

This comments concern: the impact of Luton Airport Expansion on both road congestion on the M1 and on roads around and in Harpenden and on noise pollution from Luton Airport aircraft movements for residents in Harpenden.

1. I refer to Highways response to Luton Airport. In their letter dated 23 January 2024 to the Examining Authority National Highways objected to the Airport Expansion and stated in relation to the M1: "The revised post-covid modelling also indicates a risk of severe congestion at junction 9, potentially as a result of rat-running due to congestion approaching junction 10." This is because the Expansion of Luton Airport will put huge strains on the road network regardless of the Airport's modelling, which Highways called "inconclusive". I believe this will spread to roads such as the A5183 and the A1081 which travels directly through Harpenden and is already very busy and to local B roads and surrounding residential roads.

2. Noise pollution

Since I made my original objection to the expansion based on the excessive noise during the day and night caused by aircraft from Luton airport over Redbourn and Harpenden especially on westerly departures, this noise has, in my opinion, worsened due to increased aircraft movements and divergences from the designate route. Incredibly, aircraft from Luton Airport have only ever used use one westerly departure route (the Examining Authority should compare this to other airports which have several different routes) and do not climb fast enough to reduce noise levels (again compare this to other airports) resulting in very loud aircraft over Redbourn and Harpenden. Several years ago this was worsened by the airport implementing RNAV technology and concentrating all westerly departures along a narrow route, claiming that this had been consulted on beforehand. I dispute this as do many other residents. The route also flies over heavily populated areas and the restrictions on climb rates mean that effectively Harpenden South/South West Harpenden suffer as if they were located much closer to the airport than they are! This could be alleviated by Luton Airport using, say, 5 different routes and by their aircraft climbing more steeply. I and many other have been suggesting this for many years, as have other local organisations, councils, politicians local and national. This has been ignored - i have no idea why. Until there are several respite routes and new departure and arrival routes, including some over Bedfordshire rather than Hertordshire, no Luton Airport Expansion should be allowed. It is intolerable for residents to hear that there is nothing the airport can do about this apparently due to other bodies such as Air Traffic Control and the CAA which the Airport has been using as excuses for several decades. I and other residents feel that this is being used by the Airport and the other authorities as an excuse. Moreover, I have noticed that this noise level experienced by residents is (cleverly) disguised by Luton airport using various techniques: when complaints are received about noise the response is now usually only first time complainants receive any explanation and complaints are only registered is they comply with all the myriad Luton Airport procedures and systems such as Travis. If a resident complains, the Airport should have the courtesy to respond to each complaint. The Airport told me: "As per our complaints policy attached, we will provide information to every first-time complainant explaining our policies and the routes aircraft take. After this, we will only provide additional detail in the event a complaint relates to an aircraft not following LLA's policies and procedures for example an aircraft off track or a noise violation. We will only investigate specific aircraft tracks when we receive individual email complaints or submit specific complaints via Travis, our online flight tracking system that can be accessed via the following link <https://travisltn.topsonic.aero/>. If the complaint includes more than one disturbance, this will be logged as a General complaint."

Also, in many cases, I have noticed that this explanation means that if a response is received it is usually to state that this aircraft had to depart from its usual flight path for a variety of ever-increasing reasons (not only safety but operational etc) which are not recorded under normal noise monitoring and do not breach any promises. For example, when I complained about an unusually located, low and noisy aircraft on 12 September 2023 on the 08:53am track the Airport informed me that this was related to arriving aircraft (not departing as usual) which was instructed to make a "go-around" and "go-arounds.. cannot be predicted and therefore the aircraft are instructed to remain low, below any other aircraft which may be in the airspace above, and they also do not follow the normal flight paths to keep them separated. This unfortunately meant the aircraft directly overflowed your location". From the feedback I have seen I do not think anyone can rely on the accuracy and completeness of the Airport's methods of counting and recording complaints and data on compliance with their policies for aircraft routes.