

AUDIO_LUTON_OFH3_SESSION2_27112023

00:06

Welcome back everyone to this open floor hearing. The time is now 820 once and I'd like to resume the hearing. And I'm now going to ask Mr. Moran on behalf of Luton Town Football Club to make his representation Thank you

00:43

just turn your microphone on onto the button on the right. Yes.

00:48

All right. I thought I needed to shut up. I'll start again. Madam Chair. Thank you so much for the opportunity to address the examination panel. My name is Michael Moran, Chief Operating Officer at 2020 developments, which is a sister company in the development arm of Luton Town Football Club, and today I'm representing both entities. I'm proud to represent our club with this long heritage in the town and rooted in its local community based at Kenilworth road since 1905, we've all had a very busy summer getting the ground ready for the Premier League and media attention from around the world. It is brilliant to be able to say we are a Premier League club. I started working with the club almost 10 years ago, and without any disrespect intended is quite the leap from the first games watching Luton play the likes of Catherine and Alphington in the non league conference. Now of course, that was the low point in the club's history. We do believe now modestly, we are back where we belong in the top flight of English football, having built steady promotions on the back of a strong culture and sustainable budgets. I'm representing my company and the club today to express our wholehearted support for Luton risings proposed long term and sustainable growth of the airport. We are strong partners for lift and rising and the council. We want to acknowledge their support for our club and our journey. Indeed, of course, we wouldn't be have got where we have got to without the support of the whole town for which we are grateful. We are humbled that Ludens football club and airport are undoubtedly the two single biggest assets for which our town is principally known across the UK and beyond. More than that we have aligned ambitions for the town and its people. This is not a moment for Luton to be standing still. So we applaud the investment and ambition displayed by Luton rising and its shareholders to plan for the future success of our town and to go further than that of any UK airport to have proposed to minimise the impacts on the environment through its unique green controlled growth framework. We recognise of course that the expansion plans are significant. For that reason it is important to be part of a meaningful consultation programme such as this that all issues may be examined. For our part we are working to relocate the club's current football stadium for Kenilworth road to our site a power cord more than doubling the stadium's capacity in the process. The intention is to create a thriving new landmark that we can be proud of. Many recent commentators have estimated the value of a club in the Premier League to its town to be approximately 100 million pounds per annum. This is a course over and above the economic 30 seconds that the football club already contributes to the local economy. Our Luton Town Football Club Community Trust is a fervent supporter of Lutens rise rising social impact programme. At closing thought might seem ambitious, but we look forward to the day when fans

can go across Europe for matches and fly from our home airport. The connectivity and reputation enjoyed by our town is already a vital part of our club success. Hopefully there is more to come. Thank you.

03:58

Thank you for your submissions that one question I have and I'm not sure whether you are aware but in the written representations, we had comments from stop Luton Airport Expansion group, who raised some concerns that professional athletes could be exposed to increased pollution and noise from aviation, particularly given the proximity of the weather training ground is located right under that. And they have also quoted in their submission references to various and journals as well. I'm not expecting you to be aware of those and I'm not setting up an ICU any sort of detail questions, but just from a general point of view, are you aware of the proximity of the training ground under the flight path having any effect on the physical activity of football as at all

04:45

so so I was part of the club and the development company in in identifying and developing the training ground? So we looked at a number of sites. And what I can say is that over the course of the those years, there's not been any reports of issues that I'm aware of the feedback from players who have trained across the country and indeed internationally has always been positive. So it's not something that we've been reported we've seen reported.

05:17

Okay, thank you for that. I think we would probably find it useful to have some sort of response from the football club to those comments. And I'll give you the reference. And this is something that you can look at to as an action point. And to submit for deadline six are the comments the examination Library Reference is rep one, Dash 061. And it's comments from stock Luton, airport expansion, and we would we would find it useful if we could have some comments on that. And this within that relevant written representation is there's actually the articles and journal articles included. So if you could have any response to that, we would find that quite useful and

06:00

clearly the welfare of the club's players and staff is paramount. So I'll take that away to liaise with the club staff.

06:06

Thank you.

06:07

Thanks. Thank you.

06:15

Thank you very much. I'm now going to ask the day from national same day to come up and speak. Thank you, Mr. Day. Once you settle, we've got three minutes.

06:28

Thank you. Good evening. My name is Pastor day, and I'm here to support the expansion of the airport. The founder of national same day courier company I set up in Luton over 30 years ago. With the help of the airport, I obtained airside passes. And with this I found a niche market and obtained passes at 17 other UK airports. This allowed us to open up a national airside service with our head office locally based London Luton Airport. Today we turn over six and a half million pounds and employ 90 staff and of course, several sub contractors. We've been supported by the airport with premises firstly with a warehouse facility which stores aviation parts and visit facilitated crosstalk operation. And secondly, with truck parking to operate our fleet of small vans to articulated lorries. And of course, the growth of the airport attracts airlines and therefore aircraft that gives us the parts to move. With the airport support, we have created job opportunities which have contributed to the town's prosperity and well being. We invest in our staff through training and development. And this can only benefit local residents that make up our staff base. Post pandemic, we see aviation as a growth market. And with the support of the airport, we will continue to invest in our business creating opportunity and therefore prosperity and wellbeing for the local community.

07:56

Thank you very much. And I do apologise for pronouncing your name incorrectly to start with just a couple of questions. And you mentioned your courier company so and that it's an international courier company. So I'm assuming it's utilising the airport to courier parts or could just maybe expand a little bit more on what exactly it is you do. Yeah.

08:15

So we're a domestic courier company. So we move parts from airport to airport within the UK. And that's

08:29

and you made reference to your turnover, but roughly how many people do you employ?

08:33

We've got 90 staff so 89 staff on the payroll.

08:37

Thank you

08:44

Thank you very much. I'm just going to check if anyone else has any questions for you. Thank you very much Mr. Day.

08:57

then could we have the Andrew Robley Next please?

09:08

believe Mr. Rob please not here. Okay. So moving on to the next person. Can we have a DVI Callie?

09:31

I think nothing. Okay, so we'll move on to the next speaker which is councillor Steven Stevens please.

09:49

Thank you very much. I would like to start if I may, by reading a motion that I put to the Council at the last full council which was supported by all councillors because I think it might have some relevance to these proceedings. This council recognises the vital role that London Luton Airport plays in the provision of income, charitable and community funding and jobs for the residents of Luton. It understand is that appropriate and proportionate expansion of the airport will help to increase both income and the availability of jobs for the town's population. It equally recognises that more stringent measures are urgently needed to reduce the impact of noise pollution, and worsening air quality that the airport surface access traffic and associated airline companies caused to Luton residents in general. And in particular, to those residents in my ward south with more stops Lee Vauxhall round green and central Ward's therefore, I request the chief executive and I understand he's willing willingly going to do this, together with relevant offices to initiate discussions with London Luton Airport, limited loot and rising London homesnap operation limited and NTIA is to seek solutions to reduce the effects of detrimental Polit pollutants and noise residence noise blight for the residents. consideration in these discussions should be given to the possibility of moving the Western flight paths further to the south and I do understand that the incoming flight path, it may not be possible due to safety reasons. I'm setting a firm deadline for airlines to replaced older noisier aircraft with more or less noisy planes. At the moment we have about I understand we have 17% of the planes which are modern and less noise meaning that 83% of the planes are still of the noisier type. We are very easily able to set a deadline for 2035 in the country for no new petrol and diesel cars. It should not be beyond the realms of possibility to actually to ensure that our airports, including London Luton Airport is able to set a deadline by which the newer planes are brought into service if they wish to continue using the airport. And lastly, placing more permanent noise monitors near to the populated populated areas. Luton. Be mindful that reading from monitors currently located in residents gardens cannot be used to take legal action against airlines found to be in breach of statutory and local Empire imposed noise pollutions. So the gist of this motion is not to say that the council and indeed my residence in Southport are against any expansion. They do recognise that jobs and income come to the town. However, there is a view from the residents that that these are goals must be predicated by an a more overarching goal, which is to reduce the blight, noise blight pollutant blight, which is affecting residents daily lives. In addition, the residents that I've spoken to they have reservations about whether Luton will be able to meet its net 20 its net carbon neutral target by 2014. With the expansion of off the air with the airport, they also have doubts that the infrastructure is in place to be able to handle the the expanding number of passengers that were coming to use the airport as it is at the moment the trains from London, the fast train from London go every half hour. If by any chance and it's happened recently, there was a major holdup on the one that causes a major backlog going into the airport. And I'm not sure the residents aren't sure that this has been dealt with. If that impact happens again, it's likely to throw the passengers that are coming to the airport or the potential passengers that are coming to the airport onto other roads such as Coutinho Road, such as London Road, onto eating green road where they do not have the capacity to handle that number of of vehicles coming forward. So I come back to the fact that the residents are I'm not against any expansion, they do see the benefits. But it's imperative that any expansion is only allowed

to go ahead on a considerate basis, on a basis that the expansion on the amount that Luton Airport really needs that the town really needs. And it must be predicated that expansion must be predicated on being able to solve the problems of noise blight, which definitely will expand as the airport expands up to 22 point 5 million up to 27 million passengers a year. And finally up to 32 million pounds of passengers per year. And there is nothing that's in the system so far, that really resolves that problem. Just by handing out to residents 3800 pounds to insulate three windows, when noise comes through the rest of the windows in the house, and through the roofs. That isn't going to solve the problem going forward for the residents. They are still going to be suffering, and they will be suffering more as the years go by, as the expansion goes up from 90 million passengers a year, up to 32 million passengers. Thank you.

16:23

Thank you very much. Councillor Stevens, you mentioned that it was a motion that you put to council. What date was that? When did you that last

16:31

full Council, which was Robin?

16:40

Tell you what, if you want to confirm when you put your submission in after today's hearing, that'd be helpful.

16:45

It was very recent.

16:48

Thank you very much. And and you say that it was supported by all members. It

16:53

was it was supported.

16:57

1414 Thank you. It was supported by all members. If it was possible for you to submit a copy of that motion, it would be helpful to the examination just so that we've got it in front of us.

17:10

I certainly will. Yes.

17:11

Thank you. I don't think I have any further questions. Because I think the points that you've raised we've discussed before, and we will be discussing throughout the week going forward at various of the issue specific hearings. I'm just going to check with my colleagues as to whether or not there's anything that they want to raise.

17:30

I had one question cancel Steve, as it was just uh, you mentioned the possibility of a Western flight path going further to the south. Could you lose? Yes.

17:40

I obviously not suggesting that it would be going very far south because it's not the idea wouldn't be to put that same problem on to two other residents in other areas. But certainly, the idea would be to go over Luton, who grounds at the moment, the takeoff, which goes on the westerly takeoff is far less noisy for residents. It's something that can accept. But it is the incoming flights that are coming from the west that come straight over London Road that come up cute now road, they come over Park Street, and it's that it's causing the major blight. Now I do understand, for safety reasons, it may not be possible to move that flight paths further south. But there are possibilities of tweaking both the takeoff and the landing in some way to reduce the noise. And it may be possible, certainly to look at the airspace and the protocols around the airspace around the airport to try to reduce noise further.

18:54

Thank you. The only other thing I just wanted to highlight is obviously we will be talking about the compensation proposals later in the week, which are revised from the current figures that you've you've read, I think

19:04

so you're up to about 4000 or something but that is still not enough to to for resident to insulate all of the house. Because if you're just going to insulate a few windows at the front of the house, the noise will come in through the back of the house and it comes through the and obviously comes through the roofs. And if we really wanted to be able to help sort the problem for the residents not just in Southwark, which in my ward, but in eastern wards as well. A far greater package of money should be made available to the residents in order to be able to insulate that noise and to allow themselves to have a decent life. Thank you.

19:49

Thank you very much, Councillor Stevens. I'm not sure if you're aware but if you look at the site visits we've undertaken we have experienced both takeoff and landing on cut Alright, so experienced both

20:01

sides. Have you seen what I say?

20:04

Okay, I'm now going to move to Mr. lamborn who is attending virtually. Mr. lamborn

20:15

thank you Andrew lamborn speaking on behalf of ladder can open floor hearing to We noted that the vast majority of local people who made representations to the panel are strongly opposed to major expansion of capacity at Luton Airport, particularly given its location, and allows young mitigated noise and surface transport impacts it already causes we highlighted has yet to undelivered commitments

from Project curiam which persist even if the 19 million permission is utilised. cluding a strategy to reduce the noise contours, the need for transport plan and a carbon reduction strategy. We're told the taxiway extension should be completed by 2026. There are dwellings entitled to noise insulation which either has not been fitted, or which has not been confirmed to reduce noise to an acceptable degree. As part of getting to the 18 million passengers which occurred in 2019. Some information were being provided still appears to be erroneous. The applicant has told the panel that Neo aircraft would account for 40% of flights this summer. In fact, it looks more like 30%. The application also overstates the noise benefit of the a three to one ratio by round two decibels which is significant. The Boeing 737 900 aircraft now being flown by LL is proving much louder than the cargo freighters in the old 7378 Hundreds by substantial margin, which is clearly a big step in the wrong direction. Prospects of airspace modernisation by 2030 is receding rapidly. They've gone for transport and the CAA now considering changing the whole process to use a single design entity for all of the airports involved. There is still no technical solution to the problem of flight paths which cross and cause Ludens arrivals and departures to be held low. In short, this application is premature. Despite claims of a mitigation hierarchy, there is no such thing. Fleet Modernization will progress at a rate which suits the airlines motivated by a reduction in fuel costs and more seats per flight. This will happen anyway. Compensation by noise installation for the worst affected people does not assist the majority, who would suffer increasing noise disturbance both day and night over a far wider area than the innermost noise contours. Noise impacts will be made intolerable by adding 70% More night flights as its proposed. Noise is a key concern for airport development projects. And the DFT commission the Civil Aviation Authority to give guidance on the process of creating and agreeing the noise envelope. Those envelopes are required by policy and are valuable because they define both the scope of impact through limits associated with noise measurement parameters and the controls which ensure those limits are respected. And that's why members of the noise envelope design group engaged diligently with the applicant over a prolonged period. We and the other group members representing local authorities were incredulous when Lewton rising dispensed with all the control parameters we'd agreed apart from some noise contours and new to the thresholds. This has caused an awful lot of additional effort and wasted a lot of time during this examination which is completely unnecessary. Position is evolving during the examination as negotiations continue with host authorities and controls are restored. But this is in danger of becoming confusing because it's now unclear how each control will be secured. The night movements limit sits in the draft DCO the noise contouring green control growth others to be advised. This is not how our noise envelopes should be defined. Given the history of increasing noise communities are entitled to a noise envelope defined properly in accordance with the CIA's guidance of which two aspects stand out in particular. Firstly, noise envelopes should address precisely the noise issues local to the airport under consideration. That's page 45. And secondly, the parameters should be set based on an agreement reached between the industry and local community stakeholders. In line with the vision defined by the noise policy statement for England, an appropriate balance between minimising noise impacts, and maximising sustainable growth must be struck. Neither of these is optional both require an agreement of stakeholders. Balance which sits between minimising noise and maximising growth is consistent with policy that industry can share the benefits of technical development only as noise levels fall. Regrettably, the noise overload design was not approached. In accordance with this guidance. It does not address the specific issues of this airport as mentioned earlier, the magnitude of the noise envelope was not agreed. By striking a balance. The noise envelope design group was simply informed of the limits in its penultimate meeting. The scope of this envelope is

crucial to community health, since he represents the scale of noise impacts. The final noise envelope parameters, limits and controls has not been consulted on because it was completed after the statutory consultation. This is unacceptable in the context of such a major development proposal. There is also still disagreement between the applicant and join us authorities over the proper way to handle a nice baseline when assessing impacts. We remain unclear also over the funding for the development of new funding statement leaves us none the wiser about how Phase two will be paid for hypothetical options are described. But without definiteness. It's possible that compulsory purchases may go ahead, no development could be found paying for terminal two and the associated works, particularly bearing in mind the track record of incomplete work from the previous application. Large amounts of office space currently stand empty in Luton yet, green horizons Park depends on this airport access road which Luton Borough Council is due to pay for my proof superflous. He also raised concerns over governance. The chief executive of Luton Borough Council and who's also a shareholder representative for Luton rising, spoke to us earlier publicly takes credit for the growth incentive scheme. He's led the airport to 80 million passengers by 2019. Nine years too soon and in breach of the council's own noise limits. Finally, we've raised concerns over the halving of the operational carbon emissions between the consulted p e ir and the DCO application. similar numbers of aircraft of similar types are proposed to be flown in the years to 2043. They are not equivalent zero emissions aircraft waiting in the wings. How will the emissions magically reduce remain firmly of the opinion that Luton deserves a better airport, not a bigger one. And in fact, the college students would have a chance to learn more relevant and useful skills in this type of energy and climate crisis. And the charities would still benefit. Thank you.

28:40

Thank you, Mr. lamborn. I don't have any questions for you. Does anybody else? Dr. Hunt?

28:46

Yeah. Mr. lamborn. I'm conscious that quite a number of the issues that certainly you've outlined are things that will be discussed in further detail at issue specific hearing number eight. So I won't go into the detail of those. Now. You did make one point about particular Boeing aircraft being louder than cargo aircraft. I'm afraid it didn't catch the type of aircraft.

29:10

So it's the 737 900 which is a stretched version of the 737 800. It's not a new generation aircraft. It's a traditional aircraft, but ll has now started flying that and it is proving to be considerably noisier than the standard 737 iron condor, which itself is one of the noisiest passenger types. And vies with the we used to fly with the cargo aircraft, the Airbus 303 360s.

29:49

That's helpful. Thank you. Thank you.

30:07

Okay, I think that's all the questions we have for you, Mr. lamborn. So thank you for your contributions this evening. Okay, next, could we have Joe Kelly, please who I believe is online?

30:28

Kelly, you have three minutes started from whenever you're ready.

30:32

Okay, I'll keep this brief as late. My comments concern, compensation and statutory blight. In my opinion expansion should not take place without statutory compensation for the 10,000 residents or so who live under and adjacent to the easterly and westerly flight paths. And this cost needs to be factored into the net present value calculations in order to assess if the project is viable. Much has been made of the socio economic benefits, which I dispute, but there was also compensation costs that needs to be considered and included in the financial plan. Under the current application that the airport has deemed that virtually no compensation is necessary, other than for those who are directly adjacent to the development and compensation will only be payable if statutory blight is held to exist. In practice, proving blight on the current legal definition is very difficult, and may take years and generalised blight gives no right compensation. We've seen the f1 Pass has expanded and has paid zero compensation for blight from his previous expansions. Proving blight also requires Luton Council accepting that stuffy blight exists. And we also have we all know that there is a lack of independence there. And so there's this is not going to happen anytime soon, and no indeed can the council afford it? In my view, if these expansion plans are to be approved, the planning expert also has to designate the residential areas that are subject to statutory blight and make it easier for them to achieve compensation, as I believe took place with the Heathrow expansion. Otherwise, these residents face years of battles to get compensated as is a direct cost of the development, the cost of compensation must be factored into the development cost and not ignored in order that the NPV of the project can be more accurately determined. And I don't see how it can be done retrospectively. And I suppose I would question then whether the net present value would remain positive if these costs are fully factored into the development. That's it. Thank you.

32:37

Thank you, Mr. Kelly. Obviously, you've made quite a lot of comments there about compensation. And we've we've heard, obviously, Councillor Stevens raising similar things as well. And but just to make you aware that compensation policies will be discussed in more detail at issue specific hearing nine, which is taking place on Thursday, and that will be held at item seven, if you are interested in participating in that more, or

33:02

in STATA, is that broadly or just in relation to the Wigmore? What area?

33:09

It is broadly, but what I would do is I would encourage you to go and have a look at the agendas online for issues specific here in nine and it sets out a list of points of of the topics that will be covered. But not not necessarily limited to that. But that sort of gives a framework as to what what will be touched upon on on Thursday. All right, I'll

33:35

do that. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

33:39

Thank you for your contributions this evening.

33:44

I'm now going to ask Mr. Jeremy young to come. Talk.

33:56

Mr. Yang, when you're ready, you have three minutes.

34:01

Good evening, when I spoke at the last open forum, had a written text. But this time, I've just got six words which I like to use. You've heard tonight about the benefits that he gives to various charities and normalisation of that. I don't think there's any dispute on that. But we've also heard from the council about the economic benefits, which I would probably dispute. In a recent article in The Guardian newspaper identified 10 local authorities which hadn't issued the publicly issued the audit accounts for the last five years. Luton Borough Council was among that list. So I would question why they haven't issued it. Have they got something to hide? Is the airport a golden egg? Or sorry, a golden goose? Or is it a millstone around the Luton Luton Town. We then Move on to the other side of the argument about the fact that we've heard from various groups. What's her name? Now, Daisy Cooper, who I thought spoke very eloquently and actually put some very good points over. But we've also heard from individuals, I think there was a relation of the former Queen Mother whose whose property or is business is going to be blighted with an expansion, and various other people. But there is one group here, which nobody we've hadn't heard from at all. And it's very unlikely that we will do and they're the people that have been blighted by the climate emergency, there's probably hundreds 1000s 10s of 1000s of people, which have been negatively impacted by that. And if we continue to discharge more co2 into the air, then these people or more people will be with their lives who will suffer, there might be deaths or famines, floods, whatever. So what I would ask is, when you consider your if it's a verdict or your decision, can you please make this decision? For the many, not the few?

36:28

Thank you very much for your contribution. So we've come to the end of all the people who have registered to speak and before I progressed to those who requested to speak at the start of the meeting, I'm just going to come back to two people who we who did who were here, but who then weren't here for a second half, just to check in case they've turned up. So that was Andrew, Rob Lee, or Rosalie? No. And Debbie Cali. No. Okay, in which case, we're going to proceed with those people who made a request to speak at the beginning of the meeting, but who hadn't registered, which was Mr. Morgan, Mr. White, Mr. Hayden, I did request it possible that Mr. Morgan could be allowed to go first, cuz we haven't actually heard from him, whereas Mr. White, Mr. Hayden have spoken at previous open floor hearings. So Mr. Morgan, if you'd like to come up to the desk, and then you have three minutes? Yes, thank

37:26

you. I just want to comment on Robin Porter's speech about erasing poverty. And the way to raise poverty is to expand the airport. I've downloaded some jobs today or soft noon, and these are vacancies at the airport. And these are just two of many vacancies. And these are typical vacancies. So the first one is car park attendant, Luton Airport. Shifts are from 630 in the morning to 618 30 at night and 1830 to 630 in the morning, so working 12 hour shifts working weekends working nights. They're going to be paid 11 pounds an hour. aviation security officer working four days on four days off the hours that are between three in the morning to 8am. The salary is 11,769 pounds per annum. And my question would be if he was here, and he's not here is how is he going to use poverty? When airport jobs are paying salaries live at lots of people in Luton are in poverty and the reason they're in poverty, their work, poverty, and they work at Luton Airport

38:40

said often so.

38:46

Very much Could it be possible for you to submit that information into the examination really?

38:51

Thank you so much.

38:52

Anyone have any questions? In which case, could I have Mr. White please?

39:11

Mr. White, you have three minutes.

39:13

Thank you. I'll stay within it this time. Three comments I'd like to make on what I've heard this evening. We've heard how the financial income from the airport will help charities and people. There's been no mention of how financial income will directly go into the budget of Luton Borough Council, where it will influence the lives of the real shareholders of Luton Airport and that is the residents of Luton. We are the shareholders Luton Borough Council hold it on our behalf. So there's been no direct thing that I can see of how an expanded airport would increase the income to the budgets of Luton as my first point, the second point is expansion is to tackle poverty. Poverty in any town is disgusting, whatever the town has done as an asset. But let's look at the half a billion pound debt that Luton Council has given to loot and rising in funding for the dark at 330 million. The funding for this application and funding for to keep it afloat during COVID. That's half a million pounds plus interest which is paid for from concession fee income. Now, if poverty eradication is the key of airport expansion. Why did it come second, to allowing Luton riding the applicant to rack up over half a billion pounds with a debt plus interest? That money could have eradicated poverty now in real terms, not theoretically, potentially in the future. If Once that debt is paid off, there's enough income left to actually tackle poverty. And my third point very quickly, from the start of this inquiry, you seen that Luton rising, you've been led to believe Luton rising is separate from Luton Borough Council in fact, Luton Borough Council is one of the host authorities Luton Borough Council has a planning expert who sits and tells you things about Luneberg Council

you've seen tonight from the people that spoken but Luton Borough Council and Luton rising are intrinsically linked. And the concern to myself and others is, is that if you pass this DCO, of course, the actual planning applications and the approval will go to the host authority, which is Luton Borough Council. They have shown I think tonight that they will not put anything, whether it be environmental noise, anything you care to wish in the way of expanding the airport. They've shown that in the last five years that I've been looking at various things with the development control committee meetings at Luton Council. And I'd like to prove that link that if you do pass this DCO Is there any way within the planning remit that you have another host authority who makes the planning decisions, not Luton Borough Council, thank you very much.

42:29

Thank you very much, Mr. White. don't actually have any questions on the comments that you've made. And I'm sure that the applicant will be taking away the questions that you've made, and providing a written response that deadline six for you. I'm just going to ask my colleagues if they've got any questions.

42:50

Yes, I'll ask one question. I obviously asked Luton Borough Council earlier about the poverty and how that's how expansion of the airport over the since 2014? And what impact it's had as a local resident what what would your views be of that just to just so we can have a different opinion on it. And

43:14

I'm fortunate enough to live in an area where there isn't a great deal of poverty, though it does exist. I'm a lifelong lutonium Born and bred 62 years old. I've seen what the town's become. I actually used to work at the airport, the airport used to benefit the town in so many ways that it was really an asset. And then in 2015, the applicant decided that rather than just being a rent collector, who would take the concession fee income and share it amongst the town decided to become an airport developer. Now, if I don't know if you've seen the original concession agreement from the 19, back 1998, one of the tenants of that agreement was that the airport operator would pay for all developments so that the town would not be at risk through debt. From 2015 onwards, that appears to have been rewritten in secret, which Luton Council does a lot of things, or it's been ignored. Now. I can give opinions of how that's been ignored. But that's not for the inquiry to think that's my thing. So in answer to your question, I would say what could you do with 330 million pounds plus interest, which was the cost of the door in Luton? You could take a huge chunk out of poverty, you could enhance the lives of lots of people. As I've said in my other submissions. Luton rising, the applicant is supposed to be a social enterprise on behalf of the residents of Luton. Yet it hasn't created any other job. communities outside the airport footprint. Now my idea of a social enterprise is that you give your the people in your town, every opportunity, as the people from the colleges of said tonight to be what you want to be, and to give them a raft of opportunities to be what they want to be in their hometown. in Luton, you can be what you want to be as long as your work at the airport. And that to me is wrong. So hope that answers your question.

45:31

No, thank you for that. That's really that's really useful for us to gain that understanding. Thank you.

45:37

Thank you. If I could ask Mr. Hayden from stop Luton Airport Expansion to come up

45:52

and you wrote much speech last night

45:55

is fine.

45:58

And you're speaking on behalf of so therefore you have eight minutes if you want to take it. It's going

46:05

to be quicker than that. Excuse me. I'm Chris Hayden stop Luton Airport Expansion. The latest losing lies in LBC. Promotional Video says that currently, there's 39% of people in Luton in poverty. There's 8.5% unemployed. I think Robin said earlier 24,000 households or 3.2k households I'm not sure exactly. Accessing support 23% of primary children haven't eaten today. We must do something about this slay agree. But we don't need the expansion to do this. Our current political party in Luton have been in power since 2007. To do something in 2007 4000 People children were in poverty, we will look at seventh most deprived local authority out 326. Unemployment was 4.5%. But now it's 8.5%. They have had 16 years to sort this out 16 years where they have been the major shareholder off the airport. Slightly support or statements that luteinising made in this video, but not the expansion. We all want what's best for Luton, we can see the 2040 vision. We want the jobs and the additional funding for charities. We agree we want the economic prosperity, innovation benefits and agree with Nick Platts, about the environment impacts by UK airports, but no expansion is better. I mentioned 2007 early on. And then the airport had 9.9 million passengers per year. So 18 million stroke, 19 million capacity now. It's almost doubled. So why hasn't poverty and all the good important things done between 2007 and 2016? When the airport owned, owed no money, and now 16 years since 2007? Why hasn't that happened? A single airport, low cost which encourages in poverty working and wages in nature, and a single point of failure for money, industry and jobs, as demonstrated during COVID When the council bailed out their airport company. Those in business, if they were to read the latest financial submission by Lutz and rising would wonder how the funding case has got this farm. If Luton Town Football Club and we had representatives here, submitted such a financial plan to expand this stadium, it would have never gained support. We must all do something about this. It's in our own hands. of the 19 people that have spoken on this latest of promotional video, only less than a handful actually registered to be represented by this inquiry. That's why we and that's out of 16 1600 people who did register. We must all do something about this. It's in our own hands a Luton where everyone can thrive in a competitive airport expansion market. It's not I taken a punt on the future. Thank you.

50:06

Thank you very much, Mr. Hayden, would it be possible for you to provide a link to that video? Because I don't think it's been submitted in the examination.

50:15

I think it might come out today. I'm

50:17

not sure. Okay, if you could have a word with Mr. Bernie at the back of the room as to how to do that. I'm not quite sure how we take videos, submissions, but I'm sure they the case team will be able to help sort that out. But it'd be helpful to have a look at it in the context of what you said this evening. I'm just going to check if anyone has any questions. Thank you. Thank you very much. Bye, I'm just going to make one final check to make sure that everyone who has requested to speak has actually spoken. There are a couple of people on my list here, who were here at the start of the meeting, who has subsequently not been here for the second half, which was mainly Mr. Robley. And Mr. Colley. We will put it as an action point that potentially they can submit anything that they wanted to have said in writing. So can I just check with the applicant if they're intended to provide written responses? Or if they'd like to say a few words now? But before you come up here, I've just got to go. Are you intending to say something? And I tend to want to say anything now briefly. Okay, thank you. So I'm going to then move on to the closed meeting, but I'm just going to check if there's anyone else who wants to speak this evening. No hands raised in the room. No hands online. Okay, and then I'm going to pass over to Miss Robinson to close the meeting then.

51:52

Well, thank you all the contributions so fully and usefully to this meeting this evening. We found it extremely helpful, and we'll consider all submissions made carefully. Can I just remind everybody who has made a submission tonight for you to submit any of your post hearing submissions including written submissions of all cases by deadline sixth, which is Friday, the sixth of December. The is the eighth actually sorry, is Friday, the Friday the eighth of December. So the next hearing will be compulsory acquisition hearing, which will be held in this room and will start at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. With registration from 930. A live stream link will be available on the project page of the website. For those who have pre registered you will receive an email with joining instructions. For those who have not pre registered but think they may wish to contribute to the hearing. Then please email or speak to the case team as soon as possible after the close of this hearing. So the time is now 14 minutes past nine and open floor hearing three for the London Luton Airport Expansion Project is now closed. Thank you