

**From:** [Pete White](#)  
**To:** [Luton Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Peter White-20038959/RR-1199-Additional submission.  
**Date:** 12 September 2023 19:25:27

---

Good Evening,

Following on from my submission yesterday, I would like to add the following link to for a meeting of the Luton Borough Council Local Adjudication Panel due 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2023.

Appendix A details an investigation into a decision made by the Development Management Committee.

I would like this considered by the ExA because I feel it supports my concerns with the public trusting any decisions that Committee , and LBC makes as a whole, in regard of the GCG proposal in this DCO application?

Regards

Peter White

<https://democracy.luton.gov.uk/cm5public/Meetings/tabid/70/ctl/ViewMeetingPublic/mid/397/Meeting/6383/Committee/1167/SelectedTab/Documents/Default.aspx>

Peter White-20038959/RR-1199

Response to Luton Rising (LR) responses to my written statements.

Reference Volume 8/8.31 Part 1 of 4

Pages 86/87-Response to Green Controlled Growth (GCG) questions.

The last development of Luton Airport by its operator, London Luton Airport Operations Ltd - Project Curium (LLAOL), had binding planning conditions set regarding aircraft noise contours.

It also involved a year by year passenger growth plan.

The Planning Authority, Luton Borough Council (LBC) allowed those contours to be broken in success years. No action was taken to issue any penalties on breaching those conditions, or indeed to enforce those conditions.

LBC condoned and financed the applicant LR by means of funding a rapid growth incentive scheme to airlines to ignore the passenger growth plan. and expand as quickly as possible.

The applicant could have written the same environmental controls as GCG into the application for Project Curium, but chose not to as economic growth was its only consideration.

Question for LR

What difference in environmental terms, apart from the scale of the development, is there between Project Curium and this DCO application?

Why did Project Curium, which LR was a partner in development, not have environmental controls on the same lines as this application?

What safeguards will LR legally bind within GCG to ensure that all planning conditions are adhered to, and that any breaches will be stopped at first instance, and not as an after the event measure?

LR states that in GCG it will future proof proposals to help support the future implementation of new technology.

What safeguards will GCG include regarding current aircraft technology, and current airport operational practices?

These current technologies/practices will form the Phase 1 part of this expansion.

What binding safeguards have/will LR put into GCG to ensure that increases in environmental pollutions will be controlled within all phases of development?

Page 175-Response to noise complaints for airport operations.

The applicant has stated that it will be "business as usual" for complaints about ground noise from airport operations.

They state that all complaints should go to LLAOL, in the knowledge that they do not recognise ground operations noise. They state that failure to comply with DCO requirements will be subject to enforcement by LBC.

There are no requirements within the DCO on ground operations noise, so there are no conditions for LBC to enforce, so it will be "business as usual"

Questions for LR

Why does the DCO application not cover ground operational noise, and indeed air pollution?

On what grounds were these scoped out of your application as irrelevant?

None of the questions I raised after the open floor hearings have been answered:-

Local Estate Parking Schemes

Charitable Donations

Noise Insulation Scheme

Costs of Expansion

If the applicant has deemed these to be outside their scoping for the DCO, could they please detail the reasoning and decision process behind this decision?

**Issues for the ExA to examine.**

**GCG is supposed to be a legally binding agreement to protect the public from excess intrusion from airport growth and airport operations. It is based on a high level of trust from those affected by airport operations that LR will put them first through GCG plans and not airlines, and commercial income, based on current operational practice, and historical fact.**

**Please examine the details behind the granting of planning consent for Project Curium by LBC?**

**Please examine the input of LR into the planning detail of that project, and its direct culpability in the noise contour planning conditions/yearly passenger growth targets being broken for commercial gain?**

**Please examine the refusal of LR/LBC to stop the airline growth financial scheme when it became clearly evidence that those noise contour conditions were going to be breached?**

**Please include the report compiled by your fellow Inspectors in regard for the application by LLAOL for a capacity increase to 19 million passengers per annum/Redrawing of noise contours.**

**I believe that the actions of LR/LBC and LLAOL with regard to the above application clearly show that however GCG is supposedly a legally binding concept, it will be as I stated in my original statement, above all a commercial agreement to increase revenue streams above any other considerations, and that neither LR/LBC or LLAOL can be trusted to firstly restrict their expansion plans or adequately enforce them?**