

October 2023

London Luton Airport Expansion

Planning Inspectorate Scheme Ref: TR020001

Volume 8 Additional Submissions (Examination) 8.55 Applicant's response to Deadline 2 submissions (Written Representations)

Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Application Document Ref: TR020001/APP/8.55



The Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

London Luton Airport Expansion Development Consent Order 202x

8.55 APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO DEADLINE 2 SUBMISSIONS (WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS)

Regulation number:	Deadline 3
Planning Inspectorate Scheme Reference:	TR020001
Document Reference:	TR020001/APP/8.55
Author:	Luton Rising

Version	Date	Status of Version	
Issue 1	October 2023	Additional Submission - Deadline 3	

Contents

Page

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of this document	1
1.2	Structure of document	1
Арре	endix A: Central Bedfordshire Council	

Appendix B: Flamstead Parish Council

Tables

Table 1.1: Applicant's response to Deadline 2 submissions (Written Representations)

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 **Purpose of this document**

- 1.1.1 This document has been prepared by Luton Rising (a trading name of London Luton Airport Limited) ('the Applicant') for submission to the Examining Authority (ExA). It provides the Applicant's response to additional Written Representations submitted at Deadline 2.
- 1.1.2 The Applicant has reviewed the submissions made by Interested Parties at Deadline 2 of the Examination and signposts the reader to the documents submitted by the Applicant where the issue raised has been responded to.
- 1.1.3 The Applicant has not responded to all comments raised, rather the Applicant has responded to those matters where the Applicant believes that an additional response is required or to direct the reader to where an earlier response has been provided. Please note that where the Applicant has not responded to a particular point this should not be read as acceptance by the Applicant of the point raised.
- 1.1.4 The Applicant has identified key issues on a thematic basis and has signposted the reader to the relevant document where the issue has been addressed. This is presented in Table 1.1 below.
- 1.1.5 It is recognised that the additional Written Representations submitted by Central Bedfordshire Council **[REP2-047]** and Flamstead Parish Council **[REP2-053]** have raised matters that are more specific in nature, as a result **Appendices A and B** respectively, set out detailed responses to the issues raised.

1.2 Structure of document

- 1.2.1 This document is structured as follows:
 - a. Section 1: Introduction and response to common topics raised in Written Representations submitted at Deadline 2.
 - b. Appendix A: Detailed response to Witten Representation submitted by Central Bedfordshire Council at Deadline 2
 - c. Appendix B: Detailed response to Witten Representation submitted by Flamstead Parish at Deadline 2

Table 1.1: Applicant's response to Deadline 2 submissions (Written Representations)

Interested Party and Examination Reference	Summary Sentence	Luton Rising's Response		
Air Quality	Air Quality			
Pamela Rose Jesson REP2-068	Concerned that the Proposed Development will lead to worsening of exposure to aviation fuel.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 8-10, in response to RR-0277 and others.		
Climate Change				
David Hart Jesson REP2-050	General concern that the Proposed Development will accelerate environmental degradation.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 31, in response to RR-0550 and others.		
Pat Valian REP2-069	Concern that the Proposed Development, at the construction and operational phase, will contribute towards climate change, cause damage to the environment.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 30, in response to RR-0508 and others.		
General				
David Hart Jesson REP2-050	General opposition to the Proposed Development.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part		
Pamela Rose Jesson REP2-068		1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 81-83, in response to RR-0277 and others.		
Pat Valian REP2-069				

Interested Party and Examination Reference	Summary Sentence	Luton Rising's Response		
Health and Community				
David Hart Jesson REP2-050	Concern that the Proposed Development will cause harm to the physical and mental health of residents living near to the Airport, leading to	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part		
Pamela Rose Jesson REP2-068	a reduced quality of life.	1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 109-111, in response to RR-0470 and others.		
Pat Valian REP2-069				
Need Case				
David Hart Jesson REP2-050	Concern that the Proposed Development is unnecessary.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 134-135, in response to RR-0550 and others.		
Pamela Rose Jesson REP2-068	Concern that the Proposed Development is profit driven.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 134, in response to RR-1469 and others.		
Noise and Vibration				
David Hart Jesson REP2-050 Pat Valian	Concern about the impact of future increases in levels of noise as a result of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 147-150, in response to RR-0520 and others.		
REP2-069				

Interested Party and Examination Reference	Summary Sentence	Luton Rising's Response
Pamela Rose Jesson REP2-068 Pat Valian REP2-069	Concern about the detrimental impact of noise on quality of sleep.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 150-153, in response to RR-1140 and others.
Planning		
David Hart Jesson REP2-050	Concerned that there is not a sufficient level of physical and social infrastructure in the area.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 173-174, in response to RR-0128 and others.
Surface Access		
David Hart Jesson REP2-050	Concern that the Proposed Development will result in more road traffic.	The Applicant considers that the issue raised was answered within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Part 1 of 4 [REP1-020] page 17-18, in response to RR-0794 and others.