


**From:**   
**To:** [Joanna Vincent](#)  
**Subject:** LPA Ref 210/00031/VARCON. PINS Ref . APP/B0230/V/22/3206455  
**Date:** 19 August 2022 16:00:42

---

I object to this application.

We were only informed it had been amended on 12th July which was very late in the day. The letter sent me a link which should have shown the amendments but didn't and I wasted much time on a more detailed response before finding out via a 3rd party, who sent me a revised link to the three correct documents of over 200 words.

All very late in the day and typical of planning consultants seeking to wrong-foot ordinary citizen objectors and local groups with limited means.

#### MY COMMENTS

The original approval, whilst in my view flawed in principle, included conditions that were presumably applied by the LPA for a reason. ie to control ATMs, night time flights, hours of operations, noise nuisance and environmental pollution.

It was ingenuous then to approve the airport operator's application to disregard these to satisfy their flagrant flouting of them, just to satisfy the rapid increase in passenger numbers well before promises.

The LPA should have stood by and enforced their own conditions.

I believe that this was done because Luton Borough Council owns the airport and that the LPA is not independant and am now glad that the Inspectorate has stepped in to examine this decision.

The supporting information in the application amounts to a retrospective attempt to justify the removal of these conditions, following their flagrant violation.

In particular the applicant cites the proposed introduction of larger quieter aircraft in order to reduce ATMs and allow wider areas of maximum noise nuisance. However, they have been promising such aircraft for many years, with little success, as they have no control over what aircraft the airlines use.

Therefore, the detrimental effects on climate change, noise and pollution promised are unlikely to result

Therefore these are not proposals, but aspirations designed to increase profit. They should not be accepted as justifications for relaxing conditions because they are unlikely to be achieved. In any case even if the aspired benefits were to be achieved, they should be used in their own right to help tackle climate change, not to allow them to increase passenger numbers.

In terms of the climate emergency pledges by the UK government and ( incredibly ) Luton Council, the need for action is now . Future small benefits even if they were to occur would be too little, too late.

The only way to tackle it is by curbing unsustainable air travel on short/medium haul flights, which from this airport are mostly holiday flights to European destinations, more sustainably served by the improving European rail network, which is rapidly electrifying and decarbonising.

It is certainly counter-productive to increase flights and passenger numbers.

There is little prospect of electrification/decarbonising happening in the airline industry and certainly not in sufficient time.

In terms of the detrimental effects of noise/health/environmental on the local area, I have the following comments.

Luton Airport is particularly badly located for the following reasons:

It is on a hill

It is under 3 layers of ATMs and therefore Luton ATMs are restricted to below 5,000 feet. and excessively noisy.

Whilst Luton is a relatively small borough , it is surrounded by larger authorities over a wider area. including much of the Counties of Bedfordshire and Hertfordshire. Therefore there is no representation of these areas at district or county council level.

In my own settlement of Wheathampstead, we are affected mainly by departures from the Airport.

In westerly winds, the published flight path is shown to be to the South of the settlement with departures travelling Eastbound.

In easterly winds it is shown to be north of the settlement with departures travelling roughly South West.

However, in the easterly scenario I experience flights directly over the centre of the village flying South West, whilst on westerlies I see them to the South, flying Eastwards over the South end of the village.

In peak times I see flight after flight following the same directions and heights at very close intervals and very noisy.

The airport tell us that in fact they do not control the vectors of aircraft East of the London Midland Rail Line.

However, as they are following a consistent trajectory, someone must be doing so!.

The incessant increase in ATMs over years has transformed what was once a relatively peaceful and tranquil area.

The flights begin very early in the mornings and also peak in the late evenings and this disturbs sleep, especially in Summer when more are crammed in to maximise turnover and windows really need to be open in the hotter summers we must now expect.

The night flights are obviously also detrimental to sleep and health. These typically use the oldest and noisiest planes and it is also likely that they are unsustainably carrying exotic imported foodstuffs from very long distances, whereas they should be reserved for essential items.

For the above reasons, we are aghast at the prospect of ever-increasing over-flying and noise, which approval of this application will only make worse and believe that to grant it would send the wrong message and encourage the airport's relentless expansion, (bearing in mind they are now preparing to apply for an increase from 19 million to 32 million, which will have a disastrous effect on our lives and on the government's climate change policy.

We are therefore pleased that at last our views can be finally taken into account by a disinterested authority and would urge that it be refused for our sake, that of the natural and historic environment and that of the Planet.

Andrew Robley. dip Arch RIBA, dip grad cons(AA), IHBC.