

February 2024

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination)

8.18 Statement of Common Ground between London Luton Airport Limited and Buckinghamshire Council (Tracked Change Version)

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.18

The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

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

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

Deadline:	Deadline 11
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/8.18
Author:	Luton Rising

Version	Date	Status of Version
Issue 1	September 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 2
Revision 1	October 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 3
Revision 2	December 2023	Additional Submission – Deadline 6
Revision 3	February 2024	Additional Deadline 11 Submission

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) Buckinghamshire Council.

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

Signature:

Name:

Position:

Date:

Signed on Behalf of Buckinghamshire Council

Signature:

Name:

Position:

Date:

Contents

	Page
1 Introduction and purpose	1
1.1 Purpose of Statement of Common Ground	1
1.2 Parties to this SoCG	2
1.3 Proposed Development description	2
2 Engagement with Buckinghamshire Council	4
2.1 Summary of engagement	4
3 Matters agreed, ongoing, or not agreed	7
3.1 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases	7
3.2 Surface Access	16
3.3 Noise and Vibration	40
3.4 Air Quality	47
3.5 Green Controlled Growth	54
3.6 Employment, Training and Skills	60
3.7 Economics and Employment	63
3.8 Landscape and Visual	64
3.9 Draft DCO	68 ⁶⁹
3.10 Airspace change	81
3.11 Health and Community	82 ⁸³
3.12 Section 106 agreement (s106)	88

Tables

Table 2-1: Engagement between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council

Table 3-1: Summary of matters between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council (BC)

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 Buckinghamshire Council in respect of the Proposed Development. In particular, this SoCG focuses on:
- a. Climate change and greenhouse gases
 - b. Surface access
 - c. Noise and vibration
 - d. Air quality
 - e. Green Controlled Growth
 - f. Employment Training and Skills
 - g. Economics and employment
 - h. Landscape and visual impact
 - i. Draft DCO
 - j. Airspace change
 - k. Health and Community
 - l. [Section 106 agreement](#)
- 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 Buckinghamshire Council is a neighbouring 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. Until April 2020, when Buckinghamshire Council was formed, the Applicant engaged with Buckinghamshire County Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council, and Chiltern District Council as neighbouring authorities.
- 1.2.3 Having reviewed the application documents and the Relevant Representations, the ExA requested on 13 July 2023 that the Applicant should seek to develop an SoCG with Buckinghamshire Council.
- 1.2.4 The Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council are collectively referred to in this SoCG as 'the parties'. The parties have been, and continue to be, in direct communication in respect of the Proposed Development.

1.3 Proposed Development description

- 1.3.1 The Proposed Development builds on the current operational airport with the construction of a new passenger terminal and additional aircraft stands to the north east of the runway. This will take the overall passenger capacity to 32 mppa¹. In addition to the above and to support the initial increase in demand,

¹ On 1 December 2021, the local planning authority (Luton Borough Council) resolved to grant permission for the current airport operator (LLAOL) to grow the airport up to 19 mppa, from its previous permitted cap of 18 mppa. However, the application was then called-in and referred to the Secretary of State for determination instead of being dealt with by the local planning authority, and an inquiry to consider the called-in application took place between Tuesday 27 September 2022 and Friday 18 November 2022. At the time the application for development consent was submitted, the outcome of the inquiry was still unknown and, therefore, all of the core assessment undertaken for the application used a "baseline" of 18 mppa. The application by LLAOL has however since been approved, with a joint decision to grant planning permission issued by the Secretary of State for Transport and Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities on 13 October 2023. In anticipation of this, the Applicant's environmental assessments included sensitivity analysis of the implications of the permitted cap increasing to 19 mppa. As a result, the Applicant believes that the environmental assessments are sufficiently representative of the likely significant effects of expansion, whether the baseline is 18 mppa or 19 mppa. Where the change of the baseline does affect an assessment

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;
- f. enhancement of the existing surface access network, including a new dual carriageway road accessed via a new junction on the existing New Airport Way (A1081) to the new passenger terminal along with the provision of forecourt and car parking facilities;
- g. extension of the Luton Direct Air to Rail Transit (Luton DART) with a station serving the new passenger terminal;
- h. landscape and ecological improvements, including the replacement of existing open space; and
- i. further infrastructure enhancements and initiatives to support the target of achieving zero emission ground operations by 2040², with interventions to support carbon neutrality being delivered sooner including facilities for greater public transport usage, improved thermal efficiency, electric vehicle charging, on-site energy generation and storage, new aircraft fuel pipeline connection and storage facilities and sustainable surface and foul water management installations.

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.

² This is a Government target, for which the precise definition will be subject to further consultation following the *Jet Zero Strategy*, and which will require further mitigations beyond those secured under the DCO.

2 ENGAGEMENT WITH BUCKINGHAMSHIRE 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 DCO application, is set out in full in the **Consultation Report [AS-048]**. As a statutory consultee, Buckinghamshire Council was consulted on the proposals as a neighbouring local authority in accordance with Section 42 of the Act and submitted a formal response to the statutory consultation carried out by the Applicant in 2022.
- 2.1.2 The parties continue to be in direct communication in respect of the Proposed Development.
- 2.1.3 This SoCG is based on a programme of consultation and ongoing engagement which are summarised in Table 2-1. This sets out the meetings and substantive correspondence that took place and the topics discussed. Matters under discussion are set out in section 3.

Table 2-1: Engagement between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council [\(BC\)](#)

Date	Form of correspondence	Details
18 March 2021	Greenhouse Gas and Climate change working group – meeting no 1.	Meeting to discuss GHG assessment on topics of methodology, assessing the significance of the effects and potential mitigation. The Jet Zero Strategy and Green Controlled Growth were also discussed.
04 November 2021	Climate change and greenhouse gas working group – meeting no 2	Preliminary findings of 2022 PEIR presented and update on Green Controlled Growth was provided and discussed.
04 April 2022	Email/letter	Response submitted to the 2022 Statutory Consultation
13 September 2022	Climate change and GHG working group – meeting no 3	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. Comments raised about some of the thresholds in the new likelihood and consequence criteria.
8 June 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss the DCO application, Buckinghamshire

Date	Form of correspondence	Details
		Council's BC's role in the DCO process, and key issues related to Highways & Passenger Transport, Noise, Air Quality, Climate Change and Sustainability.
2 August 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Landscape and Visual Impact, Climate Change and Sustainability, and Cultural Heritage.
3 August 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Transport, Air Quality, Economic Development, and Noise.
8 August 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Transport.
8 August 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss Airspace Change and Sustainable Aviation Fuels.
21 September 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting to discuss <u>the Outline</u> Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (<u>OTRIMMA</u>) and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF)
21 September 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's Landscape Architect to discuss landscape and visual impacts on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)
2 October 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's highway officers to discuss and progress surface access matters in the SoCG.
15 November 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's highway officers to discuss and progress surface access matters in the SoCG.
16 November 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's officers to discuss Green Controlled Growth and Noise
6 December 2023	Meeting – MS Teams	Meeting with BC's traffic and transport officers to discuss the <u>OTRIMMA</u> .
<u>12 December 2023</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting with BC's traffic and transport officers to discuss the surface access related matters in the SoCG.</u>
<u>15 January 2024</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting with BC to discuss the draft S106 agreement, in particular the ETS related sections.</u>
<u>15 January 2024</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting with BC's traffic and transport officers to discuss the surface access related matters in the SoCG, and the</u>

Date	Form of correspondence	Details
		<u>surface access documents submitted at Deadline 7.</u>
<u>17 January 2024</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the outstanding health and community matters in the SoCG.</u>
<u>29 January 2024</u>	<u>Meeting – MS Teams</u>	<u>Meeting to discuss the outstanding surface access matters in the SoCG.</u>

3 MATTERS AGREED, ONGOING, OR NOT AGREED

Table 3-1: Summary of matters between the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council ~~(BC)-(BC)~~

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.1 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases							
<u>3.1.1</u>	Sustainable Aviation Fuels – modelling scenarios	<p>BC considers that the Applicant places an unwarranted level of confidence in the introduction of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) and next generation aircraft.</p> <p>The Applicant should assess and account for, in a meaningful way, the probability of the delivery of hydrogen/Low Carbon aircraft and sufficient quantities of SAF being available in the future.</p> <p>Sensitivity analysis using uncertainty analysis should be undertaken to reflect the probability of realisation. Graphics should be updated to show this meaningfully and clearly e.g. apply uncertainty bars/probability bars to figures 12.1 and 12.2 of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12.</p> <p>Future legislative targets relating to the introduction of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAFs) and next generation aircraft are presented as “certainties” without accounting for probability of delivery.</p> <p>BC welcomes the acknowledgement by the Applicant that there is significant uncertainty. BC’s position regarding the need to model these uncertainties remains unchanged.</p> <p>BC does not accept that insufficient data is available; as a minimum, professional judgement should be used to apply uncertainty to the data in Fig. 12.4, e.g., a 40% slower development in each case and</p>	<p>Carbon emissions for aviation in the Environmental Statement (ES) are modelled on the Jet Zero Strategy (JZS) High Ambition scenario that represents current UK Government policy on aviation.</p> <p>As such, the assumptions that underpin this scenario are therefore assumed to be an appropriate basis on which to model future GHG emissions from the Proposed Development.</p> <p>There are numerous DCO and other planning application examples where future GHG emissions have assumed to be in line with Government Policy for example Bristol Airport aligns with the JZS and with the recently granted-awarded DCO for the A428 Black Cat to Caxton Gibbet is reliant on the government’s commitments set out in the Transport Decarbonisation Plan to decarbonise emissions from road transportation.</p> <p>The Climate Chapter 12 in of the ES [REP3-007APP-038] acknowledges that there is some uncertainty about the speed and mix at which the various technology options, including SAFs and next generation aircraft, will be implemented. The graph presented in Inset 12.4, on page 70, presents the contribution each GHG reduction option makes to overall reduction from aviation emissions. Given the acknowledgement around uncertainty, it is therefore possible to see the relative contributions that the use of SAFs, improvements in efficiencies, and the use of zero emission aircraft make according to the High Ambition Scenario presented in the JZS and to discount each mitigation</p>	<p>BC maintains that the Applicant places an unwarranted level of confidence in the introduction of Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) and next generation aircraft.</p> <p>BC welcomes the acknowledgement by the Applicant that there is significant uncertainty. BC’s position regarding the need to model these uncertainties remains unchanged.</p> <p>BC does not accept that insufficient data is available; as a minimum, professional judgement should be used to apply uncertainty to the data in Fig. 12.4, e.g., a 40% slower development in each case and subsequently to recalculate the carbon emissions that would result. This should also be fed into the GHG analysis and the modelling of cost of the carbon etc.</p> <p>By undertaking this exercise, the Applicant will also be able to demonstrate the impacts of the slower development in the decarbonisation of aviation. Where this could be the case, the slower development in SAF and next generation aircraft</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should generate scenarios reflecting different probabilities of SAF and next generation aircraft usage.</p> <p>Scenarios should be subject to sensitivity testing.</p>		<p>Ongoing <u>Not agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>subsequently to re-calculate the carbon emissions that would result. This should also be fed into the GHG analysis and the modelling of cost of the carbon etc.</u></p> <p><u>By undertaking this exercise, the Applicant will also be able to demonstrate the impacts of the slower development in the decarbonisation of aviation. Where this could be the case, the slower development in SAF and next generation aircraft would result in greater reliance on the UK Emissions Trading Scheme and CORSIA to offset the resulting GHG emissions from increased passenger number, as well as the BAU emissions. With the increased need for offsetting, this could impact on the Right to Fly at low-cost aspect put forward by the DCO, with the cost of offsetting passed through to the customer by airlines and potentially resulting in reduced passenger numbers due to affordability.</u></p>	<p>measure as necessary. But it is not possible, given the existing availability of modelling data, to apply quantitative estimates of uncertainty via the use of error bars or similar means.</p> <p><u>Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA)</u> works alongside other measures to offset CO₂ emissions that cannot be reduced through the use of technological improvements, operational improvements, and sustainable aviation fuels (SAFs) with emissions units from the carbon market. CORSIA aims to ensure that international aviation's net carbon emissions do not increase from 2020 levels. Participating airlines are required to monitor their emissions and report them to their respective national authorities. These authorities verify the reported emissions and ensure compliance with CORSIA regulations.</p> <p>Currently the scheme is voluntary and serves as a pilot phase. From 2027 onward, all eligible international flights will be required to offset their emissions above the baseline level.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider there to be any specific evidence on the production and take up of SAFs that could be modelled to provide a more 'meaningful way' of modelling emissions from aviation.</p> <p>It remains the Applicant's position that it is reasonable to assume that stated government policy, including on aviation decarbonisation as described in the Jet Zero Strategy, will be implemented in full in order for the UK to remain compliant with carbon budgets and net zero targets.</p> <p>The Applicant's position on sensitivity analysis remains as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [REP3-007APP-038], specifically paragraphs 12.9.17 to 12.9.19, Table 12.23 and Inset 12.3. The relative contributions to</p>	<p>would result in greater reliance on the UK Emissions Trading Scheme and CORSIA to offset the resulting GHG emissions from increased passenger number, as well as the BAU emissions. With the increased need for offsetting, this could impact on the Right to Fly at low-cost aspect put forward by the DCO, with the cost of offsetting passed through to the customer by airlines and potentially resulting in reduced passenger numbers due to affordability.</p> <p>BC's position on this matter remains unchanged.</p>			

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>decarbonisation of the aviation mitigation measures described in the <u>JZSet Zero Strategy</u> are shown graphically in Inset 12.4.</p> <p>It should be noted that the demand forecasts already take into account the costs of carbon, including the costs of <u>UK Emissions trading Scheme (UK ETS)</u> permits, CORSIA or of abatement as set out in the Need Case [AS-125], Section 6.3. Hence, the level of demand growth has already been moderated to reflect the higher future costs associated with meeting carbon reduction targets.</p>				
3.1.1 b	Sustainable Aviation Fuels – efficiency savings	<p>Historically, efficiency improvements are offset by increased use, see Jevons Paradox. Any efficiency gains in future and next generation aircraft are likely to be at least in part or totally offset by an increase in flying. For example, although jet engines are considerably more efficient than in the 1950s, they are also significantly larger and more powerful. Aircraft size is typically increased to accommodate more passengers thus negating the efficiency savings. This must be adequately accounted for and graphically displayed within the conclusions.</p> <p>In addition, “efficiency savings” are presented as pure gains. This has implications for the assessment of greenhouse gas emissions, air quality and noise generated by the Proposed Development. <u>BC disagrees that ‘efficiency savings’ should be presented as pure gains within assessment work.</u></p> <p><u>BC asserts that the Applicant should do the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Make explicit the sensitivity analyses conducted on UK ETS</u> 	<p>The Applicant recognises that greater efficiencies resulting from improvements in aircraft engines and airspace management could exert a downward pressure on costs that might lead to increased demand (via the Jevons Paradox noted). But this downward pressure will be more than countered by increased costs resulting from market-based measures such as the <u>UK Emissions Trading Scheme (UK ETS)</u> and the <u>Carbon Offsetting and Reduction Scheme for International Aviation (CORSIA)</u> as well as the higher costs associated with the use of SAFs and other new technologies.</p> <p>The JZS envisages that the costs associated with carbon or its abatement through the adoption of SAFS, or other new technologies are expected to increase the costs to airlines.</p> <p>The demand forecasts underpinning the Proposed Development have taken these higher costs, using the same assumptions as used in Jet Zero, into account, so reducing the level of demand growth projected. Ultimately, passenger demand cannot grow beyond the limits imposed by planning authorities, and overall aviation emissions from aviation at Luton Airport will be managed and capped by the UK ETS</p>	<p>BC disagrees that ‘efficiency savings’ should be presented as pure gains within assessment work.</p> <p>BC’s position remains unchanged—BC’s fundamental concerns have not been addressed.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should do the following:—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make explicit the sensitivity analyses conducted on UK ETS and CORSIA price development within its models. Show the effect of the above within an update to the GHG assessment TR020001/APP/5.01 [REP3-007]. Show also how the sensitivity analyses above accounts for failure of any or all of the JZS measures to come forward and show the effect upon both price and cumulative emissions of each or all of these measures not 		Not agreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>and CORSIA price development within its models.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Show the effect of the above within an update to the GHG assessment [REP3-007].</u> <u>Show also how the sensitivity analyses above accounts for failure of any or all of the JZS measures to come forward and show the effect upon both price and cumulative emissions of each or all of these measures not coming forward; Efficiency savings, SAF savings, Zero Emissions Aircraft (ZEA), savings (see Insert 12.4 within [REP3-007]).</u> <p><u>The above notwithstanding, BC considers that Table 12.23 within [REP3-007] should be extended to include sensitivity analyses upon Efficiency savings, SAF savings and ZEA savings not coming forward upon cumulative carbon emissions. The above must demonstrate beyond doubt that the Proposed Development is robust to the sensitivities inherent within future technological development and that they would not increase GHG emissions to the extent that future governments were unable to meet future carbon budgets.</u></p>	<p>within the European Economic Area, and CORSIA for all international aviation.</p> <p>The UK ETS sets an overall, scheme-wide cap on the amount of carbon which may be emitted by operators, including participating airlines. The available allowances place a cap on the total amount of GHG emissions that can be emitted by sectors, including aviation, covered by the UK ETS. This cap will be reduced over time stimulating innovation by participants to increase the carbon efficiency of their operations, or indeed to take steps which would reduce the overall scale of their operations. This effectively puts a binding cap on the amount of GHG emissions the aviation sector can emit. The UK government has made it clear that available allowances under the UK ETS will be aligned with the UK meeting the 6th <u>Sixth</u> Carbon Budget and later Carbon Budgets to net zero in 2050.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the inevitable uncertainty around the future cost of compliance with market-based mechanisms such as the UK ETS and CORSIA, and the incidental implications for passenger demand. The coverage of the UK ETS across multiple sectors including aviation means that any projections of future cost of carbon are subject to uncertainty, particularly in combination with the delivery of mitigation measures.</p> <p>Any attempt to model <u>the impact of</u> this uncertainty <u>on GHG emissions</u> via sensitivity analysis, involving so many different variables, can be of only very limited value to the planning process. The Applicant notes that while improved efficiency of the aviation sector can have an upward pressure on passenger demand, this is not only <u>countered by the impacts of carbon pricing which are fully accounted for with sensitivity tests of a range of carbon/abatement costs as set out within the Need Case [AS-125] and Need Case Appendix B [APP-214].</u></p>		<p>coming forward; Efficiency savings, SAF savings, Zero Emissions Aircraft, ZEA savings (see Insert 12.4 within TR020001/APP/5.01 [REP3-007]).</p> <p>The above notwithstanding, BC considers that Table 12.23 within TR020001/APP/5.01 [REP3-007] should be extended to include sensitivity analyses upon Efficiency savings, SAF savings and ZEA savings not coming forward upon cumulative carbon emissions. The above must demonstrate beyond doubt that the Proposed Development is robust to the sensitivities inherent within future technological development and that they would not increase GHG emissions to the extent that future governments were unable to meet future carbon budgets.</p>		

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>This ensures that the implications of any change in carbon pricing is accounted for in the demand forecasts, but also constrained by passenger limits imposed at an airport level.</p> <p>It remains the Applicant's position that the existing qualitative sensitivity analysis as presented in Table 12.23 of Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [REP3-007APP-038] provides sufficient context for the purposes of the DCO application <u>and having regard to the fact that GHG emissions from aircraft are a matter to be addressed at the national level principally.</u></p>				
3.1.1 c	Sustainable Aviation Fuels - forecasting	<p>As stated by BC in SoCG ID 3.1.1, the Applicant should be able to demonstrate the impacts of the slower developments in SAF and next generation aircraft.</p> <p>If this scenario occurred, it would result in a greater reliance on the UK Emissions Trading Scheme (UK ETS) and CORSIA to offset the resulting GHG emissions from increased passenger numbers, as well as existing BAU emissions. With the increased need for offsetting, this could impact on the right to fly at low-cost aspect put forward by the DCO, with the cost of offsetting passed through to the customer by airlines and potentially resulting in reduced passenger numbers due to affordability.</p> <p>The right to fly cheaply needs to be demonstrated as achievable even if these measures do not come forward, otherwise the need case is undermined.</p> <p>BC does not agree with the forecasting. BC asserts that the Applicant should generate scenarios reflecting different probabilities of</p>	<p>As part of the forecasting process, account has been taken of the costs of carbon abatement, i.e. the higher cost of SAFs or of electric or hydrogen aircraft consistent with the assumptions made by Government in JSZ as explained in the Need Case and Appendices [AS-125 and APP-213/214]. Efficiency savings such as from improved airspace design are also taken into account in the demand forecasts to ensure that the forecasts are robust. <u>The Applicant considers that any uncertainties as to the take up of SAFs or next generation aircraft usage are reflected in the range of carbon pricing assumptions used in deriving the forecast demand scenarios albeit that these cannot be directly related to specific assumptions about SAF take up, the price of SAF or the take up of new generation aircraft. The approach is consistent with that applied in the Government's Jet Zero Strategy modelling.</u></p> <p>The Applicant's position on sensitivity analysis remains as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [REP3-007APP-038], specifically paragraphs 12.9.17 to 12.9.19, Table 12.23 and Inset 12.3. The relative contributions to decarbonisation of the aviation mitigation</p>	<p>As stated by BC in SoCG ID 1, the Applicant should be able to demonstrate the impacts of the slower developments in SAF and next generation aircraft.</p> <p>If this scenario occurred, it would result in a greater reliance on the UK Emissions Trading Scheme (UK ETS) and CORSIA to offset the resulting GHG emissions from increased passenger numbers, as well as existing BAU emissions. With the increased need for offsetting, this could impact on the Right to Fly at low-cost aspect put forward by the DCO, with the cost of offsetting passed through to the customer by airlines and potentially resulting in reduced passenger numbers due to affordability.</p> <p>-</p> <p>The Right to Fly cheaply needs to be demonstrated</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should generate scenarios reflecting different probabilities of SAF and next generation aircraft usage.</p> <p>Scenarios should be subject to sensitivity testing.</p>		-Not agreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>SAF and next generation aircraft usage.</u></p> <p><u>Scenarios should be subject to sensitivity testing.</u></p> <p>[sub-divided subsequent to this iteration – SoCG ID 1]</p>	<p>measures described in the Jet Zero Strategy are shown graphically in Inset 12.4.</p>	<p>as achievable even if these measures do not come forward, otherwise the need case is undermined.</p> <p>BC does not agree with the forecasting.</p>			
<p><u>3.1.2</u></p>	<p>Forecasting – RCP</p>	<p>BC agrees with the use of 10%, 50% and 90% probability levels, leading to the selection of Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP) 8.5 from UKCP18, commensurate with a global temperature increase of approximately 4.3 degrees centigrade by 2100. This represents an appropriately conservative case to assess climate change resilience against.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>Unchanged.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>This was added to BC's Comments on Further Deadline 1 Submissions [REP1-038]</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>3.1.2 b</p>	<p>Decommissioning</p>	<p>It is noted that de-commissioning of the Proposed Development has been scoped out (para 9.3.18 of Chapter 9 of the Environmental ES Statement). BC recommend a Requirement of the DCO to ensure that a separate assessment is required for future de-commissioning.</p> <p><u>The Applicant should accept and draft a requirement for a separate assessment of climate change resilience with regards to future decommissioning of the site.</u></p> <p><u>The decommissioning of a development is an important component of its lifecycle. Consideration should be given to how the site will be used following the decommissioning of the airport, ensuring that the impacts of climate change projected for that time period are assessed and that strategies or</u></p>	<p>Decommissioning was scoped out of the ES entirely, not just the Climate Change Resilience assessment [APP,-035] and this was agreed by the Planning Inspectorate in the Scoping Opinion [APP-168]. The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to include any requirement for decommissioning to be subject to further assessment. It is considered that the airport, once operational, will be a permanently functional airport and that the site will not be undertaking activities that pose a long-term risk requiring detailed decommissioning plans or assessment. There are no foreseen elements of the airport which will become redundant during the lifespan of the Proposed Development. No shorter timescale decommissioning has been identified at the point of submission for development consent. Future decommissioning which arises after the consent of the Proposed Development will be subject to appropriate planning and assessment requirements.</p>	<p>Unchanged.</p>	<p>Not agreed – [The Applicant should accept and draft a requirement for a separate assessment of climate change resilience with regards to future decommissioning of the site.]</p> <p>-</p> <p>The decommissioning of a development is an important component of its lifecycle. Consideration should be given to how the site will be used following the decommissioning of the airport, ensuring</p>		<p>Not agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>actions are formed based on the projected outcomes.</u></p>			<p>that the impacts of climate change projected for that time period are assessed and that strategies or actions are formed based on the projected outcomes.</p>		
<p><u>3.1.3</u></p>	<p>Sensitivity analysis – mitigation measures tested</p>	<p>The Applicant should quantitatively assess the effect upon GHG emissions of the “Faster Growth Scenario” as set out in the (JZS), and should conduct sensitivity analyses with respect to the effects of the different technological development trajectories that are recognised within the JZS. This should include, as a minimum:</p> <p>a) What would be the effect upon cumulative emissions of annualised efficiency improvements that still meet the 2% over the whole period, but where the initial improvements are lower and made up for with accelerated development in the 2040s?</p> <p>b) What if sufficient feedstock is not available to supply the required levels of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF)?</p> <p>c) What would be the impact upon cumulative emissions if the zero emission aircraft do not develop at the anticipated rate?</p> <p><u>The Applicant implies that it is for the public and other interested parties to read off the data from the graph and assess the sensitivities themselves, which is hardly a reasonable approach. The Applicant, at ISH2 mentioned that a Monte Carlo simulation had been conducted on</u></p>	<p>The High Ambition Scenario considered in the JZS and Core Planning Case assessed and reported in Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [REP3-007] consider the national delivery of three key mitigation measure to reduce aviation emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel efficiency measures; • Sustainable aviation fuel; and • Zero emission aircraft. <p>The efficacy in of each of these measures in reducing emissions incrementally during assessment for the Proposed Development is shown in Inset 12.4: The incremental effect of JZS mitigation policies on <u>a</u>Aviation emissions of Chapter 12 of the ES [REP3-007]. Therefore, the aviation emissions should each of these measures not be delivered is also shown in Figure 12.4; which in effect provides a quantified sensitivity test should each of these measures not be delivered with the top line being aviation emissions without any of these measures, that is, the ‘worst case’; which it is understood is being requested. This is inherent to the Core Planning Case for GHG emissions from aviation and does not need to be included in the section on ‘sensitivity tests’ which is in response to the process and tests described in Chapter 5 of the ES [AS-075]. Therefore, <u>it</u> is not considered proportionate or appropriate to develop numerous combinations of each of these measures over various timescales and calculate the emissions.</p>	<p>BC does not agree with the position provided. The Applicant implies that it is for the public and other interested parties to read off the data from the graph and assess the sensitivities themselves, which is hardly a reasonable approach.</p> <p>The Applicant, at ISH2 mentioned that a Monte Carlo simulation had been conducted on carbon pricing, which can involve hundreds or even thousands of scenarios to be calculated. Yet for this case, even a single sensitivity analysis is being rejected.</p> <p>Whilst we agree that the assessment must be proportionate, the Applicant’s rejection of conducting any sensitivity analysis at all is not a position that we can understand or accept. Note also that the ExA specifically asked about sensitivity studies in ISH2, therefore this is clearly a matter of interest, not only for the BC.</p>	<p>Not agreed. Position is the same as pre-Deadline 3.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should quantitatively assess the effect upon GHG emissions of the “Faster Growth Scenario” as set out in the (JZS) and should conduct sensitivity analyses with respect to the effects of the different technological development trajectories that are recognised within the JZS. This should include, as a minimum:—</p> <p>a) What would be the effect upon cumulative emissions of annualised efficiency improvements that still meet the 2% over the whole period, but where the initial improvements are lower and made up for with accelerated</p>		<p>Not agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>carbon pricing, which can involve hundreds or even thousands of scenarios to be calculated. Yet for this case, even a single sensitivity analysis is being rejected.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant’s position on sensitivity analysis remains as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [REP3-007APP-038], specifically paragraphs 12.9.17 to 12.9.19, Table 12.23 and Inset 12.3. The relative contributions to decarbonisation of the aviation mitigation measures described in the Jet Zero Strategy are shown graphically in Inset 12.4.</p>		<p>development in the 2040s?—</p> <p>b) What if sufficient feedstock is not available to supply the required levels of Sustainable Aviation Fuel (SAF)?—</p> <p>e) What would be the impact upon cumulative emissions if the zero-emission aircraft do not develop at the anticipated rate?—</p>		
3.1.3 b	Sensitivity analysis – application of guidance	<p><u>BC is not suggesting that national policy mitigation measures, such as the Jet Zero Strategy (JZS) are excluded from scenarios. What we are requesting is for sensitivity analysis to be applied to the JZS High Ambition scenario, providing evidence that steps have been taken to look at this in detail, rather than assume that what is demonstrated in this scenario will happen come 2050.</u></p> <p><u>BC do not disagree that the IEMA guidance highlighted by the Applicant has been followed correctly, only that greater depth of modelling and analysis needs to be undertaken to ensure that a range of possible emissions pathways are demonstrated. The above will also provide a view on the impact that offsetting schemes will need to meet the Net Zero Targets, as well as demonstrate the financial impact on the airline industry and potentially passenger numbers if costs are</u></p>	<p>The assessment of significance of these quantified emissions follows the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment (IEMA) Guide: Assessing Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Evaluating their Significance, 2nd Edition, February 2022. Key to defining significance in this guidance is the degree to which a project mitigates emissions with respect to “applicable existing and emerging policy requirements and good practice design standards for projects of this type”. Given that the JZS, and the mitigation measures in it and considered above, are national policy that can be delivered, and not hindered, by the Proposed Development they are considered embedded in the Proposed Development, not additional. Therefore, further assigning of significance to any scenarios where these national policy mitigation measures are not delivered is not considered appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant’s position on sensitivity analysis remains as presented in Chapter 12 Greenhouse Gases of the ES [REP3-007APP-038], specifically paragraphs 12.9.17 to 12.9.19, Table 12.23 and Inset</p>	<p>BC is not suggesting that national policy mitigation measures, such as the Jet Zero Strategy (JZS) are excluded from scenarios. What we are requesting is for sensitivity analysis to be applied to the JZS High Ambition scenario, providing evidence that steps have been taken to look at this in detail, rather than assume that what is demonstrated in this scenario will happen come 2050.</p> <p>BC do not disagree that the IEMA guidance highlighted by the Applicant has not been followed correctly, only that greater depth of modelling and analysis needs to be undertaken to ensure that a range of possible emissions pathways are demonstrated. The</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC directs the Applicant to the resolution suggested for SoCG ID 3.1.2. The Applicant should generate scenarios reflecting different probabilities of SAF and next-generation aircraft usage.</p> <p>Scenarios should be subject to sensitivity testing.</p>		Not agreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>passed through, potentially reducing the requirement for the expansion of Luton Airport.</p> <p>The area of uncertainty is clearly covered in the IEMA guidance, which states that:</p> <p>“Uncertainty can be considered by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing upper and lower limits; • Testing for different inclusions and exclusions; (p.13)”. <p>As stated by the Applicant in SoCG ID 1, there is uncertainty with regards to the future fleet mix and how it will develop, therefore this should be tested to establish the potential range of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from aviation and not rely only on the JZS High Scenario.</p> <p>It is for the Applicant to demonstrate that the Proposed Development does not hinder the delivery of national policy. The sensitivity studies are necessary to show that this is the case and the Applicant has so far failed to do this. N/A</p>	<p>12.3. The relative contributions to decarbonisation of the aviation mitigation measures described in the Jet Zero Strategy are shown graphically in Inset 12.4.</p>	<p>above will also provide a view on the impact that offsetting schemes will need to meet the Net Zero Targets, as well as demonstrate the financial impact on the airline industry and potentially passenger numbers if costs are passed through, potentially reducing the requirement for the expansion of Luton Airport.</p> <p>The area of uncertainty is clearly covered in the IEMA guidance, which states that:</p> <p>“Uncertainty can be considered by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testing upper and lower limits; • Testing for different inclusions and exclusions; (p.13)”. <p>As stated by the Applicant in SoCG ID 1, there is uncertainty with regards to the future fleet mix and how it will develop, therefore this should be tested to establish the potential range of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from aviation and not rely only on the JZS High Scenario.</p> <p>It is for the Applicant to demonstrate that the Proposed Development does not hinder the delivery of national policy. The sensitivity studies are necessary to show that this is the case and the Applicant has so far failed to do this.</p>			

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.2 Surface Access							
3.2.1	Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – primary vehicular access to Airport	BC accepts that the M1 motorway will provide the primary vehicular access to the airport.	<p>The Applicant welcomes and agrees with BC's comment. The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p>	<p>Unchanged. BC agrees that the majority of the traffic will be served by the M1.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Initial meeting between Buckinghamshire Council BC and the Applicant on 2 August 2023.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
3.2.1 b	Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – methodology of preferential vehicular route through Buckinghamshire	<p>However, there is a large catchment area to the west of the airport that is not well served by the motorway network and therefore the local road network will continue to provide preferential routes across Buckinghamshire. It is these areas that the Highway Authority seeks to ensure are not impacted in an unacceptable manner as a result of this DCO.</p> <p>BC has received sufficient information from the Applicant that demonstrates that the impacts are below a level that requires mitigation. BC has confidence in the modelling outputs within Buckinghamshire now that validation has taken place within the County.</p> <p>BC maintains that the B488 is the most appropriate route for traffic using the western long-distance commuting route, and has undertaken surveys on the B489 to support its position, and obtain baseline traffic flows on the route. It is now agreed that BC are satisfied</p>	<p>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p> <p>Further and extensive data including early morning flows (5am to 7am) that was requested by BC was reported in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 – Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070]</p> <p>The B489 Traffic Modelling Note, submitted at Deadline 6, shows the relative change in airport trips.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>	<p>BC has maintained since its Written Representation [REP1-042] paragraph 2.2.6 that the demonstrated long distance commuting route uses the Buckinghamshire network via the B489. The intensification in use of this is shown within the applicants Trip Distribution Plans [REP4-048REP1-019].</p> <p>It is not yet agreed that the impacts on the Buckinghamshire network are not significant. BC is yet to receive sufficient information from the Applicant that demonstrates that the impacts are below a level that requires mitigation. From the evidence before BC at present it is not possible to have BC has confidence in the modelling outputs within</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should do the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engage with BC to present the work that it has undertaken to support its position. 2. Should the Applicant require access to the count data obtained by BC, a request should be made. 3. Demonstrate that the modelled flows on the B489 are representative of the actual flows on that route. 4. Provide a numerical assessment of the additional development traffic 	<p>Meeting on 15.01.2024 15 January 2024</p>	<p>OngoingAA greeed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>that the model validates well enough for the matters of the B489 to be considered using the model and the existing screenlines following review of the B489 note against BC's survey data.</u></p>		<p>Buckinghamshire now that as no-validation has taken place within the County.</p> <p>BC maintains that the B488 is the most appropriate route for traffic using the western long-distance commuting route, and has undertaken surveys on the B489 to support its position, and obtain baseline traffic flows on the route.</p>	<p>expected to use the B489.</p> <p>All information was requested well in advance of D6 to allow proper review of the information. <u>None - resolved</u></p>		
<p><u>3.2.1 c</u></p>	<p><u>Impact of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – morning flows</u></p>	<p><u>It is not agreed that the impacts of morning flows on the Buckinghamshire network are not significant.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant is of the view that the impacts of morning flows on the Buckinghamshire network are not significant. Further and extensive data on the redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development, including early morning flows (5am to 7am), that was requested by BC was reported in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 - Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070].</u></p>	<p><u>It is not agreed that the impacts of morning flows on the Buckinghamshire network are not significant.</u></p>		<p><u>x</u></p>	<p><u>Not agreed</u></p>
<p>3.2.1 c</p>	<p>Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – Aylesbury</p>	<p>It is also recognised that the highway network in Aylesbury acts as a route hub for all directions and is therefore very sensitive to congestion and small changes in traffic have a significant impact on the performance of the network.</p> <p><u>BC are satisfied that sufficient information has been provided regarding the way in which Temprow has been applied for the Aylesbury area.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p> <p><u>The Applicant will explained that growth within Buckinghamshire area was directly tied up to DfT projects as included in NTEM v7.2 and agreed with BC to summarise the information and share it with BC. This was</u></p>	<p>As stated in 3.2.1b, BC has not been provided evidence that the Applicant has considered the impacts of the development adequately through the modelling process within Aylesbury.</p> <p>BC highlighted in the PADSS [AS-053] that the modelling did not clearly set out how growth in Aylesbury has been taken into account, given the sensitivities of Aylesbury to minor disruptions to the network.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>None – resolved <u>BC requires a document to be provided showing how growth in Aylesbury has been accounted for within the model.</u></p> <p>This can be a summary of information already provided.</p>	<p><u>Meeting on 15.01.2024 15 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>shared directly with BC on 11th December 2023.</p> <p>shared what is included in TEMPro, including a list of NTEM7.2 assumptions, and what major developments are included around Aylesbury, at Deadline 6.</p>				
3.2.1d (1)	<p><u>Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – re-prioritisation works on the B488/B489</u></p>	<p><u>The villages of Pitstone, Marsworth and Ivinghoe are also sensitive to traffic changes, noting they are situated on a direct route to the airport.</u></p> <p><u>BC seeks agreement from the Applicant for highway mitigation works at the junction of the B488 and B489 in Ivinghoe to change the junction priority, as required by Policy TRA2 of the 'made' Ivinghoe Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2033. It is acknowledged that the projected peak hour traffic in this area is expected to be low, but BCthe Council considers that this is a major route from Buckinghamshire and Dacorum to the Airport, and the sensitivity of the network in this area is such that small changes would have unacceptable impacts. The continuous nature of the traffic profile is therefore sufficient to justify this mitigation.</u></p> <p><u>BC has maintained since its Written Representation [REP1-042] paragraph 2.2.6 that the demonstrated long distance commuting route uses the Buckinghamshire network via the B489. The intensification in use of this is shown within the applicants Trip Distribution Plans [REP5-0374-048] and therefore mitigation should be provided.</u></p> <p><u>BC has data that has been obtained from ATC surveys commissioned</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</u></p> <p><u>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206]. As such, the Applicant does not believe it necessary or appropriate to utilise BC's survey data.</u></p> <p><u>This junction was not identified as requiring mitigation following a comprehensive Transport Assessment.</u></p>	<p><u>BC has maintained since its Written Representation [REP1-042] paragraph 2.2.6 that the demonstrated long distance commuting route uses the Buckinghamshire network via the B489. The intensification in use of this is shown within the applicants Trip Distribution Plans [REP4-048] and therefore mitigation should be provided.</u></p> <p><u>BC has data that has been obtained from ATC surveys commissioned after ISH4 and can be shared with the Applicant (on request) to assist this position.</u></p>	<p><u>BC asserts that route re-prioritisation works at the B488/B489 junction should be included as Off-Site highway works within the DCO.</u></p>	<p><u>Meeting on the 15/01/2024</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Not agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>after ISH4 and can be shared with the Applicant (on request) to assist this position.</u></p> <p><u>BC asserts that route re-prioritisation works at the B488/B489 junction should be included as Off-Site highway works within the DCO.</u></p>					
3.2.1 d	Impacts of airport traffic on Buckinghamshire communities – rural villages on B488/B489	<p>Additionally, the villages of Pitstone, Marsworth and Ivinghoe are also sensitive to traffic changes, noting they are situated on a direct route to the airport. Additionally,</p> <p>BC seeks agreement from the Applicant for highway mitigation works at the junction of the B488 and B489 in Ivinghoe to change the junction priority, as required by Policy TRA2 of the 'made' Ivinghoe Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2033. It is acknowledged that the projected peak hour traffic in this area is expected to be low, but the Council considers that this is a major route from Buckinghamshire and Dacorum to the Airport, and the sensitivity of the network in this area is such that small changes would have unacceptable impacts. The continuous nature of the traffic profile is therefore sufficient to justify this mitigation.</p> <p>The Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) for the strategic modelling identifies this as a long distance commuting route and therefore intensification of use of the route is to be expected. It is also noted that based on the information that has been presented to the Council to date, the Applicant is indicating that in the region of an additional 30 movements are expected within the</p>	<p>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p> <p>This junction was not identified as requiring mitigation following a comprehensive Transport Assessment. Any proposed mitigation at this junction is the responsibility of the local highway authority.</p> <p>The Strategic Model CBLTM-LTN has been calibrated and validated as per the DfT's TAG guidance. Moreover, the model is considered fit for purpose by all Host Authorities and National Highways.</p> <p>Within Appendix E of the LMVR, several route choice validation analyses were reported, including to and from the airport, and "long distance".</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to liaise with Buckinghamshire County Council on any concerns. However, it is advised that the Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report, Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201] should be considered, as it includes an extensive level of outputs such as traffic flows, link volume to capacity ratios, nodes delays and routing analysis.</p>	<p>Following discussions with the applicant BC accept that remains of the view that the strategic modelling has is not been demonstrated to be suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire. (See 3.2.1.b).</p> <p>BC has confidence in the modelling outputs within Buckinghamshire now that validation has taken place within the County.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment Appendices – Part 2 of 3 [APP-201] contains figures showing additional local plan growth, and it is noted that no local plan growth is considered within Buckinghamshire, and there is no forecast growth presented for the Buckinghamshire area.</p> <p>BC maintains that in the absence of any detailed analysis of the B489 route and the concerns raised with the modelling suitability then mitigation is required to protect the route of concern. BC considers that the information provided within the Deadline 1 submission</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that route re-prioritisation works at the B488/B489 junction should be included as Off-Site highway works within the DCO.</p> <p>None – resolved BC wishes a specific requirement/commitment.</p> <p>Regarding traffic impacts due to trip generation along the A41, B489 and B488, the Council requires the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details of link flows for the base year and future years with and without development for the B489, B488 and A41. Select link analysis of development traffic only for the B489, B488 and A41 links. 	<p><u>BC comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p><u>Agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>peak hour periods. This would indicate to the Council that this route requires further assessment in order to fully understand the impacts of the Proposed Development, noting the Council BC does not consider the strategic model to be fit for assessment purposes within Buckinghamshire at present. The Council BC at present cannot consider this figure to be reliable due to the outstanding work required to demonstrate that the strategic model can be relied upon.</p> <p><u>Following discussions with the Applicant BC accept that the strategic modelling and the Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) is demonstrated to be suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire. (See 3.2.1.b).</u></p> <p><u>BC has confidence in the modelling outputs within Buckinghamshire now that validation has taken place within the County.</u></p> <p>The Council considers it necessary to have continued engagement with the Applicant in order to address the concerns regarding the assessment within the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205 and APP-206] and reach an agreement for mitigation on this route to protect the sensitive locations on the B489. The Council reserves its position on the final mitigation measures that may be required to address the impacts on traffic within Buckinghamshire.</p>	<p>This should help provide Buckinghamshire County Council with a more detailed insight into the areas of interest.</p> <p>The Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report, Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201] has an extensive level of outputs reported such as traffic flows, link volume to capacity ratios, nodes delays, select link and routing analysis. Moreover, the recently submitted daily airport passenger and staff trip distribution, which was requested by the Examining Authority, adds to the list of outputs.</p> <p>Based on the forecast and impact assessment, the Applicant considers the impact on the mentioned areas to not be significant. This is primarily due to the low level of airport demands travelling to and from Buckinghamshire and/or using its local road network.</p> <p><u>Whilst the Applicant is willing to continue engagement with Buckinghamshire Council, the Applicant does not consider the volumes of generated traffic associated with the airport expansion sufficient to justify mitigation measures.</u></p> <p><u>At Deadline 4 tThe Applicant submitted the has issued (for D4), Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination), 8.99 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 6: Traffic on B489 Link [REP4-087].</u></p> <p><u>At Deadline 6, Further and extensive data that was requested by BC was reported in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 - Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070]. This also includes the trip distribution of the early hours as requested.</u></p> <p>The Applicant will provide BC with trip distribution information for the early morning</p>	<p>8.30 Trip Distribution Plans [REP4-048] shows that there will be intensification of use of the route and therefore mitigation should be provided.</p> <p><u>BC has data that has been obtained from ATC surveys commissioned after ISH4 and can be shared with the Applicant (on request) to assist this position.</u></p>	<p>• <u>Reassessment of the A41/B489/B488 route using the updated and validated traffic model.</u></p> <p><u>Matters that BC needs to be explored include junction re-prioritisation at the B488/B489 junction, modal conflict, traffic speeds and safety for all users.</u></p> <p><u>BC wishes to be consulted on the findings of the updated modelling work and discussions regarding mitigation and/or enhancement works along the whole of this route.</u></p> <p><u>BC is willing to meet with the Applicant to progress these matters. However, that meeting was requested to take place prior to Deadline 6.</u></p>		

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>period (5am to 7am), including data assumptions, particularly for Marsworth, Pitstone, and Ivinghoe. As agreed with BC, further engagement will be held around this matter.</p> <p>The Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (OTRIMMA) [TR020001/APP/8.97]REP8-043REP5-041REP4-085] and the Sustainable Transport Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119] provides further information on how traffic impacts will be mitigated, including how residual impacts – such as those on the Ivinghoe Junction – may be mitigated.</p> <p>The Applicant will provide information on how BC can have sight of the S106 process, to inform a side agreement with BC on monitoring and mitigation.</p> <p>The Applicant will review Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination), 8.99 Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 4 Action 6: Traffic on B489 Link for greater detail on trip distribution and the Outline Transport Related Impacts Monitoring and Mitigation Approach (OTRIMMA) [REP5-041REP4-085]. The Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 - Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070] provides further information. The B489 Traffic Modelling Note, submitted at Deadline 6, provides further information.</p>				
3.2.2	Technical Concerns with Strategic Model	<p>Following discussions with the Applicant BC accept that the strategic modelling is demonstrated to be suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire. The Council does not consider that the validation and calibration of the strategic model is of an adequate standard within Buckinghamshire to provide certainty</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that it has confidence in the modelling outputs. The Strategic Model GBLTM-LTN has been calibrated and validated as per the DfT's TAG guidance. Moreover, the model is considered fit for purpose by all Host Authorities and National Highways. The level of detail in the model's geographical coverage was agreed with Host Authorities and National Highways, and was informed</p>	<p>Following discussions with the applicant BC accept that the strategic modelling is demonstrated to be suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire. As set out in the above sections, BC has not been party to the engagement afforded to the host</p>	<p>None – resolvedNot agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request access to BC's survey data or carry out 	<p>Meeting on 15.01.202415 January 2024</p>	<p>Ongoing Agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>of the traffic impacts within the county.</p> <p>Without the certainty of the quality of the modelling as an assessment tool, the exact nature of the impacts within Buckinghamshire cannot be quantified by the Applicant or the Council, and the Council is unable to agree that the assessment methodology is suitable or appropriate in this location.</p>	<p>by observed Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) data on the distribution of airport passengers / staff.</p> <p>As set out within the Strategic Modelling Model Specification Report, Appendix B of the Transport Assessment [APP-200], the model is originally based on the CBLTM, following which a more enhanced version was developed to add more network and zoning details within the core area of influence.</p> <p>Areas within Buckinghamshire were included within the model simulation area, although the level of detail decreases the further the distance from the airport. Several routing validation analyses were reported in the model LMVR, including east-west routes.</p> <p>The Applicant has reviewed the case using the survey data offered received from by BC. It would not be appropriate to incorporate the data into the strategic modelling, as the survey data is from 2023, and the strategic model's base year is 2016. The Applicant welcomes BC to undertake their own comparative analysis and are happy to discuss this further. This is further considered in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 - Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070] B489 Traffic Modelling Note, submitted at Deadline 6. will consider how the survey data offered by BC could be incorporated into the strategic modelling.</p>	<p>authorities. As yet the Applicant has not collaboratively sought to address the concerns raised by BC regarding the application of the traffic modelling to the BC highway network.</p> <p>BC has obtained data to be able to undertake an exercise of confirmation of the quality of the model for the key links within Buckinghamshire of concern in the absence of the Applicant offering any additional information.</p> <p>The routing analysis published by the Applicant in the Trip Distribution Plans [REP5-037] shows that the Buckinghamshire network is affected by the development traffic, and therefore BC considers that this should have been comprehensively assessed, recognising that the Applicant's conclusions to date used an area of the model that was remote from the validation screen lines.</p>	<p>surveys of the B489.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrange a presentation of the technical note to BC officers for review for both the base line and development traffic. <p>All information has <u>was been requested</u> in advance of D6 to allow other specialists to assess the impacts of the development traffic on their fields.</p>		
<p><u>3.2.3</u></p>	<p>Traffic impacts within Buckinghamshire – input data for the Traffic modelling</p>	<p><u>Following discussions with the Applicant, information on how NTEM v7.2 has been included in the modelling, and the submission of the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 - Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070], BC accept that the strategic modelling is demonstrated to be suitable for</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that it accepts that the strategic modelling is suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire. The Strategic Modelling Forecasting Report, Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201], has an extensive level of outputs reported.</u></p> <p>Based on the forecast and impact assessment, the impact on the mentioned</p>	<p><u>Following discussions with the applicant, information on how NTEM v7.2 has been included in the modelling, and the submission of the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 - Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070] BC accept that</u></p>	<p><u>None – resolved</u> Not agreed.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should provide a technical note containing the previously requested information;</p>	<p><u>Meeting on 15 January 2024 15.01.2024</u></p>	<p>Ongoing <u>Agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire.</u></p> <p>BC are satisfied that the modelling quality is suitable for the areas of concern within Buckinghamshire. The Council requires the following to address the certainty of the traffic impacts within Buckinghamshire, and therefore enable the Council to have confidence in the nature of the traffic impacts of the Scheme within the county:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journey time data to confirm the model's appropriateness for the purposes of assessing development proposals within Buckinghamshire. • Calibration and validation data to confirm the model's appropriateness for the purposes of assessing development proposals within Buckinghamshire. • Confirmation that long stay survey data was included in the Civil Aviation Authority <u>CAA</u> trip rate data. • A Forecasting Report that confirms how growth has been calculated and applied within the model to ensure that growth within Buckinghamshire has been taken into account appropriately. • An updated Local Model Validation Report (LMVR) that addresses the above. 	<p>areas were considered not significant. This is primarily due to the low level of airport demands travelling to and from Buckinghamshire and/or using its local road network.</p> <p>It is not intended by the Applicant to utilise the local road network for material supplies, however it is expected that the origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p> <p>The Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 – Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070]. The B489 Traffic Modelling Note, submitted at Deadline 6, provides further information. The Applicant explained that growth within Buckinghamshire area was directly tied up to DfT projects as included in NTEM v7.2 and agreed with BC to summarise the information and share it with BC, which was shared directly with BC on 14th December 2023.</p>	<p><u>the strategic modelling is demonstrated to be suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire.</u> Unchanged – BC maintains that the requested input data is required for inclusion in re-running of the traffic modelling by the Applicant, once it has been validated in accordance with the suggested resolution to point 3.2.2.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journey time data to confirm the model's appropriateness for the purposes of assessing development proposals within Buckinghamshire. • Calibration and validation data to confirm the model's appropriateness for the purposes of assessing development proposals within Buckinghamshire. • Confirmation that long stay survey data was included in the Civil Aviation Authority <u>CAA</u> trip rate data. • A Forecasting Report that confirms how growth has been calculated and applied within the model to ensure that growth within Buckinghamshire has been taken into account appropriately. <p>This information was requested prior to D6 to allow full and comprehensive review by all specialists impacted.</p>		

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.2.4	Airport Transport Forum (ATF) representation	<p>BC welcome the fact that two of the five objectives for the Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] relate to improving public transport mode share, and that there is a focus on bus and coach access specifically. BC note that there is an Airport Transport Forum AETF which includes many local Councils. BC accepted on 29th September 2023 an invitation to partake in the ATF as a member.</p> <p><u>BC has identified suitable participants for the ATF meetings.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to working with local stakeholders to improve sustainable transport options including public transport. The 5-yearly Travel Plans will monitor airport travel against the agreed targets and any <u>mitigation measures</u> required will be subject to consultation before implementation on potential initiatives to improve the sustainable mode share and meet targets.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges that BC accepted on 29 September 2023 an invitation to partake in the ATF; the Applicant will work with BC and other ATF members to deliver any necessary <u>mitigationsustainable transport measures</u>.</p>	Unchanged	Agreed—BC has identified suitable participants for the ATF meetings.	Meeting with BC on 3 August 2023	Agreed
3.2.5	Local bus routes in Buckinghamshire – route 61	<p><u>BC welcomes the increase in the size of the STF and considers that it now has sufficient funds available to support the range of measures intended.</u></p> <p><u>BC has reviewed the Bus and Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122REP8-032REP5-058], and welcome the inclusion of the route X61 service, but consider the proposed three-hourly frequency of the X61 service to be insufficient to provide a level of service suitable for use by commuters or passengers to the airport.</u></p> <p><u>However, BC welcome the update to the Bus & Coach Study at Deadline 8 to include an hourly X61 service for discussion in the ATF Steering Group, for the inclusion of the service in future Travel Plans.</u></p> <p><u>BC would like to secure the restoration of a local bus route (service 61) connecting Luton and Aylesbury via the communities of Eaton Bray, Edlesborough, Pitstone, Ivinghoe, Marsworth and</u></p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to working with bus operators to support measures for further improving sustainable transport within the area.</p> <p>Improvements to the public transport network are not entirely within the gift of the Applicant and require discussion and negotiation with third parties. In the future, the airport operator will work closely with bus service operators through the Airport Transport Forum AFT and development of future Travel Plans, which will set out measures to improve services in order to meet future mode share Targets.</p> <p><u>The Bus and Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122REP8-032REP5-XXX058 TR020001/APP/8.122], submitted at Deadline 5, identified bus service 61 as a route to be prioritised for implementation. This may be confirmed for funding through processes outlined in the Sustainable Transport Fund (Sustainable Travel FundTF) [TR020001/APP/8.119REP5-056 TR020001/APP/8.119], involving following consultation with the ATF Steering Group, and</u></p> <p><u>The increase in the value of the fund and the introduction of the opportunity to</u></p>	<p>BC acknowledges that it now has a seat at the ATF, and this is considered to be progress towards ensuring that Buckinghamshire residents needs will be heard.</p> <p>STF</p> <p>BC have reviewed the Bus & Coach Study [REP5-058], and welcome the inclusion of the route X61 service, but consider the proposed three-hourly frequency of the X61 service to be insufficient to provide a level of service suitable for use by commuters or passengers to the airport. However, BC welcome the update to the Bus & Coach Study at D8 to include an hourly X61 service for discussion in the ATF Steering Group, for the inclusion of the service in future travel plans. BC continues to be concerned</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with BC public transport team regarding supporting of extended bus routes. Seek to remove barriers to operators being able to access the airport. <p>Demonstrate that a funding mechanism is in place to support the establishment of services. None resolved</p>	Meeting on 15 January 2024	OngoingAgreed Ongoing

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>Cheddington. For the majority of northern Buckinghamshire, Luton Airport will be primarily a destination for leisure/holiday trips. However, it is also a major employer in the region, with this likely to be especially notable in villages close to the border with Central Bedfordshire and Luton Borough Councils. This local bus service should run hourly rather than every 90 minutes and have its operational hours extended as dictated by the operational needs of the airport. A Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) service may also be able to meet the connectivity needs of these communities.</p> <p>The number 61 local service will incorporate a greater number of stops and offer a lower cost alternative to the private car and high speed bus service for local trips and staff commuting to the airport.</p>	<p><u>pump prime interventions -has been subsequently added to increase stakeholder confidence in the fund and its ability to achieve the ambitious targets to be set out in future Travel Plans. Further information on the Sustainable Transport fund STF is within the updated Sustainable Travel Fund TF document Topic Paper [TR020001/APP/8.119REP5-056] and draft Ss106 agreement. The Bus and Coach Study presents undetailed potential services that may be included in future Travel Plans. Any detail around routes and timetabling are not yet confirmed. Any potential intervention for sustainable transport funding should be submitted to the ATF and the ATF Steering Group</u> and following serving of the notice to grow under article 44 off the draft DCO (dDCO) [REP9-003], to and will be considered in Bus and Coach Market Study REP8-032REP8-XXX]. All spending decisions regarding the STF will be made by the ATF Steering Group.</p> <p><u>Further information on the STF, regarding how funding may be brought forward to pump prime bus and coach services, will be provided at Deadline 7 in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 10 – Sustainable Transport Fund Sustainable Travel Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119]. [REP7-042].</u></p> <p><u>The Bus and Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122REP8-032REP8-XXX] has been updated to identify the X61 route operating at least hourly for discussion by the ATF Steering Group.</u></p>	<p>that the Applicant has not presented any evidence that the suggested funding is sufficient to support the bus services required.</p> <p>BC remains of the position that this service is required in order to fulfil the Applicant's stated aims of connecting the local workforce to the airport, as well as addressing air quality, economic benefits and health and well-being in the area.</p> <p>Without certainty that services will be provided BC considers it unlikely that it will be possible to secure mode shift effectively.</p> <p>BC to share its review of the Bus & Coach Study [REP5-058TR020001/APP/8.122] and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056TR020001/APP/8.119] before providing an updated position - this is within BC's Deadline 6 submissions.</p>			
3.2.6	Strategic bus services in Buckinghamshire	<p><u>BC acknowledges that it now has a seat at the ATF, and this is considered to be progress towards ensuring that Buckinghamshire residents needs will be heard.</u></p> <p><u>BC remains of the position that this high speed service between</u></p>	<p>The Applicant is committed to working with bus operators to support measures for further improving sustainable transport within the area.</p> <p>Improvements to the public transport network are not entirely within the gift of the Applicant and require discussion and</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that it now has a seat at the ATF, and this is considered to be progress towards ensuring that Buckinghamshire residents needs will be heard.</p>	<p><u>None - resolved</u> Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with BC public transport 	<p><u>Meeting on 15 January 2024</u></p>	<p>Ongoing Agreed Ongoing</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>Aylesbury and London Luton Airport is required in order to fulfil the Applicant's stated aims of connecting the local workforce and passengers to the airport, as well as addressing air quality, economic benefits and health and wellbeing in the area.</u></p> <p><u>This service is required to provide a viable public transport option for those approaching from the west of the airport.</u></p> <p><u>BC welcome the update to the Bus and Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122] that identifies this high speed route for discussion in the ATF Steering Group, for inclusion in future travel plans. BC would like to secure a more strategic express service to Aylesbury and points further west. This would address the existing lack of long-distance fast bus services connecting east and west, or locations within Buckinghamshire with Luton Airport or the M1 corridor and the East Coast mainline, without a requirement to use London interchanges. The express service should be secured explicitly within the Surface Access Strategy as well as detailed within the Travel Plans.</u></p> <p><u>This high speed bus will provide a real alternative to the private car on the basis of it offering a high quality, high frequency, high speed service from Aylesbury.</u></p>	<p>negotiation with third parties. In the future, the airport operator will work closely with bus service operators through the <u>Airport Transport Forum AFT</u> and development of future Travel Plans, which will set out measures to improve services in order to meet future mode share Targets.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted the Bus & Coach Study [REP8-032TR020001/APP/8.122REP5-058TR020001/APP/8.122] at Deadline 5, updated at Deadlines 8 and 10, which provides more information on bus service provision. The</p> <p><u>Further information on the STF, regarding how funding may be brought forward to pump prime bus and coach services is outlined in the (Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 10 – Sustainable Transportvel Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119]. Sustainable Transport Fund [REP7-0429-045].) (draft Section 106 Agreement [TR020001/APP/8.167REP7-074]) was</u></p> <p><u>The Bus and Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122REP8-032REP8-XXX] has been updated to identify the high speed high-speed route between Aylesbury and London Luton Airport for discussion by the ATF Steering Group. Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that it is content with the arrangements for discussions in the ATF Steering Group.</u></p>	<p>STFss</p> <p><u>BC continues to be concerned that the Applicant has not presented any evidence that the funding being suggested is sufficient to support the bus services required.</u></p> <p><u>BC remains of the position that this high speed service between Aylesbury and London Luton Airport service is required in order to fulfil the Applicant's stated aims of connecting the local workforce and passengers to the airport, as well as addressing air quality, economic benefits and health and wellbeing in the area.</u></p> <p><u>Without certainty that services will be provided, BC considers it unlikely that it will be possible to secure mode shift effectively.</u></p> <p><u>This service is required to provide a viable public transport option for those approaching from the west of the airport.</u></p> <p><u>BC welcome the update to the Bus & Coach Study that identifies this high speed route for discussion in the ATF Steering Group, for inclusion in future travel plans. BC to share its review of the Bus & Coach Study [REP5-058TR020001/APP/8.122] and Sustainable Transport</u></p>	<p><u>team regarding supporting of extended bus routes.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Seek to remove barriers to operators being able to access the airport.</u> <u>Demonstrate that a funding mechanism is in place to support the establishment of services.</u> 		

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.2.7	Sustainable Transport Fund – mechanism for identifying eligible projects and funds	<p><u>BC welcomes the increase in the value of the STF and the ability to make £1 million available for forward funding.</u> The Council has been informed that there is to be a Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) created, however, there are currently no clearly defined parameters set for establishing the value of that fund. If the STF is not sufficient to support the services across all parts of the highway network needed to support sustainable transport to serve the Scheme it shall not be able to make the provisions necessary to make the application acceptable. On this basis, the Council considers that there is no certainty that any public transport provision can be secured, nor is there clarity around the process for assessing need and benefit.</p> <p>The Council requests clarify as to how the STF will be calculated.</p>	<p>Following the submission of the application for development consent, the Applicant has developed the Sustainable Transport Fund (Sustainable Transport Fund) [TR020001/APP/8.119REP5-056TR020001/APP/8.119] to be used to fund measures identified within the Framework Travel Plan Framework Travel Plan (FTP) [REP84-02444][AS-131]. The Bus and Coach Study [TR020001/APP/8.122REP8-032REP5-058TR020001/APP/8.122] identified six bus and coach interventions to be prioritised, which would be funded through the STF if agreed for implementation through the ATF Steering Group.</p> <p><u>Further information on the STF, regarding how funding may be brought forward to pump prime bus and coach services (Applicant's response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 10 – Sustainable Transport Fund [REP7-042]), and information on the S106 agreement (draft Section 106 Agreement [REP7-074]), was provided at Deadline 7.</u></p> <p><u>£1 million of the fund will be made available at the beginning of the Proposed Development to allow the pump priming of services. See the Sustainable Transport Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119REP7-042]TR020001/APP/8.167.</u></p> <p><u>Further information on the STF, regarding how funding may be brought forward to pump prime bus and coach services, and information on the S106 agreement, will be provided at Deadline 7.</u></p>	<p>The Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044] Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] does not reference the funding mechanisms that are proposed to be implemented or the value and timing or availability of those funds.</p> <p><u>BC have reviewed the Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056] and are concerned it has not been set based on any form of calculation of the costs of the required interventions set out in the Bus & Coach Study [REP5-058].</u></p> <p><u>BC are also concerned about the availability of funds in the early years of the Proposed Development. BC are aware that the Applicant is considering this and await further information.</u></p> <p><u>In order for BC to be satisfied that the STF mechanism can achieve its objectives, the Applicant needs to set out the full remit and parameters of the STF, when the monies will become available and who will be the decision makers to determine where that money shall be spent.</u></p> <p><u>BC to share its review of the Bus & Coach Study [REP5-</u></p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should provide a document outlining the fund value, greater detail on when it shall be made available and a full description of the proposed governance of the overseeing body.</p> <p>The documents shall be required to address any lags in funding to ensure that they are available at the correct time to facilitate the measures required in a timely manner.</p>	<p><u>BC comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the Council as the proposals are developed, including the size of the fund, the parameters for prioritising measures to be funded by the STF and the legal mechanisms for securing the fund.</p>	<p>058TR020001/APP/8.122] and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056TR020001/APP/8.119] before providing an updated position – this is within BC’s Deadline 6 submissions.</p>			
<p><u>3.2.8</u></p>	<p>Sustainable Transport Fund – benchmarking of funding</p>	<p><u>BC welcomes the changes in the STF wording, and therefore the ability to administer the funds more freely. Whilst some uncertainty remains, BC is willing to agree at this stage that the fund is available and able to meet its objectives. The Council considers it necessary for the STF to be established on the basis of a robust and locationally specific assessment of Luton Airport and its surrounding areas, rather than benchmarking from other airports within the UK, as has been presented as the Applicant’s proposed approach.</u></p> <p>The Council requests certainty of mode shift, linked to specific targets and hold points and embedded in the Sustainable Transport Fund <u>STF</u>.</p>	<p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC’s confirmation that it agrees with the STF funding and that it is able to meet its objectives. Benchmarking was one component of the approach taken. The Applicant has been progressing and developing more detail around bus and coach routes 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.</u></p> <p>These improvements are being developed in tandem with a STF that will set the framework around how these types of improvements, alongside the others listed out within the toolbox of measures within the Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044] Framework Travel Plan [AS-131], would be funded. The Applicant will continue to engage with the Council as the proposals are developed.</p> <p>£1 million of the fund will be made available at the beginning of the Proposed Development to allow the pump priming of services. See Applicant’s response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 10 – Sustainable Transport Fund [REP7-042] and the draft Section 106 Agreement [REP7-074] for further information. XXXX Further information on the STF, regarding how funding may be brought forward to pump prime bus and coach</p>	<p>The Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044] Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] does not provide BC with any additional information regarding the funds to be made available for the STF, or the timing or the availability of those monies. It is stated that the toolbox of measures would be funded, however it also states that not all measures will be needed. It is therefore unclear which measures would be delivered and who would be the decision maker as to which measures are required.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should set out clearly which measures they intend to deliver and how those measures are to be funded.</p>	<p><u>BC comments on SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>services, and information on the S106 agreement, will be provided at Deadline 7.</p>				
<p>3.2.9</p>	<p>Sustainable Transport Fund - governance</p>	<p>BC are satisfied that the dDCOs106 suitably captures the requirements of the STF. The Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044 AS-131] is required to be updated to provide certainty of governance of the Sustainable Transport Fund STF.</p>	<p>At Deadline 10 the Applicant took the decision for the STF to be secured via the dDCO rather than the Section 106 Agreement as previously proposed. All of the requirements relating the STF that were captured via the terms of the Draft Section 106 Agreement are now captured via the STF document itself, which in turn is to be secured via requirement 32 of the Deadline 10 version of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01]. The Sustainable Transport Fund (Sustainable Transport Fund [REP5-056TR020001/APP/8.119]) was submitted at Deadline 55. Further information on the STF, regarding details of the S106 agreement and its headline Terms of Reference, will be provided at Deadline 7. The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that the s106 captures the requirements of the STF.</p>	<p>Unchanged. BC await information on the headline Terms of Reference of the S106 agreement. BC to share its review of the Bus & Coach Study [REP5-058TR020001/APP/8.122] and Sustainable Transport Fund (STF) [REP5-056TR020001/APP/8.119] before providing an updated position – this is within BC's Deadline 6 submissions.</p>	<p>Ongoing. BC asserted that the Applicant should supply an updated copy of the STF sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 for all Interested Parties to have time to provide meaningful comment and for issues to be resolved.</p>	<p>BC comments on SoCG on 24 January 2024</p>	<p>Ongoing/Agreed</p>
<p>3.2.10</p>	<p>Construction traffic – primary route network</p>	<p>BC welcome the prioritisation of movements of construction traffic via the Primary Route Network and acknowledge that the majority of spoil movements are unlikely to pass through Buckinghamshire. <u>The Council also welcome the forming of the TMWG and would emphasise the importance of it being a member, specifically given its role as consultee in discharging requirements 14 and 15.</u> <u>The inclusion of the Council as a consultee on Requirements 14 and 15 and the Applicant's confirmation that the Deadline 11 CTMP will reflect BC's invitation to be a member of the TMWG means that this matter is now agreed.</u></p>	<p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [TR020001/APP/8.97] has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (Appendix 18.3 of the ES REP6-009APP-130). This includes a proposal for a Traffic Management Working Group to be formed as a forum for stakeholder engagement during construction (refer to Section 3 of the Outline CTMP). A detailed CTMP, substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP, will be prepared and submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority following approval of the DCO. This is secured by Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO (dDCO) [TR020001/APP/2.01 REP5-003AS-067AS-005]. <u>The Applicant invites Buckinghamshire Council to be a member of the TMWG, as</u></p>	<p>Unchanged.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>BC comments on the SoCG on 3 November 2023 Application Index [AS-003]</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>confirmed in the updated CTMP submitted at Deadline 11 [TR020001/APP/5.02].</p>				
3.2.1 0b	Construction traffic – use of local road network	<p>The CouncilBC notes that sections of the Major Road Network which may be affected include routes through Buckinghamshire (e.g. A41 via Hemel Hempstead or A418 via Leighton Buzzard). A robust Construction Traffic Management Plan will be required, which should include measures that protect rural routes from impacts and BC are happy to work with the Applicant to develop this.</p> <p>BC considers it necessary to be a part of the Traffic Management Working Group (TMWG) or a required consultee of the TMWG to ensure that local routes in Buckinghamshire are not adversely impacted by construction traffic.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm if Buckinghamshire sites are required for construction materials to be sourced from. - If construction trips are required from Buckinghamshire, BC should be part of the TMWG. - If construction trips are not required to begin or end in Buckinghamshire, BC should be a named consultee of the TMG. <p>The inclusion of the Council as a consultee on Requirements 14 and 15 and the Applicant’s confirmation that the Deadline 11 CTMP will reflect BC’s invitation to be a</p>	<p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [TR020001/APP/8.97] has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (Appendix 18.3 of the ES [REP6-009APP-130]). This includes a proposal for a Traffic Management Working Group to be formed as a forum for stakeholder engagement during construction (refer to Section 3 of the Outline CTMP). A detailed CTMP, substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP, will be prepared and submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority following approval of the DCO. This is secured by Requirement 134 of the draft DCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5A003S-067AS-005].</p> <p>It is not currently with the design not mature enough it is not possible to clearly fully identify what materials are to be used and where they will be sourced from, so the Applicant is therefore unable to confirm what sites, if any, in Buckinghamshire material will be sourced from used. However when the design is at a much more mature stage and materials to be used and sources where these materials are procured are identified, the CTMP will be updated accordingly and consultations will be made with the council.BCThe Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p> <p>The version of the draft DCO, submitted at Deadline 9 [REP9-030], now was updated to explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (requirements R14 and R15).</p>	<p>BC considers it necessary to be a part of the Traffic Management Working Group (TMWG) or a required consultee of the Traffic Management Group TMWG to ensure that local routes in Buckinghamshire are not adversely impacted by construction traffic.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <p>Confirm if Buckinghamshire sites are required for construction materials to be sourced from.</p> <p>If construction trips are required from Buckinghamshire, BC should be part of the TMWG.</p> <p>If construction trips are not required to begin or end in Buckinghamshire, BC should be a named consultee of the TMG.</p>	<p>xMeeting on <u>29 January 2024</u></p>	<p>OngoingAgreedOngoingAgreed.</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>member of the TMWG means that this matter is now agreed.</u></p>	<p>BC are a consultee on the discharge of Requirements 14 and 15, and the Applicant invites Buckinghamshire Council to be a member of the TMWG. The CTMP has been updated to reflect this and submitted at Deadline 11 [TR020001/APP/5.02]. More assurance about being consulted – applicants to investigate whether the wording be accepted – consultee to CTMP and CTWP</p> <p>TOR are in the OTRIMMA –> check work in the CTMP-</p>				
3.2.1 0c	Construction traffic – CTMP controls	<p>The CTMP is silent on protections for the Buckinghamshire network from freight operations and lacks detail on freight routing strategy.</p> <p>Without strong provision within the CTMP, the Council BC does not have confidence that there will be suitable control of potential impacts from freight operations in respect of the Buckinghamshire transport network. The Council BC seeks to secure consultation on these documents where they affect Buckinghamshire’s network and residents, and the ability to require changes and/or clarifications and controls within the management strategies be included within the documents.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some of this detail will not be available until a contractor is involved. It may be possible for the Applicant to set stipulations within the CTMP of things that will not be permissible, and this could include certain stipulations regarding the Bucks transport network. This needs to be explored further.</p> <p><u>Should suppliers be based in Buckinghamshire they will be operating under existing permission,</u></p>	<p>An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [TR020001/APP/8.97] has been prepared and submitted as part of the application for development consent (Appendix 18.3 of the ES [REP6-009APP-130]). This includes a proposal for a Traffic Management Working Group to be formed as a forum for stakeholder engagement during construction (refer to Section 3 of the Outline CTMP). A detailed CTMP, substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP, will be prepared and submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority following approval of the DCO. This is secured by Requirement 134 of the Draft dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003AS-067AS-005].</p> <p>Detailed measures to manage construction traffic impacts would be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), which would be developed in detail by the appointed contractor during the detailed design stage, and must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan CTMP [TR020001/APP/8.97][REP6-009APP-130].</p> <p>It is expected that origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have</p>	<p>Please see the response to 3.2.10b. It remains BC’s concern that until it is known where construction trips are expected to originate or terminate it is not possible to conclude this position.</p> <p>Should suppliers be based in Buckinghamshire they will be operating under existing permission, however routes may not be suitable for large numbers of trips by certain vehicles, and so BC require involvement to ensure that management strategies are in place to protect routes and communities on any affected routes.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should agree to the requirements set out in 3.2.10b.</p> <p>BC request involvement in the CTMP and for the Applicant to establish a mechanism for this.</p>	<p><u>Meeting on 29 January 2024x</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreedOngoingAgreed.</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>however routes may not be suitable for large numbers of trips by certain vehicles, and so BC require involvement to ensure that management strategies are in place to protect routes and communities on any affected routes.</u></p> <p><u>BC asserts that the Applicant should agree to the requirements set out in 3.2.10b.</u></p> <p><u>BC request involvement in the CTMP and for the Applicant to establish a mechanism for this.</u></p> <p><u>The inclusion of the Council as a consultee on Requirements 14 and 15 and the Applicant's confirmation that the Deadline 11 CTMP will reflect BC's invitation to be a member of the TMWG means that this matter is now agreed.</u></p>	<p>existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p> <p>The CTMP outlines the formation of a traffic management working group (TMWG) as a forum for stakeholder engagement prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development. The TMWG would seek representation from the lead contractor, the local highway authorities, and National Highways.</p> <p>The Applicant will consider whether construction impacts can be included in the ATF Steering Group governance processes, or if it would be appropriate to involve BC in the CTMP process.</p> <p><u>The version of the draft DCO, submitted at Deadline 9 [REP9-003], was updated to explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (requirements 14 and 15).</u></p> <p><u>BC are a consultee on the discharge of Requirements 14 and 15, and the Applicant invites Buckinghamshire Council to be a member of the TMWG. The CTMP has been updated to reflect this and submitted at Deadline 11 [TR020001/APP/5.02]. The draft DCO, submitted at D9, now explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (R14 and R15). As above</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</u></p>				
3.2.1 0d	Construction traffic – CTMP and <u>Code of</u>	<u>The Council</u> BC considers the B488 to be wholly inappropriate for any HGV movements associated with construction of the airport expansion	Detailed measures to manage construction traffic impacts would be set out in the <u>Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</u> , which would be developed in detail	<u>The B489 falls within the Ivinghoe HGV strategy area and therefore is required to</u>	<u>Ongoing.</u> <u>The CTMP framework needs to be updated</u>	<u>Meeting on 29 January 2024</u>	<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u> <u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	<p><u>Construction Practice (CoCP) – compliance to BC Freight Strategy</u></p>	<p>and so should feature as an excluded route within the Code of Construction Practice CoCP [REP6-00348-013-011APP-049]. This would accord with the Council's BC's Freight Strategy.</p> <p><u>The B489 falls within the Ivinghoe HGV strategy area and therefore is required to be protected from airport construction traffic.</u></p> <p><u>To do this the Applicant should use an HGV management system, similar to those undertaken for HS2 and East West Rail. These systems provide certainty that sensitive locations are protected from impacts and require the schemes to use approved routes only.</u></p> <p><u>The CTMP framework needs to be updated to reflect measures by which the full CTMP shall protect those areas identified by BC policy as sensitive.</u></p> <p><u>The inclusion of a requirement on the lead contractor to use an HGV management system, and the inclusion of BC as a consultee on the CTMP means that this matter can be agreed.</u></p> <p><u>The inclusion of the Council as a consultee on Requirements 14 and 15 and the Applicant's confirmation that the Deadline 11 CTMP will reflect BC's invitation to be a member of the TMWG means that this matter is now agreed.</u></p>	<p>by the appointed contractor during the detailed design stage, and must be substantially in accordance with the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan CTMP (Appendix 18.3 of the ES [TR020001/APP/8.979 [REP6-009APP-430].</p> <p>It is not intended by the Applicant to utilise the local road network for material supplies however it is expected that the origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p> <p><u>To protect sensitive roadways within the local and greater areas, such as the B488, the contractor will be required to utilise a HGV management system that aligns with the logistics policies as agreed within the development team and with the Local authorities. This management system will be secured in the final CTMP, as stated in the Outline CTMP (Appendix 18.3 of the ES [TR020001/APP/8.9709-]. The measures may include the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Provide the HGV drivers information packs through the contractor/supplier, this pack would contain routes to take during that specific construction phase including locations of site entrances, the presence of cycle and pedestrian infrastructure within the vicinity of the construction site/compound and local congestion points and periods.</u> <u>The logistics routes will include acceptable highways/intersections and will delineate prohibited travel routes. The use of prohibited travel routes will be penalised and my result in "red card" banned from delivery and/or supply of services to site.</u> <u>All Site deliveries will be electronically managed with delivery slots allocated</u> 	<p>be protected from airport construction traffic.</p> <p>To do this the Applicant should use an HGV management system, similar to those undertaken for HS2 and East West Rail. These systems provide certainty that sensitive locations are protected from impacts and require the schemes to use approved routes only.</p>	<p>to reflect measures by which the full CTMP shall protect those areas identified by BC policy as sensitive.</p>		

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p><u>to each load. As such all scheduled deliveries will be timed to cause minimum disruption to the highway and avoid peak travel times (including school runs etc.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Periodic inspections of vehicle travel routes will be taken on by the contractor to ensure travel is maintained within the accepted HGV delivery routes. All reviews will be available for local authority's inspection by request.</u> <p><u>The version of the draft DCO, submitted at Deadline 9 [REP9-003], was updated to explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (requirements 14 and 15). The draft DCO, submitted at D9, now explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (R14 and R15). As above</u></p>				
3.2.11	Impacts of operational HGV movements on Buckinghamshire	<p>For post-build movements, BC note that the increase in HGVs (rising from 133 currently to a projected 2043 figure of 268) is unlikely to impact upon local roads in Buckinghamshire. A large proportion of the projected HGV flows appear to serve the extended passenger terminal facilities – these do not identify Buckinghamshire as being a generator of these movements, but BC would welcome clarification of this.</p> <p>BC is seeking clarity on how HGV movement will be</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that the forecast increase in HGVs would be minimal on the Buckinghamshire local road network, with negligible traffic originating in Buckinghamshire. <u>The Framework Travel Plan [REP8-024] states that future travel plans may explore opportunities to increase the efficiency of goods vehicles trips and consolidation of servicing movements, which can be discussed with BC through the ATF Steering Group. However, at this stage before the Proposed Development begins the Applicant is not willing to restrict HGV movements relating to the supply chain of the airport's operations to exclude Buckinghamshire.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant appears to have misunderstood the nature of this point. This does not relate to the CTMP but rather operational movements.</p> <p>It is stated that the increase would be minimal. BC considers that this is in principle acceptable. However, a protection should be made that should an operational trip generator create a number of movements over a threshold (i.e. 19/day) a routing</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <p>Undertake a commitment to secure routing agreements with suppliers serving the airport with more than</p>	<p><u>Meeting on 29 January 2024x</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing</u> <u>Agreed</u> <u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not</u> <u>Agreed.</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>controlled/excluded from the BC highway network.</p> <p><u>BC asserts that the Applicant should undertake a commitment to secure routing agreements with suppliers serving the airport with more than 10 HGVs a day.</u></p>	<p>However, more information would be provided within the detailed CTMP which will be prepared and submitted for approval by the relevant local planning authority following approval of the DCO. This is secured by Requirement 1434 of the Draft dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003AS-067AS-005]. Further engagement can also be arranged once that document detailed CTMP has been prepared.</p> <p>It is not predicted that an operational trip generator will create a number of movements over 19 journeys a day outside of the areas predicted, however if this were to potentially arise, the contractor would endeavour to form a routing agreement and gain consent from the relevant authority (Local or Highways) prior to commencement of the piece of work through which the HGVs would be required to pass. The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p> <p>The version of the draft DCO, submitted at Deadline 9, was updated to explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (requirements 14 and 15). The draft DCO, submitted at D9, now explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (R14 and R15). As above</p>	<p>agreement should be secured with consultation with the Local Highway Authorities through which these HGVs would be required to pass.</p>	<p>10 HGVs a day.</p>		
<p><u>3.2.12</u></p>	<p>Construction Traffic – modal share and</p>	<p>Regarding construction traffic movements, the CouncilBC requires the following:</p>	<p>Detailed construction impacts would be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (as secured by Requirement 1434 of the dDCOdraft Development</p>	<p>BC appreciates that the Applicant is not yet in a position to provide the clarity sought regarding the</p>	<p>Ongoing. BC asserts that the Applicant should ensure that BC is</p>	<p><u>Meeting on 29 January 2024</u></p>	<p>Ongoing <u>Agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	worker movements	<p>• Consultation on the further development of the CTMP, which should incorporate specific targets for each mode to expand on the current division between sustainable and unsustainable modes. <u>'Unsustainable' modes should be disaggregated into types, with associated data.</u></p> <p>• The Outline Construction Workers Travel Plan ([REP8-018 APP-131]) is required to be updated to show how the Buckinghamshire network is to be affected; and this should be tested within the updated traffic modelling as appropriate.</p> <p><u>BC appreciates that the Applicant is not yet in a position to provide the clarity sought regarding the movement of construction workers.</u></p> <p><u>Notwithstanding this, BC views the CTMP as a document that could potentially provide some parameters to control potential impacts from construction worker movements. BC is therefore keen to be kept informed of updates to the CTMP and given the opportunity to have a meaningful influence upon them.</u></p> <p><u>BC asserts that the Applicant should ensure that BC is afforded the opportunity to review the updated CTMP prior to its finalisation. It is suggested that this could be part of the discussions undertaken through the ATF.</u></p> <p><u>This matter can now be considered agreed as BC have been included as a consultee on Requirements 14 and 15.</u></p>	<p>Consent Order DCO [TR020001/APP/2.01 REP5-0033-003], which would be developed in detail by the appointed contractor during the detailed design stage and must be substantially in accordance with the <u>Outline CTMP [TR020001/APP/8.97] Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan CTMP [REP6-009 APP-130]</u>. It is expected that origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p> <p>ffected</p> <p>The version of the draft DCO, submitted at Deadline 9 dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01], haswa been updated to explicitly state that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following this will require consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (requirements 14 and 15). The draft DCO, submitted at D9, now explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (R14 and R15). As above</p>	<p>movement of construction workers.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, BC views the CTMP as a document that could potentially provide some parameters to control potential impacts from construction worker movements. BC is therefore keen to be kept informed of updates to the CTMP and given the opportunity to have a meaningful influence upon them.</p>	<p>afforded the opportunity to review the updated CTMP prior to its finalisation. It is suggested that this could be part of the discussions undertaken through the ATF, noting that the Applicant intends to provide the Terms of Reference for the ATF at Deadline 5.</p>		
3.2 .13	Traffic modelling	<p><u>Following discussions with the applicant BC accept that the strategic modelling is demonstrated</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that the traffic modelling has been demonstrated to be useful. The Applicant</u></p>	<p><u>Following discussions with the applicant BC accept that the strategic modelling is</u></p>	Not agreed.	<u>BC comments on</u>	<u>Agreed/Not agreed</u>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	methodology	<p>to be suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire. The full potential impacts of any change in the traffic modelling data (in line with the request of the Examining Authority in their letters dated 16th May 2023 and 13 June 2023) are not fully known in respect of the following matters: traffic and transport, noise and air quality. In addition, the growth of Aylesbury is not currently accurately represented within the analysis for the DCO.</p> <p>BC are satisfied that the model validates well enough for the matters of the B489 to be considered using the model and the existing screenlines following review of the B489 note against BC's survey data.</p> <p>BC would like to reach agreement with the Applicant as to the appropriate methodology if the traffic modelling data is not re-based. Accurate representation of Aylesbury within the LMVR is also requested.</p>	<p>agreed the approach to modelling with officers at relevant highway authorities including LBC and National Highways. The approach is consistent with that adopted for the 2019 statutory consultation and no material concerns on the approach were raised at the time. The base models have been developed, calibrated and validated in compliance with TAG guidance with 2016 and 2017 base years. The modelling approach has been agreed with the relevant local and national highway authorities and the base validated model reflected operational conditions at the time.</p> <p>Future baseline models have taken account of the changes in demand and mode share as the airport grows in both the Do Minimum and Do Something scenarios. The future year projections of airport passenger demands and mode split take account of GAA data and trends. Comprehensive analysis and assessment of the surface access effects and impacts is provided within the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206] and the Surface Access Strategy [APP-228] and associated Appendices which set out the Local Model Validation Report and Forecasting Note.</p> <p>It is the view of the Applicant that the effects and impact of the scheme that forms part of the application for development consent has been robustly tested and assessed and this has been subject to numerous pre-application discussions with the Host Authorities and their appointed consultants.</p> <p>Further information is provided in the Covid 19 Additional Modelling Technical Note 1 [REP4-086][TR020001/APP/8.98] and Traffic on B489 Link [REP4-087][TR020001/APP/8.99] Technical Notes.</p>	<p>demonstrated to be suitable for detailed assessment within Buckinghamshire. The Applicant has not agreed the modelling with BC officers, and has not engaged with BC regarding the modelling.</p> <p>The Applicant has not made any effort to confirm with BC if the model can be demonstrated to be suitably used for routes within Buckinghamshire.</p>	<p>BC asserts that the Applicant should engage with BC and agree the validation within Buckinghamshire, with particular reference to the B489. <u>None - agreed</u></p>	<p>SoCG on 24 January 2024</p>	

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.2 .14	Scope of transport assessments	<p>BC request to know if any transport assessments have been undertaken which suggest that the airport is or will be a regular attractor of trips from the south of Buckinghamshire, in particular Chesham, Amersham or High Wycombe, for which public transport access is also unavailable.</p> <p><u>BC is content to accept that subject to the supply of distribution information of a satisfactory quality this matter can be considered closed.</u></p> <p><u>It is maintained that the assessment in this area is less than the standard that BC would expect, however it is also accepted that in practical terms mitigation would be unlikely to be justified to these locations. BC does however consider that this places a greater responsibility on the Applicant to ensure that provisions are made where they can be, such as to two public transport services that BC has identified. BC request further information is provided with regards to the scope of the transport assessment and implications for south Buckinghamshire.</u></p>	<p>See response to 3.2.1. Any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203 to APP-206].</p>	<p>BC is content to accept that subject to the supply of distribution information of a satisfactory quality this matter can be considered closed.</p> <p>It is maintained that the assessment in this area is less than the standard that BC would expect, however it is also accepted that in practical terms mitigation would be unlikely to be justified to these locations. BC does however consider that this places a greater responsibility on the Applicant to ensure that provisions are made where they can be, such as to two public transport services that BC has identified.</p>	<p>Agreed—closed.</p>	<p><u>Transport Assessment – Part 1 of 4 [APP-203], Transport Assessment Part 3 of 4 [APP-205].</u> <u>BC comments on SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p>Agreed – no longer applicable.</p>
3.2 .15	Glint and glare assessment	<p><u>BC has reviewed the Glint and Glare Assessment [REP4-040AS-146] and is satisfied that there are no likely adverse impacts on highways in Buckinghamshire. BC await the receipt of the glint and glare assessment to understand if there are any likely impacts upon highway safety as a result of glint and glare.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC’s confirmation that it is satisfied that there are no likely adverse impacts on highways in Buckinghamshire. A Glint and Glare Assessment [AS-146] was submitted to PINS on 9 August.</u></p>	<p>BC has reviewed the Glint and Glare Assessment [AS-146]</p> <p>BC is satisfied that there are no likely adverse impacts on highways in Buckinghamshire.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>[BC comments on SoCG on 24 January 2024 Glint and Glare Assessment [AS-146 (now superseded by REP4-040)]</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.2 .16	Rule 9 Covid Modelling	<p><u>BC has received sufficient information from the Applicant that demonstrates that the impacts are below a level that requires mitigation. BC has confidence in the modelling outputs within Buckinghamshire now that validation has taken place within the County. BC remain as of the above positions and await the results of the additional modelling work and remain that the Council's position is reserved.</u></p> <p><u>BC are satisfied that the model validates well enough for the matters of the B489 to be considered using the model and the existing screenlines following review of the B489 note against BC's survey data.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that the modelling has been demonstrated to be suitable. In May 2023 the Examining Authority requested the Applicant to review the transport modelling undertaken for the DCO in light of DfT interim advice, dated April 2023, regarding the treatment of the COVID-19 pandemic in transport modelling. The ExA stated it "has made a Procedural Decision to request that the Applicant reviews its transport modelling considering the recently published guidance. The ExA also requests that the Applicant engages with stakeholders, including National Highways and the Local Highway Authorities, at the earliest possible opportunity with a view to gaining agreement as to the appropriate methodology if the model is not re-based." The proposed approach set forward by the Applicant considers the size and complexity of the strategic transport model and the timescale for the DCO examination though will include (1) analysis of recent local and national trends in travel demand (2) updating the future year forecasts using the latest DfT projections case scenario (NTEM8 & NRTP22) and (3) an assessment of the risks associated with the updated forecasts and determination of any necessary adjustment factors that may arise from the analysis of recent trends. The VISSIM model will follow a similar approach to the base year update and the forecasts will update committed developments and take growth from the strategic model as an input. For the M1 motorway and Vauxhall Way – the M1 motorway approach, considering the Governments pause of 'smart motorways' will (1) retain the motorway widening as a core scenario and for the Demand Scenario 2043 (32mppa) assume Phase 2 J10 improvements. For Vauxhall Way dualling was assumed to be delivered by LBC by 2027, this delivery is now expected in 2028</u></p>	<p><u>BC has received sufficient information from the Applicant that demonstrates that the impacts are below a level that requires mitigation. BC has confidence in the modelling outputs within Buckinghamshire now that validation has taken place within the County. BC remains of the position that until the modelling work has been completed that it is unable to conclude this matter. The model has not been validated well within Buckinghamshire. As has been stated in previous documents and through ISH4. Validation is required within Buckinghamshire to confirm that the model results are reliable within Buckinghamshire.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p><u>BC asserts that the Applicant should provide calibration information within Buckinghamshire, and provide BC with modelling results well in advance of D6. None – resolved</u></p>	<p><u>BC comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>and so the revised modelling will remove dualling from the 2027 modelling scenario.</p> <p>The Applicant has reported on the Rule 9 modelling update results in Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 2 – Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling Final Report [AS-159], which was submitted on 15th December.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>				
3.3 Noise and Vibration							
<p><u>3.3.1</u></p>	<p>Operational air noise impacts on Buckinghamshire residents</p>	<p>BC consider that an increase in operational air noise may be noticed by some Buckinghamshire residents. This is because despite the whole of the Buckinghamshire administrative area falling outside the predicted lower observed adverse effect level (LOAEL) contours, although ES assessments indicate the final phase night-time contour could extend just across the Buckinghamshire border, the 92-day summer average day and night noise (as measured by the LOAEL) doesn't reflect the noise generated by individual overflights or at periods of peak activity. It is these events that generally lead to complaints. Areas most likely to be affected are Dagnall, Pitstone and a section of BC to the east of Aylesbury, including Wendover, which is also overflowed by low level northbound traffic from Heathrow.</p> <p><u>BC confirm that these technical issues are now largely resolved. However, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. The not</u></p>	<p>The assessment has shown that Buckinghamshire is outside of the Lowest Observable Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL), even for the final phase night-time contour. Below the LOAEL, Planning Practice Guidance – Noise (Department for Communities and Local Government (2019), Planning Practice Guidance: Noise) notes that noise may be “present and not intrusive” and that the outcome is that “Noise can be heard, but does not cause any change in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response. Can slightly affect the acoustic character of the area but not such that there is a change in the quality of life.” This is consistent with the conclusions of the assessment presented in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP9-011REP1-003].</p> <p>However, additional context for the noise assessment is provided using N65, N60 and overflight metrics, which provides information on noise generated by individual overflights over Buckinghamshire. For example, see Figures 16.21 – 16.26 (assessment phase 1), Figures 16.45 – 16.50 (assessment phase 2a) and Figures 16.69 – 16.74 (assessment phase 2b) of the ES [AS-106; AS-107; AS-110; AS-111; AS-114].</p>	<p><u>BC have confirmed that technical issues are largely resolved.</u></p> <p><u>However, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. The not agreed areas are covered separately as item 3.5.0 in this SoCG. BC's position remains unchanged – clarity is required on the interaction of Buckinghamshire and the final phase night-time contour; and the exclusion of noise generated by individual overflights and peak activity.</u></p>	<p><u>This issue was discussed as part of Issue Specific Hearing 9 as Deadline 6 Submission – 8.136 Applicant's Post Hearing Submission – Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) [REP6-067].</u></p> <p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC's deadline-6 response includes updated comments on this and will be the basis for further discussions.</p>	<p><u>?This issue was discussed as part of Issue Specific Hearing 9 as Deadline 6 Submission - 8.136 Applicant's Post Hearing Submission - Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) [REP6-067].</u></p> <p><u>ISH9BC noted in comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024 their agreement with the technical responses included in the Applicant</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>agreed areas are covered separately as item 3.5.1 in this SoCG.</u></p> <p><u>Notwithstanding the above BC acknowledge the amendments made to the Technical Panels Terms of Reference and welcome the Council's potential inclusion within the noise technical panel, should the noise limit review identify any changes to the noise contours that cross the BC boundaries.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</u></p>			<p><u>applicant position.</u></p>	
<p><u>3.3.2</u></p>	<p>Air noise impacts on the Chilterns AONB</p>	<p>Part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Chilterns AONB) lies within the Council'sBC's administrative area. The CouncilBC will resist any changes which have a permanent significant noise effect on the Chilterns AONB. The NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should 'identify and protect tranquil areas which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value'. As set out in section 3.2(e) of the Air Navigation Guidance 2017, where practicable, it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 feet should seek to avoid flying over AONBs and National Parks. The CouncilBC seeks better protection than this. In line with CAA expectations the impact must be considered more carefully by the applicant during the remainder of the DCO process.</p> <p><u>BC confirm that technical issues are now largely resolved. However, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical</u></p>	<p>The approach to the assessment of noise and tranquillity in line with the NPPF is set out in Section 16.5 of Chapter 16 of the ES [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003].</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of noise (amongst other factors including overflight below 7,000 ft) on the Chilterns AONB is presented in Chapter 14 of the ES [AS-088].</p> <p>As is made clear in Paragraph 3.2 and 3.3 of the Air Navigation Guidance (Ref 1), paragraph 3.3(e) which notes "where practicable, it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 feet should seek to avoid flying over Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and National Parks" is in the context of "requests to change the airspace design" (para 3.3). Changes to airspace and flightpaths are outside the scope of the Proposed Development and any changes, including their impact on AONBs and National Parks, would be assessed as part of the Civil Aviation Authority's CAA's environmental assessment process (Ref 2).</p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that technical issues are now largely resolved.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</u></p>	<p>BC have confirmed that BC's position remains unchanged.</p> <p>BC requires further information from the Applicant to convey the confidence that there will not be permanent significant adverse noise effects on the Chilterns AONB and potential areas of extension to the AONB, in Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>BC is seeking stronger controls on the noise experienced within the AONB than that provided in the Air Navigation Guidance 2017, which is advisory, not mandated.</p> <p>Technical issues are largely resolved.</p> <p>However, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. The not agreed areas are</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC is seeking a meeting with the Applicant to discuss matters relating to noise that remain within this SoCG as ongoing. Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC's deadline 6 response includes updated comments on this and will be the basis for further discussions.</p> <p>This issue was discussed as part of Issue Specific Hearing 9 as Deadline 6 Submission - 8.136 Applicant's Post Hearing Submission -</p>	<p><u>This issue was discussed as part of Issue Specific Hearing 9 as Deadline 6 Submission - 8.136 Applicant's Post Hearing Submission - Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) [REP6-067].</u></p> <p><u>ISH9</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>Panels. The not agreed areas are covered separately as item 3.5.1 in this SoCG.</u></p> <p><u>Notwithstanding the above BC acknowledge the amendments made to the Technical Panels Terms of Reference and welcome the Council's potential inclusion within the noise technical panel, should the noise limit review identify any changes to the noise contours that cross the BC boundaries.</u></p> <p><u>It is agreed between BC and the Applicant that the proposals will give rise to significant adverse landscape character effects including impacts on tranquillity within the areas of the Chilterns AONB in Buckinghamshire that lie beneath the identified 7000ft noise contours (as identified in Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual Figures 14.14 – 14.17) [AS-102].</u></p> <p>BC accept that there are no mitigation measures available to address the significant adverse effects on the tranquillity of the AONB</p>		<p><u>covered separately as item 3.5.0 in this SoCG.</u></p>	<p><u>Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) [REP6-067].</u></p>		
<p><u>3.3.3</u></p>	<p>Overflight of the Chilterns AONB – mechanism for assessment and control</p>	<p>The CouncilBC wishes to see overflight of the Chilterns AONB included within the Terms of Reference for the NEDG, and secured appropriately through the DCO, as the Noise Envelope is developed further. In addition, the CouncilBC is seeking a guarantee that the Noise Envelope review process will provide certainty that any future airspace changes will</p>	<p>The work of the Noise Envelope Design (NEDG) group has concluded and the NEDG issued their final report in October 2022. The purpose of the NEDG was to provide advice and recommendations of the design of the Noise Envelope, with no intention that the NEDG would have an ongoing role post consent. See the NEDG terms of reference appended to the NEDG</p>	<p><u>BC have confirmed that technical issues are largely resolved.</u></p> <p><u>However, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. The not agreed areas are</u></p>	<p><u>This issue was discussed as part of Issue Specific Hearing 9. Deadline 6 Applicant's Post Hearing Submission - 8.136 Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) [REP6-067].</u></p>	<p><u>?This issue was discussed as part of Issue Specific Hearing 9 as Deadline 6 Submission - 8.136 Applicant's Post Hearing</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed Ongoing</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>ensure that noise impacts are no greater than those relied upon should the DCO be granted.</p> <p><u>BC confirm that technical issues are now largely resolved. However, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. The not agreed areas are covered separately as item 3.5.1 in this SoCG.</u></p> <p><u>Notwithstanding the above BC acknowledge the amendments made to the Technical Panels Terms of Reference and welcome the Council's potential inclusion within the noise technical panel, should the noise limit review identify any changes to the noise contours that cross the BC boundaries.</u></p>	<p>Final Report in Annex A of Appendix 16.2 of the ES [REP4-023APP-111].</p> <p>Ongoing oversight and technical review of Green Controlled Growth (GCG) and the Noise Envelope will be undertaken by the Noise Technical Panel and Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG). See Green Controlled Growth GCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP7-019REP5-020REP3-015].</p> <p>In line with the NEDG recommendations, the Noise Envelope contains a defined framework to review the Noise Envelope Limits in response to airspace change (see paragraph 3.2.27 onwards of Green Controlled Growth GCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-020REP3-015]).</p> <p>The Noise Limit Review process (see paragraph 3.2.27 onwards of Green Controlled Growth GCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-020REP3-015]) sets out the process through which the Noise Limits will be reviewed, and where possible reduced, following an approved airspace change.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.4 of the Green Controlled Growth GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP5-0223-017] states "There will be no ability to change any of the Level 1, Level 2 Thresholds or Limits to permit materially worse environmental effects than those identified in the ES."</p> <p>Assessment of changes to airspace and flightpaths (and their impacts on the Chilterns AONB) are outside the scope of the Proposed Development. Any changes to future flight paths are the subject of a future airspace change process being sponsored by the UK Government and will be subject to a separate assessment (which explicitly requires the consideration of overflight of AONBs) and consultation exercise by the airport operator in accordance with Civil</p>	<p>covered separately as item 3.5.0 in this SoCG. BC's position is largely unchanged.</p> <p>BC understands and accepts that the NEDG work is concluded and that the point raised previously regarding NEDG ToR is no longer relevant.</p> <p>However, a number of issues remain ongoing — BC has queries relating to the GCG and NE oversight being via the Noise Technical Panel and ESG, particularly while the Applicant continues to resist representation of BC on the ESG and Technical Panels. BC also has queries regarding the potential efficacy of the GCG in practice.</p> <p>BC's position regarding the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP5-020REP3-015] is set out within BC's deadline 4 submissions. A further set of comments is included on GCG in BC's Deadline 6 submissions.</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC's deadline 6 response includes updated comments on this and will be the basis for further discussions.</p>	<p>Submission - Issue Specific Hearing 9 (ISH9) [REP6-067].</p> <p>ISH9</p>	

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>Aviation Authority (CAA) procedure (CAP1616).</p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that technical issues are now largely resolved.</u></p>				
<p><u>3.3.4</u></p>	<p>Noise Envelope reviews</p>	<p>In order to ensure the correct application and efficacy of the Noise Envelope, the CouncilBC is seeking reassurance that the Noise Envelope will be subject to timely review at such time as changes in airspace are proposed (i.e. through FASI-S). In addition to this, the CouncilBC wishes to see a review one year after operation and a mechanism to trigger intervening reviews more frequently than the five years currently proposed within the Terms of Reference for the NEDG, secured appropriately through the DCO.</p> <p><u>BC confirms that technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels.</u></p> <p><u>Notwithstanding the above BC acknowledge the amendments made to the Technical Panels Terms of Reference and welcome the Council's potential inclusion within the noise technical panel, should the noise limit review identify any changes to the noise contours that cross the BC boundaries.</u></p>	<p>In line with the NEDG recommendations, the Noise Envelope contains a defined framework to review the Noise Envelope Limits in response to either the ICAO publishing a new 'noise chapter' for the Next-Gen, low carbon, aircraft (i.e. the next 'Chapter' following on from the current 'Chapter 14') or the approval of an Airspace Change Proposal such as FASI-S (see paragraph 3.2.27 onwards of Green Controlled GrowthGCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-020REP3-015]). This mechanism would be triggered by these operational changes, rather than being time limited as suggested. See response to paragraph 3.4.8 on timing of the review cycle.</p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that technical issues are now largely resolved.</u></p>	<p><u>Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC acknowledges that the Applicant published additional information on this matter at Deadline 3. BC's position regarding the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP5-020REP3-015] is set out within BC's deadline 4 submissions. A further set of comments is included on GCG in BC's Deadline 6 submissions.</u></p> <p><u>BC continues to assert that the review cycle proposed for the NE is not optimal.</u></p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p><u>Technical issues are largely resolved; however, BC has questioned the threshold values used for monitoring and trigger points, as well as membership eligibility for the ESG and Technical Panels. BC's Ddeadline 6 response includes updated comments on this and will be the basis for further discussions.</u></p> <p><u>BC to confirm current position and clarify whether this is resolved in light of paragraph 56 (iii) of their Deadline 6 Post Hearing Submission [REP6-087]</u></p>	<p><u>BC comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing. Agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.3. 5	NEDG role outside of the ESG	<p>The NEDG should continue to operate as an independent entity from the ESG, with this independence secured through appropriate means as part of the DCO.</p> <p><u>BC understands and accepts that the NEDG work is concluded and that the point raised here is no longer relevant.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC’s confirmation that this point is no longer relevant, as the NEDG has concluded. The work of the Noise Envelope Design (NEDG) group has concluded and the NEDG issued their final report in October 2022. The purpose of the NEDG was to provide advice and recommendations of the design of the Noise Envelope, with no intention that the NEDG would have an ongoing role post consent. See the NEDG terms of reference appended to the NEDG Final Report in Annex A of Appendix 16.2 of the ES [REP4-023APP-111].</u></p> <p><u>Ongoing oversight and technical review of Green Controlled Growth GCG and the Noise Envelope will be undertaken by the Noise Technical Panel and Environmental Scrutiny Group ESG. See Green Controlled Growth GCG Explanatory Note [REP5-020REP3-015].</u></p>	<p>BC understands and accepts that the NEDG work is concluded and that the point raised here is no longer relevant.</p>	<p>Closed – N/A</p>	<p><u>BC response to draft SoCG 23 November 2023?</u></p>	<p>Agreed – no longer relevant</p>
3.3. 6	WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines	<p>To protect residents from local impacts and as far as reasonably practicable, the Council asks that the promoter should work towards compliance with WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines 2018 for the European Region 10. It is acknowledged that the guidelines are not adopted UK policy and the ask is aspirational. Whilst BC would still encourage the Applicant to comply with WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines 2018 for the European Region, it is acknowledged that these are aspirational and that there is no policy requirement to do this.</p>	<p>The Government response on the WHO Environmental Noise Guidelines 2018 is as follows: “The government is considering the recent new environmental noise guidelines for the European region published by the World Health Organization (WHO). It agrees with the ambition to reduce noise and to minimise adverse health effects, but it wants policy to be underpinned by the most robust evidence on these effects, including the total cost of action and recent UK specific evidence which the WHO report did not assess.”</p> <p>Although the dose-response relationship in the new WHO Guidelines is not currently adopted in UK policy, sensitivity testing using the relevant updated relationships in the WHO guidelines has been undertaken and is presented in Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [AS-078].</p> <p><u>The Applicant notes BC position.</u></p>	<p>Whilst BC would still encourage the Applicant to comply with WHO Guidelines, it is acknowledged that these are aspirational and that there is no policy requirement to do this.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p><u>BC response to draft SoCG 23 November 2023?</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.3.7	Construction noise impacts	<p>The CouncilBC requests confirmation of the noise impacts of the scheme construction on receptors in Buckinghamshire, and seeks clarity on the controls that will be incorporated within the CTMP as it is developed.</p> <p><u>BC acknowledges that there is an outline CTMP and that Requirement 134 of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003] secures its implementation. Notwithstanding this, BC is concerned that the CTMP is not sufficiently rigid in establishing a framework of protection for the Buckinghamshire highway network, meaning that there remains too much flexibility in the development of the detailed CTMP for BC to be certain that unexpected adverse effects will not manifest within Buckinghamshire. Suggestions for additional controls are presented in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.9, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</u></p> <p><u>The inclusion of the Council as a consultee on Requirements 14 and 15 and the Applicant's confirmation that the Deadline 11 CTMP will reflect BC's invitation to be a member of the TMWG means that this matter is now agreed.</u></p>	<p>Detailed construction impacts measures would be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (as secured by Requirement 1443 of the draft DCO Development Consent Order [TR020001/APP/2.01REP35-003]), which would be developed in detail by the appointed contractor during the detailed design stage.</p> <p>It is expected that origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP6-009] outlines the formation of a traffic management working group (TMWG) as a forum for stakeholder engagement prior to the commencement of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The version of the draft DCOdDCO, submitted at Deadline 9 [REP9-003], was updated to explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (requirements 14 and 15).</p> <p>The Applicant invites Buckinghamshire Council to be a member of the TMWG, as confirmed in the updated CTMP submitted at Deadline 11 [TR020001/APP/5.02]. The draft DCO, submitted at D9, now explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (R14 and R15). As above</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that there is an outline CTMP and that Requirement 143 of the dDCO [REP5-003] draft DCO secures its implementation. Notwithstanding this, BC is concerned that the CTMP is not sufficiently rigid in establishing a framework of protection for the Buckinghamshire highway network, meaning that there remains too much flexibility in the development of the detailed CTMP for BC to be certain that unexpected adverse effects will not manifest within Buckinghamshire. Suggestions for additional controls are presented in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.9, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p>	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts that are to be controlled through the CTMP process. The resolution is directly connected to BC suggestions at 3.2.9, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p><u>BC to clarify position noting that item 3.2.9 of this SoCG is now agreed.</u></p>	<p><u>Meeting with BC on 29 January 2024x</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreedOngoingAgreed.</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.4 Air Quality							
3.4.1	Air quality assessment study area	It is noted that the study area for the air quality assessment completed as part of the ES does not cover any area within Buckinghamshire Council BC . The study area has been discussed and developed with stakeholders in the air quality working group, of which Buckinghamshire Council BC is a member.	This is noted by the Applicant.	Unchanged	Agreed	BC's relevant representation submitted to PINS on 30 June 2023 [RR-0166]	Agreed
3.4.2	Air quality assessment methodology and baseline data	The approach to the air quality assessment and baseline data used is generally considered acceptable.	This is noted by the Applicant.	Unchanged	Agreed	BC's relevant representation submitted to PINS on 30 June 2023 [RR-0166]	Agreed
3.4.3	Air quality assessments	BC believe that there is the potential for the villages within the north of Buckinghamshire to be negatively impacted by changes in traffic from the Proposed Development . BC requested that if the revised traffic data shows that the screening thresholds, as outlined within the Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance document 'Guidance on land-use planning and development control: Planning for air quality', were exceeded then there may have been be a requirement to conduct an additional air quality assessment that makes use of the updated transport modelling. <u>Deficiencies in traffic modelling have now been addressed and agreed by BC. REP7-079 Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling –</u>	<u>The Applicant welcomes BC's position that it agrees with the conclusions reported in Chapter 7 of the ES [AS-076]. This is noted by the Applicant.</u> The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter. The EPUK/IAQM criteria referenced will be used in the air quality review of the updated traffic data and the outcome will be reported following the timeline indicated in the Applicant response to the Rule 9 letter [AS-064]. The results of the assessment outlined in the Rule 9 letter Applicant response will be submitted at Deadline 7.	BC's position is unchanged. BC is seeking confirmation from the Applicant that it accepts the referenced IAQM document as containing appropriate triggers to screen the need for additional air quality assessment work. Resultant actions from this will then be dependent upon the way in which the Applicant chooses to address points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.	This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant. The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC's suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d. The Applicant should complete the	<u>BC comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024</u>	<u>OngoingAgreed</u>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>Environmental Appraisal screens the findings of the updated traffic data against the IAQM triggers. Further assessments were completed where required and the report concludes the updated traffic is not considered to materially change the results and conclusions reported in Chapter 7 Air Quality Revision 1 of the ES [AS-076], nor are there any new significant impacts predicted. Buckinghamshire Council BC agrees with this conclusion and does not have any further comments.</u></p>			<p>additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs against the IAQM triggers to determine whether further air quality assessment is needed. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to be written up in the air quality chapter of the ES, as well as inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>BC requested that this is programmed sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by the Council and other Interested Parties, as appropriate.</p>		
3.4.4	Automatic monitoring station data	<p>Section 7.5.6 of Chapter 7 of the ES states that an automatic monitoring station has been installed at the airport and that the data is published near to real time. It is noted in the exceedance summary monitoring data for PM10 and PM2.5 (particulate matter) in 2023 that there is limited data and what data is available is at very low capture rates (between 10 and 60%). It is therefore recommended that the automatic monitor is inspected to understand why this pollutant is no longer being measured as the data could prove to be very important to understanding the impact the proposed</p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant and has been investigated. Data loss occurred due to repairs required on the GRIMM monitor. This has now been fixed and is back in operation, it does not impact any of the data used in the ES to inform the baseline. The Applicant is happy to discuss any additional queries and will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p>	<p>BC accepts the Applicant's response.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p><u>BC accepts the Applicant's response.</u></p> <p><u>Agreement confirmed via BC's review of SoCG 19 October 2023</u></p>	<p>Agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>Development may have on the local air quality.</p> <p>BC wishes to see the evidence supporting the Applicant's assertion that the data gap does not impact the baseline.</p>					
3.4.5	Air quality baseline data	BC agrees with the baseline data collection and presentation of future baseline information	The Applicant considers that the baseline data collection and future baseline information, as detailed in Appendix 7.2 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [APP-062] , are robust. These were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed—no requirement for further Applicant engagement on this matter.	ES Appendix 7.2 Air Quality Baseline Data [APP-062]	Agreed
3.4.6	Air quality assessment study area	<p>BC agrees with the study area, however the Council'sBC's Strategic Environmental Protection Team would seek to ensure that the Stole Road, Friarage Road and Tring Road AQMAs are not negatively impacted by the DCO Aapplication for development consent. This is especially as air quality monitoring data collected by the councilBC in 2022 found exceedances of the National Air Quality Objectives within the Friarage Road AQMA. The results of the air quality monitoring can be found within the 2023 Annual Status Report.</p> <p>Deficiencies in traffic modelling have now been addressed and agreed by BC. [REP7-079] Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling – Environmental Appraisal screens the findings of the updated traffic data against the IAQM triggers. Further assessments were completed where required and the report concludes the updated traffic is not considered to materially change the results and conclusions reported in Chapter 7 Air Quality</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes BC's position that it agrees with the conclusions reported in Chapter 7 of the ES [AS-076]. The Applicant considers that the study area, as detailed in sections 7.3.5 to 7.3.9 in Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076], is appropriate and robust. This was discussed and agreed during the EIA Scoping Meeting and Air Quality TWG meetings. However, it is acknowledged that this cannot be confirmed until such time that the updated traffic modelling has been finalised.</p> <p>The three mentioned AQMAs (Stoke Road AQMA, Friarage Road AQMA, and Tring Road AQMA) located on routes that the Council anticipates will experience increases or changes in traffic, are all over 19km from the affected road network. No significant impacts are predicted to occur within the study area. No significant air quality effects would occur outside of the study area, which would include the above-mentioned Buckinghamshire AQMAs.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p> <p>The updated traffic data will be reviewed with regards to the resulting air quality effects and the outcome will be reported</p>	Unchanged. BC reserves its position pending receipt of the updated traffic modelling.	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC awaits the results of the updated traffic modelling in relation to the impact from COVID-19 pandemic and wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to the updated traffic modelling and the Council's suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic</p>	See point 3.4.3. REP7-079 Accounting for Covid-19 in Transport Modelling – Environmental Appraisal [REP7-079]	OngoingAgreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>Revision 1 of the ES [AS-076], nor are there any new significant impacts predicted. Buckinghamshire Council BC agrees with this conclusion and does not have any further comments.</u></p>	<p>following the timeline indicated in the Applicant response to the Rule 9 letter [AS-064]. Consideration will be given to the AQMAs in Aylesbury referenced by BC.</p> <p>The results of the assessment outlined in the Rule 9 letter Applicant response will be submitted at Deadline 7.</p>		<p>modelling; and then review the outputs against the IAQM triggers to determine whether further air quality assessment is needed. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to be written up in the air quality chapter of the ES, as well as inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>BC requested that the Applicant should ensure that this is programmed sufficiently in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC other Interested Parties, as appropriate.</p>		
<p><u>3.4.7</u></p>	<p>Air quality assessment – construction dust methodology, results and mitigation</p>	<p>BC agrees with the construction dust assessment methodology and findings, including mitigation included in the code of construction practice CoCP which follows best practice.</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 CoCP [REP6-0034] follows best practice. The construction dust assessment methodology is detailed in section 2 in Appendix 7.1 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076]. The construction dust results are detailed in section 2.2 in Appendix 7.3 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [REP4-013AS-076]. The construction dust mitigation included in the code of construction practice CoCP is detailed in section 8 of Chapter 4 The Proposed Development of the ES [REP5-013AS-074]. These have been discussed</p>	<p>Unchanged</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Air Quality TWG meetings from 2020 to 2022</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.				
3.4.8	Air quality assessment modelling methodology	BC agrees with the modelling methodology including data sources, model set up including use of Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS) , receptor locations selected, assessment years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects, and verification methodology.	The Applicant considers the modelling methodology including the data sources, model setup including use of the Atmospheric Dispersion Modelling System (ADMS) , modelled receptor locations, assessment years, emission inventory methodology, model parameters, spatial modelling aspects and verification methodology to be robust. The modelling methodology is detailed in section 3 in Appendix 7.1 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-028AS-076] . The modelling methodology was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2020 to 2022	Agreed
3.4.9	Air quality assessment significance criteria	BC agrees with the significance criteria used in the assessment.	The Applicant considers the significance criteria used in the assessment, as detailed in section 4 in Appendix 7.1 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-028AS-076] , to be appropriate and robust. The significance criteria used in the assessment was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2020 to 2022	Agreed
3.4.10	Air quality assessment – odour impact methodology	BC agrees with the odour impact methodology and results and requests additional information on odour report methodology.	The Applicant considers the odour impact methodology, as detailed in section 5 in Appendix 7.1 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-028AS-076] , to be robust. The odour impact methodology was discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	BC's relevant representation submitted to PINS on 30 June	Agreed
3.4.10b	Air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases	BC agrees with the air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases. Modelling is now agreed, and air quality modelling reviewed. See point 3.4.3 and 3.4.6.	The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that the modelling is now agreed. The Applicant considers the air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases to be robust. The air quality assessment results for construction and operational phases are detailed in 7.9 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [AS-076] and Appendix 7.3 of Chapter 7 Air Quality	BC is in agreement that the findings presented to date by the Applicant accord with the current traffic modelling. However, as set out within the Surface Access topic of this SoCG, BC has reservations regarding the validity of this underlying	Ongoing. BC asserts that the Applicant should address the suggested resolutions to the Surface Access topic and then explore the need for additional	BC comments on SoCG on 24 January 2024	OngoingAgreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>of the ES [REP4-013AS-076]. The results were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings. However, it is acknowledged that this cannot be confirmed until such time that the updated traffic modelling has been finalised.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with BC on this matter.</p> <p>The updated traffic data will be reviewed with regards to the resulting air quality effects and the outcome will be reported following the timeline indicated in the Applicant response to the Rule 9 letter [AS-064].</p>		<p>air quality assessment, as per the approach proposed in 3.4.3 and 3.4.6.</p>		
3.4.11	Air quality good practice mitigation for operational phase	BC agrees with the good practice mitigation identified for the operational phase.	The Applicant considers the good practice mitigation identified for the operational phase, as detailed in Appendix 7.5 of Chapter 7 Air Quality of the ES [APP-065AS-076] , to be appropriate. The mitigation identified were discussed and agreed during Air Quality TWG meetings.	Unchanged	Agreed	Air Quality TWG meetings from 2020 to 2022	Agreed
3.4.12	Air quality assessments including sensitive receptors	<p>The CouncilBC request updated air quality assessment, on a quantitative basis, for Aylesbury and sensitive receptors along the A41, B488, B489. Also, confirmation of any additional locations on the Buckinghamshire transport network where changes in traffic flows significantly affect air quality.</p> <p><u>Modelling is now agreed, and air quality modelling reviewed as per matters 3.4.3 and 3.4.6.</u></p>	<p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that the modelling is now agreed.</u>The air quality assessment (Chapter 7 of the ES [AS-076]) has provided an assessment of air quality following the methodology and study area agreed with the local Councils. The study area is considered appropriate and takes into account the affected road network using the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) and Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) guidance. It is noted that Aylesbury is not within the study area. Aylesbury is located over 19km from the study area, no significant air quality effects would occur outside of the study area.</p> <p>The trip distribution of the airport traffic was based on observed CAA passenger survey data. Within Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201], airport distribution figures were included. The Applicant also submitted daily airport passengers and staff</p>	<p>The Trip Distribution Plans [REP1-019] appear to highlight increases in traffic along the routes cited by the Council as being of concern. Quantitative data has been requested for these routes, both by the ExA through the ISH process and by BC in its various responses to Deadline 2 documents. The Applicant has also yet to fulfil the request for quantitative data on the existing air quality assessment reported in ES Chapter 7 Air Quality [AS-076].AS-076.</p> <p>BC reserves its position regarding the potential</p>	<p>Ongoing. The Applicant should provide the quantitative air quality assessment data requested for the routes of concern for BC, underpinning the reporting in ES Chapter 7 Air Quality [AS-076].</p> <p>Further resolution of this matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to</p>	<p><u>BC comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>distribution figures (Trip Distribution Plans) [REP5-0371-019] as was requested by the Examining Authority. The distribution shows relatively low volumes of traffic heading towards Aylesbury.</p> <p>Access routes for construction traffic will be limited, as far as reasonably practicable, to the trunk road network and main roads on the local road network. It is not intended by the Applicant to utilise the local road network for material supplies however it is expected that the origin of these movements would be from existing freight and materials suppliers who would have existing permissions to utilise the network for their purposes.</p> <p>The updated traffic data will be reviewed with regards to the resulting air quality effects and the outcome will be reported following the timeline indicated in the Applicant response to the Rule 9 letter [AS-064]. Consideration will be given to Aylesbury and the specific roads mentioned by BC.</p>	<p>downstream impacts, including on air quality, that may arise from changes in traffic identified through updated traffic modelling. BC cites the IAQM guidance as containing appropriate thresholds for determining whether additional air quality assessment is required, as set out in point 3.4.3.</p> <p>Resultant actions relating to this matter will then be dependent upon the way in which the Applicant chooses to address points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p>	<p>be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs against the IAQM triggers to determine whether further air quality assessment is needed. If required, this should be undertaken and the analysis will need to be written up in the air quality chapter of the ES, as well as inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant should ensure that this is programmed sufficient in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC and other Interested Parties, as appropriate.</p>		

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
<p>3.5 Green Controlled Growth</p>							
<p><u>3.5.1</u></p>	<p>Environmental Scrutiny Group membership (ESG)</p>	<p>The Applicant proposes to use a “Noise Envelope” to control the expansion and as part of the Green Controlled Growth (GCG) principle. This will impose a series of ‘thresholds’, ‘stops’ and ‘limits’ on the size of average summer daytime and night-time noise contours, based on an agreed Noise Envelope Design Group approach. The applicant claims that GCG provides a more robust and transparent approach to noise monitoring and enforcement than the current planning controls. This GCG framework will only be effective if the body managing it is truly independent and includes BC as a party to the Environmental Scrutiny Group ESG. This should therefore be established early with clear terms of reference set out.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Green Controlled Growth GCG Framework, as outlined within the DCO, will place controls on air quality. This framework will only be effective if the body managing it is truly independent and includes BC as a party to the Environmental Scrutiny Group ESG. BC acknowledges that the Applicant updated the ToR for the ESG at Deadline 3 and has provided comment on this.</p> <p>BC does not agree with the rationale presented by the Applicant regarding the membership of the ESG. BC maintains that it should be included as an ESG member.</p>	<p>It is agreed that independent, effective scrutiny and review of the environmental effects of the expanding airport, combined with robust governance, is fundamental in making the GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP5-0223-017] effective. Section 2.4 of the Green Controlled Growth GCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-020REP3-015] sets out proposals for the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) that is proposed to oversee the operation of Green Controlled Growth GCG, with clear Terms of Reference provided at Appendix A of the Green Controlled Growth GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP5-0243-017]. Requirement 20 of the Draft Development Consent Order DCO [REP5-0033-003] sets out the required timing for the establishment of the ESG.</p> <p>It is considered important that the ESG includes representatives of local authorities to ensure that the views of those authorities that are impacted across the whole range of environmental topics within the scope of GCG are captured. However, it is important to strike an appropriate balance between the need to capture a diversity of views, the relevance of views to the impacts arising from expansion that may be experienced around the airport and the need for membership of ESG to be focused in support of its decision-making role and in the interests of managing the costs of administering GCG (both for the airport operator and for local authorities). It is on this basis that the membership of ESG reflects those local authorities that are forecast to experience environmental impacts at the level upon which the Limits and Thresholds included within GCG are based.</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that the Applicant updated the ToR for the ESG at Deadline 3 and has provided comment on this.</p> <p>Matters relating to the way in which the GCG and Noise Envelope thresholds and limits are applied and reviewed are set out in a separate Council response – 3.3.5.</p> <p>BC does not agree with the rationale presented by the Applicant regarding the membership of the ESG. BC maintains that it should be included as an ESG member.</p>	<p>Not agreed. The Applicant should invite BC to be a member of the ESG. This is also required as a resolution to matters raised in 3.3.5.</p>		<p>Not agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>Paragraphs 2.4.19 to 2.4.24 of the GCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07] set out the forecast distribution of environmental impacts within the scope of GCG. Specifically for aircraft noise, the baseline and forecast daytime and night-time noise contours used to inform the GCG noise Limits / Noise Envelope are shown in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003] as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Baseline noise contours for day-time and night-time 2019 actuals are Figure 16.5 and 16.6 [AS-104] b. Phase 1 forecast noise contours for the Faster Growth scenario are Figure 16.91 and 16.92 [AS-117] c. Phase 2a forecast noise contours are Figure 16.41 and 16.42 [AS-109] d. Phase 2b forecast noise contours are Figure 16.65 and 16.66 [AS-113] <p>In all of the above figures, the 54 dBL_{Aeq,16h} (daytime) and 48 dBL_{Aeq,8h} (night-time) noise contours, used as the basis for the GCG Limits, do not extend into Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>On this basis, a role for Buckinghamshire Council BC on the ESG (or the Noise Technical Panel) is not considered proportionate or relevant.</p>				
3.5.2	Environmental Scrutiny Group – terms of reference for air quality	<p>The ESG remit and governance should be established early with clear terms of reference set out – this should include controls on air quality.</p> <p><u>BC does not agree with the rationale presented by the Applicant regarding the membership of the ESG. BC maintains that it should be included as an ESG member.</u></p>	<p>It is agreed that independent, effective scrutiny and review of the environmental effects of the expanding airport, combined with robust governance, is fundamental in making the GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP5-022] GCG Framework [REP3-017] effective. Section 2.4 of the Green Controlled Growth GCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-020REP3-015] sets out proposals for the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) that is proposed to oversee the operation of Green Controlled</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that the Applicant updated the ToR for the ESG at Deadline 3 and has provided comment on this.</p> <p>BC does not agree with the rationale presented by the Applicant regarding the membership of the ESG. BC maintains that it should be included as an ESG member.</p>	<p>Not agreed. The Applicant should invite BC to be a member of the ESG.</p>		Not agreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>GrowthGCG, with clear Terms of Reference provided at Appendix A of the Green Controlled GrowthGCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP5-0223-017]. Requirement 20 of the dDraft Development Consent OrderDCO [REP5-0033-003] sets out the required timing for the establishment of the ESG.</p> <p>It is considered important that the ESG includes representatives of local authorities to ensure that the views of those authorities that are impacted across the whole range of environmental topics within the scope of GCG are captured. However, it is important to strike an appropriate balance between the need to capture a diversity of views, the relevance of views to the impacts arising from expansion that may be experienced around the airport and the need for membership of ESG to be focused in support of its decision-making role and in the interests of managing the costs of administering GCG (both for the airport operator and for local authorities). It is on this basis that the membership of ESG reflects those local authorities that are forecast to experience environmental impacts at the level upon which the Limits and Thresholds included within GCG are based.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.4.19 to 2.4.24 of the GCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-0203-015APP-247] set out the forecast distribution of environmental impacts within the scope of GCG. Specifically for air quality, Figure 3.8 of the GCG Explanatory Note shows proposed air quality monitoring locations, which have been derived based on an assessment of those locations that are forecast to experience the greatest air quality impact as a result of expansion. These are located across the administrative areas of Luton, Central Bedfordshire and North Hertfordshire, concentrated on the area immediately around the airport with</p>				

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>some additional locations in Hitchin and to the west of Luton / east of Dunstable.</p> <p>There are no locations in Buckinghamshire, and on this basis, it is not considered relevant or appropriate for Buckinghamshire CouncilBC to have a role on the Environmental Scrutiny GroupESG (or the Air Quality Technical Panel) on the basis of air quality impacts.</p>				
3.5.2b	Controlling air quality – community first fund	<p>BC would also welcome if the community first fund proposed also supported schemes to help improve air quality in local communities within Buckinghamshire, <u>and accept that the approach to funding schemes that support decarbonisation will have beneficial impacts on air quality as a result.</u></p>	<p>During the first 5 year period of Community First the Applicant believes that this fund should reflect both national and local agendas of decarbonisation and levelling up. The 5 yearly reviews of the fund present the opportunity for the funding themes to change in the future.</p>	<p>The Council has made separate comments regarding the need for annual reviews of measures intended to mitigate emerging impacts of the airport expansion.</p> <p>BC's position is that improving air quality aligns with key priorities and should be a focus for the Community First Fund from the outset.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p> <p>The Applicant should amend the Community First Fund to include annual reviews, at least within the initial 5 years of operation.</p> <p>Air quality improvement should be a priority for schemes that could be supported by the Community First Fund.</p>	<p><u>BC comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p>Not Agreed<u>Agreed</u></p>
<u>3.5.3</u>	Environmental Scrutiny Group conflicts of interest	<p>The enforcement arrangements proposed by the Applicant would involve the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG), which includes Luton Borough Council, recommending the undertaking of enforcement action by the relevant planning authority – also Luton Borough Council. It is observed that Luton Borough Council is also the airport owner, and it is unclear that this potential conflict of interest has been adequately addressed.</p>	<p>At present, the airport is operating under a planning consent granted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (TCPA), with planning reference 12/01400/FUL, as amended by 15/00950/VARCON and 21/00031/VARCON. Under the TCPA, only the local planning authority can bring enforcement action against the airport operator for breach of a condition in planning permission and there are limited requirements for transparency around the enforcement process.</p> <p>As set out in Section 2.4 of the Green Controlled Growth (GCG) Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-020] [REP3-015APP-217] it is proposed that</p>	<p>BC's position is unchanged. It is noted also that the ExA has posed a question to the Applicant on this matter within its First Written Questions, citing similar concerns raised by other Interested Parties.</p> <p>BC will review its position on reviewing the Applicant's response to the ExA's question.</p>	<p>Not agreed.</p>		<p>Not agreed</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>governance of GCG will be through a new body established through the DCO, the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG). Section 2.4 sets out the proposed functions and membership of the ESG, enshrined through Terms of Reference included at Appendix A of the Green-Controlled GrowthGCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.08REP5-0243-017]. The ESG will be chaired independently and include independent experts.</p> <p>The GCG process is designed to be self-enforcing in respect of mitigating environmental effects above Limits, with the process designed to require action by the airport operator to address any exceedances of the Limits. However, it is acknowledged that circumstances where the processes set out in the GCG Framework are not followed also need to be considered, and this is set out in Section 2.7 of the GCG Explanatory Note.</p> <p>In addition to the GCG process, and as outlined in Section 2.7, the statutory enforcement regime for DCOs is set out in the Planning Act 2008. This defines the ‘relevant planning authority’ for the purposes of enforcement action as the planning authority for the area in which the development is situated. This means the ‘relevant planning authority’ for most of the Proposed Development must be Luton Borough Council. However, Section 2.7 also sets out ways in which other local authorities could bring action under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>In summary therefore, the GGC proposals are considered to include independent and transparent oversight and scrutiny in response to concerns around the potential conflict of interest of LBC and represent a significant improvement from current processes.</p>				

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>The Applicant would also draw BC’s attention to Paragraphs IR8.109 to IR8.114 of the P19 decision which state that LBC have “followed an entirely orthodox, proportionate and lawful approach of responding to the breaches” and that “far from there being any basis for suggesting any improper or less than exacting process of scrutiny of the Airport, the whole history has been characterised by exactly the opposite”.</p>				
<p><u>3.5.4</u></p>	<p>Technical Panel membership</p>	<p>The CouncilBC wishes to have representation of suitably qualified and experienced technical officers on each of the four Technical Panels being proposed.</p> <p><u>BC views the Technical Panels (and ESG) as important forums in the ongoing monitoring and response to effects of the proposed scheme both in construction and operation, including those that may not currently be anticipated. Insofar as they have a role in defining mitigation that may be developed in the future, BC does not accept the Applicant’s rationale for excluding authorities that are not currently predicted to experience significant effects.</u></p>	<p>No significant adverse effects for each of the environmental topics within GCG have been identified within the boundary of Buckinghamshire CouncilBC. It is therefore the Applicant’s position that it is not relevant or appropriate for Buckinghamshire CouncilBC to have a role on the Environmental Scrutiny GroupESG or any of the Technical Panels.</p>	<p>BC views the Technical Panels (and ESG) as important forums in the ongoing monitoring and response to effects of the proposed scheme both in construction and operation, including those that may not currently be anticipated. Insofar as they have a role in defining mitigation that may be developed in the future, BC does not accept the Applicant’s rationale for excluding authorities that are not currently predicted to experience significant effects. BC’s position is unchanged – it requests representation on the four technical panels (and the ESG – see 3.3.5).</p>	<p>Not agreed. The Applicant should invite BC to be members on all four of the Technical Panels. The resolutions at 3.3.5 is also relevant.</p>		<p>Not agreed</p>
<p><u>3.5.5</u></p>	<p>ESG membership</p>	<p>Although broadly in agreement with the role of the ESG, the CouncilBC is further concerned that the ESG may not be fully independent. This is because (according to the Green Controlled GrowthGCG Framework Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP3-015APP-217]) the independent chair will initially be nominated by the airport operator, following</p>	<p>Whilst the airport operator will identify the proposed chairperson of the ESG, ultimately the appointment of that Chairperson is decided by an independent third party (the Secretary of State).</p> <p>As set out in the ESG Terms of Reference included as Appendix A of the Green Controlled GrowthGCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-0223-017], it is proposed that the independent chairperson serves a three-year term. Any subsequent</p>	<p>BC acknowledges that the Applicant published additional information that relates to this matter at Deadline 3. BC’s position regarding the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [REP5-020REP3-015] is set out within BC’s deadline 4 submissions and will be</p>	<p>Not agreed. BC is seeking a meeting with the Applicant to discuss matters relating to noise that remain within this SoCG as ongoing.</p>		<p>Not agreed.</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>consultation with the London Luton Airport operator. The CouncilBC suggests the initial appointment be reviewed by all ESG members within the first year of operation and this continues on a rolling basis</p>	<p>appointments of a chairperson would be subject to consultation with all members of the ESG.</p> <p>As set out in Section 2.3 of the GCG Framework [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-022]Green Controlled Growth Framework [REP3-017], it is also proposed that the airport operator carries out a review of all GCG processes within 12 months of the end of the Transition Period. The findings of this review will be submitted to the ESG for comment. Subsequently, a similar review will be carried out every five years.</p>	<p>updated within BC's deadline 6-submissions.</p> <p>BC continues to have concerns about the membership and independence of the ESG.</p>			
<p>3.6 Employment, Training and Skills</p>							
<p><u>3.6.1</u></p>	<p>Airport access – public transport accessibility from Buckinghamshire</p>	<p>Whilst BC welcomes the activities outlined in the Employment and Training Strategy (ETS) [REP8-020APP-215] Employment and Training Strategy and supports a focus on some of the more deprived areas within Buckinghamshire, it is vital that accessibility to the airport is addressed. As noted above in relation to surface access transport, at present there are no realistic public transport connections between Buckinghamshire and Luton Airport which could be utilised by potential employees of the airport. Without significant improvements in accessibility the prospect of Buckinghamshire residents taking up employment at London Luton Airport are limited and will undermine the aims of the Employment and Training StrategyETS.</p> <p><u>BC is of the opinion that the Applicant needs to provide a firm commitment to the delivery of specific public transport proposals to serve the residents of Buckinghamshire as an intrinsic part of ensuring accessibility of</u></p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant. The Framework Travel Plan [REP8-024REP4-044AS-131], and future Travel Plans to be produced every 5-years in accordance with Requirement 30 of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003]Draft Development Consent Order [REP3-003] will seek to deliver improved public transport connectivity to the airport, including towards Buckinghamshire, which will support the aims of the Employment and TrainingETS Strategy [REP8-020APP-215].</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to working with bus operators to support measures for further improving sustainable transport within the area.</p> <p>Improvements to the public transport network are not entirely within the gift of the Applicant and require discussion and negotiation with third parties. In the future, the airport operator will work closely with bus service operators through the Airport Transport ForumAFT and development of future Travel Plans, which will set out measures to improve services in order to meet future mode share Targets.</p>	<p>BC is of the opinion that the Applicant needs to provide a firm commitment to the delivery of specific public transport proposals to serve the residents of Buckinghamshire as an intrinsic part of ensuring accessibility of opportunity for all parts of the prospective workforce (in construction and operation) as well as delivering modal choice for passengers (addressed in Surface Access). Furthermore, for such proposals to be effective in promoting sustainable travel behaviours, they will be required from the outset of construction activities—this approach is considered the best way to maximise the economic benefits (as well as supporting mental health and wellbeing).</p> <p>BC does not accept that the Framework Travel pPlan is a</p>	<p>Ongoing.</p> <p>BC asserts that the Applicant should:</p> <p>Make a firm commitment to specific public transport measures that will provide accessibility to the airport for Buckinghamshire residents (as per Surface Transport –route 61 and strategic transport to Aylesbury)</p> <p>Revise the approach to travel planning, as described in the Framework Travel Plan [REP4-044]Framework Travel Plan [AS-</p>		<p>Ongoing <u>Not agreed</u> Ongoing</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>opportunity for all parts of the prospective workforce (in construction and operation) as well as delivering modal choice for passengers (addressed in Surface Access). Furthermore, for such proposals to be effective in promoting sustainable travel behaviours, they will be required from the outset of construction activities – this approach is considered the best way to maximise the economic benefits (as well as supporting mental health and wellbeing).</u></p> <p><u>BC does not accept that the Framework Travel Plan is a sufficiently prescriptive means to ensure that the specific services sought by BC will be delivered. BC does not support the embedded reactive approach of actions being triggered by potential breaches of mode share Targets – BC seeks a pro-active approach of providing realistic accessible choices from the outset.</u></p>	<p><u>The Bus and Coach Study [REP8-032REP8-XXX] outlines bus and coach services that may be prioritised for implementation in future travel plans, which includes the local X61 service between Aylesbury and London Luton Airport, - as well as an express service between Aylesbury and London Luton Airport. The ATF provides a forum for BC to be consulted on the contents of future travel plans, including the inclusion of the aforementioned services.</u></p> <p>The Applicant disagrees with BC's second request ("Revise the approach to travel planning, as described in the Framework Travel Plan [REP8-024REP4-044]Framework Travel Plan [AS-131] such that it focuses on predictive provision, rather than reactive provision (i.e. providing interventions to deliver choice, rather than delaying interventions until modal targets are at risk of being missed).") as such a 'predictive provision' would not align with the evidence-based monitoring approach which is described in the <u>Framework Travel Plan</u>. The Applicant's commitment to funding for sustainable transport through the STF demonstrates its clear intention to deliver transport improvements to benefit sustainable surface access to and from the airport. <u>More information can be seen in the response to matter 3.2.5.</u></p>	<p><u>sufficiently prescriptive means to ensure that the specific services sought by BC will be delivered. BC does not support the embedded reactive approach of actions being triggered by potential breaches of mode share Targets – BC seeks a pro-active approach of providing realistic accessible choices from the outset.</u></p>	<p><u>131] such that it focuses on predictive provision, rather than reactive provision (i.e. providing interventions to deliver choice, rather than delaying interventions until modal targets are at risk of being missed).</u></p>		
<p><u>3.6.2</u></p>	<p>Local Economic Development Working Group membership</p>	<p>The <u>ETS [REP8-020APP-215]Employment and Training Strategy</u> helpfully covers both the construction and operation phases. It references engagement with local government and the creation of a Local Economic Development Working Group. <u>BC would welcome involvement in this working group, and BC welcomes the invitation to join this and confirms it has suitable representation to attend.</u></p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant – <u>Buckinghamshire CouncilBC</u> are welcome to join the Local Economic Development Working Group when this is set up.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the <u>ETS [REP8-020APP-215] Employment and Training Strategy</u> would be secured through an S106 agreement as outlined in the Applicant's responses to Deadline 4.</p> <p><u>It is noted that- Buckinghamshire CouncilBC will not be a party to the S106 agreement however, alternative agreements will be</u></p>	<p><u>BC welcomes the invitation to join <u>Local Economic Development Working GroupLEDWG</u> and confirms it has suitable representation to attend.</u></p> <p><u>BC is concerned that there is no certainty on how the <u>Employment Training StrategyETS</u> and in turn the <u>Local Economic Development Working Group</u></u></p>	<p>Ongoing.</p>	<p><u>Confirmed via email on 5 February 2024</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed Ongoing.</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>BC was previously concerned that there was no certainty on how the ETS and in turn the Local Economic Development Working Group can be secured, which was been raised in Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 submissions by BC.</u></p> <p><u>BC is now content that the Mitigation Route Map now confirms that the ETS in its entirety is secured by the S106.</u></p> <p><u>BC</u></p>	<p><u>sought with the council BC to ensure that they BC can participate in the Local Economic Development Working Group LEDWG and the Applicant will continue to discuss this with BC.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant has updated the Mitigation Route Map at Deadline 10, which now reflects the position where the full ETS is secured by the S106.</u></p>	<p><u>LEDWG can be secured, which has been raised in Deadline 3 and Deadline 4 submissions by BC.</u></p>			
<p><u>3.6.3</u></p>	<p>Local employment benefits</p>	<p>The <u>ETS [REP8-020APP-215] Employment and Training Strategy</u> includes an initiative to “Encourage local employment and local businesses (Construction and Operation)” which talks of continuing to prioritise utilising local businesses within their supply chain. There is scope to include more information around this and other ideas that could be considered, e.g. ‘meet the buyer’ type events, training/information sessions for interested businesses covering how they apply, requirements etc. <u>BC would welcome initiatives to support local procurement during both construction and operational phases, which would also target the ten priority wards listed in the ‘Opportunity Bucks’ programme.</u></p>	<p>This is noted by the Applicant, consideration will be given to adding further detail where appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed that BC would be an active member of the Local Economic Development Working Group. The <u>Proposed ETS [REP8-020APP-215]</u> sets out the proposed ETS study area, which includes BC. The Proposed <u>ETS [APP-215]</u> does set out a series of firm initiatives in relation to supply chain preparedness and support to local procurement through all phases of the Proposed Scheme. Details on how initiatives are delivered in specific areas and specific commitments will be established once DCO consent has been granted.</p>	<p><u>BC is seeking a firm commitment on this matter from the Applicant. BC is seeking the inclusion of the ten priority wards listed in the Opportunity Bucks programme within the ETS [APP-215] ETS, with targeted activities to residents in Aylesbury and Chesham Opportunity Bucks wards; and the Council wishes to see specific commitments in relation to supply chain preparedness and supporting local procurement throughout the project lifecycle.</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing. Agreed</u></p> <p><u>BC would like involvement within the Working Group to shape activities and ensure these activities align with what else is going on in Buckinghamshire.</u></p> <p><u>BC would like the Applicant to commit to continued engagement on this matter, through the Local Economic Development Working Group and other means as appropriate.</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed via email 21 Dec 2023</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>
<p><u>3.6.4</u></p>	<p><u>Inclusion of priority wards within the ETS</u></p>	<p><u>BC is seeking the inclusion of the ten priority wards listed in the Opportunity Bucks programme within the ETS [REP8-020], with targeted activities to residents in Aylesbury and Chesham Opportunity Bucks wards; and BC wishes to see specific commitments in relation to supply chain preparedness and</u></p>	<p><u>It is not appropriate to name priority wards within Buckinghamshire within the ETS as this approach has not been adopted for the other local authorities also covered by the ETS. Buckinghamshire Council is welcome to put forward the priority wards for consideration within the Local Economic Development Working Group once this has been established.</u></p>				<p><u>Not agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		supporting local procurement throughout the project lifecycle.					
3.6.5	Maximising beneficial economic impacts	The Council BC wishes to partner with appropriate organisations, such as Bucks Business First, to work with the Applicant on supply chain readiness and accessibility of local businesses to suitable supply chain opportunities.	As outlined in the Employment and Training Strategy ETS [REP8-020APP-215] during the construction phase, the existing procurement process will support, the development of standard procurement materials, easy-to-understand requirements, and provide support to ensure procurement opportunities are inclusive and accessible to various types and sizes of businesses. The p Proposed ETS [REP8-020APP-215] sets out initiatives to work with local organisations including Initiative 1.1. The details of partners have not yet been confirmed and will be confirmed and defined once DCO consent is granted. The Applicant acknowledges the request to include Bucks First in engagement and will endeavour to include this organisations in engagement once partners are defined and identified shouldence DCO consent beis granted.	BC welcomes the Applicant's recognition of the issue of supply chain preparedness; however, BC maintains the position that the Applicant should expressly commit to partnering with knowledgeable local organisations, including Bucks First. This is seen as an essential means of maximising the employment benefits of the Proposed Development at the local level.	Ongoing. Agreed The Applicant should provide a firm commitment to partnering with Bucks First and other suitable knowledgeable local organisations to provide suitably tailored activities to support local supply chain preparedness.	Agreed via email 21 Dec 2023	Agreed
3.7 Economics and Employment							
3.7.1	Inbound tourism benefits for Buckinghamshire	BC welcomes the positive impact expansion will have on inbound tourism and the visitor economy. BC would welcome the opportunity to explore ways to maximise the positive impacts across the county, by promoting Buckinghamshire to those arriving at London Luton Airport, to increase visits and overnight stays.	This is noted by the Applicant and will be discussed with BC in future engagement following DCO consent should it be granted. The proposed ETS [REP8-020APP-215] sets out initiatives to work with local organisations including Initiative 1.1. The details of partners have not yet been confirmed and will be confirmed and defined shouldence DCO consent beis granted. The Applicant acknowledges the request to include Bucks First in engagement and will endeavour to include this organisation in engagement once partners are defined and identified once DCO consent is granted.	Unchanged	Ongoing.	Confirmed via email on 21 December 2023	Agreed Ongoing
3.7.2	Jobs and Gross Domestic	BC initially At this stage BC reserves judgement on the number of jobs and Gross Domestic Product	The full details of the estimation of employment and GDP impacts are given in Appendix 11.1 to the ES [APP-079] .	BC trusts the statistics as presented and did not intend to challenge them.	Agreed.	8.37 Applicant's comments	Agreed.

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	Product forecast	forecast to be created until it has had opportunity to interrogate the underpinning assumptions in more detail. <u>BC confirms it trusts the statistics as presented and did not intend to challenge them.</u>	<u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that it trusts the statistics as presented.</u>			on Local Impact Reports (BC) [REP2A-004] Application Document Ref: TR020001/A PP/8.37	
3.7.3	<u>Community First Fund</u>	<u>Additional clarity to be provided by the Applicant relating to the Community First fund, including its overall effectiveness. BC notes that whilst information has been provided by the Applicant on the aims of the Community First fund, its coverage, administration and review, further detail would be beneficial. In particular, further clarity on how the 60/40 split between Luton and other areas has been determined and how the effectiveness of the fund will be defined, measured and reported upon.</u> <u>BC now accepts the Applicant's position on this matter.</u>	<u>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.</u> <u>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.</u> <u>The Community First fund will require the fund administrator to produce an Annual Report on how the funds have been used.</u> <u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that it accepts the Applicant's position on this matter.</u>		<u>BC</u>	<u>Agreement confirmed via BC comments on SoCG on 24 January 2024</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
3.8 Landscape and Visual							
3.8.1	Tranquillity impacts on the Chilterns AONB	BC notes the Applicant's conclusions in respect of landscape and visual impacts, particularly the deterioration to the aesthetic and perceptual characteristics of the Chilterns AONB, including impacts on certain views, as well as its tranquillity. <u>It is agreed between the Council BC and the Applicant that the proposals will give rise to significant adverse landscape character effects including as a result of impacts on tranquillity (including noise and lighting from</u>	Noted. A draft report assessing the Special Qualities of the AONB, including tranquillity, was submitted to Natural England and other stakeholders for review on 23 October 2023. A meeting with NE and other stakeholders was held on 30 October 2023 to discuss the draft assessment. The Applicant is currently considering comments raised on the report and preparing an updated version of the assessment. <u>Following the issue of the draft assessment and the meeting, the Examining Authority (ExA) held a further Issue Specific Hearing</u>	It is agreed between the Council and the Applicant that the proposals will give rise to significant adverse landscape character effects as a result of impacts on tranquillity (including noise and lighting from aircraft in dark skies) within the areas of the Chilterns AONB in Buckinghamshire that lie beneath the identified 7000ft noise contours (as identified in Chapter 14 Landscape	Ongoing. The Applicant should continue to engage with the Council to determine suitable and effective mitigation of the agreed significant adverse effects.	<u>Agreed via email on 11 January 2023</u>	<u>Ongoing Agreed</u>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>aircraft in dark skies) within the areas of the Chilterns AONB in Buckinghamshire that lie beneath the identified 7000ft noise contours (as identified in Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual Figures 14.14 – 14.17) [AS-102].</p> <p>BC accept that there are no mitigation measures available to address the significant adverse effects on the tranquillity of the AONB. However, it is unclear from the submitted LVIA and accompanying information as to which parts of the Chilterns AONB and wider Buckinghamshire are anticipated to be affected.</p> <p>BC requests that the areas of effect are clearly identified. Whilst it may be anticipated that the response is that only those areas within the 'study area' are being identified, it is noted that the applicant has identified a viewpoint at Ivinghoe Beacon (Viewpoint 45) that is outside of the study area and that this along with the ambiguous nature of the assessment description within the LVIA leads to ambiguity.</p> <p>The applicant should be specific as to the extent of the AONB adversely affected during both the construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>(ISH8) on environmental matters on 29 November 2023. During ISH8 the Applicant provided the ExA with an update on the current status of the Assessment, details of the consultation held, a summary of feedback provided, the current scope of the Assessment and timescales for submission. A draft version of the Assessment was submitted to the ExA at Deadline 6 [REP6-075] with a final version to be submitted to the ExA at by Deadline 7 [REP7-046].</p> <p>To address the ambiguity issue raised, the Study Area extends 5km from the perimeter of the Main Application Site. It also includes the full extent of any character areas that may be affected within that 5km envelope and additional land within the AONB where aircraft would be below 7,000ft to consider effects on tranquillity. Figures 14.14-14.17 of Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual of the ES [AS-079] illustrate the number of Overflights per day as well as the extent of the AONB (including Buckinghamshire) potentially affected in relation to tranquillity, i.e. the extended study area as set out above.</p> <p>It is agreed that the proposals will give rise to significant adverse landscape character effects as a result of including impacts on tranquillity (including noise and lighting from aircraft in dark skies) within the areas of the Chilterns AONB in Buckinghamshire that lie beneath the identified 7000ft noise contours (as identified in Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual Figures 14.14 – 14.17)</p> <p>Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual of the ES [AS-079] concludes no physical impact on land within the AONB (within Buckinghamshire). The aesthetic or perceptual qualities of the AONB, i.e. tranquillity (one of the AONB's Special Qualities) within the identified part of the AONB within Buckinghamshire will, however, be affected. From assessment Phase 2b onwards, it concludes that there</p>	<p>and Visual Figures 14.14 – 14.17) [AS-102].</p> <p>The Council wishes to continue engagement with the Applicant to determine suitable and effective mitigation.</p>			

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>will be a noticeable deterioration to the aesthetic and perceptual characteristics of the AONB in this part of Buckinghamshire, the effect on this receptor is assessed to be moderate adverse which is significant.</p> <p>Figure 14.8 Assessment Viewpoint Locations identifies the Viewpoints as well as the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). View 45 (Ivinghoe Beacon) is identified as view 45 on an inset plan (15km away from the order limits and not within the ZTV). Ivinghoe Beacon was added in as a viewpoint following a direct request in the 2018 Non-Statutory Consultation and is recorded in the Non-Statutory Consultation Feedback Report [APP-174]. Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual of the ES [AS-079] concludes that the Airport is not visible from this location and anticipates only that there may be more aircraft visible in the sky.</p> <p>In response to clarification on the impact to Dark Skies raised on 2 August 2023 - The LVIA references A Light Obtrusion Assessment and is provided as Appendix 5.2 of the ES [APP-052 and APP-053]. The LVIA cannot address visibility of Aircraft Lighting.</p> <p>Section 14.4.6 of Chapter 14 Landscape and Visual of the ES [AS-079] confirms that lighting and night time effects within the LVIA were discussed and agreed with the LVIA Working Group (the working group was created and met four times pre-2019 consultation and contained relevant officers from the following Host Authorities; LBC, NHDC, HCC and CBC. Buckinghamshire Council-BC weren't part of this group as they are not a Host Authority).</p> <p>There are no landscape measures available to mitigate the adverse effects on the perceptual and aesthetic characteristics of the AONB in this part of Buckinghamshire.</p>				

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.8.2	Glint and glare impacts on the Chilterns AONB	<p>BC has reviewed the Glint and Glare Assessment and is in agreement with the findings of the Applicant. There is an absence of information to address possible glint and glare impact upon the Chilterns AONB. The Applicant should prepare a glint and glare assessment and assess any lighting impacts.</p>	<p>A Glint and Glare Assessment [REP4-040] was submitted to PINS on 9 August 2023.</p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's position that it is in agreement with the findings of the Glint and Glare assessment.</u></p>	<p>BC has reviewed the Glint and Glare Assessment and is in agreement with the findings of the Applicant.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Glint and Glare Assessment [REP4-040]</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
3.8.3	Construction landscape and visual impacts	<p>BC request that construction landscape and visual impacts should be scoped into the ES (particularly in the AONB). BC is seeking additional clarity on the controls that will be incorporated within the CTMP as it is developed. Ideally this will include controls preventing mass haul and lorry routes and construction compounds or other sites supporting construction (e.g. spoil disposal) being sited within Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>BC has set out requirements in relation to specific controls sought in relation to the CTMP within the matters associated with Surface Access. Resultant actions from this will then be dependent upon the way in which the Applicant chooses to address points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>BC considers that these matters have now been addressed through the inclusion of the Council as a consultee to the CTMP and CWTP as part of the discharge of requirements 14 and 15 respectively.</p>	<p><u>Construction landscape and visual impacts are scoped into the Environmental Statement (ES). Section 14.9 and Section 14.11 of Chapter 14 of the ES [AS-079] assess the landscape and visual effects, including effects on the AONB.</u> The Affected Road Network (ARN) is determined by the strategic model and includes the roads from which likely significant effects may potentially occur and is therefore the study area for traffic related environmental effects. The ARN is shown in Figure 7.1 [AS-098] and Figure 16.1 [AS-103] of the ES for air quality and noise respectively. Receptors within the ARN determined study areas are included in the assessments and effects assessed and reported in the ES. Roads and receptors outside of the ARN, which includes most of Buckinghamshire and the rural roads mentioned, are not likely to experience significant environmental effects and are therefore not assessed. This approach is widely accepted, included in relevant guidance, and best practice for assessment of environmental effects from highway related impacts.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP6-009APP-130] provides the principles to and measures to be developed in the full CTMP by the appointed contractor which, as secured by Requirement 134 of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003] draft DCO [AS-067] must be substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP. As</p>	<p>BC's position is unchanged. BC has set out requirements in relation to specific controls sought in relation to the CTMP within the matters associated with Surface Access. Resultant actions from this will then be dependent upon the way in which the Applicant chooses to address points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p>	<p>This matter is a downstream consequence of traffic impacts. BC wishes deficiencies in the traffic modelling in relation to the Buckinghamshire highway network to be resolved through further modelling and downstream analysis. BC is keen to discuss this with the Applicant.</p> <p>The resolution of this matter is therefore directly connected to BC's suggestions at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>The Applicant should complete the additional traffic modelling; and then review the outputs against the potentially sensitive receptors within Buckinghamshire. If required, further assessment of potential visual impacts should be undertaken and the</p>	<p><u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024x</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreedAgreedOngoing</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>described in Section 4.2 of the Outline CTMP “A principal consideration when identifying designated routes will be the minimisation of travel along any road that does not form part of the Primary Route Network (PRN)” and “it is envisaged the great majority of construction vehicles will approach the Site using the M1 and the A1081 (New Airport Way)”.</p> <p>Given that the areas of concern raised are the west of the M1 very little construction traffic is expected on that part of the network. There are no construction activities or compounds proposed in Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>There are no construction activities or compounds proposed in Buckinghamshire. The Applicant’s response to BC’s point made at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d can be found above.</p> <p>The version of the draft DCOdDCO, submitted at Deadline 9 [REP9-003], was updated to explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (requirements 14 and 15). The draft DCO, submitted at D9, now explicitly states that no authorised development may commence until a CTMP and CWTP has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with Buckinghamshire Council (R14 and R15). As above</p>		<p>analysis will need to be written up in the landscape chapter of the ES, as well as inform a review of the health and community assessment findings in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant should ensure that this is programmed sufficient in advance of Deadline 6 to enable meaningful review and comment by BC and other Interested Parties, as appropriate.</p>		
3.9	Draft DCO						
3.9.1	Draft DCO requirements	<p>BC welcomes their inclusion as a discretionary BC welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and</p>	<p>Article 6(3) stipulates that any variation to the limits of deviation must not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects.</p>	<p>BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>BC review of SoCG on 6 December 2023</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>considers that their amendments made addresses BC the Council's previous concerns (below) regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.:</p> <p>'Limits of Works', Article 6, sub-paragraph 3, does not stipulate consultation outside of the relevant planning authority for works in excess of the limits.</p> <p>Given the broad parameters to which this article could apply, BC is concerned that its wording does not stipulate consultation outside of the relevant planning authority for works in excess of the limits. It is suggested that neither the Applicant nor the relevant planning authority could rule out, at this stage, works outside the limits that would have potential impacts requiring input from external consultees into the decision-making process.</p> <p>Given the unknowns associated with works being undertaken outside the limits of works there are concerns over the ability to certify such a change without the requirement to consult key external consultees, where relevant.</p> <p>BC would expect sub-paragraph 3 to make provision for the relevant planning authority to undertake appropriate consultation on any works in excess of the limits.</p>	<p>This stipulation, therefore, provides a significant control on the Applicant's ability to vary the limits of deviation, and accordingly the provision is considered appropriate in limiting any 'unknowns' that may be associated with works undertaken outside of the limits of deviation.</p> <p>The relevant local planning authority, who has pre-existing knowledge of and experience with the project design and planning matters, is competent to authorise such variations. Nevertheless, the draft Development Consent Order dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003] has been amended to provide a mechanism for the discharging local authority, at its discretion, to consult specified parties on any application article 6(3) should relevant conditions be met. See further article 6(4) of the draft Order and Part 5 of Schedule 2. This change was made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p> <p>Article 6(3) is necessary to provide the proportionate flexibility required to ensure that the delivery of this nationally significant infrastructure project is not unnecessarily impeded or delayed by a requirement to make minor variations to the limits of deviation. The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that its inclusion as a discretionary consultee addresses its previous concerns.</p>	<p>that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.</p>			
—	Amendments to approved details	<p>BC welcomes their inclusion as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that their amendments made addresses BC's BC welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and</p>	<p>This requirement stipulates that any variation to the parameters of authorised development must not give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects.</p> <p>It is the Applicant's view that this provides a significant control on the Applicant's ability to vary the limits of deviation, and</p>	<p>BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding</p>	Agreed.		Agreed.

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>considers that this amendment addresses the Council's Paragraph 2, sub-paragraph 1, of Part 1, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003] Draft dDCO allows the undertaker to apply to the relevant planning authority for approval to amend the parameters specified in paragraph 6, of Part 2, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO. Subparagraph 3 limits any approval to one where it can be demonstrated that it would not give rise to any materially new or materially different effects to those reported in the ES and sub-paragraph 4 limits consultation on such an application to those consultees specified within the requirements contained in Part 2 and Part 4 of the dDCO.</p> <p>As paragraph 6 of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO <u>dDCO</u> is a compliance requirement Buckinghamshire Council <u>BC</u> would have concerns regarding an absence of consultee specification to inform paragraph 2(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO. It is suggested that the Applicant should make provision for the relevant planning authority to undertake consultation on any changes to the parameters specified in paragraph 6.</p>	<p>accordingly the provision is considered appropriate in limiting any 'unknowns' that may be associated with works undertaken outside of the limits of deviation.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the relevant local planning authority is competent to approve such variations and does not need to consult on any proposed changes. Nevertheless, the <u>dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003]</u> draft Development Consent Order has been amended to provide a mechanism for the discharging local authority, at its discretion, to consult specified parties on any application article paragraph 2 should relevant conditions be met. This change was made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.</p>			
—	Code of Construction Practice <u>CoCP</u>	<p><u>BC welcomes their inclusion as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses BC's</u> BC welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's Paragraph 8, sub-paragraphs 1-2, of Part 2, of</p>	<p>The Applicant considers that the relevant planning authority is competent to approve such variations to the Code of Construction Practice <u>CoCP</u> and its associated management plans. Requirements 34-35 of the <u>dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003]</u> draft DCO make provision for the relevant planning authority to elect to consult with other parties (where not already specified by a requirement (if the relevant conditions in requirement 35 are met. This change was</p>	<p><u>BC w</u> Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation</p>	Agreed.	?	Agreed.

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>Schedule 2 of the dDCO makes provision for the Code of Construction Practice CoCP and its associated management plans to be approved by the relevant planning authority, following consultation with the relevant highway authority on matters related to its functions. Whilst this may not apply to all management plans Buckinghamshire Council BC has concerns that some management plans could be approved without consultation with the appropriate technical authority.</p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council BC would suggest that paragraph 8, sub-paragraphs 1-2 of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO should make provision for the relevant planning authority to undertake wider consultation on management plans that require the input of external consultees.</p>	<p>made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.</p>			
<p>—</p>	<p>Draft DCO requirements</p>	<p>BC welcomes their inclusion as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's BC has concerns regarding requirement/paragraph 910 of Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO and the approval of Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plans without requiring consultation with external consultees such as Natural England.</p>	<p>The Applicant would draw BC's attention to the fact that the Landscape and Biodiversity Management Plan (LBMP) [AS-029], to be approved by the relevant planning authority, must be substantially in accordance the Outline LBMP [AS-029].</p> <p>This Outline LBMP [AS-029] has been produced as part of the environmental impact assessment process, and has been subject to consultation. The Outline LBMP will be subject to further scrutiny by the ExA and interested parties during the examination.</p> <p>The Applicant does not believe, therefore that the final LBMP [AS-029] requires additional consultation with other external consultees such as Natural England as the relevant local planning authority is competent to approve such a plan.</p>	<p>BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>		<p>Agreed.</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>Requirements 345 and 356 of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003] draft DCO make provision for the relevant planning authority to elect to consult with other parties (where not already specified by a requirement) if the relevant conditions in requirement 35 are met. This change was made directly in response to BC's suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p>				
3.9.2	ESG membership	<p>Given the remit of the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG), particularly in relation to any approved increase in the Night quota cap (requirement/paragraph 27 of Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the draft-DCO) and when considering the current uncertainty regarding the submitted traffic data, BC would request its inclusion in the ESG moving forward in order to allow it to represent its communities' best interests effectively.</p> <p>Whilst BC acknowledges the Applicant's inclusion of a requirement to add local authorities to the Noise Technical Panel, where the shape of the relevant noise contour changes in the future, they Council Council maintains its theirs itsposition that the analysis of traffic survey data at its key junctions against baseline traffic flows may present implications for further traffic, noise, air quality and health impact effects. These potential impacts support BC's case for inclusion in the ESG moving forward. Buckinghamshire Council suggests that the Applicant makes provision within Paragraph 20, sub paragraph 2, of Part 3, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO for the inclusion of Buckinghamshire Council, and any other neighbouring authority, where</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that paragraph 27 referred to by BC in its comments has been significantly amended since the time of the comment. The mechanism for securing the night movement cap has now been "carried across" to the DCO to a new Air Noise Management Plan adapted from the P19 planning consent and paragraph 27 of Schedule 2 now secures compliance with this. Nevertheless, the Applicant has responded here in relation to BC's comments on ESG membership.</p> <p>It is considered important that the ESG includes representatives of local authorities to ensure that the views of those authorities that are impacted across the whole range of environmental topics within the scope of GCG are captured. However, it is important to strike an appropriate balance between the need to capture a diversity of views, the relevance of views to the impacts arising from expansion that may be experienced around the airport and the need for membership of ESG to be focused in support of its decision-making role and in the interests of managing the costs of administering GCG (both for the airport operator and for local authorities). It is on this basis that the membership of ESG reflects those local authorities that are forecast to experience environmental impacts at the level upon which the Limits and Thresholds included within GCG are based.</p>	<p>Whilst BC acknowledges the Applicant's inclusion of a requirement to add local authorities to the Noise Technical Panel, where the shape of the relevant noise contour changes in the future, the Council maintains its position that the analysis of traffic survey data at its key junctions against baseline traffic flows may present implications for further traffic, noise, air quality and health impact effects. These potential impacts support BC's case for inclusion in the ESG moving forward.</p>	Ongoing		Ongoing Not agreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; noise or surface access impacts are identified as being experienced within their administrative boundaries.</p>	<p>Paragraphs 2.4.21 to 2.4.27 of the GCG Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-020] set out the forecast distribution of environmental impacts within the scope of GCG. Specifically for aircraft noise, the baseline and forecast daytime and night-time noise contours used to inform the GCG noise Limits are shown in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003] as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline noise contours for day-time and night-time 2019 actuals are Figure 16.5 and 16.6 [AS-098] • Phase 1 forecast noise contours for the Faster Growth scenario are Figure 16.91 and 16.92 [AS-075] • Phase 2a forecast noise contours are Figure 16.41 and 16.42 [AS-087] • Phase 2b forecast noise contours are Figure 16.65 and 16.66 [AS-094] <p>In all of the above figures, the 54 dBL_{Aeq,16h} (daytime) and 48 dBL_{Aeq,8h} (night-time) noise contours, used as the basis for the GCG Limits, do not extend into Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>Similarly, Appendix A to the Transport Assessment [APP-200] shows the locations of proposed off-site highway mitigation measures on the basis that these are the locations where transport impacts are potentially significant enough to require mitigation. Again, these are focused on Luton and North Hertfordshire, and include works to the Strategic Road Network, which is owned and operated by National Highways. There are no such locations in Buckinghamshire.</p> <p>On this basis, a role for Buckinghamshire Council BC on the ESG is not considered proportionate or relevant.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments made and is considering these further.</p>				

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.9.3	Schedule 2, Part 4	<p>Paragraphs 26 and 27, of Part 4, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO make provision for the relevant planning authority to approve variations to the passenger cap for the authorised development and the night quota cap, respectively. As currently drafted, BC is of the opinion that these requirements do not adequately deal with the phased approach to increasing passenger numbers to the cap. This places the Requirements at odds with the GCGF proposed by the Applicant and BC wishes to see this amended to address the inconsistency.</p> <p><u>BC is now content that requirement 26 contains sufficient controls to satisfy its concerns regarding potential changes to the passenger cap.</u></p> <p><u>BC is satisfied that its reserves its position in relation to the night quota cap until such time that the Applicant sets out its final position on this matter has been satisfied through the measures to be secured through the Air Noise Management Plan.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant understands that, following amendments made to the dDCO [REP5-003] draft Development Consent Order, BC's comment now refers to paragraphs 25 and 26 of the current draft of the Development Consent Order (as submitted at Deadline 5).</p> <p>Should the DCO be granted, the passenger cap for the airport would increase to 32 million passengers per annum. This cap is set by paragraph 26 of Schedule 2. Paragraph 26 makes no provision for that passenger cap to be varied by the LPA. Growth up to that passenger cap could take place provided that the limits set by the Green Controlled Growth framework are being met. Hence the two provisions are entirely aligned in this respect, and not at odds as suggested. Phasing of physical growth is dealt with in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 10 by paragraphs 5 and 6 of Schedule 2.</p> <p>As foreshadowed in the Applicant's submissions at Deadline 5, the mechanism for securing the night quota cap (currently which was previously paragraph 26) is being reviewed in conjunction with an increase in the noise conditions being "carried across" to the DCO to a new Air from the Noise Management Plan, adapted from accompanying the P19 planning consent. It is anticipated that the P19 measures (including the night quota cap) will be set out in a management plan secured by a Schedule 2 requirement.</p> <p>At Deadline 9, the Applicant submitted the Air Noise Management Plan [REP9-047 TR020001/APP/8.125 REP6-051], which duly includes details on the night quota cap. At Deadline 7, Schedule 2 of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01 REP75-003] draft DCO was updated to secure compliance with this document.</p> <p>The draft DCO as submitted for Deadline 8 [TR020001/APP/2.01 REP8-003] retains th</p>	<p>BC reserves its position in relation to the night quota cap until such time that the Applicant sets out its final position on this matter.</p>	Ongoing	<p><u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024</u></p>	<p><u>Ongoing Agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>contains <u>two requirements relating to this matter. Requirement 26 deals with the passenger cap for the authorised development and provides that the undertaker may operate under this Order the airport so that it permits up to 32 million passengers per annum. There is no option for the relevant planning authority to permit a variation to this cap. Requirement 27 secures compliance with the Air Noise Management Plan [REP9-047TR020001/APP/8.125REP7-044] which includes details on the night quota cap. -The Air Noise Management Plan is capable of future amendment but only in accordance with the process set out in paragraph 2 of Schedule 2. These provisions remain in the draft DCO submitted at Deadline 10.</u></p>				
<p><u>3.9.4</u></p>	<p>Draft DCO requirements</p>	<p>BC would query <u>queried</u> whether requirements/paragraphs 31, 32 and 33 of Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the draft dDCO <u>DCO</u> should require consultation with the ESG as a minimum due to the broader, regional implications of the associated plans.</p> <p><u>BC no longer consider this as an area of disagreement and therefore agree with the Applicant's position on the matter.</u></p>	<p>The Applicant understands that the requirements referred to by BC are now requirements 33, 34 and 35 in the <u>draft DCO submitted for Deadline 10 [TR020001/APP/2.01]</u>.</p> <p>Under the terms of the draft DCO <u>CO</u>, the ESG may not have been constituted prior to the undertaker seeking to discharge requirements 33, 34 and 35 of Part 4 of Schedule 2, so could not be consulted with. Furthermore, even when constituted the ESG only meets annually (within 28 days of receipt of the annual monitoring report) and so it would not be reasonable or practicable to have to await its sitting before these requirements could be progressed / discharged</p> <p>In any event:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As regards Requirements 33 and 34, the Applicant considers that the relevant planning authority is competent to discharge these matters without consulting with the ESG. The ESG will ultimately monitor air quality and greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with its remit, and should 	<p>It is understood that the Applicant's stated position within this draft dDCO section of the SoCG has not been updated pending resolution of the ExAs written questions, and may need to be updated again in due course ahead of Deadline 6. On this basis, BC reserves its position on this matter.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p><u>BC comments on SoCG on 24 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u> <u>Ongoing</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
			<p>further remedial action be necessary (i.e. additional to the operational air quality and greenhouse gas action plans), this will emerge through the GCG process with the ESG's oversight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement 353 does not pertain to the scope and remit of the ESG, and so the issue of consultation with the ESG is not considered to be relevant in this context. <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that this is no longer an area of disagreement.</u></p>				
3.9.5	ESG right of appeal to the Secretary of State (SoS)	<p>Within the GCG Framework the ESG Terms of Reference (paragraph A2.3.3) [REP5-023APP219] and the dDCODdco [TR020001/APP/2.01AS-067] has identified that Airport Operator has a right of appeal to the SoS for Transport. BC previously recommended s-that, in addition to BC being admitted to the ESG, each of the (then) five Local Authorities sitting within the ESG are additionally given a right of appeal to the SoS —S- he Council BC has given further consideration to this matter and is in agreement with the Applicant's latest position.</p>	<p>It is not clear why it would be necessary for the ESG to have a right of appeal to the SoS, as the ESG is the only decision-making body in the GCG process. Section 2.7 of the Green Controlled Growth Explanatory Note [TR020001/APP/7.07REP5-020REP3-015] sets out the possible enforcement approaches where the GCG Framework has not been complied with. This includes the option for any local authority to take enforcement action pursuant to Section 161 of the Planning Act 2008, including those where land under the application for development consent is not within their jurisdiction.</p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that it is in agreement with the Applicant's position.</u></p>	<p>The Council has given further consideration to this matter and is in agreement with the Applicant's latest position.</p>	Agreed.	<p><u>?BC review of SoCG on 6 December 2023</u></p>	Agreed.
3.9.6	Schedule 2 Part 3	<p>BC previously recommended that tThe dDCODdco Schedule 2 Part 3, paragraph 24 should set out the maximum timescales for delivery of any actions.</p> <p><u>Following further consideration of this matter the Council BC considers that paragraph 24 and the requirement for the undertaker to</u></p>	<p>The Applicant understands this comment now relates to paragraph 243 of the latest version of the dDCODdco [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003] draft Development Consent Order (as submitted at Deadline 10-5). That paragraph is headed "exceedance of a limit".</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider it appropriate for paragraph 24 to set out</p>	<p>Following further consideration of this matter the Council considers that paragraph 23 and the requirement for the undertaker to implement a relevant mitigation plan, as approved, should provide adequate control over the</p>	Agreed.	<p><u>?BC review of SoCG on 6 December 2023</u></p>	Agreed.

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<u>implement a relevant mitigation plan, as approved, should provide adequate control over the implementation of any actions.</u>	<p>maximum timescales for taking action – this is a matter to be considered by the ESG in reaching a decision under this paragraph and it is not considered appropriate to fetter the ESGs discretion in this respect. The drafting of paragraph 234 allows the ESG to refuse the Mitigation Plan if they are not satisfied that it will address the exceedance of the Limit as soon as is reasonably practicable.</p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC’s confirmation that it no longer disagrees with the provision referred to.</u></p>	implementation of any actions.			
<u>3.9.7</u>	Monitoring findings of the GCG Framework and Framework Travel Plan	<p>A list should be included in the draft DcedDCO to indicate which bodies are responsible for monitoring the findings of the GCG Framework and the <u>Framework Travel Plan</u>, including the data collection and authorisation of changes to in order to address any failures to meet targets.</p> <p><u>BC no longer consider this as an area of disagreement and therefore agree with the Applicant’s position on the matter.</u></p>	<p>Proposals for monitoring surface access performance under the GCG Framework are set out in Green Controlled Growth<u>GCG Framework Appendix F – Surface Access Monitoring Plan [REP7-032-REP5-0322REP3-017]</u>. Governance arrangements for the <u>Framework Travel Plan [REP8-024]REP4-044]Framework Travel Plan [AS-131]</u> are set out in Section 7.4 of that document, compliance with which is secured through Requirement 310 of the DCO. The requirements within the Framework Travel Plan do not therefore need to be transposed in the DCO itself.</p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC’s confirmation that it is in agreement with the Applicant’s position.</u></p>	BC reserves its position on this matter subject to further discussions with the Applicant.	Ongoing	<u>BC comments on the SoCG on 24 January 2024</u>	<u>Agreed</u>
<u>3.9.8</u>	Economic benefits	<p>How economic benefits associated with the expansion will be secured should be reflected in the draft dDCODeco.</p> <p><u>BC reserves its position on this matter. The CouncilBC has raised comments previously on the securing of the whole of the ETS within a s106 agreement and its need to have sight of the draft s106 agreement in order to draft its own side agreement with the</u></p>	<p>The Applicant notes the comments made. Whilst the Applicant’s case is that the development for which consent is sought would generate significant economic benefits, these cannot nor should not be “secured” in some way by the DCO. It would <u>be</u> highly novel and unusual to attempt to do so. The Applicant has developed an <u>ETS [REP8-020APP-215]employment and training strategy</u> which is currently proposed to be secured by a s106 agreement. –The Applicant has</p>	BC reserves its position on this matter. The Council has raised comments previously on the securing of the whole of the ETS within a s106 agreement and its need to have sight of the draft s106 agreement in order to draft its own side agreement with the Applicant.	Ongoing	<u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024</u>	<u>OngoingAgreedOngoing</u>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		Applicant:BC have reviewed the draft s106 and the updated Mitigation Route Map with the ETS now adequately secured.	shared the s106 agreement with the CouncilBC.				
	Schedule 2, Part 2	Schedule 2, Part 2 (1) references 'the' relevant planning authority (singular entity). However, some of the matters to be considered have trans-boundary implications. It is suggested that this should be broadened to state 'all relevant authorities' (plural). This change should be implemented throughout the draft dDCO to include Buckinghamshire CouncilBC as a Relevant Authority.BCBCtheir	The Applicant considers that the definition of the relevant planning authority is appropriate as the definition refers to both '... the area in which the provision relates is situated' and 'for the matter to which that provision relates' so already refers to the part of the Authorised Development. The relevant planning authority will therefore be determined according to the geographic area in which work is located, or in which a power is being exercised. For the 'relevant highway authority' the definition refers to the highway authority being the authority for the 'highway to which the provision relates'. Again, there will be only one "relevant highway authority" with respect to any particular highway that is being worked on. No works are taking place in Buckinghamshire Council's BC's administrative area, which is outside of the Order Limits. Accordingly, the CouncilBC does not qualify as a relevant authority under the DCO. The approach taken by the Applicant is consistent with other made DCOs.	The Council accepts the Applicant's stance regarding the definitions of relevant planning / highway authorities and welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council's concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.	Agreed.	?	Agreed.
3.9.9	Schedule 2, Part 2, 8	Following further consideration, the CouncilBC accepts the Applicant's stance on this matter. BCThe Council's initial position can be seen below: Schedule 2, Part 2, 8 (2) - BC agrees that these plans need to be developed pre-commencement, but there should also be reference in the requirement to them being 'implemented' pre-commencement.	The Applicant notes that this is now at paragraph 7 in the latest version of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003]draft Development Consent Order (Deadline 5). The Applicant considers that the control plans secured by paragraph 87 of Schedule 2 of the draft DCO already achieve the ends referred to by BC.	Following further consideration the Council accepts the Applicant's stance on this matter.	Agreed.	?BC review of SoCG on 6 December 2023	Agreed.

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>In the context of the health and community assessment, the specific rationale here is 8 (2) (e) Community Engagement Plan, which BC would expect to include pre-commencement activities, for example, to ensure that affected communities are fully aware of the impacts and potential effects that they will experience and able to feel supported and heard, should any adverse effects arise once construction is underway.</p>	<p>Paragraph 87 requires the Applicant to comply with the CoCP, including the various plans secured under it which must be approved by the relevant planning authority prior to works commencing.</p> <p>Section 4 of the CoCP requires that the Community Engagement Plan must include procedures to communicate with affected communities prior to the commencement of the relevant construction operations about how the effects of construction activities will be managed and, where appropriate, mitigated (paragraph 4.1.2(b)).</p> <p>Furthermore, paragraph 4.2.2 continues: <i>“Wherever possible, the lead contractor will notify occupiers of nearby or affected properties, businesses, adjacent or affected parish councils, and other elected representatives at least four weeks in advance, and again at least two weeks in advance, of the nature and anticipated duration of planned construction works that may affect them, including both principal and ancillary works”</i>.</p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC’s confirmation that it is in agreement with the Applicant’s position.</u></p>				
—	<p>Procedure for discharge of Requirements</p>	<p>BC welcomes their inclusion as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that their amendments made addresses BC’s BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council’s BC has concerns regarding the implications of paragraph 36 (3) of Part 5 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO on consultation. Paragraph 36(3) would appear to limit consultation on the discharge of DCO requirements to those consultees specified within a</p>	<p>Requirements 354 and 365 of the dDCO [TR020001/APP/2.01REP5-003] draft DCO now make provision for the relevant planning authority to elect to consult with other parties (where not already specified by a requirement) if the relevant conditions in requirement 356 are met. This change was made directly in response to BC’s suggestion in this regard submitted at Deadline 3.</p>	<p>BC Welcomes the inclusion of the Council as a discretionary consultee, alongside other key stakeholders, and considers that this amendment addresses the Council’s concerns regarding adequate consultation relating to the discharge of DCO requirements.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>	<p>±</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>requirement itself. Given the wording of this requirement BC would emphasise the need to ensure that relevant consultees are stated within the wording of each requirement, where considered necessary, to ensure that an appropriate assessment of the associated impacts is made.</p>					
<p><u>3.9.10</u></p>	<p>Schedule 2, Part 5</p>	<p>Whilst Buckinghamshire Council BC recognises that there are prescribed consultees stipulated in relevant requirements the Council they would expect paragraph 35, of Part 5, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO to make provision for a minimum consultation period for applications made under requirements, akin to the 21 days defined in Paragraph 18, of Part 3, of Schedule 2 of the dDCO. The Applicant should also ensure that an appropriate mechanism is included within the dDCO for extending this consultation period should further issues arise or if insufficient information is made available to the consultee.</p>	<p>The Applicant has not prescribed a specific period for consultation on a requirement, but has instead specified a <u>determination</u> period of <u>13 weeks for any application under paragraph 35 of Schedule 2 for detailed design approval of Works Nos. 3b(01), 3b(02), 3f and 4a, and 8 weeks for all other applications under Part 1, Part 2 or Part 4 of Schedule 2, determining an application under the requirements.</u> It is considered that this allows for an appropriate period of consultation, to be determined by the discharging authority depending on the subject matter. Furthermore in this context it should also be noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — the period of 8 weeks “re-starts” if a request for further information is made in accordance with the process in the requirements; - the period of 8 weeks can be extended by agreement with the undertaker; and — provision has been made to allow the undertaker to carry out the necessary consultation prior to submission of the application to the discharging authority. - An update will be provided regarding this at Deadline 7. <p><u>Due to drafting amendments at Deadlines 8, 9 and 10, the paragraph referred to by BuckinghamshireC is now paragraph 37, not 35.</u></p>	<p>The Council maintains its stance that the procedure for discharging the DCO requirements should include a minimum consultation period that would be standard procedure under other consenting regimes.</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>		<p>Ongoing Not agreed. Ongoing</p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.10 Airspace change							
—	Airspace change— impacts on heritage assets due to noise and vibration	BC requests an explanation of how the Applicant intends to integrate the CAA’s CAP1616 and the airport expansion whilst mitigating noise impacts. Consideration of how airspace change will impact local communities with possible implications for the area’s heritage assets is required.	The process of airspace change across the South East of England is a separate process being sponsored by the Department of Transport and the CAA, with the ultimate acceptability of any proposed change resting with the CAA. This requires complex coordination of the requirements of each of the airports. The DCO does not directly require an airspace change, so it does not form part of the application. Some sensitivity analysis has been undertaken of the potential implications of air space change on the noise envelope and this suggests that the noise implications are unlikely to be greater than assessed. Decisions on future airspace change will be taken in accordance with the CAA’s process as set out in CAP1616: <i>Airspace change: Guidance on the regulatory process for changing the notified airspace design and planned and permanent redistribution of air traffic, and on providing airspace information.</i>	BC addresses this matter within the noise section of the SoCG. This includes reference to the downstream analysis that is required should the Applicant identify changes to the noise climate (e.g. for heritage assets and health and well-being). BC considers these matters to be linked and this additional aspect may be removed from separate consideration.	Ongoing as a sub-set of noise matters. Refer to the resolutions within the Noise section.		Ongoing
3.10.1	Airspace change	<p>BC previously advised that cChange is needed to allocate more airspace for safe departures and arrivals across the southeast airports to allow expansion. It is acknowledged that this will be subject to a separate regulatory process to the DCO, however, there is a degree of uncertainty over how these changes will impact residents. Change to airspace and in combination effects with Heathrow should be reflected in the DCO.</p> <p>BC now accepts the Applicant’s position – it is agreed that there will be insufficient information regarding airspace change at the strategic</p>	<p>A sensitivity test is presented in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003] to assess the potential implications of airspace change at Luton based on the options consulted on by the airport operator. As there is no information currently regarding potential options for airspace change associated with London Heathrow Airport, it is not possible at this stage to consider in combination effects.</p> <p>The Applicant welcomes BC’s confirmation that it agreed with the Applicant’s position.</p>	<p>BC accepts the Applicant’s position – it is agreed that there will be insufficient information regarding airspace change at the strategic scale, delivered through the separate regulatory process, to enable this aspect of the CEA to be delivered in a meaningful manner.</p>	Agreed	BC review of SoCG on (19 October 2023)	Agreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<u>scale, delivered through the separate regulatory process, to enable this aspect of the CEA to be delivered in a meaningful manner.</u>					
3.10.2	Consideration of airspace change in the cumulative effects assessment	<p>BC asserts that the Applicant needs to consider the inter-project cumulative interactions between the levels of growth that will be necessitated by the Proposed Development in achieving the growth in mppa against a trend of growth associated with the existing flightpaths for the other south east airports. The focus should be on receptors that already experience intersection of flight paths from Luton plus at least one other airport.</p> <p>This will be possible on a qualitative basis since the existing receptors subject to impacts from intersecting flightpaths are known.</p> <p>Furthermore, BC is of the opinion that the Applicant should consider ways in which the likely exacerbation of in-combination noise and disturbance cumulative effects may be monitored and, if necessary, mitigated.</p> <p>This aspect of inter-project cumulative effects should be included in the scope of the ES.</p>	<p>Changes to airspace and flightpaths and their cumulative effects are outside the scope of the Proposed Development. Any changes to future flight paths are the subject of a future airspace change process being sponsored by the UK Government and will be subject to a separate assessment and consultation exercise by the airport operator in accordance with Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) procedure (CAP1616), in due course. A note explaining the relationship between the two processes was submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-028].</p>				<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not agreed</u>
3.11 Health and Community							
3.11.1	Traffic related health and community impacts	<u>Subsequent to receipt of specific data from the traffic modelling supplied by the Applicant at D6, BC traffic officers have undertaken analysis of the applicability of the traffic modelling to the areas of concern within the Buckinghamshire network. This is now accepted by BC</u>	<u>The Applicant understands there is the potential for some redistribution of vehicular trips around the local highway network as a result of the Proposed Development. However, any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205,</u>				<u>Ongoing</u> <u>Not agreed</u>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>as valid, without a requirement for remodelling.</u></p> <p><u>BC's principal area of concern is the indirect health effects of traffic impacts (as reflected in the change to Table 13.6 made by the Applicant in [REP7-009/010]). The BC traffic officer analysis of the early morning traffic flow data supplied by the Applicant for the B488/B489 has informed the response. It is acknowledged that in numerical terms, flow levels along this route fall below thresholds of significance for a number of technical assessment areas that inform the health assessment. However, in percentage increase terms, BC maintains that there are likely to be members of the population in the villages of Pitstone, Marsworth and Ivinghoe who will increasingly experience adverse health effects as a result of the changes (increases) in the traffic flows.</u></p> <p><u>In the early hours, this is expected to manifest mainly as sleep disturbance, but throughout the day there are concerns relating to modal conflict and general adverse impacts on the overall amenity and key characteristics of these villages. These are detailed in REP6-087.</u></p> <p><u>BC is seeking the Applicant's written acknowledgement of these potential health effects within the suite of documentation (e.g. within the ES, or within material supporting mitigation approaches, or an alternative approach that links to access to suitable mitigation routes). BC is also seeking a commitment from the Applicant that there is a clear route to ensure that adverse health effects arising from traffic impacts are to be</u></p>	<p><u>APP-206] and in matter 3.2.1d (re-prioritisation).:-</u></p> <p><u>The Strategic Model CBLTM-LTN has been calibrated and validated as per the DfT's TAG guidance. The level of detail in the model's geographical coverage was agreed with Host Authorities and National Highways and informed by observed CAA data on the distribution of airport passengers / staff.</u></p> <p><u>The trip distribution of the airport traffic was based on observed CAA data. Within Appendix F of the Transport Assessment [APP-201], airport distribution figures were included. The Applicant also submitted daily airport passengers and staff distribution figures as was requested by the Examining Authority at Deadline 1 which showed relatively low volumes of traffic through Buckinghamshire [REP1-016].</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant will discuss these issues further with BC. has discussed this with BC in relation to item 3.2.1b with additional flow information provided in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 - Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review [REP6-070] provided at D6. The effects of traffic noise are assessed in Chapter 16 of the ES [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003] and takes into account the effects of night-time noise on health and quality of life including sleep disturbance. The assessment has been undertaken with reference to the 'Noise exposure hierarchy table' in PPGN (Table 16.29), which includes consideration of effects on sleep disturbance and quality of life. The ES does not identify any significant noise effects in Buckinghamshire.</u></p> <p><u>As explained in the Applicant's response to Written Question NO2.12 [REP7-056], traffic noise effects in Buckinghamshire have been scoped out according to the agreed methodology, which is informed by WHO studies into the health effects of traffic noise</u></p>				

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>effectively addressed for the affected receptor(s).</u></p> <p>BC is seeking the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Qualitative written health assessment of the data that has been generated by the Applicant, to demonstrate that the potential health effects of traffic impacts arising from the Scheme are acknowledged and have been carefully analysed. This should set out the issue, the underlying data, the percentage increase in flows over existing, potential health effects arising and routes to mitigation. - For BC, this must lead to a commitment to mitigation for affected receptor(s). It is suggested that an augmentation of text at 13.13.3 to express what 'initiatives to address concerns identified' will be, in REP7-009/010 may be a location to address the latter part, although the Applicant may identify alternative locations/means. - Commitment by the Applicant to undertake works to re-prioritise the B488/B489 junction, working with relevant BC officers on the approach. <p>BC is aware of the Applicant's concerns regarding setting a precedent, and appreciates a creative approach may be required reflecting that this is a locationally specific issue; and also that there could be consequences elsewhere (e.g. in Tring), following reprioritisation of B488/B489. BC's position is unchanged. BC has concerns regarding the validity of the traffic modelling undertaken by the</p>	<p><u>and takes account of early morning peaks in traffic volumes.</u></p> <p><u>Significant health effects are assessed at population level (see paragraphs 13.5.2 and 13.5.4, Chapter 13 of the ES [REP7-009]. Changes to health determinants (such as noise) that are identified as not having do not have the potential to lead to significant population health effects are scoped out of the health assessment. The Applicant notes that a judgement of 'no likely significant effect' does not equate to 'no change'. Sensitivities and attitudes to noise vary widely and small changes may be perceived as adverse by some individuals; it does not follow that all perceptible changes will lead to significant health effects. The Applicant does not propose to undertake an assessment of issues that have been scoped out according to the agreed methodology.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant does not propose to provide specific mitigation for non-significant effects that have been scoped out of the assessment. The Applicant notes that text at 13.13.3 of ES Chapter 13, referred to by BC, concerns monitoring of complaints and feedback during construction whereas this matter relates to the effects of operational surface access. The airport operator employs a Community and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) manager and is committed to continued community engagement. The London Luton Airport Consultative Committee (LLACC) meets four times year and its agenda includes Environmental Management & Surface Access issues. The Applicant notes that text at 13.13.3 of ES Chapter 12, referred to by BC in relation to augmentation of mitigation, refers to to express what 'initiatives to address concerns identified' will be, in REP7-009/010 The Applicant does not propose to provide specific mitigation for</u></p>				

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>Applicant in respect of the impacts on the Buckinghamshire network, which in turn means that the conclusions of the downstream analysis of health and community impacts is not currently considered robust.</p> <p>BC has set out its requirements in relation to addressing this in points made by BC in relation to Surface Access at 3.2.1d, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.10c and 3.2.10d.</p> <p>BC reserves its position on this downstream analytical matter, pending the provision of traffic modelling outputs that are considered robust by BC's relevant technical officers.</p> <p>BC raised a number of matters relating to health in ISH8 that will be set out in writing within the D6 submission — these matters will need to be discussed further with the Applicant.</p>	<p>non-significant effects that have been scoped out of the assessment.</p> <p><u>As there are no significant traffic effects in Buckinghamshire, it is not considered necessary to undertake a health assessment of traffic increases in this area.</u></p>				
3.11.2	Analysis of health implications	<p>Subsequent to receipt of specific data from the traffic modelling supplied by the Applicant at D6, BC traffic officers have undertaken analysis of the applicability of the traffic modelling to the areas of concern within the Buckinghamshire network. This is now accepted by BC as valid, without a requirement for remodelling. As there is no request from BC for remodelling, there is no downstream request for re-modelling of air quality and noise.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, BC maintains the position, as expressed through ISH and written in REP6-087 (para. 36) that health assessment should be based on an analysis of the totality of discernible impacts</p>	<p>As there are no Environmental Statement ES significant traffic <u>[AS-030] [REP1-003] [AS-076]</u> effects in Buckinghamshire, it is not considered necessary to undertake a health assessment of traffic increases in this area. The Applicant has discussed this with BC in relation to item 3.2.1b with additional flow information provided in the Applicant's Response to Issue Specific Hearing 7 Action 3 – Ivinghoe Junction Modelling Review <u>[REP6-070]</u> provided at D6. Air quality and noise effects are assessed in Chapter 16 [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003] and Chapter 7 [AS-0786] of the ES and no significant effects are identified. There is a wide variety of sensitivities to noise and air quality within the population and an assessment of 'no significant effect' in EIA does not signify no change.</p>				Ongoing Not agreed

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p>rather than relying on thresholds of significance from contributing assessments.</p> <p>On this basis, BC maintains that the Applicant should expand the write up of health matters to acknowledge this. Further, there should be statements included within appropriate documents (e.g. an update to REP7-009/010) to explain that there is an appreciation that changes of noise and air quality (for example and from both surface and air traffic changes) may be discernible below significance thresholds used for reporting; that the Applicant acknowledges individual responses, perceptions and attitudes differ and will result in differences in effects accordingly; and that the Applicant has included mitigation approaches that are intended to support health should individuals experience significant adverse health effects. As noted above, expansion of detail associated with the monitoring of complaints and triggering of initiatives to resolve issues will be valuable (REP7-009/010 para 13.13.3 and also within the descriptions of effects and mitigations in Table 13.20).</p>	<p><u>The Applicant also notes that where potential health and wellbeing effects on sensitive receptors as a result of air quality or noise are identified, these effects are assessed and reported Chapter 16 [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003] and Chapter 7 [AS-0786] of the ES and not duplicated in the health assessment.</u></p>				
3.11.3	Impacts on Aylesbury	<p>BC requires consideration of the impacts of the Proposed Development on Aylesbury. This relates both to the proposals for traffic movement on the highway network in and around Aylesbury and specifically in relation to the impacts on the AQMAs, which are not reported within the Hhealth and communities-Community chapter of the ES [AS-078].</p>	<p>The change in traffic flows as a result of the Proposed Development were reviewed for the road links in the strategic model, including those in the south of Buckinghamshire, to identify those links that met the magnitude of impact thresholds in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms. The impacts on road links in this area did not meet the thresholds that triggered consideration of significant effects.</p>			<p><u>Confirmed at meeting on 17 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline-3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>Subsequent to receipt of specific data from the traffic modelling supplied by the Applicant at D6, BC traffic officers have undertaken analysis of the applicability of the traffic modelling to the areas of concern within the Buckinghamshire network. This is now accepted by BC as valid, without a requirement for remodelling.</u></p> <p><u>BC air quality officer is satisfied with the assessment findings and the way in which the Aylesbury AQMAs are represented within the submission. Consequently, BC no longer considers it necessary to draw out specific commentary in the health and community assessment.</u></p>	<p>Any significant effects have been identified through detailed modelled assessments and mitigation proposed. More details are provided in the Transport Assessment [APP-203, AS-123, APP-205, APP-206].</p> <p><u>The Applicant notes that BC raised a number of matters relating to health in their Post-Hearing Submission [REP6-087]. The impact on Aylesbury was not one of the issues raised in this submission.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC's confirmation that the modelling is considered valid and that the air quality officer is satisfied with the assessment findings.</u></p>				
3.11.4	Expansion of the health and community assessments	<p>The Hhealth and Ccommunityies chapter of the ES [AS-078] reports increased aircraft movements and changes in aircraft noise exposure in the population as a moderate adverse permanent effect on health outcomes across the study population. BC considered this very generalised and the health and suggested that the <u>health and community assessment</u> should be expanded to assess the impacts on tranquillity of affected parts of the Chilterns AONB, as well as any sensitive community receptors that are scoped in following the updates. Should any significant adverse effects be identified, BC would wish to be directly involved in developing proposals for mitigation, from the perspective of avoiding adverse effects on health and communities.</p> <p><u>Subsequent to receipt of specific data from the traffic modelling supplied by the Applicant at D6, BC traffic officers have undertaken</u></p>	<p>The impact of noise from the Proposed Development on health and quality of life for residential and sensitive community receptors has been assessed and all reasonably practicable measures have been explored to reduce noise impacts. Further details can be found in Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration of the ES [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003].</p> <p>The effects of aircraft noise on the perception of tranquillity by recreational users of landscape receptors, including the Chilterns AONB and rural areas in proximity to the Airport, have been assessed in Chapter 14 of the ES, Landscape and Visual [AS-079].</p> <p>An assessment of the impact of noise on health and communities has been undertaken and reported in Chapter 13 Health and Community of the ES [AS-078APP-039]. This assessment inherently considers impacts and results of the assessment in Chapter 16 Noise and Vibration of the ES [REP9-011TR020001/APP/5.01REP1-003].</p>			<p><u>Ref. resolution of technical issues in SoCG IDs 3.3.1 and 3.3.24</u></p> <p><u>Confirmed at meeting on 17 January 2024</u></p>	<p><u>AgreedOngoing</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>analysis of the applicability of the traffic modelling to the areas of concern within the Buckinghamshire network. This is now accepted by BC as valid, without a requirement for remodelling. BC officers are satisfied with the assessment findings and the way in which issues relating to the AONB are represented within the submission. Consequently, BC no longer considers it necessary to draw out specific commentary in the health and community assessment.</u></p>	<p><u>Technical issues raised in SoCG ID 3.3.1, relating to operational air noise impacts on Buckinghamshire residents, have now been resolved.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant notes that BC raised a number of matters relating to health in their Post-Hearing Submission [REP6-087]. Expansion of the assessment of health effects of aircraft noise was not one of the issues raised in this submission.</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant welcomes BC’s confirmation that the modelling is considered valid and that the air quality officer is satisfied with the assessment findings.</u></p>				
<p>3.12 Section 106 agreement (s106)</p>							
3.12.1	<p><u>BC membership of the ATF Steering Group</u></p>	<p><u>The updated s106 does name BC as a prospective member of the ATF Steering Group and prospective recipient of the RIF, but it fails to secure membership in perpetuity. BC request that the Council’s membership of the ATF is secured through the s106 agreement.</u></p> <p><u>The amalgamation of the RIF within the STF, its securing via requirement 32 and its status as a certified document satisfies the Council’s concerns on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The obligations relating to the STF are no longer secured through the s106 agreement and the s106 DCO does not secure any member in perpetuity, so it is not appropriate to identify BC as such.</u></p> <p><u>Note, the STF is now secured by requirement 32 in the Deadline 10 version of the dDraft DCO [TR020001/APP/2.01].</u></p>			<p><u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed.</u></p>
3.12.2	<p><u>Definition of the Relevant Highways Authority in the s106</u></p>	<p><u>BC requests that the term ‘Relevant Highways Authority’ is defined in the s106 so as to include BC in the list of potential highway authorities ‘relevant to type 2 mitigation under the TRIMMA and RIF.</u></p> <p><u>The amalgamation of the RIF within the STF, its securing via requirement 32 and its status as a certified document satisfies the Council’s concerns on this matter.</u></p>	<p><u>The TRIMMA is now secured as a requirement 30 of the DCO. It is no longer secured via the S106.</u></p> <p><u>Note that at Deadline 10 the RIF was amalgamated into the STF, and the STF is also now secured by requirement in the dDraft DCO [TR020001/APP/2.01].</u></p>			<p><u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed.</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
3.12.3	<u>Funding of the TRIMMA</u>	<p>BC consider the TRIMMA to be <u>underfunded and believe that it must be index linked.</u></p> <p><u>The ability for the ATF Steering Group to fund Mitigation Type 2 proposals through the STF, providing doing so does not have a significant detrimental effect on the ability to fund Travel Plan measures in any given year, satisfies the Council's concerns regarding fund size.</u></p>	<p>As outlined in the updated Sustainable Transport Fund [TR020001/APP/8.119REPx-xxx] submitted at Deadline 10, any surplus <u>The STF funds will now be available for use for fund interventions associated with MT2 in the TRIMMA. The parking levies - which the STF will be generated through – will remain proportionate to the cost of parking throughout the period of the Proposed Development, and so the fund will increase if the price of parking increases with inflation.</u></p>			<u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024</u>	<u>OngoingAgreed.</u>
3.12.4	<u>Definition of 'local area'</u>	<p><u>The definition of 'Local Area' currently refers to the 'Aylesbury Vale area of Buckinghamshire Council'. The Council considers that to align with the Local Procurement Protocol, the Employment & Training Strategy and the Community Fund area that this definition should refer to the 'administrative area of Buckinghamshire Council'.</u></p> <p><u>Further to the Applicant's response the definition of Local Area within the Deadline 9 s106 does not make it explicit that it relates solely to the Community Fund. Moreover, the definition of the Local Procurement Protocol also includes the term 'Local Area' which would appear to fall outside of the Community Fund's remit.</u></p>	<p><u>The definition of 'Local Area' in the section 106 relates only to the Community Fund and does not relate to the ETS. The Community Fund is an existing fund that is already established and run by LLAOL and therefore the definition of Local Area remains as drafted and will not be amended.</u></p>				<u>OngoingNot Agreed</u>
3.12.5	<u>Noise Technical Panel membership</u>	<p><u>Notwithstanding BC's opinion that it should be part of the ESG and all Technical Panels from the outset, sShould BC, or any other authority, be included as a member of the Noise Technical Panel as a result of a noise limit review then the s106 should make allowance for the potential change in the technical panel membership to specifically</u></p>	<p><u>In response to these concerns, the Applicant is proposing to makehas made amendments to both the Draft ESG Terms of Reference [TR020001/APP/7.08REP9-024] and Draft Technical Panels Terms of Reference [TR020001/APP/7.08REP9-26] to include the following:</u></p> <p><u>"Members of the ESG/TP are proposed to, subject to agreement, have contributions</u></p>	te		<u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024</u>	<u>Agreed</u>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<p><u>include BC as a potential member and Schedule 5 be amended commensurately to ensure relevant payments are made to any new member of the technical panel.</u></p> <p><u>It should also be noted that in its current form Schedule 5 fails to capture all additional members of the Technical Panel outlined in Table 2.1 of the Technical Panel Terms of Reference. Whilst not all of these members may be party to the S106 the Council believes that the Applicant should set out clearly how the payments proposed for the host authorities (in their role on the Technical Panels) would also be secured for other authorities, either currently proposed or as a future addition to the membership.</u></p> <p><u>The Council welcomes the proposed amendments to the draft ESG and Technical Panels Terms of References to include the stated text on the basis that the commitment made by the Applicant applies to both currently proposed and subsequently added members of ESG and Technical Panels.</u></p>	<p><u>paid in respect of officer time associated with the attendance of ESG/TP meetings. The amounts payable are to be agreed between the parties, but [the Applicant] should seek to ensure all members have access to contributions on an equivalent footing (and the starting presumption is that any ratessums will reflect contributions provided under the section 106 agreement in connection with the Proposed Development)."</u></p> <p><u>This amendment will be made at Deadline 11.</u></p>				
3.12.6	<p><u>Flexibility in the approach to allocation of payments under Schedule 5 -Green Controlled Growth – Funding Elements and</u></p>	<p><u>BC proposes that Schedule 5 – Green Controlled Growth – Funding Elements, paragraph 1.1 should be amended to provide flexibility in the approach to allocation of payments under the schedule to allow for membership of the ESG to be expanded to cover other local authorities, including BC.</u></p> <p><u>BC suggests the following wording:</u></p> <p><u>The Applicant covenants to make annual payments to CBC, HCC, LBC and NHDC as inaugural members of ESG according to the table in this</u></p>	<p><u>Please refer to the Applicant’s position in matter 3.12.5 above.</u></p>			<p><u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024</u></p>	<p><u>Agreed</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position (pre-Deadline 3)	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
	<p><u>expansion of ESG membership</u></p>	<p><u>Schedule (the “Table”) to assist them in meeting their obligations arising in relation to the ESG (or any successor body) and / or any related Technical Panel on account of the Authorised Development on the basis that doing so imposes on them additional cost burdens over and above their general duties and responsibilities and in particular discharging the obligations mentioned in the Table and any other responsibilities arising from their responsibilities on the ESG and /or Technical Panel. Where any new member of the ESG and / or Technical Panel is established annual payments will also be made to the additional member(s) according to the table in this Schedule.</u></p> <p><u>The Council welcomes the proposed amendments to the draft ESG and Technical Panels Terms of References to include the stated text on the basis that the commitment made by the Applicant applies to both currently proposed and subsequently added members of ESG and Technical Panels.</u></p>					
<p><u>3.12.7</u></p>	<p><u>Securing the commitment to fund 40% of the Community Fund on projects outside the administrative area of Luton</u></p>	<p><u>In terms of the commitment to fund 40% of the Community Fund on projects outside the administrative area of Luton, Schedule 7 already secures the Compensation policies and Measures and Community First document. Schedule 9 should align with Schedule 7 and make reference to the document as well as specifically confirm the 40% commitment within Schedule 9.</u></p> <p><u>The amalgamation of the RIF within the STF, its securing via requirement 32 and its status as a certified</u></p>	<p><u>The obligation relating to the STF (previously schedule 9) has now been removed from the section 106 agreement and is now secured by requirement 32 in the DCO.</u></p>			<p><u>Agreed via email on 8 February 2024</u></p>	<p><u>OngoingAgreed.</u></p>

SoC G ID	Matter	Buckinghamshire Council position <i>(pre-Deadline-3)</i>	The Applicant position	Latest Buckinghamshire Council position	Status and Suggested resolution	Source of agreement	Agreed / Ongoing / Not agreed
		<u>document satisfies the Council's concerns on this matter.</u>					

~~Ref 1 Department for Transport (2017), Air Navigation Guidance.
Ref 2 Civil Aviation Authority (2021), CAP1616: Airspace change: Guidance on the regulatory process
for changing the notified airspace design and planned and permanent redistribution of air traffic, and on
providing airspace information, Version 4~~