For official use only (date received): 17/05/2022 16:13:33

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	MR DAVID WALMSLEY
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 oppose the Application and have previously documented my earlier objections to it (all still valid). This is an application by a self interested Borough Council acting as judge and jury in its own interests. It is quite apparent that much of the pollution that we see in the sky is caused by aircraft contrails. During the period of very low aircraft activity the sky was blue for much of the time. That is no longer the case. In the past the applicant has dressed up its proposed activities by attaching conditions to them which it has then promptly breached on a continuous basis.

Luton Borough ends at the start of the airport to the south and extends a very short distance in all other directions. It is the people living in the surrounding areas who are expected to pick up the bill for infrastructure and approach works and to suffer all the inevitable disruption for a self-serving Luton project. It is an insult to the intelligence to suggest that an increase in the number of persons using the airport can do anything other than increase the level of disruption, pollution and distress and inconvenience to the neighbouring areas. Much of the original application was predicated on the basis of a likely future with what they labelled as "quiet" aircraft. There is no such thing. Some are more noisy than others and twice or three times as many aircraft in the air will inevitably double or triple the noise and other polluting factors. If a "silent" aircraft is ever invented that will be a great benefit but it is not remotely possible at the present time and defies all laws of physics and common sense.

To couple what is in fact an enormous escalation in the disruption caused to its neighbours with a rebranding/renaming exercise is a rather pathetic way of trying to persuade people that this is a different operation by a body which will suddenly, in conjunction with its PR plan, change into a body which will in fact abide by its promises or comply with any conditions imposed upon it and police the proper observance of those conditions. That is to start from a base suggesting that all is well now and that a slight (doubling or trebling!) will not make things much worse. The fact is that even if they now complied with the conditions as previously imposed the disruptive effect would still be very damaging. The case against the original proposals was well founded. Even the Applicant seems to admit to the fact that nuisance was caused and how it can, in all conscience, say that an escalation of all the unacceptable factors involved will not make things much worse is hard to fathom.