

## Michael Reddington: Comments on Deadline 9 Submission -Noise and Vibration – ID 20037459

### Contents

**Table 1: Responses to Relevant Comments in Deadline 9 [REP9-051] against REP8-078]**

**Table 2: Responses to Relevant Comments in Deadline 9 [REP9-051] against REP8-079**

**Table 3: Comments on Deadline 9 Submission Ch 16 Noise and Vibration (Tracked Changed) [REP9-012]**

**Table 4: Comments on Deadline 9 Submission Ch 16.1 Noise and Vibration Information (Tracked Changed) [REP9 -018]**

### Glossary

19mppa application	Application 21/00031/VARCON on the LBC Planning Portal – submitted by LLAOL to LBC to further increase noise contour limits and the passenger cap
2022 inquiry	Planning Inspectorate Inquiry (ref APP/B0230/V/22/3296455) into the called-in decision by LBC to grant the 19mppa application
Airport	London Luton Airport
Airport Operator	London Luton Airport Operations Ltd, currently the concessionaire at the Airport
Applicant	Luton Rising (London Luton Airport Ltd)
Application	This application TR020001 for a Development Consent Order
ATM	Air Transport Movement, hence ATMs is a count of the number of flights
BAP	Bickerdike Allen Partners
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LBC	Luton Borough Council, ultimate owner of and Local Planning Authority for LLA
LLA	London Luton Airport
LLAOL	London Luton Airport Operations Ltd, the operator of LLA
mppa	‘million passengers per annum’: a measure of an airport’s passenger capacity or actual passenger throughput
NEDG	Noise Envelope Design Group
NIS	Noise Insulation Sub-Committee
noise contour	An outline on a map enclosing an area in which the 8-hour or 16-hour logarithmic average of aircraft noise for an average day in a defined 92-day summer period equals or exceeds a given value, expressed in terms of LAeq for an 8h or 16h period
NTSC	Noise and Track Sub-Committee
Project Curium	Application 12/01400/FUL on the LBC Planning Portal – submitted by LLAOL to LBC in 2012 for development works to increase LLA capacity to 18mppa by 2028

**Table 1: Responses to Relevant Applicant's Comments in Deadline 9 [REP9-051] against REP8-078**

I.D	[REP9-051] ID ref.	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	M. Reddington's Response
<b>Table 2.9 of [REP9-051]: Applicant's Response to Deadline 8 Submissions – Noise and Vibration ([REP8-078 Table 1])</b>				
1	(ID 10)	<p>In REP7-013 the Applicant compares Ground Noise for 'DS' against that of 'DM' for 2027 (Table 8.3), 2038 (Table 8.4) and 2043 (Table 8.5).</p> <p>In every case the increase in Ground Noise between the 'DM' and 'DS' case is typically less than 1 dB - and even in some cases the ground noise for 'DS' is actually less than for 'DM'.</p> <p>This does not make sense as there will be little difference in the type of aircraft utilised over the period whether 'DS' or 'DM' yet there will be typically a 50% increase in ATMs for 'DS'.</p>	<p>Ground noise is not just influenced by the type of aircraft in the fleet, but the locations of ground noise sources and screening provided.</p> <p>In Phase 1 there are very minor differences with the baseline scenario; however, in Phase 2a there is substantial screening introduced by the raised platform, Terminal 2 buildings, acoustic barriers and the engine run-up bay. Screening is enhanced in Phase 2b when Terminal 2 is completed. Consequently, there are noise improvements for some sensitive receptor locations in the DS scenario when compared to the DM scenario</p>	<p>The Applicant has already advised elsewhere that Ground Noise cannot be measured -and therefore cannot be monitored - because it is difficult to separate aircraft noise from the total.</p> <p>However (see also Item 10 under ID 7 below) it must be possible – albeit difficult – to correlate aircraft movements with the total noise measured in order to provide a reasonable indication of Ground Noise levels. Without that, we are dependent upon 'models' ad infinitum.</p> <p>We have complained of the 'dice and slice' noise measurement system previously, in which Air Noise is measured and calculated separately from Ground Noise, whereas human receptors hear the totality and in some ways may not be protected by insulation to the extent that may be necessary..</p> <p><b>We would greatly appreciate the ExA's support in instructing the Applicant to research this element.</b></p>

I.D	[REP9-051] ID ref.	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	M. Reddington's Response
2	(ID 11)	The Applicant has only considered Crawley Green Road, but Wigmore Lane will also be subject to vastly increased traffic between the junctions with Ashcroft Road (traffic leaving/joining the A505) and Eaton Green Road (traffic entering/leaving Terminal 2)	It is not the case that the Applicant has only considered Crawley Green Road. Noise from increased traffic on Wigmore Lane and Eaton Green Road has been fully assessed and no significant effects have been identified. This is reported in <b>Chapter 16</b> of the <b>ES [TRO20001/APP/5.01]</b> .	Could the Applicant please advise what assumptions were made in relation to Wigmore Lane – is it assumed that traffic towards Terminal 2 will use the Stopsley Wat Bypass, Vauxhall Way and Crawley Green Road ?
3	(ID 12)	7) Furthermore the Applicant ignores the fact that the 'Do Minimum' ('DM') scenario produces less noise per annum than the 'Do Something' ('DS') scenario. Therefore, promises to 'reduce noise in the future are empty, as a 'DM' scenario would also offer a noise reduction through the use of improved aircraft fleet. This is another example of 'smoke and ( mirrors'	The Applicant does not ignore the 'Do-Minimum' scenario and the fact that it has lower noise levels. The Applicant has fully considered the comparison between the Do-Minimum and the Do-Something scenario in the identification of adverse likely significant effects in <b>Chapter 16</b> of the <b>ES [TRO20001/APP/5.01]</b> .	Can the Applicant please confirm what ATM figures were used for comparison of the 'DM' scenario with 'DS'.
4	(ID14)	The Applicant states in response to 4.13.12 above: f. Furthermore, in line with the OANPS, the total adverse effects of noise are counterbalanced by increased economic and consumer benefits. Can the Applicant please explain how this conclusion can be so confidently stated ? For example what is the base level of 'adverse effects' and how are 'adverse affects' costed ?.	The methodology for identifying adverse effects is set out in section 16.5 of <b>Chapter 16</b> of the <b>ES [TRO20001/APP/5.01]</b> and adverse effects are reported in sections 16.9 and 16.14 of the same chapter. It is not necessary nor standard practice for adverse effects to be costed for them to be considered in the planning balance.	Can the Applicant please explain how "total adverse effects of noise are counterbalanced by increased economic and consumer benefit" as this seems to be a straightforward statement of economic comparison. How else ids this to be interpreted ?...'x' nuber of additional dB is equivalent to 'y' number of £millions ?

**Table 2: Responses to Relevant Applicant's Comments in Deadline 9 [REP9-051] against REP8-079**

I.D	[REP9-051] ID ref.	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	M. Reddington's Response
<b>Table 2.12 of [REP9-051]: Applicant's Response to Deadline 8 Submissions – Town Planning [REP8-079]</b>				
5	(ID 1)	Can the Applicant please explain the 'relevance' of the Luton Local Plan extending only to 2031. For example does that mean that Phase 2 cannot be commenced until a revised Local Plan is provided and the Phase 2 proposals are compliant ?	The currently adopted Local Plan period for Luton ends in 2031. The assessment phases refer to commencement and construction of the Proposed Development, these are not related to local planning policy timescales.	The Applicant has not answered the question. 2031 is when the current Local Plan runs out and this is before the beginning of Phase 2. IN effect then is it true that should the DCO go ahead, the new Local Plan will be redundant for this purpose as it cannot overrule the DCO ?
6	(ID 2)	<p>The Applicant's approach is typical of the 'smoke-and mirrors'/'dice-and-slice' approach that in my view has been adopted throughout this DCO process.</p> <p>(1) Project Curium increased the passenger throughput by 9mppa from 9mppa to 18mppa, a sleight of hand which meant that the project did not meet the 10mppa criterion of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP).</p> <p>(2) Project Curium gave a timescale of 2028 by which</p> <p>(a) 18mppa would be achieved and</p> <p>(b) benefits such as quieter aircraft and additional funds would accrue to residents and communities.</p> <p>(3) The Airport Operator was incentivised (questionably perhaps) to accelerate growth so that 18mppa was achieved by 2019.</p>	Points (1)-(5) are outside the scope of this application for Development Consent.	The point being made here is that using a 2019 baseline from which to compare the impacts or benefits of 'DS' is fatuous, since by 2019 LLAOL was serving 18mppa ten years before the alleged benefits of smaller noise contours were in place. In truth the DCO should be using 2028 contours as the baseline from which to determine impacts..

I.D	[REP9-051] ID ref.	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	M. Reddington's Response
		<p>(4) The Airport operator then proposed an increase of 1mppa from 18mppa to 19mppa which was called in by the Planning Inspectorate but eventually permitted. This is an example of 'dice and slice'.</p> <p>(5) From 2014 (to 2019 before Covid but expected to return by 2025) there has been a doubling of passenger numbers and a significant increase in noise – which has essentially been unmitigated because of the poor performance of the insulation programme and the lack of time within which carriers could provide larger, less noisy craft.</p>		
7				<p>The Applicant failed to respond to the following comments submitted in [REP8-078] paragraphs 4.13.8 to 4.13.12</p> <p>(6) Therefore, when the Applicant compares past noise levels to present or predicted noise levels, he invariably ignores the unbridled increase produced by Project Curium and concentrates on the 'insignificant' noise increases due to the additional 1mppa. This is an example of 'smoke and mirrors'</p>

I.D	[REP9-051] ID ref.	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	M. Reddington's Response
				<p>(7) (<u>See Applicant's response to (ID 12) above</u>)</p> <p>(8) Residents are subject to unbearable levels of noise at all hours of the day and night. Dry figures on a piece of paper (worse still when they say 'insignificant') do not reflect the sheer level of misery inflicted on residents such as myself – especially when these figures do not compare the noise to 2014 before Project Curium took effect and which is the standard by which we residents gauge the level of annoyance and frustration at Luton Borough Council, Luton Rising and LLAOL who appear to have no goal but airport expansion at whatever cost.</p> <p>(9) The Applicant talks about 'mitigation' in the form of insulation, as if this were some panacea. It is not. Noise figures quoted are free-field, so are external to properties. We all use – or should I say would LIKE to use - the open spaces, whether it is our private gardens, public spaces, or otherwise. No amount of 'mitigation insulation' removes the</p>

I.D	[REP9-051] ID ref.	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	M. Reddington's Response
				<p>noise from these areas which makes them almost unusable, especially when they are most needed, during the summer months.</p> <p>(10) In respect of Ground Noise, there are no plans to monitor levels because the Applicant considers this to be too difficult. Instead, the Applicant models Ground Noise and uses the output to set noise contours. However, these cannot be checked. Indeed there are no plans to measure even the total noise at the extremities of the Ground Noise contour to provide an indication of the impact on residents..</p> <p>I have stated elsewhere (<b>[ID1 above]</b>) in responses that it must be possible to generate algorithms to correlate and extract arrival and departure Air Noise from the total measured noise so that the Ground Noise model can be checked. (Air Noise contours fortunately can be checked using the Air Noise monitoring programme by comparing levels measured at distances from the airport with</p>

I.D	[REP9-051] ID ref.	Summary of Matter Raised Requiring a Response (Verbatim)	Luton Rising's Response	M. Reddington's Response
				<p>those used in the model to produce the contours).</p> <p>(11) The only way not to increase the noise is to not increase the number of ATMs AND to insulate</p>
8	(ID 3)	<p>Luton Local Plan LLP6 also states:          "Proposals for development will only be supported where the following criteria are met, where applicable/appropriate having regard to the nature and scale of such proposals.."          "(iii) are in accordance with an up-to-date Airport Master Plan published by the operators of London Luton Airport and adopted by the Borough Council";          Can the Applicant please provide evidence that the latest Airport Master Plan includes for an extension to 32mppa and has been adopted by the Borough Council prior to the DCO application.</p>	<p>The policies contained within the Luton Local Plan, whilst are likely to be both important and relevant, are not the starting point for the consideration of a DCO.          Policy LLP6 makes provision for the airport to respond positively to future growth (paragraph 4.51) which this application has demonstrated.          Please see the Applicant's and LBCs responses to Written Question PED.1.2 at Deadline 4 which deals with this matter in detail.</p>	<p>See comments ID 15 and ID16 in Table 4 below.</p>



**Table 3: Comments on Deadline 9 Submission Ch 16 Noise and Vibration (Tracked Changed) [REP9-012]]**

ID	Para.	Comment
9	PDF Page 18	<p><b>“How and where addressed in ES” states:</b></p> <p><i>“Section 16.9 shows that noise during the Proposed Development will reduce from 2019 Actuals baseline scenario due to fleet transition to less noisy new generation aircraft, therefore, there will be no increase in significant adverse impacts on health and quality of life from noise as less people will be affected by significant levels of noise in the future. The application of the Noise Envelope (Section 16.8) and noise insulation (Section 16.10) demonstrates how the Proposed Development will mitigate and minimise adverse impacts on health and quality of life. Provision of noise insulation will improve acoustic conditions within dwellings and improve health and quality of life for occupants when compared to a ‘with Proposed Development scenario’ in which noise insulation is not provided. The noise envelope will provide a mechanism for predictable growth and the sharing of noise benefits from new aircraft technology with local communities”</i></p> <p>We do not accept that there would ever be a ‘Proposed Development scenario’ in which noise insulation is not provided or this is a fatuous comparison.</p>
10	16.5.76	<p><b>Paragraph states:</b></p> <p><b>“Relative tranquillity</b></p> <p><i>The perception of relative tranquillity is dependent on the sensitivity of the receptor, its use or activity and other considerations such as the visual sense of relative tranquillity. The assessment of relative tranquillity for the Proposed Development is a consideration of an existing noise source (aircraft noise) where the number of aircraft movements in areas currently exposed to aircraft noise would change, but the locations exposed to aircraft noise would not change. Furthermore, the overall noise assessment in this chapter shows a reduction in noise contour areas (day and night) compared to the 2019 Actuals baseline. In other words, the Proposed Development would not give rise to aircraft noise becoming audible and intrusive for the first time at any location within the study area. Impacts on relative tranquillity are therefore primarily associated with absolute noise level exposure and noise change (to areas already exposed) as a result of the Proposed Development.”</i></p> <p>These are fine words but meaningless, compounded by the fatuous comparison between 2019 noise contours and ‘DS’ contours. We have repeatedly stated that 2019 saw 18mppa but without any community noise benefit- this was not going to be reached completely until 2028 (and did not allow for Covid !).The Community was already being short-changed by the Applicants and LLAOL. What the Applicant is saying is</p>

		<p>that if you were subject to loud aircraft noise already, - irrespective of whether you complained bitterly - then this little old DCO would not bother you too much since your 'relative' tranquillity due to mismanagement by LBC, LR and LLAOL was already pretty low.</p> <p>The Applicant uses exaggerated noise levels from 2019 as a baseline when should have been using 2028 noise contours as a baseline because Project Curium by 2019 has delivered more flights and more noise, not the community benefit that was promised.</p>
<b>11</b>	16.5.77	<p>States:</p> <p><i>"This approach to the consideration of relative tranquillity is consistent with guidance and a proposed methodology on the impact of noise on the setting and tranquillity of heritage and cultural receptors commissioned by English Heritage (now Historic England) (Ref. 16.66). This methodology considers absolute noise level exposure (relative to thresholds that are analogous to the LOAEL and SOAEL thresholds defined in this chapter) and noise level change supplemented by number above metrics."</i></p> <p>Amazing that one body, Historic England, can demand 'tranquillity' for a handful of properties yet thousands of locals affected by the abhorrent level of noise have to just 'suck it up', stay indoors and not use their gardens..</p>
<b>12</b>	Table 16.29:	<p>"Noise Effect Level Descriptions" LOAEL, SOAEL, &gt;SOAEL are all in the context of external free-field levels yet &gt;LOAEL and &lt;SOAEL: <i>"Affects the acoustic character of the area such that there is a small actual or perceived change in the quality of life."</i></p> <p>How is the 'small' effect measured ? The Applicant insists (by reference to CAA recommendations) that the only measure is dB LAeq. yet paragraph 16.5.77 states: <i>"LOAEL and SOAEL thresholds defined in this chapter) and noise level change <b>supplemented by number above metrics</b>"</i>[my emphasis]</p>
<b>13</b>	<b>16.10</b>	<b>Additional mitigation and compensation measures</b> does not mention ground noise compensation
<b>14</b>	<b>16.13</b>	<b>Monitoring</b> does not mention ground noise compensation.

**Table 4: Comments on Deadline 9 Submission Ch 16.1 Noise and Vibration Information (Tracked Changed) [REP9 -018]**

ID	Para.	Comment
15	3.2.1	<p>Luton Local Plan ('LLP') 2011-2031 paragraph 4.45 states:  <i>"4.45 London Luton Airport is a busy, growing airport currently operating at around 10 million passengers per annum with a capacity to manage up to 12.4mppa, and with the planning consent 12/01400/FUL allowing the airport to grow to an operating capacity of 18mppa. This is supported by Policy LLP6, which includes criteria to allow additional proposals to be considered in accordance with the most up-to-date Master Plan (i.e. <b>that Master Plan which is applicable at the time of determining any planning application</b>" [my emphasis].</i></p>
16	3.2.2	<p>3.2.2 States: <i>"Expansion proposal will only be supported where the following requirements relating <b>to noise</b> are met"</i></p> <p>The Applicant then goes on to mis-quote the sub-clause numbers of LLP6B as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Should read (ii);</li> <li>(b) should read (iv)</li> <li>(c) should read (v)</li> <li>(d) should read (vi)</li> <li>(e) should read (vii).</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant has still failed to include or refer to LLP6B sub-clause (iii): <i>"iii. are in accordance with an up-to-date Airport Master Plan published by the operators of London Luton Airport and adopted by the Borough Council;"</i></p> <p>It is assumed that the Applicant has ignored this clause because it does not include the word 'noise'. However, one cannot pick and choose (and mis-refer) to policies such as this.</p> <p>Can the Applicant please provide confirmation that there is a Master Plan that conforms to LLP6B (iii) that includes expansion to 32mppa ? If not then the Applicant may be in breach of the Local Plan's conditions para. 4.45 (see ID15 above).</p>