

LONDON LUTON AIRPORT EXPANSION
ISSUE SPECIFIC HEARING 3 (ISH3) – NOISE AND VIBRATION
POST HEARING SUBMISSIONS

HERTFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL, NORTH HERTFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL, DACORUM BOROUGH COUNCIL, CENTRAL BEDFORDSHIRE COUNCIL, LUTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document sets out the post hearing submissions and summarises the oral submissions made jointly by Hertfordshire County Council, North Hertfordshire District Council and Dacorum Borough Council (together, “**the Hertfordshire Host Authorities**”), Central Bedfordshire Council and Luton Borough Council (together, “**the Host Authorities**”) at Issue Specific Hearing 3 (“**ISH3**”) held on 27 September 2023 in relation to Luton Rising’s (“**the Applicant**”) application for development consent for the London Luton Airport Expansion Project (the “**Project**”).
- 1.2 ISH3 was attended by the Examining Authority (the “**ExA**”), the Applicant, the Host Authorities, together with a number of other Interested Parties.
- 1.3 Where the ExA requested additional information from the Host Authorities on particular matters, or the Host Authorities undertook to provide additional information during the hearing, the Host Authorities’ response is set out in or appended to this document.
- 1.4 This document does not purport to summarise the oral submissions of parties other than the Host Authorities, and summaries of submissions made by other parties are only included where necessary in order to give context to the Host Authorities’ submissions in response.
- 1.5 The structure of this document generally follows the order of items as they were dealt with at ISH3 set out against the detailed agenda items published by the ExA on 19 September 2023 (the “**Agenda**”).

1.6 In addition, the Host Authorities have included in this note, responses to the Supplementary Agenda Questions published by the ExA on 19 September 2023, where these are relevant to them.

2. **SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS MADE**

PINS' Agenda Item	Response
2 Construction noise and vibration	
<p>The Applicant will be asked to justify aspects of their reasonable worst-case assessment, including assumptions regarding, methods and hours of working, use of hoardings, types of plant used and the approach to assessment of works at Junction 10 of the M1.</p>	<p>The construction noise and vibration methodology and assessment set out in Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [AS-080] was reviewed before the preliminary hearing and is considered by the host authorities to be acceptable. This was agreed with the Applicant in the Host Authorities' Statements of Common Ground [REP2-020; REP2-021; REP2-022; REP2-023; REP2-024].</p> <p>The Host Authorities have no further comments on this agenda item over and above what is set out in their Local Impact Reports [REP1A-002; REP1A-003; AS-147; REP1A-004] and Written Representations [REP2-047; REP1-068; REP1-069; AS-148; REP1-098; REP2-063].</p> <p>The ExA questioned whether the Host Authorities have had discussions with Applicant about Table 14.2 of the Code of Construction Practice [APP-049]. No discussions have been held between the Host Authorities and the Applicant on these relaxed thresholds and they are not referenced within Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [AS-080] itself, nor is it clear where they have been derived from or what they apply to. The Host Authorities note that the Applicant will be submitting further information in this regard and will review and comment on that information once received from the Applicant.</p> <p>The Host Authorities have been seeking for the Applicant to make the Statements of Common Ground [REP2-020; REP2-021; REP2-022; REP2-023; REP2-024] more factual documents, simply listing out items (such as LOAEL, SOAEL, UAEL) to be precisely clear about what the Host Authorities are agreeing to. The Host Authorities refer the ExA to the example below.</p>

Applicant's Position	Host Authorities' response
Construction Noise Criteria	
Day, dB LAeq,12hour	Day
LOAEL: 65 / SOAEL: 75 / UAEL: 85	Accept / Accept / Accept
Evening, dB LAeq,4hour	Evening
LOAEL: 55 / SOAEL: 65 / UAEL: 75	Accept / Accept / Accept

Action Point 4 arising from ISH3

Action Point 4 of the Action Points arising from ISH3 required Luton Borough Council to provide detail (sections/ plans/ locations/ acoustic specification) for the acoustic screen in relation to the access road that was to be provided as part of the New Century Park development (LPA ref: 17/02300/EIA) and where / how it would be secured.

The report to the planning committee of 27 March 2019 (**REP1-006**) included in paragraph 317 the following comment:

“The one receptor where specific mitigation was identified for the operation phase was the Holiday Inn hotel. Here, given the existing ambient noise level and the nature of the use, the impact was not considered to be significant, but mitigation in the form of acoustic screens is proposed.”

The plans submitted with the application included the scheme layout for the new access road (drawing no. KQ30131H141Rev6), the general arrangement for the bridge section (drawing no. KQ30131H148Rev3) and the general arrangement for the bridge structure, including the acoustic screen (drawing no. D-Q30131-H-0101). The planning decision notice (**REP1-007**) included Condition 7 which required the detail of the acoustic screen to be included within the Construction and Environmental Management Plan that was to be submitted to and approved by the LPA prior to the development commencing. Further, Condition 23, was a specific condition relating to the acoustic screen, and stated:

“No development shall commence until details of the acoustic screen associated with the proposed New Century Park Access Road to the west of the Holiday Inn hotel (illustrated on drawing D-Q30131-H-0101 have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include acoustic reduction properties, height, materials and colour. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plans and thereafter permanently retained and maintained.”

	<p>The three plans referenced above are submitted with this response for inclusion within the Examination Library.</p> <p>Action Point 9 arising from ISH3</p> <p>Action Point 9 arising from ISH3 required Luton Borough Council to confirm whether any discussions have been held with the Applicant on the subject of piling. Luton Borough Council can confirm that there have been no discussions to date with the Applicant with regard to piling associated with the Project. We are aware that the Environmental Statement indicated that for Phase 1 “a continuous flight augur piling method would be adopted, which is typical for this type of construction and considered to be best practice” (paragraph 16.9.58 of Chapter 16: Noise and Vibration (REP1-003)). However, for Phase 2a the piling method for the DART extension is not indicated (paragraph 16.9.58 of REP1-003), though the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor is circa 500m, and the same is true for Phase 2b (paragraph 16.9.64 of REP1-003), though again the distance to the nearest receptor is approximately 200m.</p> <p>The Code of Construction Practice (APP-049) does not indicate that piling will be limited to CFA piling, since it notes that there could be “impact or vibratory piling” (paragraph 14.3.5 of APP-049). This need not be an issue provided appropriate controls are in place, since for both the original DART planning application (LPA ref: 17/00283/FUL) and the New Century Park application (LPA ref: 17/02300/EIA) percussive piling was not ruled out. For the DART a planning condition covering piling was imposed (Condition 20) in order to protect the underlying chalk aquifer (not for reasons of noise). For the New Century Park planning permission (REP1-007), three planning conditions addressed piling: Condition 7 in relation to the Construction Environmental Management Plan, Condition 8 specific to impact piling and requiring a method statement to be provided, whilst Condition 17 sought to protect the aquifer.</p>
<p>3 Surface Access Noise</p>	
<p>Aspects of the surface access noise assessment including modelling approach, assumptions and the model validation process will be discussed. The Applicant will</p>	<p>The surface access noise methodology and assessment set out in Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [AS-080] was reviewed before the preliminary hearing.</p> <p>Information presented by the Applicant within Table 16.25 and in the following paragraph (16.7.14) of Chapter 16 (Noise and Vibration) of the Environmental Statement [AS-080] was questioned by Ben Holcombe of Suono, the Host Authorities’ noise and vibration expert, in a Statement of Common Ground</p>

<p>be asked to explain how upgrades to the existing road network have informed the traffic noise model for future scenarios.</p>	<p>meeting on 26th July 2023 with the Applicant. The questions related to uncertainty in the modelling introduced by significant differences between measured and predicted values, and insufficient explanation as to why these were acceptable.</p> <p>Following that meeting the Applicant produced REP2-040 8.41 Surface Access Noise Modelling Additional Information, which still failed to produce a satisfactory answer as to why such differences were present.</p> <p>Collaborative discussions were held between Suono and the Applicant's noise team to investigate the shortcomings, which identified several errors within the surface access noise model. These errors related to measurement positions being placed in the incorrect position within the model. These errors have now been corrected and further information shared by email from the Applicant to Suono on 22nd September 2023.</p> <p>Suono reviewed this information and confirmed with the Applicant on the same day that the surface access noise model, methodology (save for the below point) and assessment are considered to be generally acceptable.</p> <p>The exception regarded as not acceptable is that of the daytime Unacceptable Adverse Effect Level (UAEL). The use of 74 dB LAeq,16hour as the daytime UAEL was first raised before ExA acceptance of the scheme in a noise Statement of Common Ground meeting on 1st December 2022 between the Applicant and the Host Authorities. It was not accepted by the Host Authorities, due to being higher than that used by Heathrow Airport within their PEIR. The Applicant has proposed using 74 dB LAeq,16hour, but the Host Authorities consider 71 dB LAeq,16hour to be more suitable, consistent with the Heathrow PEIR.</p> <p>Although the Heathrow PEIR has not been examined, the Host Authorities view it as highly unlikely that if that had gone to Examination an Examining Authority would have increased the UAEL threshold above what was set out in the PEIR/ES, and it is therefore considered sufficiently robust.</p> <p>Irrespective of whatever value is chosen (within the range of 71-74 dB), it is accepted that the assessment outcomes remain unchanged and acceptable. The actual necessity for a UAEL in surface access noise is also questionable, given that it does nothing beyond what is offered by the SOAEL (Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level), and its inclusion is due to the Applicant (it has not been requested by the Host Authorities).</p>
--	---

	<p>No further information is expected from the Applicant, given that they have set out their reasoning for selecting their UAEL in their Surface Access Noise Modelling Additional Information. The Host Authorities would expect that the matter is left to the ExA to select the UAEL value (or determine one is simply unnecessary), again noting that a value within the stated range would not change assessment outcomes.</p>
<p>4 Fixed Plant Noise</p>	
<p>The Applicant will be asked to justify its approach to control of fixed plant noise (including for non-residential receptors) and confirm how this satisfies the requirements of the Airports National Policy Statement (ANPS) to provide a description of noise sources and an assessment of the likely significant effects of predicted changes on any noise sensitive premises. The Applicant will be asked to explain how the approach would avoid 'creep' in light of evolving baseline noise conditions due to the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The approach to control of fixed noise plant, as set out in APP-112 5.02 Environmental Statement - Appendix 16.3 Fixed Plant Noise Management Plan, was reviewed before the Preliminary meeting and has not been a topic of discussion between the Host Authorities or the Applicant, as it is a minor noise issue.</p> <p>The Host Authorities' position is that the approach is fundamentally acceptable and acknowledge that this approach is typical for such noise sources within Environmental Statements.</p> <p>Luton Borough Council have requested that the noise limits within the methodology be changed from 5 dB below background to 10 dB below background, to fall in line with their standard planning guidance on the matter. This point was put to the Applicant on 22nd September in a meeting between noise consultants and is being reviewed by the Applicant. Setting of limits 10 dB below background noise would avoid 'creep', whereby background noise levels can slowly increase over time when less onerous noise limits are used.</p> <p>The ExA queried during ISH3 whether the methodology in relation to non-residential receptors had been discussed with the Host Authorities. The Host Authorities indicated that they would welcome further engagement with the Applicant on this point but acknowledge that the approach is fundamentally acceptable.</p>
<p>5 Aviation noise assessment (including ground noise)</p>	
<p>The Applicant will be asked to provide a brief explanation of the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) noise model and the noise model validation process, including commentary on its ability to assess cumulative noise. The following matters will also be discussed:</p>	
<p>The use of the 2019 actuals baseline and consented baseline</p>	<p>In 2019, Luton Airport breached its noise limits set by planning condition. This resulted in actual noise contour areas exceeding prescribed limits, meaning local communities experienced an increase in noise (up to 1dB in both the day and night).</p>

While this increase cannot be argued as constituting a material harm (thereby compromising the ability of an LPA to take statutory enforcement proceedings), this is contrary to the government's position that noise envelopes are expected to give certainty to local communities.

As highlighted in the Local Impact Reports [REP1A-002; REP1A-003; AS-147; REP1A-004] and Written Representations [REP2-047; REP1-068; REP1-069; AS-148; REP1-098; REP2-063] of the Host Authorities, the Applicant has used the '2019 actual' baseline to demonstrate how noise will reduce in future years, as per the requirement of the Overarching Aviation Noise Policy statement. However, this baseline reflects a period when the airport was operating in breach of its existing planning conditions and must therefore be considered to be unreasonably inflated. This is possibly most easily seen on Insets 3.1 and 3.2 of 5.02 Appendix 16.2 Operational Noise Management Explanatory Note [APP-111]. Inset 3.1 shows daytime and 3.2 shows night-time.

In the daytime, air noise is proposed to reduce **marginally** below the 2019 Actual, and the 2019 consented baseline (reflecting a situation in which the condition had not been breached). This technically represents a reduction in noise but does not meet the test of 'equal sharing' between communities and airport set out in the Noise Envelope Design Group consultation (found in Annex A of 5.02 Appendix 16.2 Operational Noise Management Explanatory Note [APP-111]).

In the night-time, the noise envelope limits are **above** the 2019 consented baseline, and there is therefore no reduction. The Applicant reasons that this is a reduction compared to 2019 Actual, but this is an unreasonable comparison as 2019 Actual noise levels, being in breach of conditions, should not have occurred.

The Applicant stated in a Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) meeting in 2022 that they intended to use 2019 Actuals as a baseline. This was not accepted by the Host Authorities, as set out in a note produced by Suono for the NEDG dated 23rd September 2022. A request was made to ascertain from the Applicant on what basis they considered this correct.

The Applicant responded on 11th October 2022, to which Suono responded on 18th October 2022, and the Applicant responded again on 25th October 2022. At no stage were the responses received by the Applicant satisfactory. The same reasoning has been set out in the application documentation.

	<p>The Applicant's position, alongside the Host Authorities', is set out in '8.39 Applicant's Response to Written Representations made by Interested Parties subject to an SoCG at Deadline 1' [REP2-035].</p> <p>The reasoning provided by the Applicant for using this approach remains insufficient, with the Applicant's responses to the Host Authorities' Local Impact Reports [REP1A-002; REP1A-003; AS-147; REP1A-004] also not containing the detail that has been sought in on-going noise meetings between the Host Authorities and the Applicant.</p> <p>No detailed discussions have been held with the Applicant after the Noise Envelope Design Group meetings on this topic, other than to agree to disagree on this point, but further engagement would be welcomed.</p> <p>The above response is in relation to the use of 2019 as the baseline within the noise assessment from which the Applicant claims a noise reduction. At ISH3, the ExA asked a separate question relating to the use of 2019 noise measurement data being used within the validation process for the AEDT air noise model. To confirm, the Host Authorities accept the use of 2019 noise measurement data being used to validate the AEDT air noise model. The noise measurements which have been used by the Applicant to validate the noise model will not be affected by the reasons for the condition breach. This is because the average noise measurements of each individual aircraft have been used in the validation process, whereas the process by which LAeq noise contours (the breached metric) are calculated is different and relates to the sum of noise from all aircraft within the relevant period.</p>
<p>Fleet mix assumptions and the assumption of quieter planes</p>	<p>No discussion has been held between the Host Authorities and the Applicant on this point.</p> <p>The Host Authorities note that no quieter aircraft are assumed within the core case in future years – should the Applicant reasonably expect these to materialise, they should be detailed within the application documentation and accounted for within the core case.</p> <p>If the Applicant wishes to rely on any benefits arising from quieter aircraft, the Host Authorities' position is that such benefits should not be claimed, as they have not been included within the applicant's core case.</p>
<p>The approach to model validation and modelling assumptions</p>	<p>The Host Authorities have no further comments over and above those matters recorded in the Statements of Common Ground [REP2-020; REP2-021; REP2-022; REP2-023; REP2-024].</p>

<p>The level of detail provided in respect of noise impacts on non-residential receptors</p>	<p>Given that the Host Authorities and their noise experts have held a number of meetings with the Applicant on the wider air noise impacts, the level of detail within 5.01 Environmental Statement – Chapter 16 – Noise and Vibration [AS-080] is sufficient to allow for likely significant effects to be identified by a noise and vibration expert and for those effects to be mitigated at non-residential receptors. However, it would be difficult for a lay person to understand and engage with the assessment.</p> <p>No discussion has been held between the host authorities and the Applicant on this point.</p>
<p>The implications of phasing and limits of deviation for the conclusions of the operational noise impact assessment</p>	<p>The Host Authorities have no further comments.</p> <p>No discussion has been held between the Host Authorities and the Applicant on this point.</p>
<p>6 Green Controlled Growth (GCG) and wider noise mitigation approach</p>	
<p>Noise controls and mitigation will be considered including:</p>	
<p>Night noise controls and whether a ban on scheduled night flights should be imposed on the airport to provide predictable periods of respite</p>	<p>Night-time bans have not been raised by the Host Authorities in their representations and would require all other aspects of the ICAO Balanced Approach to be considered before being able to be implemented.</p> <p>Any night-time ban would have a beneficial impact on noise effects. The potential disturbance to local resident populations from night-time noise is the area of greatest concern to the Host Authorities.</p>
<p>Whether noise controls from the existing planning permission should be retained</p>	<p>The noise envelope set out in GCG only contains day and night-time limits based on a single metric, which applies during the busiest summer period (92-day period).</p> <p>Additional metrics have been requested to be included in the GCG by the Host Authorities in their Local Impact Reports [REP1A-002; REP1A-003; AS-147; REP1A-004] to ensure the existing planning condition constraints continue to have effect. These will form a suite of metrics which apply throughout the year and over different time periods. These include movement limits, Quota Count (QC) limits, and Noise Violation Limits (NVLs), which allow for the Environmental Scrutiny Group (ESG) (formed as part of the GCG scheme) to have a suitable level of control over the airport’s noise emissions.</p> <p>The range of metrics suggested were proposed by the Applicant originally, within Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) meetings and can be seen in the NEDG interim report, which is an appendix to APP-111. The Applicant then changed to a single metric before the production of the final NEDG report, which was not accepted by the host authorities.</p>

Discussions on these points have been covered at all noise Statement of Common Ground meetings since and have not progressed.

The Host Authorities expect Green Controlled Growth documentation to be updated to account for the above and would seek collaboration with the Applicant to ensure all relevant documentation is in order. This especially applies to the Aircraft Noise Monitoring Plan **[APP-221]**, to ensure all aspects are acceptable (such as noise monitoring in conjunction with Local Planning Authorities).

The Applicant has now submitted **REP2-032** 'Deadline 2 Submission – 8.36 Noise Envelope – Improvements and worked example', which provides a worked example of how the GCG scheme would prevent future breaches. Further information has been sought from the Applicant in a noise Statement of Common Ground meeting on 15th September 2023 on what mitigation options could be available, as no detailed information is provided.

Ben Holcombe of Suono, the Host Authorities' noise and vibration expert, stated that:

- The Applicant has focused green control on outcome basis, but this ignores the fact that the breaches were known or expected in advance already. The operator at the airport was well aware that a breach was expected, it just wasn't forward looking enough.
- The controls in the current planning permission are all separate, and for example the night-time QC controls were not breached when the LAeq contour metric was exceeded. It was emphasised that they are separate and distinct controls.
- The QC budget that is proposed by the Applicant (in **REP2-032**) is an internal tool to check that they are doing what they are meant to be doing, and is not an additional metric or control for compliance purposes.
- The Noise Envelope Design Group (NEDG) spent a lot of time setting out a range of metrics that could apply to form a suite of controls that applies throughout the year and at different time periods, and they have been swept aside in favour of a single metric and control mechanism.

Action Point 27 arising from ISH3

	<p>Action Point 27 arising from ISH3 required Luton Borough Council to provide a copy of the section 106 agreement for the 2015 planning permission 15/00950/VARCON.</p> <p>The engrossed Section 106 agreement is being submitted at Deadline 3.</p>
<p>The use of the faster growth scenario and the noise controls proposed in the APP218 GCG framework (as amended by REP2-032), where not already discussed as part of the ISH1 on the draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</p>	<p>The Host Authorities consider that the application is not in line with UK aviation noise policy. Before the application was submitted, the policy was: <i>“The government’s overall policy on aviation noise is to limit and, where possible, reduce the number of people in the UK significantly affected by aircraft noise, as part of a policy of sharing benefits of noise reduction with industry in support of sustainable development.”</i> (Consultation response on UK Airspace Policy, 2017).</p> <p>Once the application was submitted, policy was updated (as was expected) to: <i>“The government’s overall policy on aviation noise is to balance the economic and consumer benefits of aviation against their social and health implications in line with the International Civil Aviation Organisation’s Balanced Approach to Aircraft Noise Management. This should take into account the local and national context of both passenger and freight operations, and recognise the additional health impacts of night flights.</i></p> <p><i>The impact of aviation noise must be mitigated as much as is practicable and realistic to do so, limiting, and where possible reducing, the total adverse impacts on health and quality of life from aviation noise.”</i> (Overarching Aviation Noise Policy, 2023).</p> <p>Balance between noise emissions of an airport and its economic benefits has historically been, and continues to be, allowed for as UK airports are allowed to generate noise covering sometimes large areas and populations due to the benefits they bring to local and wider communities. However, it is also clear that noise must be controlled. The Overarching Aviation Noise Policy continues: <i>“We consider that “limit, and where possible reduce” remains appropriate wording. An overall reduction in total adverse effects is desirable, but in the context of sustainable growth an increase in total adverse effects may be offset by an increase in economic and consumer benefits. In circumstances where there is an increase in total adverse effects, “limit” would mean to mitigate and minimise adverse effects, in line with the Noise Policy Statement for England.”</i></p> <p>An overall reduction would be where noise contours associated with the development reduce to below the future baseline, which is not predicted to occur within the project’s lifetime.</p>

The Applicant therefore offers two mitigation strategies to “limit, and where possible reduce” noise, in accordance with policy requirements, being the Noise Insulation Scheme (NIS) and the Green Controlled Growth (GCG) mechanisms.

The NIS is a material improvement over the current scheme and is welcomed. However, it does not cover all residents who experience adverse noise effects.

The GCG scheme must therefore mitigate and minimise noise as much as is practicable and realistic to do so. However, in the Host Authorities’ view it does not.

The Applicant uses GCG to set future noise contour limits from the faster growth sensitivity case, rather than the core assessment case. As the core case should be based on the Applicant’s reasonable expectations, there is a clear case for basing noise contour limits on this. It is clearly practicable and realistic to limit noise effects to this case, and it should not be relegated to playing the role of a sensitivity study. If there are benefits arising from the faster growth case that are relied upon, this would become the core case instead, but that is not what the Applicant has submitted.

The reasoning provided by the Applicant in the Noise Envelope Design Group meetings of September and October 2022 (as referenced under Agenda Item 5 above) for using the faster growth case is the advice in PINS note 9 (Rochdale envelope), but we do not take this advice to be a relevant consideration for aviation development above the need to limit and where possible reduce noise. Should there be any risk arising from the contour limits, these are for the airport to take on, rather than pass onto local communities. The Host Authorities therefore do not agree with the applicant’s reasoning in the Need Case for using the faster growth case, as set out in the Hertfordshire authorities joint Written Representations **[REP1-069]**.

In addition, the current proposals allow for growth to continue without any noise reduction in future aircraft. This is in contradiction to the requirement for benefit sharing with local communities in the Airports National Policy Statement 2018 (ANPS) and section 3.29 bullet 2 of the Aviation Policy Framework 2013 (APF). Growth should not be allowed if there is no noise reduction benefit from next-generation aircraft.

Noise contour areas in future years (2039-2043) are not proposed to reduce and are actually proposed to increase compared to prior years. This clearly demonstrates that growth is sought even if there is no associated noise reduction, contrary to policy. Growth without noise reduction leads to people being

	<p>exposed to higher noise levels. As stated in the joint Hertfordshire Local Impact Report [REP1A-003] (but applying to all five Host Authorities) the increase in air noise in 2043 compared to the Do Minimum is predicted in the daytime to lead to an additional 18,300 people experiencing noise from Luton Airport above the LOAEL and below the SOAEL and an additional 500 people experiencing noise above the SOAEL. The corresponding night-time increases above LOAEL and SOAEL are 27,150 people and 1,900 people.</p> <p>This was put to the Applicant during NEDG meetings, but no material discussions have been held on the topic since the conclusion of NEDG (pre-acceptance).</p> <p>In addition, the current proposals allow for growth to continue without any noise reduction in future aircraft. This is in contradiction to the Airports National Policy Statement 2018 (ANPS): <i>“The benefits of future technological improvements should be shared between the applicant and its local communities, hence helping to achieve a balance between growth and noise reduction.”</i></p> <p>The same sentiment is set out in section 3.29 bullet 2 of the Aviation Policy Framework 2013 (APF) and is therefore a clear objective of policy. Growth should not be allowed if there is no noise reduction benefit from next-generation aircraft.</p> <p>Noise contour areas in future years (2039-2043) are not proposed to reduce and are actually proposed to increase compared to prior years. This clearly demonstrates that growth is sought, even if there are no associated noise reductions, contrary to policy. This is most easily seen on Insets 3.1 and 3.2 of Appendix 16.2 Operational Noise Management Explanatory Note (APP-111). Inset 3.1 shows daytime and 3.2 shows night-time.</p> <p>The above was put to the Applicant during NEDG meetings, alongside the use of 2019 baseline (as noted above). No material discussions with the Applicant have been held on the topic since the conclusion of NEDG (pre-acceptance).</p>
<p>The principle of increasing aviation noise up to 2027 prior to delivering noise mitigation to all eligible properties and</p>	<p>The principle of increasing aviation noise up to 2027 prior to delivering noise mitigation to all eligible properties and whether this can be deemed to satisfy the ANPS (or Noise Policy Statement England (NPSE)) requirement to make particular efforts to avoid significant adverse noise impacts of the scheme has not been the subject of discussion between the Host Authorities and the Applicant.</p>

<p>whether this can be deemed to satisfy the ANPS (or Noise Policy Statement England (NPSE)) requirement to make particular efforts to avoid significant adverse noise impacts of the scheme</p>	<p>The Host Authorities' position as set out in the Statements of Common Ground [REP2-020, REP2-021, REP2-022, REP2-023, REP2-024] is that the Noise Insulation Scheme is materially enhanced compared to the existing scheme; and every effort should be made to roll out the new NIS as fast as possible.</p> <p>The Host Authorities will wait until the Applicants submission of further information on mitigation including green controlled growth and noise insulation in writing before responding to this matter.</p>
<p>Other mitigation measures including details of any flight operational procedures to be applied under the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) balanced approach such as steeper descent approaches, keeping landing gear up as long as possible, minimum altitude requirements, measures to reduce go-arounds, adherence to continuous descent approach and incentives such as differential landing charges, noise violation charges and noise quotas.</p>	<p>Other mitigation measures, including details of any flight operational procedures to be applied under the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) balanced approach such as steeper descent approaches, keeping landing gear up as long as possible, minimum altitude requirements, measures to reduce go-arounds, adherence to continuous descent approach and incentives such as differential landing charges, noise violation charges and noise quotas, have not been the subject of discussion between the host authorities and the Applicant.</p> <p>Noise Violation Limits (NVLs) and Quota Counts (QC) are both sought by the Host Authorities in their Local Impact Reports [REP1A-002; REP1A-003; AS-147; REP1A-004], as mentioned in relation to noise controls. All other measures would be expected to appear in a reasonable Noise Action Plan, but would apply to both the Do Something and Do Minimum, so don't affect the assessment outcomes.</p>
<p>The status of the London Luton Airport Noise Action Plan 2024-2029.</p>	<p>Luton Airport is required to produce a Noise Action Plan, which the Host Authorities would expect to set out methods and measures to reduce noise and a high-level plan of how noise constraints are planned to be met.</p> <p>This is not a planning document, and the Host Authorities have not been asked to review any drafts in the context of the Luton Airport Expansion DCO, so have not held any discussions with the Applicant on the Plan. The Host Authorities understand that the airport operator (LLAOL) held a consultation on the draft</p>

	Noise Action Plan (NAP) between 10 May – 2 July 2023, and submitted the NAP to Defra at the end of September 2023 under the Environmental Noise (England) Regulations 2006.