

Issue Specific Hearing 8-29th November 2023- Part 1

Piling Noise

We suggested that the Inquiry could get real time information on how the noise of piling spreads across the surrounding area, from the complaints Luton Borough Council (LBC) received after works at the airport in 2017, rather than the theory in the application.

We raised this because we are baffled as to how the applicant can build Terminal 2 and other substantial structures without piling.

We would also point out that piling was done by the airport operator as part of the last development. This was under the control of LBC, but they stated they were not aware it was to take place at night. This does not give us faith in LBC controlling this development if it is passed.

Car Park Noise

We mentioned the effects on homes backing onto Eaton Green Road from the new decked car parking planned for the current car hire centre site, the upper floors of which will be on a level with bedroom windows and overlook gardens. How can that level of noise and intrusion be scoped out? We believe that road traffic past those houses will also increase when the link road from the Terminal 2 access road to Eaton Green Road is built. This would mean the cumulative effect from that traffic, the car park and the increase in airport ground noise will mean a significant impact on properties in the area of Eaton Green Road.

Consultation Events/Luton community support.

We questioned data from LBC on canvassing residents' support for this project, and that support was implied and not canvassed.

Since then LBC has implied that all residents of Luton are in favour of this project, but we have never been definitively asked.

The consultation response documents never had the option to just say no expansion.

We have asked the Chief Executive of LBC, the Political Leader of LBC and the Chair of the applicant's board why that simple question was not included on several occasions at local ward meetings.

We never received a response.

We attended the majority of both the pre-consultation and consultation roadshows, to advise the public on how to fill in the forms to register their opposition.

For information, we were not allowed to stand inside, or use the facilities at these sites, by the applicant. We had to engage with those interested in the open air, and inclement weather.

Members of the public had difficulty in responding, as they thought the questions were all skewed towards options that supported expansion, and that any response by them would be interpreted the same way.

We advised the public to simply write "no expansion" into every response box.

The applicant said after our comments that all public input was scrutinised, and included in their statistics.

We would therefore request, if it falls within the scope of this inquiry, that the applicant publish all the data on the response to both those rounds of public consultations.

This data should clearly show the proportion of the “no expansion” comments as against those in favour of the application.

It would also highlight again that the public interest and quality of life, is of secondary importance to this project, which is of crucial importance to the applicant and its parent company.

We believe this covers all the responses we made at this hearing.