



Meeting note

Project name	Luton Airport Extension
File reference	TR020001
Status	Final
Author	The Planning Inspectorate
Date	30 January 2018
Meeting with	London Luton Airport Limited
Venue	Planning Inspectorate offices
Attendees	The Planning Inspectorate Susannah Guest – Infrastructure Planning Lead David Price – EIA and Land Rights Manager James Bunten – Case Officer The Applicant Robin Porter – Chief Operations Officer, LLAL Anita Gackowska – Development Director, LLAL Tom Henderson – Partner, BDB Ian Shrubsall – Head of DCO and Infrastructure Planning, GLH Chris Stocks – Associate, ARUP
Meeting objectives	Project inception meeting
Circulation	All attendees

Summary of key points discussed and advice given

The Planning Inspectorate (the Inspectorate) advised that a note of the meeting would be taken and published on its website in accordance with section 51 of the Planning Act 2008 (the PA2008). Any advice given under section 51 would not constitute legal advice upon which applicants (or others) could rely.

Project overview

The Applicant provided a brief introduction to the scheme by explaining that Luton Airport was wholly owned by Luton Borough Council (LBC) – under London Luton Airport Limited – and operated by London Luton Airport Operations Limited, owned by a consortium and on a concession until 2031. The objective of the scheme was to increase the capacity of Luton Airport from the cap of 18 million people per annum up to 36-38 million people per annum.

The Applicant explained that the scheme did not propose to extend or add further runways to the airport, only to increase the capacity; as the proposed increase in capacity is likely to be above 10 million people per annum, the threshold to be deemed a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project will be met and the scheme would therefore need to be consented under the PA2008 regime.

The Applicant stated that the scheme had completed 'phase 1' – preparing the first set of documents on the initial scheme and procuring the team – and was currently within

'phase 2' – 'optioneering' and early dialogue with key stakeholders including the Inspectorate.

The Inspectorate queried whether the scheme would progress regardless of whether other airport extensions were to be consented. The Applicant confirmed growth was irrespectively necessary and noted the benefits of its location: accessibility from North London using either the train network or M1 corridor to accommodate more business use from the sub-region.

The Applicant explained that it was currently working on its masterplan and confirmed that the emerging analysis, with regard to additional terminals and taxi-ways, was that they would be included within its current land ownership. The Inspectorate queried elements of the land ownership arrangement and the Applicant confirmed that it had procured land outside of the existing airport boundary in anticipation of the expansion proposals.

The Applicant briefly explained the aircraft models with improved emissions that operate at Luton Airport and noted that after trialling, the flight path envelope had recently been refined to lessen the impact on residents. The Inspectorate queried whether a decrease in complaints had resulted from the refinement with the Applicant noting that although there had been a reduction in individual complaints, more repeated complaints had been received.

The Applicant stated that it was planning to conduct an eight week non-statutory consultation phase in June 2018 in conjunction with its Scoping Request. The Inspectorate advised not to have an overlap of public consultation and Scoping periods, as it may cause practical problems for consultees being asked for comments on documents from the Applicant and the Inspectorate simultaneously; to help avoid confusion, the Inspectorate recommended stand-alone consultation and scoping periods respectively.

The Applicant explained that it aimed to undertake Statutory Consultation in mid-2019, with submission of the application in Q4 2019 in order to ensure an April 2021 completion date. The Applicant noted that the funding was front-loaded and explained that each milestone met on time would release funds for the next phase. The Inspectorate advised that it was helpful to be notified of achieved milestones to help with internal resourcing.

The surrounding road network works were discussed with the Inspectorate querying whether the access roads were fundamental to the scheme. The Applicant confirmed that some road works were being prepared under a different consenting regime but might be mirrored in the Development Consent Order (DCO). The Inspectorate advised that the Applicant should be careful how the access roads were presented within the Scoping Report if the options were still not decided.

The Applicant concluded that if permissions were in place for the surrounding road network ahead of submission, amendments/changes were still likely be included within the DCO.

There was discussion regarding how regard should be taken to the current draft Airports National Policy Statement (dANPS); the Applicant stated that it aimed to utilise the existing infrastructure/facilities when optioneering, as advised within the dANPS.

The Applicant stated that it had procured its Environmental team for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and was in the process of gathering baseline data. The Applicant noted it would draft the Environmental Statement (ES) under the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and set out the assessments that would likely support it in the scoping report.

The Applicant explained it was opening dialogue with key environmental bodies such as Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage to discuss what the ES would need to assess. The Applicant advised that there were no European designated sites within 2km of the site and noted that they currently believed that the scheme was unlikely to affect European designated sites. The Inspectorate noted that increased flight activity and impacts associated would also need to be taken into account. The Applicant identified that an area of ancient woodland may be impacted or need to be removed and briefly discussed other potential ecology and heritage receptors.

There was discussion regarding land constraints with the Applicant noting it aimed to use the 'cut and fill' approach and that all soil would be taken from the site. The Applicant also confirmed that there are no air quality management areas within proximity to the Proposed Development although the assessment for air quality will consider impacts at distance from the Proposed Development.

The Applicant explained that it aimed to provide a Community Impact Assessment that would combine assessment on noise, visual and air quality effects. The Inspectorate queried whether the Applicant would identify the local community as a receptor within the ES. The Applicant confirmed it is likely to, noting other projects such as High Speed 2, which had trialled similar methodology.

The Inspectorate noted that ongoing evolution of flightpaths in relation to the increase in airport expansion schemes and asked whether there would be additional human and ecological receptors from a wider area. The Applicant stated that it was currently forecasting the scope for potential human and ecological receptors following ongoing flight path refinement and noted that it would have a cap until the boundaries had been decided.

Following the Inspectorate's query regarding existing airport efficiency, the Applicant explained that at the current capacity of 16 million PPA, its peak was 31 flights per hour. Following the expansion to 18 million ppa, the Applicant estimated that there would be 40 flights per hour, moving to 50 flights per hour during peak times.

The Applicant stated that, subject to early dialogue with Environment Agency, there was unlikely to be an issue in terms of Water Framework Directive (WFD) compliance. The Inspectorate advised there was not a prescribed way that the WFD assessment needed to be provided but recommended that it was appended to the ES. The Applicant was referred to the Inspectorate's Advice Note on WFD.

The Applicant highlighted that there were no potential s53 applications planned as there had not been land access issues to date. The Inspectorate queried whether there were

any Statutory Undertaker assets likely to be affected. The Applicant had identified a pipeline; however, it was not located near to where any works were planned and was unlikely to be affected.

The Inspectorate asked whether LBC's planning department had been primed to understand its role in the DCO progress, as the host local authority, and noted the different roles within the organisation when the host authority was the Applicant of a DCO application. The Applicant confirmed that LBC was clear what functions it needs to perform.

Next steps

The Inspectorate asked whether the Applicant is happy for the project to be registered on the National Infrastructure webpages of the Planning Inspectorate website and noted registration usually coincided with a Scoping Request. The Applicant confirmed that as the project was launched in December 2017, it was happy to be registered but would set a specific date in due course.

There was discussion regarding the benefit of a site visit (SV) with the Inspectorate advising that SVs were usually organised before Scoping started. The potential for an outreach event was also discussed and it was agreed that one event may be constructive, subject to resources.

The Applicant proposed a meeting in late April 2018 to discuss arrangements for non-statutory consultation and Scoping.

Specific decisions/ follow-up required?

The following actions were agreed:

- The Applicant to provide suitable dates for an update meeting in early April 2018.
- Both the Applicant and the Inspectorate to look into dates for a site visit.
- The Applicant to provide preferred project information for the NI website.