

Burnie, Rammiel

From: Luton Airport
To: NI Enquiries
Subject: RE: Postscript: Ref: TR020001 - Luton Airport Expansion

From: Elspeth Gass [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 October 2023 11:47
To: NI Enquiries <NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Postscript: Ref: TR020001 - Luton Airport Expansion
Importance: High

Dear Planning Inspectorate

As a postscript to my email, below, I noticed in the newspaper today (Daily Telegraph, 20 October 2023) an article on the Council's decision, together with Historic England, to 'protect officers' mess at former bomber base' - this includes the point:

'Custodians of Listed buildings hold a privileged position, having an important role to play in protecting the nation's heritage for future generations, and with that privilege comes a great responsibility to not only protect that asset but also ensure it has a sustainable future'.

I would add to my note to you that **'there is no sustainable future for our property, [REDACTED] in its Listed Status, given the expansion and continued expansion of London Luton Airport'**. One cannot have it both ways: either it is Listed and support should be given to uphold its building integrity and the fit for purpose ability of the inhabitants' ability to be able to continue to live here (given the increasing, increased and further to increase noise); or it is delisted and such work can be done'

There has been no financial offer to maintain such listed buildings under the airport's expansions. We understand plastic windows are not in keeping (as Historic England and the Council state) yet there has been no extra allocation for full wooden double glazing for such properties, including ours, nor survey offers, to ensure there is no problem with damage to such properties' building integrity caused by vibration of planes; nor acknowledgement that such old buildings cannot and must not be treated the same as every other property. Such Listed Buildings are UNIQUE, that is why they were listed in the first place. Therefore they cannot be put into the same 'funding allocation' as all other properties and for the airport to expect the property owner of such listed buildings to be directed to 'standard companies' who deal with usually built houses - **these are unusual properties by their very nature. We are directed by the airport to the same building companies, and to the same 'solutions' every other house is directed to, when we are clearly a 'SPECIAL CASE'.**

No account is taken in such airport compensation for 'special cases' - if there have, they have not been drawn to our attention, nor has additional funding been allocated. There is absolutely no way that the funding offered at present is adequate, nor to have to use the airport's sole supplier of plastic UPVC windows would be acceptable to either Historic England, NHC or ourselves.

This is all plainly ridiculous. It places us in an impossible position. Yet we cannot even sell our property. We have tried. Notwithstanding the noise, we have a large house and garden and as I am over 60 I would like to move to a more sustainable small house with small garden myself, but because of the increasing noise and continued expansion of Luton Airport, we cannot sell it. We can show you the evidence of feedback from viewers who state in their feedback proximity to the airport and lack of double glazing and price (our house has not really increased in value since we bought it 10 years ago, but we could not afford to move if we sold it for what people would want to pay for it).

Both the Council and Historic England and the two authorities of the airport have placed us in a Catch 22 situation, bouncing us like a hot potato between them, saying they are sorry, but it is not their responsibility but they will not change their mind: each of them in making us Custodian, or accepting we are Custodians, and responsible for this Grade II Listed property, but are unable to do so with decisions being made which are out of our hands yes, we 'have a part to play' but how can we do this?

Furthermore, we had a 'legitimate expectation' that the authorities who made this cottage Listed, should act as its representative (and representative of other such Listed properties) to speak up for them, when they were asked to, yet in the NHC minutes of the meetings we have seen, this was not done: NHC approved it; and Historic England did the same: no custodianship was forthcoming from those we should legitimately expect to represent such buildings, and the people living in such buildings, as the overall custodians who gave this responsibility to us in the first place.

In order to be able to live here, and given the circumstances of the airport continued expansion, we have applied for our property to be delisted, but we do not believe we will be successful. We have applied for planning permission under Listed status for plastic double glazing so we do not suffer from the increasing airport noise pollution (which is not just overhead planes but the constant whirring from the airport we hear) but have been told this is unlikely to be given.

We are thus in an impossible position.

We have been made 'custodians' of this 'asset' and thus held responsible for it: it is seen included as an 'asset' by Historic England yet we have no funding for it. We accepted this when we bought it, **however, we could not foresee, nor have been expected to foresee, the continued expansion of the airport. At a time when people are told to minimise their carbon footprint, use cars less, use less heating (and heating prices increased to ensure people would use less heat), yet the airport maintain low flight prices - flight prices for paying passengers have indeed have decreased significantly in cost since I used to fly as part of my job for the Foreign Office: people see oversee holidays as part of their right and expect low budget flights, yet in my day of flying some 30 years ago, pro rata, flights were far more expensive, thus inviting far more people to fly and thus polluting more; rather than restricting flights in common with a low carbon footprint which everyone else is expected to respect - thus, 'no reasonable person would expect airport expansion and thus an increase in noise/air/light pollution': the airport can say they offset the pollution by selling/buying carbon credits - yet we on the ground suffer this pollution. We had no reason to expect the upholding, nor have been expected to see, the continued expansion of such polluting aircraft and its subsequent noise.**

We have seen and experienced the associated deterioration of our property. When people buy a Grade II Listed cottage in the countryside, they expect peace and quiet. We accepted a certain amount of noise with Luton Airport: but not what we currently experience (which has been a gradual ratcheting up of noise and light pollution) to the point that we now experience far more night flights.

Historic England and North state, yet our hands have been tied as to its protection - decisions such as Luton Airport expansion etc are not within our control, we can only raise up our hand and state that this building vibrates under the constant planes and we have noticed this has increased in the 10 years we have lived here. It is built on footings, not foundations.

If we are to protect this Listed building, as its custodians, we have to be able to live in it; be listened to; and be adequately financially compensated so we can continue to maintain it 'for posterity if that is what is required by Historic England and the Council' and thus we need double glazing in order to live here, preferably wooden double glazing for ALL windows and doors. However, if it is merely to be kept as a museum, not fit to be lived in as it is 'unliveable' but merely a historic relic, then someone needs to purchase it from us.

Elsbeth Gass (Mrs)

----- Original Message -----

From: Elsbeth Gass [REDACTED]

To: "NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk" <NIEnquiries@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Date: 19/10/2023 18:53 BST

Subject: Ref: TR020001 - Luton Airport Expansion

Application by London Luton Airport Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the London Luton Airport Expansion

My interested party reference number: **20037650**

Dear Planning Department,

I would like to provide my comments on the decision for Ref 15/00950/VARCON and how this should be reflected in your current consideration of the application for the Order Granting Development Consent for the London Luton Airport Expansion as per your 'Rule 17'.

I am concerned that the decision on Ref 15/00950/VARCON has left myself and my family in an impossible situation as we live in a Grade II listed property and the noise mitigation plan approved with this planning is inadequate to ensure that myself and my family do not suffer as a result of the current noise and proposed increased noise (including more night flights) from the airport.

I would like to explain the current circumstances and how the decision on REF 15/00950/VARCON affects myself and my family and then suggest ways that you can consider removing these problems when considering in the current application for the Development Consent for the London Luton Airport Expansion.

The property I live in is under the flight path, and dates from 1750, it therefore was present long before the airport was established, and the noise from the planes going over my property day and night affect my enjoyment of the house and its garden. I have noticed this has increased significantly in the 10 years I have lived here.

Unfortunately the noise insulation scheme currently offered, and which Luton Airport have confirmed we are eligible for, and which you approved, does not cover the cost of installing double glazing that meets the requirements of Historic England and North Hertfordshire County Council.

We have asked North Hertfordshire County Council if we can put in plastic UPVC windows, and we have had multiple responses indicating that we could not proceed without obtaining listed building control, and they have written that they are unlikely to approve this due to other legal constraints. We raised a complaint with them because we could see no alternative remedy and they have stated that they are not responsible for the Noise Insulation Grant. It appears to me that each party uses the other to assume blame so one can never sort this issue out or obtain a solution. For example, the airport has two different companies and each state the other is responsible when anything is raised.

We have also approached Historic England, who have confirmed that although they are responsible for maintaining the list of Grade II listed buildings, the approval of modifications to our Grade II listed building to provide noise insulation is outside their remit, although we are included as an 'asset' for them.

The airport has put us in contact with 'their sole contractor' whom they say they use, who confirmed he only installs plastic windows not wooden windows and suggested that many councils would allow us to just go ahead anyway (which Historic England indicate is not permissible).

This leaves myself and my family in our home with single glazing, with the front door rattling and the house vibrating significantly as planes fly over and with single brick walls that do not reduce the noise of the planes through the night, and with no practical way forward to reduce the impact of the

noise of the planes, because Historic England, North Hertfordshire County Council and Luton Airport are not working together to provide a solution.

I would therefore like to suggest that when you consider the new order granting a development consent order for London Luton airport expansion, you ensure that the impact on people living in Grade II listed buildings is catered for in the noise mitigation plans.

I would like the Airport, Historic England and North Hertfordshire County Council to work together to provide a noise insulation scheme that is fully funded to the full cost of providing noise insulation to the windows, doors and walls to ensure that we are not disturbed by aeroplane noise and light pollution (consecutive night flights are fully lit with a flashing light coming into three of our bedrooms, illuminating the bedrooms at night).

If the three parties (Luton Airport, Historic England and North Hertfordshire County Council) cannot agree to providing acceptable noise insulation, then I would like the property to be purchased so we can move and continue our life locally in an equivalent house away from the flight path.

Yours faithfully

Elsbeth Gass (Mrs)