

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Luton Airport](#)  
**Subject:** Reject Luton Airport expansion  
**Date:** 31 August 2024 08:04:52

---

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at [REDACTED]]

I object to the proposed expansion of LLA in the strongest possible terms:

- Luton Airport deliberately hid the Swanwick AD6 'consultation' during lockdown, released the PIR during a change in government and failed to properly address concerns of residents. Standard template responses to complaints are not engagement, but merely distraction. Your policy of not responding after the first complaint was designed to mute respondents not to engage. All of this was not compliant with regulations and guidelines in relation to informing the population, engaging with residents and addressing feedback.

- Currently the majority of easterly and southerly approaches to Luton are not using the Bedford stack as was approved in the AD6, meaning large flight numbers over tranquil and 'not consulted' areas of Hardwick, Comberton, Coton, Bourne, Cambourne and others. If LLA cannot even implement what was approved during the review period then future behaviour must be suspect.

- The AD6 change results in increased fuel consumption for easterly and southerly arrivals compared to pre-change. There is no excuse or reason to do this. In fact the numbers are probably much worse. Using the shortcut southeast of Bedford means excess speed, air braking, changes of throttle and a failure to use continuous descent, all of which consume fuel.

- Luton Airport is the worst performing major airport in the UK on measures such as noise, NO2 and CO2. Why should we agree increased pollution from more flights?

- Over 7000ft fuel efficiency is considered one of the main criteria, but you are not permitted to ignore the impact of noise in tranquil areas where ambient noise is particularly low. Residents over a very large area will be impacted by increased noise.

- Below 7000ft increased noise, CO2, NO2 is a straightforward threat to health.

- A stack over the sea option was not considered. No reasoning has been put forward as to why this is the case, despite the obvious benefits to local residents.

- Residents over 70 year of age have been excluded from any comment by the complexity of documentation and the confusing feedback processes

LLA is behaving with utter disregard to the health and wellbeing of its neighbours. AD6 must be rejected. Expansion of LLA must be rejected.

Regards,  
Tai Lim  
[REDACTED]