For official use only (date received): 23/05/2022 09:38:36

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/B0230/V/22/3296455

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference	APP/B0230/V/22/3296455
Application By	LONDON LUTON AIRPORT OPERATIONS LIMITED (LLAOL)
Site Address	London Luton Airport Airport Way Luton LU2 9LY Grid Ref Easting: 511908 Grid Ref Northing: 220942

SENDER DETAILS

Name	MRS ELIZABETH GRAHAM
Address	[redacted]

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Applicant
- ☐ Agent
- ☑ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☑ Interested Party/Person Correspondence

☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I believe that Luton Airport's application to increase passenger journeys and increase its noise contours should be rejected.
In 2012 Luton Airport agreed a number of supposedly binding conditions with its owner and planning authority Luton Borough Council (LBC), as part of an expansion agreement, to mitigate the impacts of the expansion.
Since then, the planning condition on noise has been breached in three successive years, 2017, 2018 and 2019. LBC has not enforced the condition and the airport has made no attempt to comply with it, seeing the solution as a relaxation of the binding conditions it entered into.
After several attempts by the airport, and in spite of considerable opposition, LBC has now decided to relax this and other conditions. Government policy is to reduce carbon emissions and also to reduce noise over time. This decision contravenes both these policies.
If allowed, this application will add to carbon emissions and the noise suffered by local communities such as the one I live in, which is 8 miles from the airport. After two years of peace due to the pandemic, I am now again being kept awake by planes taking off up to midnight and then woken up again before 6am by more planes, not to mention planes in the middle of the night. I can also hear landing planes when the wind is in the other direction. This is causing me considerable stress and damaging my mental health. It will get worse as the weather warms up because I cannot open any windows due to the noise.
The government has committed to substantial reductions in carbon emissions. Increases in emissions from low cost leisure aviation, a 'nice to have', at a time of huge pressure on basic living costs, is a wholly avoidable step in the wrong direction.
The airport and LBC cannot be trusted to meet any promises they make, partly because they cannot control most of the factors affecting carbon emissions and noise. The new and supposedly quieter planes are noisier than the old ones when used on the short Luton runway and the airport has admitted that quieter planes are only used for one in six of the flights. They are unwilling to use the factor they can control by reducing the number of flights because they will lose money.
This brings into focus the dubious relationship between the airport and its owner LBC which is also the planning authority. The decision to allow a relaxation of the planning conditions, which were weak to start with, demonstrates that LBC is hopelessly compromised in its duties towards local residents. LBC is hugely financially dependent upon income from the airport. Key LBC officials are also executives in the company which owns the airport and LBC has recently made substantial loans to the airport to prop it up. As most local communities affected are in Hertfordshire, outside LBC's area, there is no democratic means of recourse. The decision to relax the conditions is further evidence of the lack of robust ringfencing between the planning and other areas of LBC. Therefore, I believe there should also be an investigation into LBC's ownership of the airport and its impact on planning decisions, with consideration given to removal of LBC as airport owner and financial beneficiary.