meetings on <u>03.03.20</u>, <u>20.04.20</u>, <u>07.10.20</u>, <u>09.12.20</u>, <u>24.03.21</u>, <u>16.09.21</u>, <u>07.06.22</u> and <u>09.11.23</u></p> <p><u>Agreement confirmed via email on 23.01.23</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u></p> <p><u>Agreed</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC73</b> <b>687069</b> <b>8</b>	<u>Methodology and conclusions of the RVAA Residential Visual Amenity Appraisal</u>	The Applicant has prepared a Residential Visual Amenity Appraisal (RVAA) at <b>Appendix 14.8</b> of <b>Chapter 14</b> of the <b>ES [APP-106]</b> . 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 <u>03.03.20</u>	Agreed
<b>CBC69</b> <b>747106</b> <b>9</b>	Presentation of information on the viewpoint photograph sheets	The Applicant has identified Assessment viewpoint locations as part of the ES. These are mapped in <b>Figure 14.8</b> of the <b>ES [REP4-037]</b> and information regarding the direction and area covered is recorded beneath each of the viewpoint photographs included in <b>Appendix 14.6</b> of the <b>ES [AS-088 – AS-094, AS-140]</b> .	CBC agrees with the presentation of information on the viewpoint photograph sheets.	LVIA TWG meeting on <u>07.06.22</u> .	Agreed
<b>CBC75</b> <b>0210</b>	<u>Viewpoint locations portrayed in the photomontages - Assessment years and</u>	The Applicant has prepared several wireline or block model photomontages (or Accurate Visual Representations), included in <b>Appendix 14.7</b> of this <b>ES [REP3-009 – REP3-014 and REP8-0173]</b> to support the LVIA. These	CBC agrees with the viewpoint locations portrayed in the photomontages.	LVIA TWG meetings on <u>03.03.20</u> and <u>07.10.20</u>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p><a href="#">viewpoints portrayed in photomontages</a></p>	<p>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 <b>Figure 14.8</b> of the <del>eis</del> <b>ES [APP-106REP4-037]</b>.</p>		Meeting on <a href="#">09.11.23</a>	
<b>CBC76</b> <b><a href="#">1321</a></b>	<p>Growth rates for proposed planting <del>as set out Section 14.8 of the ES</del></p>	<p>The Applicant has outlined a range of growth rates for proposed planting in <b>Section 14.8 of Chapter 14</b> of the <b>ES [AS-079]</b> and summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Hedgerows planted using 1.5-1.8m feathered trees are assumed to be maintained at a height of 2.1m within 5 years.</li> <li>• Woodland comprising transplants (0.6-0.8m height), feathered trees (circa 1.5-2m height) and light standards (2.5-3.5m height) is assumed to</li> </ul>	<p>CBC agrees with the growth rates for proposed planting as set out Section 14.8 of the ES.</p>	<p>LVIA TWG meetings on <a href="#">03.03.20</a>, and <a href="#">07.10.20</a> and <a href="#">09.11.23</a>.</p>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>			
<b>CBC77</b> <b><u>2432</u></b>	Strategic Landscape Masterplan (SLMP)	The Applicant shared the <b>SLMP</b> <b>[APP-172]</b> 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
<b>CBC78</b> <b><u>3543</u></b>	Outline Landscape and	The Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan <b>in Appendix 8.2 in the ES [AS-029]</b>	CBC agrees that the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan is consistent with	Discussed in topic specific meeting on	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	Biodiversity Management Plan	<del>aligns</del> <del>is consistent</del> with the <b>SLMP [APP-172]</b> and the measures contained <del>therein</del> <del>therein</del> are consistent with the Applicant's commitment to deliver a minimum of 10% BNG.	the aims of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) delivery, as well as the SLMP.	13.06.23 and 09.11.23.	
<b>CBC79</b> <b><u>4654</u></b>	Assessment of the Special Qualities of the AONB	The Applicant <del>is currently undertaking an</del> <del>submitted the</del> Assessment of the Special Qualities of the AONB <u>at Deadline 7 [REP7-046]</u> . A draft Assessment was submitted to CBC on 23 October 2023.	CBC <del>have</del> 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 23 <sup>rd</sup> October 2023. <u>The draft submitted at D6 [REP6-075] incorporated the feedback provided by CBC in October 2023.</u>  <u>CBC have reviewed REP7-046 and whilst reference to CBC's Tranquillity Strategy would have been welcomed to assist in the special qualities assessment, CBC are satisfied that GLVIA3 and the Landscape Institute's Technical Information Note 01/2017 provide a suitable assessment. Additionally, REP7-052 response to PED.2.28 indicates that CBC's Tranquillity</u>	Meeting on 30 October 2023  <u>Agreement confirmed via email on 23.01.23</u>	<del>Not agreed</del>  <u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>Strategy was considered, although not referenced in REP7-046.</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC80</b> <b><u>75765</u></b></p>	<p>Off-site landscape mitigation</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 <u>98</u> of the draft DCO.</p> <p>Off-site hedgerows proposed as part of the Proposed Development are subject to the <b>Outline Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan as described in section 5.2 of that document [AS-029]</b>.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 <del>H</del>hedgerow maintenance is captured in the Outline Landscape and Biodiversity</p>	<p><del>To be discussed</del></p>	<p><u>Not agreed</u></p> <p><u>Ongoing/ not agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p>Management Plan. Requirements that secure this information prior to commencement of off-site hedgerow restoration should be included in the DCO.</p> <p><u>CBC acknowledge that the detail would be secured through Requirement 98 but are concerned that the proposed work to include boundary treatment would be inappropriate in these locations, which may cause harm to the character of the area.</u></p>		
	<b>Local communities</b>				
<b><u>CBC81</u></b> <b><u>7687</u></b>	Quantitative assessment of health outcomes associated with aircraft noise	The Applicant considers that the quantitative assessment of health outcomes associated with aircraft noise presented in <b>Chapter 13 Health and Community</b> of the <b>ES [TR020001/APP/5.01REP7-009AS-078]</b> , is robust and has been undertaken applying an appropriate methodology and assumptions. This is based on the latest guidance and best practice from Department for the Environment, Food, and Rural	<p>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.</p> <p>The impact on health from noise is a significant issue and it is noted that</p>	Discussed at meeting on 23.10.2023	<b><u>Ongoing Position not confirmed by CBC Agreed</u></b>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Affairs and the World Health Organisation (WHO).</p> <p>The methodology for the assessment is set out in <b>Appendix 13.4 Methodology for Health and Community Assessment</b> of the <b>ES [APP-086]</b>.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Concerns relate to health effects of noise, rather than the methodology used.</p> <p>The health effects of air emissions are assessed in <b>Chapter 13 Health and Community</b> of the <b>ES [REP7-009AS-078]</b>. This assessment concluded that emissions from the Proposed Development would have no significant effects on health.</p>		
<b><u>CBC82</u></b> <b><u>7798</u></b>	<del>Proposed mitigation to address the significant effect on mental wellbeing due to public</del>	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	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.	Discussed at meeting on 23.10.2023.	<del>Ongoing Position not confirmed by CBC</del> <u>Not agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p><del>concern and uncertainty during the planning and construction stages of the Proposed Development Embedded mitigation to address significant moderate adverse effect on mental wellbeing</del></p> <p>t</p>	<p>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 <del>Community Engagement Plan</del> for the construction operations of the Proposed Development, as detailed in <del>the Appendix 4.2 CoCP provided as Appendix 4.2</del> of the ES [REP8-0136-003REP4-014]. The plan will provide the overall approach to community engagement and a detailed guide to the enquiries and complaints procedure.</p> <p>The residual effects section of the health and community chapter highlights that people's mental wellbeing within 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>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.</p> <p><del>The Applicant will provide a response to these points.</del></p>		



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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.</p> <p><u>Issues and concerns can be raised via London Luton Airport's website at: <a href="https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/community/noise/making-a-noise-complaint">https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/community/noise/making-a-noise-complaint</a>.</u></p> <p><u>Public Noise Surgeries provide an opportunity for residents and councillors to meet with the Flight Operations team and ask questions about airspace and aircraft noise. Details of upcoming surgeries are published on London Luton Airport's website at <a href="https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/community/noise/noise-surgeries">https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/community/noise/noise-surgeries</a>. Appointment slots are available to book two weeks in advance.</u></p> <p><u>The London Luton Airport Consultative Committee (LLACC)</u></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>meets as a full committee four times year. The agenda includes: Quarterly Planning, Environmental Management &amp; Surface Access Report, which covers planning, surface access and development issues as well as the Community Engagement Strategy; and Quarterly Monitoring Report, which provides extensive data on aircraft movements, noise monitoring, route analysis and noise/track keeping complaints. A public gallery is available for members of the public or the press who wish to observe these meetings, and minutes are published on London Luton Airport's website (<a href="https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/the-llacc/llacc">https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/the-llacc/llacc</a>).</u></p> <p><u>There is also a Noise and Track Sub Committee (NTSC) that meets 3 to 4 weeks prior to the main meeting. The agenda for NTSC includes the Quarterly Environment Report, which is considered in detail, including studying the noise and track keeping complaints. Recommendations are made to LLACC on those issues considered</u></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>to be of importance in seeking to solve difficult technical problems. NTSC also looks at specific noise and track keeping issues so as to help reduce the impact of flying on the local communities. Minutes are published on London Luton Airport's website (<a href="https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/the-llacc/ntsc">https://www.london-luton.co.uk/corporate/the-llacc/ntsc</a>).</u></p>			
<p><b><u>CBC83</u></b> <b><u>788079</u></b></p>	<p>Approach to the health and communities assessment</p>	<p>Embedded mitigation is taken into account in the final health assessment.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation initiated by the Health and Community topic and other related topics such as Noise, Landscape and Visual, Traffic and Transport, is presented in Section 8 of <b>Chapter 13 Health and Community</b> of the <b>ES</b> <b><u>[TR020001/APP/5.01REP7-009AS-078]</u></b>.</p> <p>The assessment presented in the <b>Environmental Statement (ES)</b> reports the conclusions of the final assessment of the final scheme. The environmental and social considerations of options and</p>	<p>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, potentially lacking influence on the proposed design.</p> <p>There is concern that the assessment fails to clearly demonstrate a direct impact on the design of the proposal.</p>	<p><del>To be discussed</del></p>	<p><del>Not agreed</del> <del>Petition not confirmed</del> <del>by</del> <del>CBC</del> <del>Ongoing</del></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>alternatives are reported in <b>Chapter 3</b> of the <b>ES [AS-026]</b>, and two Preliminary Environmental Information Reports were consulted on as the project developed.</p> <p>This shows that <del>shows that</del> environmental and social considerations were given throughout design development.</p>			
<p><b><u>CBC84</u></b> <b><u>79810</u></b></p>	<p>Consideration of locally produced health assessments</p>	<p>The Study Area for the health assessment reported in <b>Chapter 13 Health and Community</b> of the <b>ES [TR020001/APP/5.01REP7-009]</b> is divided into Local Neighbourhood Areas close to the airport, within which likely effects on determinants of health at specific receptor locations (<u>such as environmental effects on specific populations and direct or indirect effects on community resources</u>) were identified and scoped in. There is also a Wider Area where effects on economic determinants of health were scoped in; these economic effects are likely to be dispersed across the population and cannot be linked to specific, known receptor</p>	<p>The assessment has disregarded locally produced health assessment (except for Luton), such as <del>as Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNA)</del>, Health and Wellbeing Strategies (HWB), or Direction of Public Health Annual Reports, in favour of national data sets provided by the Office for Health Improvements and Disparities (OHID).</p> <p>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</p>	<p><del>To be discussed</del></p>	<p><u>Not agreed</u> <u>On going</u> <u>Position not confirmed</u> <u>by CBC</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>locations. Table 13.6 of shows the determinants of health that are scoped in for each area. Detailed (Ward and Lower Super Output Area) health baseline data for the Local Neighbourhood Areas, whereas county-level baseline data is presented for the Wider Area.</p> <p>The majority of the Central Bedfordshire area falls within the Wider Area.</p> <p>Detailed health baseline information (such as that included in the <a href="#">Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNA)</a>) has not been presented in the baseline for the Wider Area, as this is not proportionate to the <a href="#">general (not receptor-specific)</a> level of assessment undertaken for this area. <a href="#">The Applicant considers that it is robust and proportionate to base the health assessment of wider economic effects on local-authority level baseline data. The assessment acknowledges that there is variation across the Wider Area, including pockets of deprivation (see paragraphs 13.9.10 and 13.9.15 of</a></p>	<p>statutory consultation response. Nonetheless, the inclusion of OHID/PHE Mental Health JSNAs for all relevant authorities is welcomed.</p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [TR020001/APP/5.01REP7-009]).</u></p> <p><u>The Employment and Training Strategy (ETS) [REP8-020] sets out requirements for engagement with local authorities to identify target areas of high unemployment and deprivation and implement measures to make training and employment opportunities available to these communities.</u></p>			
<p><b><u>CBC85</u></b> <b><u>021</u></b></p>	<p>Data considered in the health and communities assessment</p>	<p><u>Detailed social baseline information such as that included in the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) has not been presented in the baseline for the Wider Area, as this is not proportionate to the general (not receptor-specific) level of assessment undertaken for this area.</u></p> <p><u>See response to ID ref CBC84 above.</u></p> <p><u>Ward-level data on health indicators, including IMD scores, for areas closest to the airport are presented</u></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 regarding Central Bedfordshire's population health and the impacts</p>	<p><u>To be discussed</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing position not confirmed by CBC</u> <u>Not agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>in Section 13.7 of Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [REP7-009AS-078] and have been taken into account in the assessment of receptor sensitivity.</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p>	<p>from the proposal have considered this.</p>		
<p><b>Soils and geology</b></p>					

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC86</b> <b><u>132</u></b>	Land contamination assessment and engagement	<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 <b>Outline Remediation Strategy</b> <del>included</del> in <b>Appendix 17.5</b> <del>of</del> the <b>ES [APP-125-REP6-005]</b> 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 <b>17</b> in the <b>draft</b> 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 is satisfied with the land contamination assessment and engagement on this to date.</p> <p>CBC's 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>	CBC's 2022 Statutory Consultation response <u>and</u> <u>Local Impact Report</u>	Agreed
<b>CBC87</b> <b><u>243</u></b>	<del>EIA methodology, specifically the magnitude, probability, duration,</del>	The Applicant considers the magnitude, probability, duration (temporary and permanent), reversibility and significance of impacts have been suitably assessed in accordance with	<del>Host Authorities to confirm agreement to the EIA methodology, specifically the magnitude, probability, duration, reversibility and</del>	Discussed in the Contaminated Land Technical Working	Agreed



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p><del>reversibility and significance of impacts</del>  <u>Magnitude, probability, duration (temporary and permanent), reversibility and significance of impacts</u></p>	<p>guidance and these are reported in the assessment text in Section 17.9 of <b>Chapter 17 Soils and Geology</b> of the ES [<del>REP7-011APP-043</del>].</p> <p>The methodology is in accordance with Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) Guidance, which has since been superseded by <del>new</del> National Highways guidance.</p>	<p><del>significance of impacts included in the assessment text within the ES.</del></p> <p>CBC have confirmed they have no issues to raise regarding the methodology as noted in Section 5.10.3 of their Local Impact Report.</p>	<p>Group Meetings of 26.07.2021 and 12.07.2022.</p> <p>Response by WSP on the PEIR 2022 on behalf of the Host Authorities.</p> <p>CBC Local Impact Report 2023</p>	
<b>CBC88</b> <u>354</u>	<p>Study area and <u>(Zone of Influence)</u> ZOI for the soils and geology assessment</p>	<p>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 <del>the Host Authorities</del> <u>CBC</u> at the Soils and geology TWG meeting on 26 July 2021. The study area and ZOI are reported in Section 17.3 of <b>Chapter 17 = Soils and Geology</b> of the ES [<del>REP7-011APP-043</del>].</p>	<p>The Host Authorities agree with the study area and ZOI for the soils and geology assessment.</p>	<p>Soils and Geology TWG meeting on 26.07.21.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC89</b> <b><u>465</u></b>	Outline Remediation Strategy	The Applicant considers the Outline Remediation Strategy (ORS), provided as <b>Appendix 17.5</b> <del>to Chapter 17</del> of the ES <b>[REP6-005APP-125]</b> , 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.	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
<b>CBC90</b> <b><u>8576</u></b>	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 <b>Chapter 17- – Soils and Geology</b> of the ES <b>[REP7-011APP-043]</b> . This is also included in- <b>Appendix 4.2</b> <del>the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) in Appendix 4.2</del> of the ES <b>[REP8-013REP4-011]</b> . <b>Compliance</b>	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

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>with t</del>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 <b>Chapter 20 Water Resources</b> of the ES <del>[TR020001/APP/5.03REP4-009-AS-031]</del>, the <b>Appendix 4.2 Code of Construction Practice Appendix 4.2</b> of the ES <del>[REP8-0136-003REP4-014]</del>, and <b>Appendix 20.4 Drainage Design Statement, Appendix 20.4</b> of the ES <del>[REP5-096REP4-034]</del>.</p>			
<p><b>CBC91</b> <b>8687</b></p>	<p>Feasible options to control the potential for off-site gas migration</p>	<p>The Applicant considers feasible options to control the potential for off-site gas migration have been identified and described in the <del>ES</del> <b>Chapter 17 – Soils and Geology Chapter 17, Soils and Geology</b> <del>[REP7-011APP-043]</del> and accompanying appendices. The options and the timing of their</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</i></p>	<p>CBC Local Impact Report 2023</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>installation are described in the ORS, <b>Appendix 17.5 of Chapter 17</b> of the <b>ES [REP6-005APP-125]</b> and in Section 17.8 embedded mitigation section of <b>Chapter 17 – Soils and Geology Chapter 17 Soils and Geology</b> of the <b>ES [REP7-011APP-043]</b>. 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 developed by the lead contractor post DCO to address this issue. The frequency of the</p>	<p><i>has been raised with regard to soils and geology”.</i></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 <u>Chapter 17 of Appendix 17.5 of Chapter 17</u> of the ES [<u>REP6-005APP-125</u>].</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>			
<b>CBC92</b> <b><u>8798</u></b>	<b>Land contamination assessment and additional engagement</b>	The Applicant acknowledges this. Additional engagement with regard to the remediation strategy was undertaken with the Host Authorities and the Environment Agency in July	CBC are satisfied with the land contamination assessment and engagement on this to date.	CBC's 2022 Statutory Consultation response	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p><u>regarding the Outline remediation strategy Dealing with matters of ground contamination through requirements of the dDCO</u></p>	<p>2022 after statutory consultation and publication of the 2022 PEIR. The <b>Outline Remediation Strategy</b> included in <b>Appendix 17.5</b> in the <b>ES [REP6-005APP-125]</b> 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 <u>17</u> 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>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 Local Impact Report 2023</p>	
<b>Biodiversity</b>					
<p><b>CBC93</b> <b>889089</b></p>	<p><u>Biodiversity survey data Baseline data for biodiversity assessment</u></p>	<p>The Applicant seeks agreement from CBC that the survey data is considered sufficient to inform the assessment of potential impacts to biodiversity. <b>Chapter 8 Biodiversity</b> of the <b>ES [AS-027]</b> sets out what surveys have been undertaken, how they comply with best practice, and</p>	<p>CBC agrees that the biodiversity survey data is sufficient.</p>	<p><u>Meeting on</u> 13.06.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		the outcomes of the surveys and their conclusions.			
<b><u>CBC94</u></b> <b><u>89910</u></b>	<u>Biodiversity net gain proposals</u> 10% <u>BNG</u>	<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 <del>the</del> <u>Appendix 8.5 BNG report</u> in <del>Appendix 8.5</del> of the <u>ES [APP-067]</u>. BNG will be secured through the extensive landscaping and habitat creation proposals incorporated within the Proposed Development, details of how these habitats will be created and managed are set out in <del>the</del> <u>Appendix 8.2 Outline LBMP</u> in <u>Appendix 8.2</u> of the <u>ES [AS-029]</u>. 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</p>	CBC accepts the Applicants positions and agree that the 10% BNG target for the project is acceptable.	<u>Meeting on</u> 13.06.23	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 <del>at in</del> <u>Figures 14.11 to 14.13 of the Landscape Mitigation Plans in Figures 14.11 to 14.13</u> of the ES [REP4-037].</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 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 <del>ambition of achieving</del> <u>target of</u> 10% BNG is proportionate.</p>			



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC95</b> <b><u>021</u></b>	Pre-construction surveys	The Applicant carried out required surveys. Pre-construction surveys would provide any necessary updates prior to construction.	CBC agrees that the survey effort showed consistent results and that pre-construction surveys would provide any necessary updates prior to construction.	Biodiversity TWG meeting on 12.09.22 and meeting on 13.06.23	Agreed
<b>CBC96</b> <b><u>132</u></b>	Sites of ecological value	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.	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.	<u>Meeting on</u> 13.06.23	Agreed
<b>Waste and Resources</b>					
<b>CBC97</b> <b><u>243</u></b>	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	CBC agrees with the assessment methodology.	Waste TWG meeting on 27.07.21	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b>.</p>			
<p><b>CBC98</b> <b><u>354</u></b></p>	<p>Baseline data, including a future baseline for landfill capacity</p>	<p>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 <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b>. The future baseline for landfill capacity is outlined in paragraphs 19.7.34-19.7.44 of <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b>.</p>	<p>CBC is satisfied with the baseline data, including a future baseline for landfill capacity.</p>	<p>Waste TWG meeting on 2.12.21</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC99</b> <b><u>465</u></b>	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 <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b> . For construction resources the study area is national (UK or GB dependent on baseline information availability). Where baseline information is available regional data is also considered in the assessment (a smaller study area).	CBC agrees with the reduction in study area for materials (national to regional where baseline information is available).	Agreed with CBC via email 16.10.23	Agreed
<b>CBC10</b> <b><u>09576</u></b>	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 <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b> . 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 13.06.22	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC10</b> <b><u>19687</u></b>	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 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 <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b> ).	CBC agrees with the adjustment of material receptor sensitivity from low to medium in light of current issues with supply e.g., concrete.	Agreed with CBC via email 16.10.23	Agreed
<b>CBC10</b> <b><u>2C9798</u></b>	Waste and resources	The Applicant considers that the assessment methodology is robust. The assessment considers impact by assessment phase and also by	CBC agrees that the assessment considers impacts by assessment	Agreed with CBC via email 16.10.23	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	assessment methodology	year within each assessment phase as outlined in Table 19.41 ‘Estimated construction material and percentage of national consumption by year’ and Table 19.43 ‘Estimated construction material and percentage of regional consumption by year’ of <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b> .	phase and also by year within each assessment phase.		
<b>CBC98</b> <b>103100</b> <b>99</b>	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 <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b> assessing resources use during operation of the airport is not possible since:</p> <p>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.</p>	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	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>b. Data on resource usage is not readily available from the airport operator.</p> <p>c. There is no publicly available information on the national 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. 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). Some data on resources required to maintain the airfield have been</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>provided by the design team and are outlined in paragraphs 19.9.22 - 19.9.24 of <b>Chapter 19 Waste and Resources</b> of the <b>ES [AS-081]</b>.</p>			
<b>Water Resources and Flood Risk</b>					
<p><b>CBC10</b> <b>499101</b> <b>0</b></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><b>REP4-031</b> <b>The Design Principles [TR020001/APP/7.09REP9-030REREP8-022P5-034]</b> 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 <b>draft DCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003TR020001/APP/2.01REP9-003REP7-003]</b> also notes that ‘No part of the authorised development may commence until for that part written details of a surface and foul water drainage plan, including means</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 with CBC via email <u>03.08.23</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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.'</p>			
<p><b>CBC10</b> <b><u>5024</u></b></p>	<p>Hydrogeological Characterisation Report</p>	<p>The Hydrogeological Characterisation Report in <b>Appendix 20.3</b> of the <b>ES [REP4-029]</b> 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 factored applied based on historical data from the Environment Agency's Hertfordshire Groundwater Model and monitoring network.</p> <p><b><u>REP4-034</u></b> The <b>Design Principles [REP9-030TR020001/APP/7.09REP8-022REP5-034]</b> sets out in section 5 the drainage design principles to be followed at the detailed design stage</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 with CBC via email <u>03.08.23</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>(secured by Schedule 2 of the <b>draft DCO [REP5-TR020001/APP/2.01003REP7-003]</b>).</p> <p>This includes item DDS.17 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 will consider the impacts of groundwater mounding, to ensure that the infiltration tanks do not result in groundwater flooding downstream.’</i></p> <p>The Hydrogeological Risk Assessment: Drainage in <b>Appendix 20.6</b> of the <b>ES [REP4-035]</b> 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.48 of the Design Principles notes that <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</i></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>hazardous substances, as defined in WFD, and are non-polluting, due to the underlying chalk being a Principal Aquifer and the infiltration tanks being proposed within a SPZ3'</i></p>			
<p><b>CBC</b> <b>106132</b></p>	<p>Water <u>Balance</u></p>	<p><b>REP4-034</b>The <b>Design Principles [ REP9-030TR020001/APP/7.09REP8-0225-034]</b> sets out in section 5 the drainage design principles to be followed at the detailed design stage. This is secured in Schedule 2 of the <b>draft DCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP75-00233]</b>.  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.  The development of these measures would be informed by the Water Cycle Strategy <b>Appendix 20.5</b> of the <b>ES [REP4-033]</b>.  The Applicant is engaging with Affinity Water on water supply.</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.  The drainage implications for this development are noted to be a minimal impact to CBC watercourses and drainage related areas.</p>	<p>-Agreed with CBC via email 03.08.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<p><b>CBC10</b> <b><u>7243</u></b></p>	<p>Flood Risk Assessment</p>	<p><b><u>Appendix 20.1</u></b> <del>The Flood Risk Assessment in <b>Appendix 20.1</b> of the ES [REP4-038]</del>, 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. <del>REP4-031</del> <b>The Design Principles [ <u>TR020001/APP/7.09REP9-030REP5-034</u> ]</b> sets out in section 5 the drainage design principles to be followed at the detailed design stage (secured by Schedule 2 of the <b>draft DCO [ <u>TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003REP7-003</u> ]</b>). Design principle DDS.21 notes that <i>'the detailed design of all drainage attenuation</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 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 with CBC via email 03.08.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><i>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 <b>draft DCO [REP5-TR020001/APP/2.01003REP7-003]</b>.</p>			
<p><b>CBC10</b> <b><u>8354</u></b></p>	<p>Design principles to mitigate the impacts on the underlying aquifer and associated receptors</p>	<p><b>Chapter 20 Water Resources and Flood Risk</b> of the ES [ <b><u>TR020001/APP/5.03REP4-009 REP4-009</u></b>] summarises the measures or design principles to mitigate the impacts on the underlying aquifer and associated receptors. These measures are secured in <del>the</del> <b><u>Appendix 4.2 CoCP included as Appendix 4.2 to of the ES [REP4-011][REP8-0136-003]</u></b></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</p>	<p>Agreed with CBC via email 03.08.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>and the <b>Design Principles</b> [<a href="#">TR020001/APP/7.09REP9-030REP8-0225-034</a>]. With these mitigations in place, there are no significant impacts anticipated to the River Lea CWS.</p>	<p>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 <del>anticipated</del> <u>anticipated</u> 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><b>CBC10</b> <b><u>9465</u></b></p>	<p><del>Study area for the water resources assessment</del> <u>Spatial scope for the water resources assessment</u></p>	<p><b>Chapter 20 Water Resources and Flood Risk</b> of the ES [<a href="#">TR020001/APP/5.03-REP4-009REP4-009</a>] 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.</p>	<p>CBC is satisfied with the study area for the water resources assessment.</p>	<p>Agreed at meeting with the Lead Local Flood Authorities on 26.03.18</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>Climate Change <u>and GHGs</u></b>					
<b><u>CBC11</u></b> <b><u>00576</u></b>	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 <b>Chapter 9 Climate Change Resilience</b> of the <b>ES [APP-035]</b> .	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
<b><u>CBC11</u></b> <b><u>10687</u></b>	Objectives for reducing climate change and greenhouse gas emissions	The Applicant considers that the lifecycle greenhouse gas (GHG) impact assessment is robust in terms of its assessment of airport operations and surface access. 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 <b>Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases</b> of the <b>ES [APP-038][REP3-007]</b> . 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	Overall, the assessment is considered sufficient and accords with the requirements of Policy CC1. Based on the foregoing, <del>Central Bedfordshire Council</del> <b>CBC</b> consider the impact on Climate Change and Green House Gas emissions to be neutral.	CBC LIR	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 and there will be no significant effects.</p>			
<p><b>CBC11</b> <b><u>20798</u></b></p>	<p>The calculations for GHG emissions</p>	<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</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</p>	<p><u>Disagreement confirmed on 11.01.24.</u></p>	<p>Not agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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>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 and this issue should be addressed in the ES.</p>		
<p><b><u>CBC11</u></b> <b><u>308105</u></b> <b><u>6</u></b></p>	<p><u>GCG</u> <u>Thresholds</u> <u>and Limits -</u> <u>GHG</u></p>	<p><u>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 [</u> <u>TR020001/APP/7.08REP9-</u> <u>023REP7-020REP5-022] they</u></p>	<p><u>CBC to confirm position, noting queries raised through response to draft DCO documents in October 2022 agrees with the GCG thresholds and limits for GHGs.</u></p>	<p><u>To be confirmed at topic-specific meeting Agreed on during the CBC SoCG roundtable on 11.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>should be expressed as a net Limit, inclusive of any offsetting that the airport operator may choose to implement.</u></p> <p><u>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.</u></p>			
<p><b><u>CBC11</u></b> <b><u>410915</u></b> <b><u>7</u></b></p>	<p><u>GCG</u> <u>Thresholds</u> <u>and Limits -</u> <u>GHG</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant considers it appropriate to exclude emissions from aviation (Landing and Take-Off (LTO) and Climb-Cruise-Decent (CCD) phases) from the scope of the <b>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP9-023REP7-020REP5-022]</b> 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.</u></p>	<p><u>See <del>CBC11208</del> (the calculations for GHG emissions)</u></p>		<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>ot agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>Cumulative Effects</b>					
<p><b>CBC11</b> <b><u>580200</u></b> <b>9</b></p>	<p><del>Cumulative effects search area</del> <del>Search area of 500m with regards to the criteria and relevant applications and allocations to be accounted for in the cumulative effects assessment</del></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p><del>To be discussed at topic specific meeting</del> <u>Agreed at CBC roundtable on 11.01.24</u></p>	<p><del>Ongoing</del> <u>Agreed</u></p>
<b>Economics and Employment</b>					
<p><b>CBC11</b> <b><u>691310</u></b></p>	<p>Methodology for assessing the effects on Economics and Employment from the construction</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the estimates of the economic benefits of the Proposed Development, as set out in the <b>Need Case [AS-125]</b> and the <b>Environmental Statement Chapter 11 [APP-037]</b> have been robustly produced using an appropriate methodology, including</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the methodology for assessing the effects on Economics and Employment from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development and that the benefits would make a material contribution to levelling up in Luton.</p>	<p>Agreed at the Economics and Employment TWG meeting on 19.03.19</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	and operation of the <del>PP</del> Proposed Development	the effects during construction and operation, and that the economic benefits are significant, specifically that the creation of employment and <del>Gross Value Added (GVA) (gross value added)</del> will contribute significantly to 'levelling up' in Luton and regeneration of the Borough.	<del>[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]</del>	Further discussion needed on this point.	
<b>CBC11</b> <del>720124</del> <u>21</u>	Economic benefits deriving from the additional air connectivity	The wider economic benefits deriving from the additional air connectivity delivered by the Proposed Development, as set out in the <b>Need Case [AS-125]</b> , are significant and will make a significant contribution to attracting additional high value economic activities to Luton and the surrounding area.	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.	Agreed via email on 05.12.23	Agreed
<b>CBC11</b> <del>821135</del> <u>32</u>	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.	CBC agrees with the scoping out of the assessment on the impact of the Proposed Development on tourism deficit.  <del>[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]</del>	Agreed at Economics and Employment TWG meeting on 28.05.19  Further discussion	<del>Ongoing</del> <u>Agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
				needed on this point.	
<b>Noise policy, legislation and guidance</b>					
<b><u>CBC11</u></b> <b><u>922146</u></b> <b><u>43</u></b>	<u>Relevant</u> <u>Appr</u> <u>opriate</u> policy, legislation and guidance	The list of policy, legislation and guidance as set out in Table 16.1 to 16.4 of <b>Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration</b> of the <b>ES nvironmental Statement</b> [ <b>TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003</b> ] (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.	<u>Meeting with Suono and Host Authorities 12.01.24</u> <u>Relevant representations</u>	Agreed
<b><u>CBC12</u></b> <b><u>031575</u></b> <b><u>4</u></b>	Compliance with aviation noise policy	The <b>Planning Statement [REP5-016]</b> 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 <u>ISH 3 post hearing submission</u> <u>post hearing submission</u> <u>submission</u> <u>[REP3-094]</u>	<u>ISH 3 post hearing submission</u> <u>[REP3-094]</u>	Not agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	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 <del>Q</del>Overarching <del>A</del>aviation <del>n</del>Noise <del>p</del>Policy <del>s</del>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 <b>Commentary on the Overarching Aviation Noise Policy Statement [REP1-012]</b>.</p>		Relevant representations	
<b>Noise assessment methodology – modelling assessment and criteria</b>					
<p><b>CBC12</b> <b>141686</b> <b>5</b></p>	<p><u>Construction noise and vibration predication and assessment methodology</u> <del>A</del> <del>pp</del>roach, <del>methodologies</del></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 16.01.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p><del>, Compliance with aviation noise policy (LOAEL), Significant Observable Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL), and Unacceptable Adverse Effect Level (UAEL) values and assessment periods for the construction noise and vibration assessment</del></p>	<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 <b>Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003]</b>.</p>			
<p><b>CBC12</b> <b><u>251797</u></b> <b>6</b></p>	<p><u>Air noise prediction and assessment methodology</u> <u>Modelling approach, methodologies</u>, <u>LOAEL</u>, <u>SOAEL</u>, and</p>	<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</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the modelling approach, methodologies, LOAEL, SOAEL, and UAEL values and assessment periods, and change criteria for the air noise assessment.</p>	<p>Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated 16.01.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<p>U<del>AEL</del> values and assessment periods, and change criteria for the air noise assessment</p>	<p>Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) software.</p> <p>The primary assessment metrics are the 92-day summer L<sub>Aeq,16h</sub> and L<sub>Aeq,8h</sub> sound levels.</p> <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 <b>Chapter 16</b> of the <del>E</del><u>Environmental Statement [TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003]</u>.</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 <b>Chapter 16</b> of the <del>Environmental Statement S</del><u> [TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003]</u>.</p>			
<p><b>CBC12</b> <b><u>361820</u></b> <b><u>187</u></b></p>	<p>Validation of AEDT aircraft noise contour model</p>	<p>The Applicant has undertaken a robust validation exercise of the AEDT aircraft noise model using radar track data and noise monitoring terminal measurements.</p>	<p>CBC are content with the use of the AEDT aircraft noise contour model (including its validation) to calculate noise contours.</p>	<p>Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated 16.01.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC12</b> <b><u>471921</u></b> <b><u>198</u></b>	Ground noise prediction and assessment methodology.	<p>The Applicant has employed a robust methodology for the ground noise assessment, with appropriate assessment criteria and assessment periods.</p> <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 <b>Chapter 16</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement S [TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003]</b> and LOAELs, SOAELs and UAELs for the different assessment periods are set out in Table 16.13 of <b>Chapter 16</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement [REP9-011-TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003]</b>.</p>	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 16.01.23	Agreed
<b>CBC12</b> <b><u>580201</u></b> <b><u>9</u></b>	<a href="#"><u>Surface access noise prediction and assessment methodology</u></a>	The Applicant has employed a robust methodology for the surface access noise assessment, with appropriate assessment criteria and assessment periods.	CBC agrees with the use of CRTN methodology. CBC agrees with the road selection within the noise assessment.	Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities	Agreed



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<del>Methodology for the surface access noise assessment</del>	<p>This methodology includes the use of the CRTN prediction methodology, and an assumption 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 <b>Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003]</b>.</p> <p>Change criteria for surface access noise are set out in Table 16.17 of <b>Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003]</b>.</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>CBC agrees with the surface access noise change criteria.</p>	dated 16.01.23	
<b>CBC12</b> <b><u>691310</u></b>	<del>Daytime surface access UAEL justification for the setting of surface</del>	<p><del>The Applicant has applied an appropriate daytime Unacceptable Adverse Effect Level (UAEL) for the surface access noise assessment: The Applicant has applied an appropriate UAEL for the surface access noise assessment:</del></p>	<p>CBC consider that the daytime UAEL for surface access noise should be 71 dB LAeq,16hr consistent with the Heathrow Airport PEIR.</p> <p>CBC note that irrespective of whatever value is chosen (within the range 71-74 dB), it is accepted that</p>	Suono submissions on behalf of the Host Authorities at Deadline 3	Not Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	<del>access noise UAELs</del>	<p>UAEL: Daytime 74 dB LAe1,16hr and night time 66 dB LAeq,8hr. (Table 16.16 of <b>Chapter 16 of the ES Environmental Statement [TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003]</b>).</p> <p>The UAEL has been set with reference to the Association of Noise Consultant's and Institute 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 "<b>Surface Access Noise Modelling – Additional Information [REP3-045]</b>" <b>Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003]</b>.</p>	the assessment outcomes remain unchanged and acceptable.		
<b>CBC12</b> <b><u>730224</u></b> <b><u>21</u></b>	Validation of the surface access noise model	The Applicant has utilised a robust surface access noise model following the methodology set out in CRTN. Confidence in the model	CBC agree with the approach taken and validation of the surface access noise modelling.	<u>Meeting with Suono and Host Authorities</u>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 explained in paragraph 16.7.14 of <b>Chapter 16 of the ES</b> [<a href="#">TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003</a>]. 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><a href="#">Further information has been provided in a document submitted at Deadline 3, Surface Access Noise Modelling – Additional Information [REP3-045]. Further information has been provided “Surface Access Noise Modelling –</a></p>		<p><a href="#">12.01.24</a> <a href="#">Relevant representations</a></p>	

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>Additional Information" Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP1-003].</del></p>			
<p><b>Noise assessment methodology – determining significance</b></p>					
<p><b>CBC12</b> <b><u>831235</u></b> <b><u>32</u></b></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 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 <b>Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration of</b></p>	<p>CBC do not accept that the 2019 Actuals baseline has been used in the core assessment and believe that the 2019 Consented baseline should have been used instead.</p>	<p>Suono response on behalf of Host Authorities dated 16.01.23</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>the ES [<a href="#">TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011REP1-003</a>].</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 effects would be avoided through the provision of the full cost of noise insulation.</p>			
<p><b><a href="#">CBC12</a></b> <b><a href="#">932246</a></b> <b><a href="#">43</a></b></p>	<p><del>Future baseline that is compliant with the airport's current consented long term noise limits</del> <a href="#">Use of a future baseline</a></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"> <li>Daytime 57 dB LAeq,16h noise contour - 19.4 km2.</li> </ul>	<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 16.01.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>N</u>ight-time 48 dB LAeq,8h noise contour – 37.2 km<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul> <p>Long-term limits for 18mppa to be achieved by 2028:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daytime 57 dB LAeq,16h noise contour – 15.2 km<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>• Night-time 48 dB LAeq,8h noise contour – 31.6 km<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>			
<b>CBC13</b> <b><u>032575</u></b> <b>4</b>	<u>Ambient</u> <u>n</u> Noise monitoring data	<b>Chapter 16 <del>sets</del></b> of the <b>ES</b> <b>nvironmental Statement</b> [ <b><u>TR020001/APP/5.01REP9-011</u></b> <b><u>REP1-003</u></b> ] 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 <b>Ambient noise</b> <b>monitoring data and survey</b> <b>sheets [AS-120]</b> . 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.	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.	Meeting with Suono on behalf of the Local Authorities 21.11.2023	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>Noise mitigation</b>					
<b>CBC13</b> <b><u>142686</u></b> <b>5</b>	<u>Noise insulation scheme</u> <del>Introduction of the noise insulation scheme</del>	The proposed Noise Insulation Scheme has been set out by the Applicant in <b>Draft Compensation Policies, Measures and Community First [TR020001/APP/7.10REP9-032REP47-04236]</b> .	<u>CBC agrees with the of the night-time SOAEL eligibility criteria and accepts the appropriateness of the noise insulation scheme in principle.</u> <del>CBC agrees with the introduction of the night-time SOAEL eligibility criteria and accepts the appropriateness of the noise insulation scheme in principle.</del>	<u>Meeting with Suono and Host Authorities 12.01.24</u> <del>Relevant representations</del>	Agreed
<b>CBC13</b> <b><u>252797</u></b> <b>6</b>	Noise Controls	As noted in the <b>Comparison of Consented and Proposed Operational Noise Controls [REP5-014]</b> , the following noise controls will be included in the DCO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise Envelope, including noise contour area limits and thresholds.</li> <li>• Movement Limit of 9,650 in during the night quota period (23:30 – 06:00).</li> <li>• Quota Count Limit of 3,500 during the night quota period (23:30 – 06:00).</li> </ul>	CBC agrees with the inclusion of these controls.	Meeting with Suono on behalf of Host Authorities 21.11.2023	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ban on QC2 and above movements during the night period (23:00 – 07:00)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Track Violation Penalties</li> <li>- Departure Noise Violation Limits</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>The Air Noise Management Plan [REP9-047TR020001/APP/8.125REP7-044] submitted at Deadline 7 sets out the additional measures to control aircraft air noise arising from the operation of the Proposed Development including Track Violation Penalties and Departure Noise Violation Limits. Compliance with this Plan is secured by a requirement 27 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO [TR020001/APP/2.04].</u></p> <p><u>The Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP9-049TR020001/APP/8.167REP7-074] secures the payment of the Track Violation and Departure Noise Violation fines into the Community Fund.</u></p>			



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<p><b>CBC13</b> <b><u>362830</u></b> <b><u>2867</u></b></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 (54dBL<sub>Aeq16h</sub> and 48dBL<sub>Aeq,8h</sub> noise contour areas).</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the numerical value chosen to represent the noise contour area Limits.</p>	<p><b>NEDG Final Report</b> <b><u>(Annex A) in Appendix 16.2 of the ES [REP4-023]</u></b></p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p><b>CBC13</b> <b><u>472931</u></b> <b><u>298</u></b></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><b>NEDG Final Report</b> <b><u>(Annex A) in Appendix 16.2 of the ES [REP4-023]</u></b></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<p><b>CBC13</b> <b><u>580202</u></b> <b>9</b></p>	<p>Effectiveness of Noise Envelope</p>	<p><b>Appendix 16.2</b> of the <b><del>ES</del>Environmental Statement [REP4-023]</b> 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 <b>Comparison of consented and proposed operational noise controls document [REP5-014]</b> 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 <b><del>GC</del>Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP9-020TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-022REP57-01820]</b>) has been designed to improve upon the</p>	<p>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 proposed), Luton Airport may be able to manage noise so as not to need to reduce capacity. 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.</p>	<p>Meeting with Suono on behalf of Host Authorities 21.11.2023</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>existing noise control regime and to effectively prevent breaches from occurring. <b>Appendix 16.2 Operational Noise Management (Explanatory Note) of the Environmental Statement [REP4-023]</b> 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 <b>Comparison of consented and proposed operational noise controls document [REP5-014]</b> 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	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	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 <b>Noise Envelope – improvements and worked example [REP2-0325-0712-032]</b>.</p>			
<p><b>CBC13</b> <b><u>691310</u></b></p>	<p><u>Additional noise controls</u> <u>Status of the current planning permission noise conditions</u></p>	<p>As set out in the <b>Comparison of consented and proposed operational noise controls [REP5-014]</b>, 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 <b>Response to Suono's note on Noise Controls [TR020001/APP/8.126REP6-052]</b>.</p>	<p><u>CBC notes that this was a matter discussed at ISH9 and the Council's position is provided in their post hearing submission [REP6- 094]</u>.</p> <p><u>CBC notes the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>- there is a P18 / P19 noise condition requiring the future QC limit to reduce to 2,800, which would be possible if the Applicant used the Core Case to set noise limits from</u></li> <li><u>- the P18 / P19 S.106 constrain early morning shoulder period movements to 7,000 ATMs.</u></li> </ul>	<p>Meeting with Suono on behalf of Host Authorities 21.11.2023</p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>CBC takes the position that the following noise controls should be included as recommended by the NEDG:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>- a future QC limit below that of the extant, included QC limit of 3,500 acting in the core night period (2330-0600)</u></li> <li><u>- an ATM movement cap (or QC limit) applying to the early morning shoulder period (0600-0700)</u></li> <li><u>- an annual 24-hour ATM movement cap</u> <del>CBC 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. The Council's position is provided in their post hearing submission [REP6-093]</del></li> </ul>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b><u>CBC13</u></b> <b><u>74032X</u></b> <b><u>XX</u></b>	<u>Total movement cap as a noise control</u>	<p><u>As set out in [REP7-056] in response to Written Question NO.2.5, the Applicant position is that an annual movement cap is not necessary or appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>Without prejudice to this position, if any annual movement cap were to be imposed it should not be less than 225,000 annual aircraft movements.</u></p>	<p><u>CBC confirmed its position at Deadline 8 in response to the ExA's commentary on, or schedule of changes to the draft DCO, noting that it was content with the suggested 209,410 cap [REP8-052].</u> <b><u>CBC position to be confirmed following receipt of CBC D8 submission. If any annual movement cap were to be imposed it should not be less than 210,000 annual aircraft movements.</u></b></p>	<u>Confirmed on 23.01.23 in response at Deadline 8 [REP8-052]</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not agreed</u>
<b><u>CBCX1</u></b> <b><u>333841</u></b> <b><u>XX</u></b>	<u>Shoulder period movement cap as a noise control</u>	<p><u>As set out in [REP7-056] in response to Written Question NO.2.6, the Applicant position is that a shoulder period (0600 - 0700) movement cap is not necessary or appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>Without prejudice to this position, if any shoulder period (0600 - 0700) movement cap were to be imposed it should not be less than 132,46000 annual aircraft movements. Justification for this limit and how it</u></p>	<p><u>CBC confirmed its position at Deadline 8 in its response to the ExA's Rule 17 questions, noting that there was no justification for the Applicant's suggested 13,000 limit, nor was it demonstrated whether the noise assessment undertaken by the Applicant could accommodate this figure [REP8-051].</u> <b><u>CBC position to be confirmed following receipt of CBC D8 submission. If any shoulder period (0600 - 0700) movement cap were to be</u></b></p>	<u>Confirmed on 23.01.23 in response at Deadline 8 [REP8-051]</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not agreed</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>relates to the noise assessment is provided in Applicant's Position on Noise Contour and Movement Limits [REP9-055].</u></p>	<p><u>imposed it should not be lessmore than 8,829 annual aircraft movements</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC13</b> <b><u>942344</u></b> <b><u>21</u></b></p>	<p>Construction Vibration Thresholds in CoCP</p>	<p>The <b>Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) [REP4-011REP6-003REP8-013]</b> <del>has been was</del> updated following ISH3 and discussions with the Host Authorities to remove the temporary vibration thresholds and maintain consistent thresholds with <b>Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement [REP9-011-TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003]</b>.</p>	<p>CBC agrees with these changes.</p>	<p>Meeting between Applicant and Suono 18.10.2023</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p><b>CBC14</b> <b><u>033553</u></b> <b><u>2</u></b></p>	<p>Fixed Plant Noise Limits</p>	<p><u>Following discussions with the Host Authorities, the Applicant has updated Appendix 16.3 of the Environmental Statement - Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan [REP4-025] to require that "Fixed plant will be designed, constructed, operated and maintained with the objective that the rating level LAr,Tr of fixed plant under normal operation at the worst affected residential</u></p>	<p>CBC agree that this is an appropriate criterion for fixed plant noise.</p>	<p>Meeting between applicant and Suono 18.10.2023</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>receptor, minus the background sound level (LA90,T), is not more than -10 dB, determined in accordance with British Standard 4142". Following discussions with the Host Authorities, the Applicant has agreed that <b>Appendix 16.3</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement - Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan [REP4-025]</b> be updated to require that "Fixed plant shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained with the objective that the rating level LA<sub>r,T</sub> of fixed plant under normal operation at the worst affected residential receptor, minus the background sound level (LA<sub>90,T</sub>), is not more than -10 dB, determined in accordance with British Standard 4142". The revised document was submitted at D4 <b>[REP4-025, REP4-026]</b>.</del></p>			
<b>CBC14</b> <b><u>143664</u></b> <b>3</b>	Control of noise and vibration from impact piling	Following discussions with the Host Authorities, the Applicant proposes to include the following text in the <b>Code of Construction Practice [REP6-003REP8-013]</b> :	CBC agrees with this inclusion.	Meeting between applicant and Suono 18.10.2023	Agreed



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>“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) 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.”<del>The revised document was submitted at D4 [REP4-011/1, REP4-012].</del></p>			
<p><del>13675X</del> <del>XCG</del> <del>aa</del> CBC <del>142537</del> <del>78654</del></p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits – Noise</p>	<p><u>The Noise Envelope Limits and Thresholds are aligned with the Faster Growth Scenario to ensure that the noise effects will not exceed the assessed 'reasonable worst case' in the ES. An Updated Faster Growth scenario was introduced in Applicant's Position on Noise Contour and Movement Limits [REP9-055] which assumes a faster</u></p>	<p>CBC considers that noise Limits should be to be set by reference to the Core Planning Case.</p>	<p>Meeting with Suono 18.10.2023</p>	<p>Not agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>fleet transition to new-generation aircraft, reducing noise effects and reducing the Noise Envelope Limits and Thresholds in turn. An assessment of the total adverse effects on health and quality of life of the Updated Faster Growth scenario is provided in Appendix A of [REP9-055]. The assessment notes that, as was the case for the ES Faster Growth scenario, the additional significant effects that arise in assessment Phase 1 compared to the Core Planning Case would be avoided through the provision of the full cost of insulation, so the noise effects in the Updated Faster Growth scenario are both limited and reduced.</u></p> <p><del>The Applicant considers that the principle of aligning noise Limits and Thresholds within the <b>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP9-022REP7-020REP5-022]</b></del> with the Faster Growth sensitivity test is appropriate and will ensure that the environmental impacts of expansion</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<del>are no worse than the reasonable worst case.</del>			
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>					
<b>CBC14</b> <b><u>363897</u></b> <b>65</b>	Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP)	The <b>Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) [REP4-020]</b> has been updated with the requested additional measures and has been resubmitted at Deadline 4 <b>[REP4-020, REP4-021]</b> .	<p>CBC's 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"> <li>- A condition survey of Someries Castle, comprising a site visit, visual inspection and photographic record, prior to the monitoring to establish its baseline conditions;</li> <li>- Clarification of how the air quality monitoring data would be disseminated and confirmation that it would be shared with the local authority; and</li> </ul> <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</p>	<p>Strategy agreed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.23.</p> <p>Updated CHMP agreed via email on 30.10.23.</p>	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p>contributing to the deterioration of the fabric of Someries Castle.</p> <p>CBC's Conservation Officer has agreed the updated CHMP via email.</p>		
<p><b>CBC14</b> <b><u>473940</u></b> <b><u>3876</u></b></p>	<p>Preservation in situ strategy in the CHMP</p>	<p>The Applicant agrees <u>with CBC's position</u> and the preservation in situ strategy in the <b>CHMP [REP4-020]</b> has been 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>CBC have agreed the updated CHMP via email.</p>	<p>Strategy agreed at topic specific meeting held 29.06.23</p> <p>Updated CHMP agreed via email on 01.11.23</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p><b>CBC14</b> <b><u>580139</u></b> <b><u>87</u></b></p>	<p><u>1km study</u> <u>Study</u> area for non-designated heritage assets</p>	<p>The Applicant proposes a 1km study area for non-designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>CBC agrees with the 1km study area for non-designated heritage assets.</p>	<p>Agreed during pre-application engagement</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>CBC14</b> <b><u>691203</u></b> <b>98</b>	<u>Written Scheme of Investigation</u> (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 14.07.22	Agreed
<b>CBC14</b> <b><u>750423</u></b> <b>1039</b>	Archaeological mitigation works will be carried out in advance of construction activities	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 14.12.22–12.01.23	Agreed
<b>CBC14</b> <b><u>851432</u></b> <b><u>4210</u></b>	Visual representation of the Proposed Development	The Applicant considers that the wirelines submitted provide an accurate visual representation of the Proposed Development.  Updated Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) include labels of development work orders	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.	Agreed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.23	Agreed

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>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 17 for the RPG and Viewpoint 17a for 2nd Floor of Luton Hoo House.</p>	<p>Awaiting further comments following submission of updated AVRs at Deadline 3.</p> <p><u>Following review of the updated AVRs CBC are satisfied with the use of block and wirelines.</u></p>		
<p><b>CBC14</b> <b><u>952443</u></b> <b><u>5321</u></b></p>	<p>Location of FTG with respect to the visual and environmental impact</p>	<p>The impacts from the FTG have been assessed as detailed in <b>Chapter 7 Air Quality</b> of the <b>Environmental Assessment [AS-076]</b>. 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 <b>Appendix 7.1 [AS-028]</b>.</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><u>Agreement to Disagreement confirmed via email on 10.01.24</u> <del>be confirmed</del></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>not agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>All impacts from airborne pollutants are predicted to be not significant.</p> <p>Updated AVR's have been resubmitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p><u>The impacts from the physical presence of the FTG on the setting of Someries Castle is detailed in Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage of the ES. The visualisations provided in Appendix 14.7 of the ES demonstrate that the FTG would be partially visible in the middle-distance and would be viewed alongside existing modern structures, including farm buildings and an earthen bund, and would further emphasise the proximity of the airport. The presence of the FTG would not affect Someries Castle's heritage value, and would represent minimal change to the asset's setting. All impacts to the setting of this asset are assessed to be not significant.</u></p>	<p><u>CBC acknowledge that there is further information in Appendix 7.1 Air Quality Methodology <del>[(AS-028)]</del> regarding the operation of the FTG.</u></p> <p><u>On 2 January 2024 the applicant shared video footage of the existing Fire Training Ground in use. The footage lasts 25 seconds and shows a fire at the rear section of the fuselage. It does not show any associated activity such as Fire Officer's or vehicle movements etc.</u></p> <p><u>The ExA undertook a visit on 27th November to witness the FTG in operation. A summary of the visit is provided in document [EV1-018] and further information is provided in the Applicant's document [EV1-017]. Based on the information provided in these two documents, the footage sent to CBC, whilst beneficial, does not show the full operational nature of the FTG and is not reflective of the training event witnessed by the ExA. Whilst it is acknowledged that the use of the FTG is intermittent and for a short period of time, concerns remain regarding the</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>impact of the operational use of the FTG on the setting of Someries Castle and the nearby rights of way network.</u></p> <p><u>There is still lack of information regarding the operational use in terms of lighting installations, smoke reduction features (please see response ISH8 [(REP6-090)]).</u></p> <p><u>Air quality monitoring and a collaborative mechanism to review this monitoring has been included in the CHMP and this is welcomed. It remains unclear how airborne pollutants from the FTG would affect the fabric of Someries Castle and what can be done to mitigate it.</u></p> <p><u>In terms of the permanent installation of the FTG, CBC are concerned about the landscape presence of the installation as shown in block form on Viewpoints 20, 23 and 25 of the LVIA [(REP3-011)]. The impact on Someries Castle remains significant and no mitigation to minimise the intrusive and incongruous nature of the FTG installation is proposed. It is</u></p>		



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>acknowledged that the current operations of the airport have a visual and audible impact on the setting of Someries Castle. However, the existing airport buildings are a significant distance from Someries Castle and the immediate setting north-east of Someries Castle, which encompasses Someries Farmhouse and Someries Cottages outbuildings (buildings of traditional form) still has an open, rural character uninterrupted by airport infrastructure. CBC attaches great importance to significance of setting in respect to Someries Castle.</u></p> <p><u>There remains lack of detail in respect of smoke reduction measures (as per Design Principles document) – point flagged at ISH8 (reference document).</u></p> <p><u>Overall, CBC consider that the FTG is in the wrong location. An alternative location was considered by the Applicant, as confirmed during ISH8 but was discounted as it was in the Green Belt. No further</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>information is provided on the alternative location to determine whether it was more appropriate in terms of reducing the impacts upon to the Scheduled Monument. Awaiting further comments following submission of updated AVRs at Deadline 3.</u></p>		
<p><b><u>CBC15</u></b> <b><u>034546</u></b> <b><u>432</u></b></p>	<p>Visibility of some components of the Proposed Development from Luton Hoo House</p>	<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 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.</p> <p><u>The Design Principles [REP7-034TR020001/APP/7.09REP8-0227-034]DQ-08 were refined and submitted at Deadline 7 to address concerns about visual impact on heritage assets.</u></p>	<p>CBC's Conservation Officer expressed concern over visibility of some components of the Proposed Development from Luton Hoo House. <u>The Conservation Officer seeks confirmation that a suitable colour palette will be used for built components of the Proposed Development and would be sympathetic to and not in conflict with the surrounding landscape; particularly in views from Luton Hoo House and RPG.</u></p> <p><u>CBC acknowledge the developments made in respect to the Design Principles document, but we note however that the detailed design and appearance of the proposed buildings would be subject to planning approval/condition</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.23 Disagreement confirmed via email on 10.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>discharge agreement but CBC would not be the discharging authority. CBC is concerned how an appropriate palette of materials and finishes could adequately be secured to fully address the concerns regarding visual impact of the development in the context of Luton Hoo House and its RPG setting.</u></p>		
<p><b><u>CBC15</u></b> <b><u>144657</u></b> <b><u>543</u></b></p>	<p>Impact assessment</p>	<p>The Applicant considers the impact assessment to be accurate and robust and <b>ES Chapter 10 [AS-077]</b> 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 <b>as Appendix D of theat Planning Statement Appendix D [APP-198]</b> that considers potential harm to heritage assets in accordance with the NPPF. This is to</p>	<p>No assessment in NPPF terms has been undertaken (e.g., no harm, less than substantial harm, substantial harm, etc).</p> <p>CBC <del>have</del> agreed the information <del>would</del> <del>it</del> be provided in the updated <b>Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [REP4-017APP-073]</b>, which <del>has been</del> <del>was</del> submitted at D4.</p> <p><u>The Gazetteer has been updated and CBC have no issue with the information provided.</u></p>	<p>Strategy agreed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.23</p> <p><u>Agreement confirmed via email on 10.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>enable the planning balance to be undertaken 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. <b>Appendix D of the Planning Statement Appendix D [APP-198]</b> 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>Further to the statement of harm in the <b>Planning Statement [REP5-016]</b>, the Applicant updated the <b>Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [REP4-017APP-073]</b> (for Deadline 4) to include the assessment of impact and assessment of harm, and to better articulate the rationale for the scoping out of heritage</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		assets from the impact assessment process.			
<p><b>CBC15</b> <b><u>254768</u></b> <b><u>654</u></b></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 <b>ES [AS-077]</b> 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 <b>ES [AS-077]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has agreed with the Conservation Officer for CBC that the impact assessment for Luton Hoo Conservation Area, as an individual heritage asset, will be articulated in the updated <b>Appendix 10.2 Cultural Heritage Gazetteer</b></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>CBC <del>have</del> agreed the information <del>will</del><u>would</u> be provided in the updated <b>Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073REP4-017]</b>, which <del>has been</del><u>was</u> submitted at D4 <del>and are satisfied with this-</del></p>	<p>Strategy agreed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.2023.</p> <p><u>Agreed via email on 10.01.24.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>[APP-073REP4-017]</del>, which has been submitted at Deadline 4.</p>			
<p><b>CBC15</b> <b><u>364879</u></b> <b><u>765</u></b></p>	<p>Cultural heritage assessment on Someries Castle</p>	<p><b>ES Chapter 10 [AS-077]</b> 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 <b><u>Chapter 7, the Air Quality, of the ES Revision 1 assessment [AS-076]</u></b>. As reiterated in Section 10.9 of <b>ES Chapter 10 [AS-077]</b>, the air quality model predicts a negligible change in the concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) 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 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 <b>ES Chapter 10 [AS-077]</b> which concludes that ground vibration would not be perceptible from</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>CBC Conservation Officer has agreed the updated CHMP via email.</p> <p><u>Further information was to be submitted by the Applicant at D6 following ISH8 that relates to the use of the FTG.</u></p> <p><u>See comments on CBC149 (Location of FTG with respect to the visual and environmental impact).</u></p>	<p>Confirmed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.2023</p> <p>Updated CHMP agreed via email on 30.10.23</p>	<p><u>Not agreed/Agreed/On-going/Position not confirmed by CBC</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>Somerles 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 <b>CHMP [REP48-01520]</b> and the CHMP has been updated to confirm that the monitoring results will be shared with the relevant local authority heritage officers.</p> <p>As detailed in the <b>Outline Operational Air Quality Plan [APP-065REP9-013]</b> reviews, repeated every 5 years, will be carried out to assess if the annual concentrations measured are 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>The Applicant has agreed with the Conservation Officer for CBC to include air quality monitoring, which has been included in the updated</p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><b>CHMP [REP4-020]</b> <del>which has been</del> submitted at Deadline 4.</p> <p><u>See response on CBC149 with respect to the visual and environmental impact.</u></p>			
<p><b><u>CBC15</u></b> <b><u>474985</u></b> <b><u>04876</u></b></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 <b>Representative Viewpoints (AVRs)</b>, submitted as <b>[REP3-010]</b> and <b>[REP3-011]</b>, include amongst other things, labels of development work orders to aid the identification of elements of the Proposed Development and labels of development work orders to aid identification.</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</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><u>Updated documents were submitted at Deadline 3 and these included labels and clarification re: the use of wirelines and blocks. CBC are satisfied with these.</u></p> <p><del>Awaiting further comments following submission of updated AVRs at Deadline 3.</del></p>	<p>Confirmed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.23</p> <p><u>Agreement confirmed via email on 10.01.24</u></p>	<p><del>Ongoing</del> <u>Agreed</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		17 for the RPG and Viewpoint 17a for 2nd Floor of Luton Hoo House.			
<p><b><u>CBC15</u></b>  <b><u>580495</u></b>  <b><u>14987</u></b></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 <del>the</del> <b><u>Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage Chapter 10</u></b> of the <b><u>ES [AS-077]</u></b>, <b><u>Chapter 7 Air Quality [AS-076]</u></b> predicts a negligible change in pollutant concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> and particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) 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 <b><u>CHMP [REP4-0208-015]</u></b> and as agreed with the local authority heritage officers the CHMP has been updated to confirm that the</p>	<p><del>There is a 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.</del></p> <p><del>Applicant to provide a response at D7 to the request for additional viewpoints. CBC requested these at D3 (after ISH6).</del></p> <p><del>Refer to CBC 142</del></p> <p><del>Refer to the air quality SoCG – FTG (CBC 63) Awaiting further comments following submission of updated AVRs at Deadline 3.</del></p>	<p><del>Confirmation of disagreement received on 10.01.24 Environmental impact from the FTG has been agreed. Confirmed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.23</del></p>	<p><del>Ongoing/ not agreed</del></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>monitoring results will be shared with the relevant local authority.</p> <p>Updated visualisations have been submitted to Central Bedfordshire Council showing correct labelling of FTG.</p> <p><u>The Applicant considers that <b>Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual</b> of the <b>ES [AS-079]</b> has a sufficient number of representative viewpoints (5no.) to fully consider and assess the effects on Luton Hoo as a receptor. <b>Chapter 10 Cultural Heritage</b> of the <b>ES [AS-077]</b> also provides a full and robust assessment of effects on Luton Hoo. The LVIA Working Group was set up for a wide variety of matters that included the number and locations of viewpoints to inform the LVIA. Further viewpoints are not considered proportionate and would not contribute any further to, or change, the assessment of effects reported in the ES.</u></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<p><b>CBC15</b> <b><u>691020</u></b> <b>498</b></p>	<p>Setting of a non-designated heritage asset</p>	<p>The Applicant considers it is correct to scope out heritage assets from the <b>ES [AS-077]</b> where they are located outside of the Site and where they would not 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>For clarity, the Applicant has updated the <b>Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073REP4-017]</b> (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.</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>CBC <del>have</del> agreed the information <del>will</del><u>would</u> be provided in the updated <b>Cultural Heritage Gazetteer [APP-073REP4-017]</b>, which <del>has been</del><u>was</u> submitted at D4.</p>	<p>Strategy confirmed at topic specific meeting held 12.09.2023</p> <p><u>Agreement confirmed via email on 10.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u> <u>ongoing</u></p>



Table 3-8: Summary of ‘flightpath’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>Flightpaths</b> <u>FLIGHTPATHS</u>					
<b>Use of flightpaths in assessments</b>					
<b>CBC157</b> <b><u>6052131</u></b> <b>049</b>	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 <u>the</u> use of existing flightpaths in noise assessments.	-Meeting with Suono on behalf of Host Authorities 21.11.2023	Agreed

Table 3-9: Summary of ‘Green Controlled Growth’ matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>GREEN CONTROLLED GROWTH</b>					
<b>Green Controlled Growth Framework</b>					
<b>CBC158</b> <b><u>6153242</u></b> <b>10</b>	Principle of GCG	The Applicant considers that the <b>GCG reen Controlled Growth (GCG) Framework [REP9-022REP7-020REP5-022]</b> represents an innovative, ambitious approach to managing the growth of the airport within definitive environmental limits. <b>[REP5-022]</b> .	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 + Gorbing, <b>04.04.22</b>	Agreed
<b>Thresholds and Limits</b>					
<b>CBC159</b> <b><u>6254355</u></b> <b>321</b>	GCG Thresholds and Limits	The Applicant considers that the proposed approach of adopting Level 1 Thresholds, Level 2 Thresholds and Limits for each of the environmental topics within the scope of the <b>GCG Framework [REP9-022TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-</b>	<b>CBC supports the proposed approach of adopting Level 1, Level 2 Thresholds and Limits for each of the environmental topics within the scope of the GCG Framework [REP9-022TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-0205-022]</b> and the processes	<b>HA SoCGs – GCG Meeting, 10.01.2024 to be confirmed at topic specific meeting</b>	<b>Agreed Ongoing</b>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>020REP5-022], REP5-022,</del> 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><del>associated with these Thresholds and Limits. Whilst the principles of GCG are welcomed there is some concern regarding the process, particularly in regard to the formal approval process for the ESG for example, in respect to exceedance of Level 1 Thresholds.</del></p>		
<p><b>CBC160</b> <b><u>6355655</u></b> <b><u>432</u></b></p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the principle of aligning Limits and Thresholds within the <b>GCG Framework [REP9-022TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020REP5-022], REP5-022</b> with the Faster Growth sensitivity test (with the exception of Air Quality, see row (CBC68) 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.</p>	<p>Email received 27.09.23</p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Position not confirmed</u> <u>by CBC</u> <u>Not agreed</u></p>
<p><b>CBC155</b> <b><u>3</u></b></p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits— Air Quality</p>	<p><del>Given the constraints around monitoring of air quality impacts outlined in the <b>GCG Framework [REP5-022], REP5-022</b> the Applicant believes it is necessary for the GCG approach to air quality to be different to the other topics within scope of</del></p>	<p><del>CBC to confirm its position on this approach, noting queries raised through response to draft DCO documents in October 2022.</del></p>	<p><del>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</del></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>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.</del></p>			
<p><b>CBC156</b> <b>4</b></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><del>any offsetting that the airport operator may choose to implement.</del></p> <p><del>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.</del></p>			
<p><b><u>CBC157</u></b> <b>5</b></p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits – GHG</p>	<p><del>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.</del></p>	<p><del>CBC to confirm its position on exclusion of aviation GHG emissions from GCG Framework.</del></p>	<p><del>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</del></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p><b><u>CBC161</u></b> <b><u>6456578</u></b> <b>76</b></p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits – Surface Access</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the approach taken with respect to surface access Limits through the <u>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020REP5-022]</u> GCG Framework is appropriate and proportionate to the</p>	<p><u>CBC agree that the approach taken with respect to the surface access Limits is appropriate and proportionate.</u> <del>to confirm its position on the proposed approach for defining both surface access Limits within the GCG Framework, and</del></p>	<p><del>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</del> <u>Agreement confirmed via</u></p>	<p><del>Position not confirmed by CBC</del> <u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>consequence of a failure to meet them, whilst allowing for more ambitious surface access Targets to be set through the <b>Framework Travel Plan</b>  <del>[TR020001/APP/7.13REP8-024REP4-044].REP4-044</del></p>	<p><del>additional, more ambitious surface access Targets through future Travel Plans.</del></p>	<p><del>email on 07.02.24</del></p>	
<p><b>CBC162</b>  <del>5576898</del>  <del>7</del></p>	<p>GCG Thresholds and Limits - Review</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that it is appropriate for the GCG process, Limits and Thresholds to be reviewed in the circumstances set out in the <b>GCG Framework</b>  <del>[TR020001/APP/7.08REP7-020REP5-022], REP5-022</del> 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.</p> <p><u>In response to concerns raised by the Host Authorities regarding ensuring monitoring plans remain up-to-date with good practice and relevant guidance, the Applicant has introduced an explicit requirement to consider new and emerging best practice as part of the review of</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant committed to updated drafting on the 17 January 2024 to include an explicit requirement to ensure "current" best practice is considered as part of reviews of Monitoring Plans.</u></p> <p>CBC now consider this matter agreed following the amendments made at Deadline 10 to REP10-025.</p> <p><del>. This update has been made to GCG documents for Deadline 9 submissions. CBC to confirm position, noting provisional support for this position expressed in response to draft DCO documents in October 2022.</del></p>	<p><u>HA SoCGs – GCG Meeting, 10.01.2024 To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed Position not confirmed by CBC Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>monitoring plans. This amendment was made to the <b>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08]</b> and <b>GCG Explanatory Note [REP9-020]</b> at <b>Deadline 9.</b></u></p>			
<p><b>CBC163</b> <b>65879X</b> <b>XX</b></p>	<p><u>GCG Thresholds and Limits – Sanctions for continued breaches</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant considers that the GCG process has been set up to avoid repeated breaches, and that (in contrast to current consent) the ESG will have an approval role over mitigation. Therefore, it would be disproportionate and unreasonable to seek sanctions where all parties have agreed that mitigation is appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant also notes that GCG explicitly links the Limits to growth, so if in breach the airport cannot grow – this is a significant commercial incentive to stay within Limits and to address breaches as soon as possible.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant has outlined its position regarding the proposal by both the Host Authorities and the ExA for the inclusion of sanctions where there is a repeated and prolonged exceedance of a Limit in the <b>Applicant's Position</b></u></p>	<p><u>CBC is concerned that the only requirement in GCG if a Mitigation Plan fails is to produce a new Mitigation Plan.</u></p> <p><u>CBC propose that there should be financial sanctions imposed alongside the requirement to produce a new Mitigation Plan.</u></p> <p><u>CBC are willing to discuss the level and structure of the proposed financial penalties with the Applicant.</u></p>	<p><u>Email received from Fiona Ross on the 09.01.2024</u></p>	<p><u>Position not confirmed by CBC Not agreed Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><b><u>Statement on Financial Penalties [REP9-058]</u></b> submitted at Deadline 9. <u>As outlined in this document, the Applicant rejects the proposal for the imposition of a financial penalty regime on the grounds that they:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. are unnecessary and wholly unjustified in light of the robust and comprehensive GCG Framework the Applicant has put forward;</u></li> <li><u>b. are inappropriate given the existing enforcement mechanism endorsed by Parliament in the context of breaches of the DCO;</u></li> <li><u>c. do not meet the planning policy tests;</u></li> <li><u>d. do not meet the specific tests which are relevant to the imposition of conditions;</u></li> <li><u>e. are being proposed without a clear legal basis;</u></li> <li><u>f. are unprecedented;</u></li> </ul>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>g. are being sought to be justified by reference to precedents which are wholly irrelevant;</u></p> <p><u>h. assume a function for the Department for Transport which it has hitherto not accepted or been consulted upon; and</u></p> <p><u>i. are not appropriate in the context of a single decision on a DCO application</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant considers that the GCG process has been set up to avoid repeated breaches, and that (in contrast to current consent) the ESG will have approval role over mitigation. Therefore, it would be disproportionate and unreasonable to seek sanctions where all parties have agreed that mitigation is appropriate.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant also notes that GCG explicitly links the Limits to growth, so if in breach the airport cannot grow – this is a significant commercial incentive to stay within Limits and to address breaches as soon as possible.</u></p>			

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>Monitoring and Reporting</b>					
<p><b>CBC164</b> <b><u>7598605</u></b> <b><u>98</u></b></p>	<p><del>Transition Period</del> <del>Transition Period</del></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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 <del>d</del><b>Draft Development Consent Order [REP7-003REP5-TR020001/APP/2.01REP9-003003REP7-003]</b> 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</p>	<p><del>CBC to confirm its position on proposed Transition Period. CBC supports the proposals for timings of monitoring for GCG topic areas, and welcomes the removal of the transition period for noise and the Applicant's commitment to baseline Air Quality monitoring ahead of serving notice under Article 44(1).</del></p>	<p><del>To be confirmed at topic-specific meeting</del> <del>Agreed via email on 01.02.24</del></p>	<p><del>Agreed Position not confirmed by CBC</del> <del>Ongoing</del></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>monitoring to be carried out over a full calendar year for these topics.</p> <p>No transition period will apply for noise.</p> <p><u>The Applicant does not consider additional baselining monitoring is required for the purposes of GCG and the proposed transition period, however in response to specific concerns raised by the Hertfordshire authorities, the Applicant will use reasonable endeavours (noting that this will require installation of air quality monitoring equipment outside of the red line boundary) to undertake Air Quality monitoring 6 months ahead of serving notice under Article 44(1).</u></p> <p><u>This amendment has been incorporated in the <b>Environmental Statement – Appendix 7.5 Outline Operational Air Quality Plan [REP9-013]</b> submitted at Deadline 9.</u></p>			
<p><b>CBC165</b> <b>8059610</b> <b>59</b></p>	<p>GCG Monitoring and</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the proposed timings for monitoring and reporting of environmental impacts provide an appropriate balance</p>	<p><u>While LCB's concerns remain regarding the time allowed for the ESG to approve a Level 2 Plan being too short, LCB accepts the</u></p>	<p><u>HA SoCGs – GCG Meeting, 10.01.2024 CB C-Response</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
	Reporting - Timings	<p>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 is managed through the Slot Allocation Process.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Applicant <del>has</del> made changes to this requirement as part of the <b>Draft ESG Terms of Reference [REP7-02REP9-02425-024]</b> 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</p>	<p><del>amendment from a 21-day period to a 28-day period proposed by the Applicant for the ESG to approve a Level 2 Plan (and Mitigation Plan), given the constraints in timescales that exist for the process.</del></p> <p><del>CBC have concerns with the adequacy of the Green Controlled Growth mechanism and their concerns with the timescales related to it.</del></p> <p><del>Given the need to assemble the representatives of the ESG, consider what may be quite considerable submissions and take the necessary technical advice 21 days is too short a determination period. It is suggested that a period of 8 weeks would be appropriate.</del></p>	<p><del>to ExA Written Questions</del></p>	



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		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.			
<b>Environmental Scrutiny Group and Technical Panels</b>					
<b><u>CBC166910210</u></b>	<u>ESG Membership Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) Membership</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 <b>Draft ESG Terms of Reference [REP5-0247-0229-024]</b> 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	Local Authority involvement is likely to be required from beyond the Host Authorities to other authorities that are impacted by the airport operations. <u>CBC is aligned with Dacorum Borough Council in its desire to be included as part of the ESG and therefore disagrees with the extent of Host Authorities nominated by the Applicant to be part of the ESG.</u>	<u>HA SoCGs – GCG Meeting, 9.11.2023 To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</u>	<u>Not Agreed Ongoing</u>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>role on the relevant Technical Panel, with Terms of Reference and membership set out in the <b>Draft Technical Panels Terms of Reference [REP5-0267-024REP9-026]</b>.</p>			
<p><b>CBC167</b> <b><u>7062132</u></b> <b>4</b></p>	<p>ESG Membership</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that, in addition to local authorities, the proposed independent members of the ESG as set out in the <b>Draft ESG Terms of Reference [REP5-0247-0229-026]</b> 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>	<p><del>CBC supports the proposed inclusion of independent members to provide impartial advice on airport operations and slot allocation. CBC to confirm its position on proposed independent members of the ESG.</del></p>	<p><del>To be confirmed at topic-specific meeting</del> <u>Agreed via email on 4.12.23</u></p>	<p><del>Ongoing</del> <u>Agreed</u></p>
<p><b>CBC168</b> <b><u>7163243</u></b> <b>2</b></p>	<p>ESG Membership</p>	<p>A key principle of the <b>GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08 08REP9-022REP7-020[REP5-022]</b> is that the ESG can provide effective, independent scrutiny of the</p>	<p><del>CBC have concerns regarding the limitations of specifying the requirement for local authority representatives on ESG to be "planning professionals" and</del></p>	<p><del>Confirmation of not agreed received via email on 01.02.2024</del> <u>To</u></p>	<p><del>Position not confirmed by CBC</del> <u>Not</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>impacts of the Proposed Development. <del>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 and</del> that any decisions made by the ESG are made on an impartial, apolitical basis. <b>REP5-022</b></p> <p><u>In response to concerns raised by LBC and the ExA regarding, the Applicant has made amendments to the <b>Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP9-020]</b> and <b>Green Controlled Growth Framework Appendix A: ESG Terms of Reference [REP9-024]</b> changing the reference from "suitably qualified senior planning professional" to "competent officer" regarding the requirements for an appropriate representative of a local</u></p>	<p><del>whether these individuals would have the ability to make decisions on behalf of the local authorities.</del></p> <p>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. <u>CBC accepts the principle that representative should be officer and not member but are concerned that the current drafting is too restrictive and may mean that appropriate officers with right level of seniority could not attend. The Host Authorities welcome the amendments to now reference "competent officers working with the relevant local authorities" but remain concerned that nomination of a suitably qualified person should rest with the Council and not the Chair of the ESG and do not agree that only "suitably qualified senior planning professionals" are to be allowed as substitutes.</u></p>	<p><del>be confirmed at topic specific meeting</del></p>	<p><u>agreed</u> Ongoing</p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant’s position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>authority on the ESG. The Applicant proposes that matters of competency in regard to local authority representation on the ESG should be at the discretion of the chair of the ESG.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant considers it entirely appropriate that the chair of the ESG should be able to decide upon matters of competence in this context, and that an independent chair will be capable of making an objective determination of whether an individual meets this requirement.</u></p>	<p><u>CBC consider that the choice of representative for the Technical Panels should rest with the Council and the suitability of a representative should not be at the discretion of the chair.</u></p>		
<p><b><u>CBC169</u></b> <b><u>726435X</u></b> <b><u>XX</u></b></p>	<p><u>Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) - Quorum</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant proposes that a quorum for an ESG meeting is met where the independent chair, independent aviation specialist, slot allocation expert and a minimum of one representative from a local authority are present.</u></p> <p><u>This criteria for quorum has been proposed to ensure that the functioning of GCG could not be frustrated or otherwise unintentionally hindered by any party to the process. In light of the concerns</u></p>	<p><u>CBC have concerns regarding the requirement for only one local authority representative to be present for ESG to be quorate and do not consider this ensures adequate representation of the local authorities for quorate decision making.</u></p> <p><u>The Host Authorities suggest that the text should be returned to where “at least 50% of other representatives are present”. CBC</u></p>	<p><u>HA SoCGs— GCG Meeting, 10.01.2024 Confirmed via email on 01.02.24</u></p>	<p><u>Not Agreed/Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>raised by LBC and the ExA in relation to the minimum number of local authorities in attendance for the ESG to be quorum, the Applicant is proposing to amend the drafting of the <b>Draft ESG Terms of Reference [REP9-024]</b> to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Require at least two local authority representatives to be in attendance. The Applicant considers that with the attendance of three independents, and at least two local authorities, sufficient technically competent persons as well as those representing local communities will be present without increasing the risk of the GCG process being frustrated.</u></li> <li><u>2. In the event that quorum cannot be achieved at the first scheduled meeting, then a further meeting will be held within seven days with a reduced quorate requirement.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Both meetings will be subject to the requirement to use reasonable endeavours to ensure 100%</u></p>	<p><u>welcome the amendments made at Deadline 9 in relation to quorum.</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>attendance by all members of the ESG.</u></p>			
<p><b>CBC170</b> <b>736546X</b> <b>XX</b></p>	<p><u>Technical Panel - Quorum</u></p>	<p><u>In light of the concerns raised by LBC and the ExA in relation to the minimum number of local authorities in attendance for the Technical Panel to be quorum, the Applicant is proposing to amend the drafting of the <b>Draft Technical Panels Terms of Reference [REP7-024]</b> to:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Require at least two local authority representatives to be in attendance. The Applicant considers that with the attendance of three independents, and at least two local authorities, sufficient technically competent persons as well as those representing local communities will be present without increasing the risk of the GCG process being frustrated.</u></li> <li><u>2. In the event that quorum cannot be achieved at the first scheduled meeting, then a further meeting will be held</u></li> </ol>	<p><u>CBC welcome the amendments made at Deadline 9 in relation to quorum. CBC have concerns regarding the requirement for only one local authority representative to be present for Technical Panels to be quorate and do not consider this ensures adequate representation of the local authorities for quorate decision making.</u></p> <p><u>The Host Authorities suggest that the text should be returned to where "at least 50% of other representatives are present".</u></p>	<p><u>HA SoCGs – GCG Meeting, 10.01.2024 Confirmed via email on 01.02.24</u></p>	<p><u>Not Agreed/Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>within seven days with a reduced quorate requirement.</u></p> <p><u>Both meetings will be subject to the requirement to use reasonable endeavours to ensure 100% attendance by all members of the ESG. The Applicant proposes that a quorum for a Technical Panel is met where the chairperson of that Technical Panel and at least one other approved member is present.</u></p> <p><u>This criteria for quorum has been proposed to ensure that the functioning of GCG could not be frustrated or otherwise unintentionally hindered by any party to the process.</u></p>			
<p><b>CBC171</b> <b><u>4665754</u></b> <b>3</b></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</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 supports the proposal to use £100/hr as the basis for calculating Local Authority funding as confirmed by the Applicant on an email on the</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed via email on 01.02.24</u></p>	<p><u>Position not confirmed by CBC</u> <u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed subject to the completion of the</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>organisations (including CBC) 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 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 <del>roles, and</del> <u>roles and</u> would be index linked.</p> <p>The intention is for this funding to be secured either through the <b>section 106 Agreement [TR020001/APP/8.167]</b> or by way of an alternative legal agreement.</p>	<p><u>17 January 2024 and to be secured through the s106 agreement.</u></p> <p><u>CBC welcomes the inclusion of review mechanism to reevaluate the appropriateness of these annual allowances as part of the funding approach.</u></p> <p><del>CBC in principle supports the approach to the funding of the ESG and relevant Technical Panels as outlined.</del></p> <p><del>CBC would like to confirm the rates that should be considered in the development of the annual cap per local authority.</del></p> <p><del>CBC would also like the inclusion of review mechanism to reevaluate the appropriateness of these annual allowances as part of the funding approach.</del></p>		<p><u>section 106 agreement</u></p>
<p><b>CBC</b> <b><u>1671725</u></b> <b><u>68654</u></b></p>	<p>ESG - <u>Establishment of ESG as a Corporate Entity</u></p>	<p>The Applicant proposes to establish the ESG as a corporate entity to provide independence from the airport. <u>One of the very important drivers in the Applicant's approach has been to ensure that the ESG is</u></p>	<p><u>CBC considers that the Applicant's approach appears to place burdens on LPA officers that would otherwise not exist (e.g. were ESG to be simply an unincorporated group of the local authorities/other</u></p>	<p><u>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</u></p>	<p><u>Position not confirmed by CBC</u> <u>Ongoing</u></p>



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>independent and is also seen to be truly independent. GCG is intended to be a clear and explicit communication to the local communities and surrounding host authorities that the structures in place are at arm's length from the operator, the owner and, indeed, in order to address a perceived conflict, LBC itself. It is on that basis that the Applicant considers the corporate entity is the right thing to do.</u></p> <p><u>Furthermore, by creating a separate legal entity which is distinctly the decision-maker, it will reduce the risk to those on local authority representatives, for example, a decision to refuse (or approve) being amenable to judicial review, and local authorities and/or representatives being liable.</u></p> <p><u>The implications for local authorities are therefore that the corporate entity (a company limited by guarantee) will secure independence, reduce potential legal liability enabling the ESG to undertake their functions, and also</u></p>	<p><u>representatives), for no discernible benefit. The information provided by the Applicant response does not change the fundamental concerns that CBC has expressed previously, and little to no further detail has been provided as to how a Company Limited by Guarantee (CLG) might work in practice. In any event, this is something that can be further considered and worked through post-examination/decision.</u></p> <p><u>CBC considers that the Applicant should remove the references to a CLG in the GCG documentation (e.g. the ESG Terms of Reference), as if such references remain in the documentation they have the potential to cause issues further down the line if the CLG model is not adopted. CBC in principle supports the approach to establish ESG as a corporate entity.</u></p> <p><u>CBC will be seeking further legal advice before confirming this position.</u></p>		<p><u>ngNot agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>ensure that the legal powers open to companies are given to the ESG (e.g., in terms of appointments and entering into contracts).</u></p>			

Table-3-10: Summary of 'Design' matters with CBC

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
<b>DESIGN</b>					
<p><b>CBC173</b> <b><u>6687976</u></b> <b>5</b></p>	<p>Design Principles</p>	<p>The Applicant's position is as set out in <del>Dead line 4 Hearing Actions [REP4-070]</del><u>Applicants Response to Deadline 6 Submissions Appendix D – Central Bedfordshire Council [REP7-067 TR020001/APP/8.163]</u>. The Applicant has engaged with CBC to discuss this position and how the Design Principles document can be refined as a live document.</p>	<p>Refer to <del>[REP6--091423]</del> Central Bedfordshire Council <u>response to ISH6 Q31 suitability of Design Principles TR020001/APP/7.098-022</u> which states: <del>comments at Deadline 6 and The Applicants response to deadline response to ISH6 Q31 suitability of Design Principles [REP5-034]</del> which states:</p> <p><i>“.....The document is currently high-level and does not provide sufficient</i></p>	<p><del>To be confirmed at topic specific meeting</del><u>Agreed via email on 01.02.24</u></p>	<p><del>Position not confirmed by CBC</del><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>The <b>Design Principles</b> <del>[TR020001/APP/7.09REP7-034REP8-0227-034REP5-034]</del> has been updated and issued <del>at</del> <u>Deadline 75</u> <del>has been strengthened</del> for the key public facing buildings and spaces with regard to design and sense of place, architectural design and passenger experience. It also includes <u>illustrative material to give an indication of design intent and references the parameters which include maximum building heights, work areas and volumes as set out in requirement 76 of the draft DCO [TR020001/APP/2.01]</u>.</p> <p>The Applicant has added the following design principles to <b>Design Principles</b> <del>[TR020001/APP/7.09REP7-034REP8-02275-034]</del> at <u>Deadline 75</u> to address CBC concerns: <del>and will continue to engage on refining these throughout the examination process.</del></p> <p><del>"DQ.08 -- in relation to the Having regard to the setting of Luton Hoo and Someries Castle the detailed</del></p>	<p><del>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 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.</del></p> <p><i>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-146REP4-040]). The panels are likely to be south-facing to maximise</i></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>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."</del></p> <p><del>"BIODV.04 – The detailed lighting design shall include measures to avoid obtrusive light effects and adverse impacts on biodiversity....." (refer to <b>Design Principles [REP5-034]</b> for full description).</del></p> <p><del>"ASF.11 – in relation to 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, <b>ASFGlint and Glare Assessment [REP4-040]</b>) to avoid unacceptable visual impacts on both ground based and airborne sensitive receptors."</del></p> <p><del>"LAND.15 – in relation to the height and massing of the Proposed Development."</del></p>	<p><del>their efficiency but there is concern this would be inappropriate due to the sensitivities of the landscape around Luton Hoo RPG.</del></p> <p><del>It is acknowledged that this is a working document and CBC welcome opportunities to discuss amendments to the document. 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."</del></p> <p><u>CBC have reviewed the Design Principles [TR020001/APP/7.09REP9-030REP8-0225-034] and welcome the clarification provided re: the inclusion of reference to Luton Hoo and Someries Castle, as acknowledged in CBC Deadline 6 document [8-022]. Concerns were raised regarding solar panels and</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>Further to the Applicants response to ID.8 [REP7-067] in relation to the smoke reduction measures and the request for further information by CBC fire training operations have the potential to generate smoke. LLAOL have confirmed that most operations mitigate the generation of smoke with the use of relatively clean (low particulate generating) LPG fuel, however two simulation scenarios do generate smoke.</u></p> <p><u>There are technologies available that claim to eliminate the smoke coming from the Compartment Fire Behaviour Training (CFBTs) units where smoke is generated. The Applicant has liaised with various suppliers including Process Combustion Ltd who confirmed they have a solution to eliminate the carbonaceous smoke from the CFBTs. This technology, known as 'Smoke dog', is a propane fired afterburner that collects the smoke via ducting from the CFBT and an extract fan to pass it through a burner to eliminate the visible smoke. This device is mounted onto the CFBT and would require a</u></p>	<p><u>absence of information, along with concerns regarding lighting and lack of detail regarding smoke reduction measures at the FTG.</u></p> <p><u>An updated document was submitted at deadline 7 [(REP78-034227-034)] and this provided suitable clarification regarding lighting but there was insufficient information in terms of the smoke reduction measures. There was some clarification provided in the Applicant's submission [(REP7-067)] but this was not sufficient.</u></p> <p><u>CBC have now reviewed the updated Design Principles document submitted at Deadline 9 and consider this is suitably robust to address previous concerns raised above.</u></p> <p><u><del>Given the sensitive nature of Luton Hoo RPG it is considered that the Glint and Glare Assessment should include a landscape and visual assessment</del></u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>propane supply and an electrical supply to function. The Applicant has included Design Principle AF.19 so this or similar measures are included at detailed design.</u></p>			
<b><u>CBCXX</u></b>	Design Code	<p>The Applicant considers that a more prescriptive design code would not be appropriate as set out in <b><u>[REP4-070] Issue Specific Hearing 6 Action 31.</u></b></p>	<p><u>As per [REP4-116] and [REP6-090] CBC consider there is a need for a Design code.</u></p>		
<b><u>CBCXX</u></b>	Design Review	<p>Since Issue Specific Hearing 8, Item 10, the Applicant confirms the agreement to the introduction of an independent design review process for Terminal 2 (Work Nos. 3b(01) and 3b(02)), T2 Plaza (Work No. 3f) and the Hotel (Work no 4a). An outline of this design review process is defined within the <b><u>Design Principles [REP7-038-0224]</u></b> submitted at Deadline 7.</p> <p>The Applicant is preparing draft ToR for inclusion as an appendix to <b><u>Design Principles [REP8-022TR020001/APP/7.09]</u></b> issued at Deadline 8.</p>	<p><u>The introduction of a design review process is welcomed. However, given the concerns that CBC has raised regarding the visual impact of the Fire Training Ground (FTG) and multi-storey car park P1 on Someries Castle and Luton Hoe RPG, respectively, it is requested that the design review process also applies to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>• Work no. 2d – Fire Training Ground</u></li> <li><u>• Work no. 4g – Car Park P1</u></li> </ul>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p>In addition, following the Rule 17 request, the Applicant has included within the draft ToR (mentioned above) two additional Works namely, the Coach Station (Work No. 3d) and the Luton DART Terminal 2 Station (Work No. 3g), within the proposed Independent Design Review process.</p> <p><b>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.167 Draft Section 106 Agreement [REP7-074]</b> issued at Deadline 7 now includes Schedule 11 Design Review. The wording of Schedule 11 is to be reviewed in relation to the number of workshops required.</p>			
<p><b><u>CBC17476987077</u></b></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 [TR020001/APP/7.09REP7-034REP8-02275-034]</u> issued at <u>Deadline 75</u>. This Design Principle <u>states the following which addresses the concerns raised by CBC (for the full Design principle refer to the</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 confirmed at topic specific meeting</u></p> <p><u>Confirmed via Email on 25 January 2024 25.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Not Agreed Position not confirmed by CBC Ongoing</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><b><u>[TR020001/APP/7.09REP7-0348-022REP9-030]</u></b>:</p> <p><i>“BIODV.04 - The detailed lighting design shall include measures to avoid obtrusive light effects and adverse impacts on biodiversity, <b>landscape and historic character of the area</b>.....<del>REP7-034</del>The detailed design of external lighting will include directional lighting to limit light spill onto adjacent habitats, <b>landscape and neighbourhoods protecting the historical character of the area.</b>”</i></p> <p>An additional Design Principle, LAND.14 has also been added to further address CBC's concerns.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the <b>draft DCO [REP8-003TR020001/APP/2.01]</b> at Deadline 8 to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>operational lighting has been added to the detailed design Requirement 6 as a new sub-paragraph under (2).</u></li> <li>- <u>highway lighting is dealt with under new paragraph (3) of Requirement 6</u></li> </ul>	<p>Whilst the Design Principles document <b><u>[(TR020001/APP/7.09REP9-030REP7-034REP8-022)]</u></b> provides further details regarding lighting, CBC consider that a lighting strategy should be secured via a requirement in the DCO (see CBCs Local Impact Report <b><u>[ref- REP1A-001]</u></b>).</p> <p>An updated Design Principles document was submitted at deadline <b><u>7[(8-022) [REP7-034]</u></b> and this provides suitable clarification regarding lighting, which along with the amendments to requirement 6 and 8 of the draft DCO <b><u>[REP8-003]</u></b> address CBC's concerns.</p>		



ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><del>—Construction lighting (sub-paragraphs (1) and (2)) is addressed by the CoCP, so the Applicant has added a “construction lighting plan” as a new obligation under Requirement 8.</del></p> <p><del>- —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.”</del></p>			
<p><b><u>CBC17085</u></b></p>	<p><u>Design Code</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant considers that a more prescriptive design code would not be appropriate as set out in [REP4-070] Applicant’s response to Deadline 4 Issue Specific Hearing 6-Action-31.</u></p>	<p><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 welcomed the opportunity to engage on this after Deadline 4.”</u></p> <p><u>As per [REP4-116] and [REP6-090] CBC consider there is a need for a Design code.</u></p>	<p><u>Confirmed via email on 30 January 2024 30.01.24</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
			<p><u>The Applicant has amended the Design Principles document at Deadline 9 [REP9-030], which provides greater detail and therefore CBC no longer consider that a design code is required.</u></p>		
<p><b><u>CBC174</u></b> <b><u>96</u></b></p>	<p><u>Design Review</u></p>	<p><u>Since Issue Specific Hearing 8, Item 10, the Applicant confirms the agreement to the introduction of an independent design review process for Terminal 2 (Work Nos. 3b(01) and 3b(02)), T2 Plaza (Work No. 3f) and the Hotel (Work no 4a). A draft Terms of Reference for the design review process was included within <b>Design Principles [TR020001/APP/7.09REP8-022REP8-022]</b> submitted at Deadline 8.</u></p> <p><u>In addition, following the Rule 17 request, the Applicant has included within the draft ToR (mentioned above) two additional Works namely, the Coach Station (Work No. 3d) and the Luton DART Terminal 2 Station (Work No. 3g), within the proposed Independent Design Review process.</u></p>	<p><u>The introduction of a design review process is welcomed. However, given the concerns that CBC has raised regarding the visual impact of the Fire Training Ground (FTG) and multi-storey car park P1 on Someries Castle and Luton Hoo RPG, respectively, it is requested that the design review process also applies to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>• <del>Work no. 2d – Fire Training Ground</del></u></li> <li><u>• <del>Work no. 4g - Car Park P1</del></u></li> </ul> <p><u>The above request was discussed with the Applicant and in response to concerns raised by CBC, the Design Principles document was amended at Deadline 9 [REP9-030]. Most notably the inclusion of ASF.24 and ASF.25 in respect to multi-storey car park P1.</u></p>	<p><u>Confirmed via email on 01.02.24</u></p>	<p><u>Not Agreed</u></p>

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>The Applicant met with Central Bedfordshire Council (CBC) on 25 January 2024 to discuss the design review process as set out in the draft Terms of Reference included as an appendix to the <b>Design Principles [TR020001/APP/7.09REP8-022REP8-023]</b>.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant explained that the design of the Fire Training Ground will be substantially driven by operational requirements and technical and safety standards and therefore the Applicant does not think there is scope for a detailed Design Review process to justify inclusion of the process.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant referenced the Design Council's 10 Principles of Design Review in the <b>draft Terms of Reference for Design Review [REP8-0223]</b>, which includes a principle about designs being proportionate. For these reasons the Applicant does not consider the Fire Training Ground should be subject to design review.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant understands the underlying concerns raised by CBC</u></p>	<p><u>CBC are satisfied that the Design Principles is suitably robust to ensure Car Park P1 and the FTG would not need to be subject to design review.</u></p>		

ID ref	Matter	The Applicant's position	Central Bedfordshire Council position	Source of agreement	Status
		<p><u>are in relation to the visual impacts on Luton Hoo Registered Park and Garden. To address these concerns the Applicant has written two additional Design Principles ASF.24 and ASF.25 (added to the Design Principles issued at Deadline 9) which consider the design of the facade and solar panels of P1 multi-storey car park with regard to the setting of Luton Hoo</u></p> <p><b><u>Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.167 Draft Section 106 Agreement [TR020001/APP/8.167REP9-049REP7-074]</u></b> issued at Deadline 7 now includes Schedule 11 Design Review. <u>The wording of Schedule 11 is to be reviewed in relation to the number of workshops required.</u></p>			

## 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 <del>scoping</del> <del>scoping</del> – report and agree principles of scoping - outline understanding of potential flood risk <del>issues,</del> <del>and issues and</del> 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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Form of engagement</b>	<b>Details</b>
09.04.18	CBC, Historic England	Meeting	Heritage EIA scoping.
10.04.18	LBC, CBC, NHDC	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment TWG. This meeting 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	Drainage meeting.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
		Street, Luton, LU1 2BQ	Agenda: project updates, landside drainage strategy and foul water discharge.
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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Form of engagement</b>	<b>Details</b>
14.02.19	CBC	Meeting	Surface access TWG.
20.02.19	LBC, CBC, NHDC, HCC	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	POCG meeting.
26.02.19	CBC, NHDC, HCC, LBC, Chilterns Conservation Board	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	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.



Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
14.03.19	LBC, CBC	Meeting	Major accidents and disasters meeting to introduce the Proposed Development.
20.03.19	CBC, NHDC	Meeting – Hart House, Luton, LU2 0LA	POCG meeting. This meeting focused on the timetable for dealing with the draft SoCC taking into account the complications faced by the host local authorities due to the upcoming local <del>elections,</del> <del>and elections and</del> recapping the areas of support/information the council could provide within the timescales.
<del>20.03.2019</del>	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
<del>31.05.2019</del>	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,

<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Form of engagement</b>	<b>Details</b>
			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 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.
07.20.19	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

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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.
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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Form of engagement</b>	<b>Details</b>
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 Systema and the pros and cons of noise violation limits.
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

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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.
25.03.20	NEDG <u>M</u> 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.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
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 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.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
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.
14.12.20	LBC	Meeting	Surface Access meeting to discuss the air passenger forecasts and the revised dates for the <del>assessment,</del> <del>and assessment and</del> 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 <del>assessment,</del> <del>and assessment and</del> 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.
<del>12.</del> 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,

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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.
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.



Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
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.
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 <a href="#">Correspondence</a>	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.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
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 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,	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise Envelope Design Group meeting. Agenda: Proposed Development update, headline passenger forecasts, model validation and GCG.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
	Buckinghamshire Council		
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, 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

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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, in particular whether there are any protected characteristic groups in the local area that may be significantly impacted by the Proposed Development. 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.
05.08.21	LBC	Meeting – MS Teams	EqIA 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.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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.
06.08.21	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	EqIA 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. 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.
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 <a href="#">Correspondence</a>	Email from CBC Archaeology Advisor confirming that the WSI for trial trenching had been agreed.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
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, Buckinghamshire 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.
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

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			items, statutory consultation – SoCC feedback, and NEDG update.
29.09.21	Host <u>L</u> ocal <u>A</u> uthorities and <u>N</u> eighbouring <u>L</u> ocal <u>A</u> uthorities	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.
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.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
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 <del>consultation</del> , <del>and consultation and</del> 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 2022 PEIR, and provide an update on GCG.
07.11.21	LBC, NHDC, CBC, HCC, NATS, LADACAN, <del>E</del> easyJet, St Albans City & District Council, WizzAir, DHL <sub>7</sub>	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



Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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.
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	Meeting – MS Teams	NEDG meeting. Agenda: presentation of suggested metrics against the controls for the Noise Envelope, open

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
	Albans City & District Council, DHL, CBC, WizzAir, Buckinghamshire Council		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 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

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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	<u>Host Local Authorities, Neighbouring Local Authorities</u> <del>Host local authorities, neighbouring local authorities,</del> 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	<u>Host Local Authorities, Neighbouring Local Authorities</u> <del>Host local authorities, neighbouring local authorities,</del>	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 <u>consultation, and consultation</u> and give a tour of the virtual consultation room.
03.02.22	CBC, LBC, NHDC, DBC, East Herts District Council, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council, St Albans City & District Council, Buckinghamshire Council,	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise TWG. Agenda: air noise assessment methodology, overview of the PEIR results, noise contours, contour areas and population exposure.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
	Stevenage Borough Council		
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 <u>C</u> econsultation <u>R</u> esponse	Joint response to statutory consultation submitted via WSP.
29.04.22	CBC	Meeting	Discussion regarding the council's consultation response, covering surface access points.
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.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
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 (PPA and Work Order), SoCG process, AOB.
04.07.22	LBC, CBC, Bedfordshire Luton and Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning	Meeting – MS Teams	Health TWG meeting agenda: update on the Proposed Development, outstanding issues from the 2022 statutory consultation including the

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
	Group, Office for Health Improvement and Disparities and UK Health Security Agency		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 <u>L</u> ocal <u>F</u> lood <u>A</u> uthorities (LBC, CBC, HCC)	Meeting – MS Teams	Water TWG: discussion of the proposals with the lead local flood authorities including statutory consultation comments.
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

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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	<a href="#">Email Communication Email</a>	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 present the results from sensitivity test modelling of the 'no widening scheme on M1' scenario.
03.08.22	LBC, CBC, NHDC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: discuss the POCG activities

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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	<u>Email Communication Email</u>	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.
14.09.22	LBC, CBC, HCC	Meeting – MS Teams	POCG meeting. Agenda: feedback from the statutory consultation and updates regarding GCG, and a briefing



Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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.
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

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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 Borough Council, St Albans City	Meeting – MS Teams	Air Quality TWG meeting. Agenda: methodology for future backgrounds used, update from the PEIR, and the sifting criteria for the selection of GCG monitoring locations and the

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
	and District Council, London Luton Airport Operations Limited		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	<a href="#">Email Communication Email</a>	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 which will be relevant and

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
			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

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
07.08.23	Suono on behalf of the Host Authorities	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
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
20.10.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access SOCG matters

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
30.10.23	CBC Conservation Officer	Email <u>Communication</u>	Email confirming agreement of updated CHMP
31.10.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss health and communities matters.
01.11.23	CBC Archaeologist	<u>Email Communication Email</u>	Email confirming agreement of updated CHMP
03.11.23	CBC, LBC, HCC, NHDC	Meeting – MS Teams	Design related matters
07.11.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Surface access SOCG matters
09.11.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Landscape and Visual matters
09.11.23	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss matters related to Green Controlled Growth
13.11.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Health and Communities matters
16.11.23	CBC, LBC	Meeting – MS Teams	East Luton development in regards to surface access SOCG matters
21.11.23	Suono on <u>B</u> behalf of the Host Authorities	Meeting – MS Teams	Noise topic specific meeting to discuss draft SoCG
23.11.23	LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Green Controlled Growth
24.11.23	CBC, LBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss the draft DCO and Section 106 Agreement.

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
05.12.23	CBC	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss matter related to Surface Access
<u>14.12.23</u>	<u>LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss Green Controlled Growth matters in the SoCG</u>
<u>03.01.24</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss outstanding air quality related matters in the SoCG</u>
<u>05.01.24</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>All topic roundtable meeting to discuss outstanding matters in the SoCG</u>
<u>10.01.24</u>	<u>LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss Green Controlled Growth matters in the SoCG</u>
<u>11.01.24</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Roundtable to discuss all outstanding matters in the SoCG</u>
<u>11.01.24</u>	<u>LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC, National Highways</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss outstanding comments on the <b>Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 7, Action 2 - Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling Final Report [AS-159]</b>.</u>
<u>12.01.24</u>	<u>LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss outstanding noise matters in the SoCG</u>
<u>12.01.24</u>	<u>LBC, CBC, HCC, NHDC, DBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the Section 106 agreement.</u>
<u>15.01.24</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the outstanding surface access matters in the SoCG, and the D7 submissions.</u>

Date	Attendees	Form of engagement	Details
<u>16.01.24</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the outstanding surface access matters in the SoCG, and the D7 submissions.</u>
<u>25.01.24</u>	<u>LBC, CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the Design matters in the SoCG.</u>
<u>26.01.24</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the outstanding surface access matters in the SoCG and the additional information submitted at D8.</u>
<u>05.02.24</u>	<u>CBC</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the outstanding surface access matters in the SoCG and the additional information submitted at Deadline 9.</u>