For official use only (date received): 07/05/2022 08:35:48

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 JOE GRAZIANO
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

Residents were opposed during a Parish survey carried out.
-Surveyed residents
-The (Parish) village has been ignored for many years without being included or consulted in matters to it. How is this fair and transparent?
- Environment Policy states "working with their communities". No evidence in direct working or being involved.
-Environment Policy of Operator does not mention Light Pollution which at present is obtrusive
-The way the airport has not acted with "community" in mind when building the carparks promoting excessive light pollution, they did absolutely nothing and we have evidence of a meeting I attended at Ramridge Primary School where Robin Porter stated they didn't have a Policy. They played lip-service and now use the DC to use as a tool to be included in "enhanced landscaping" to hide the development. It should have been done already being the "considerate neighbour" We also have some really good pictures of the "Las Vegas" effect to show the inspector of polluting lights affecting people who live in village, wildlife and clear night skies
-The noise monitoring is far too subjective. We experience excessive noise rather than the thousands of complaints from Harpenden/St. Albans who experience noise, the noise debate is not contextualised. We need a village monitor the airport must mandate. Not 2 miles away in Frogmore.
-Noise monitoring is not independent and biased (Interpreted as they wish)
-The surface-access to the airport had not been considered from a local point of view with LLA putting blame on Herts CC that they conducted a Traffic survey and didn't even think to include our issues. They have not considered the access from Eaton Green road and the carnage this will have for village access and new carpark exit roads filtering out onto Darley Road. Should consider "no access or limited access to residents only"
-The compensation scheme needs to be broader and fairer to all residents of the village/hamlets affected in the Parish of KW. It needs to be consistent not based on contour lines focused on Oxford Road. We all experience the same noise subjectively! I experience huge vibrations and rattling of windows to the point house completely shakes. Oxford Rd may get a different effect of vibrations, and noise.