

**From:** Sara Hammond  
**Sent:** 06 September 2024 10:51  
**To:** Luton Airport  
**Subject:** London Luton Airport (LLA) Expansion Project

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: DCO Planning Application for Luton Airport Expansion**

I am writing to object to the expansion of London Luton Airport (LLA). The flight path changes known as Swanwick Airspace Improvement Programme - Airspace Deployment 6 (AD6) have wrecked my quality of life and any LLA expansion would compound and amplify this intolerable lived experience.

It is impossible to over-state how catastrophic the aircraft noise is to life in a small rural village. To inflict so much noise onto such a quiet area where there is no 'ambient' noise is distressing for residents. There is no escape from the noise whether inside or outside the house. In fact, just trying to live a normal life in our own home has been destroyed. I find it difficult to get to sleep because of the noise, and I am often awoken during the night and early morning by the noise. The impact on my mental health has been extremely negative. It is miserable. My partner and I are angry and upset by this unwanted and unwelcome major disruption and significant decline to wellbeing. We feel as though this outrageous invasion has been imposed on us by stealth and we are merely bystanders to our own lives. We are also of course worried about the increased air pollution around the village, and the negative impact on our physical health and the rural environment.

I learned from a local group that there was apparently a consultation regarding the AD6 aircraft route change; I was not aware of this, I saw no publicity, I received no communication about the proposals and the monstrous intrusion into my life and community. I would argue that there has been no meaningful 'consultation' at all. Similarly, I learned recently from the same local group about the LLA expansion; and again, I am not aware of any meaningful consultation process.

The AD6 'Post-Implementation Review' PIR Main Report and Annex documents were published on 11th July 2024. I note in the document 'AD6-PIR Annex D Issue 1.0 Stakeholder Feedback' on page 8 (section 4.4.2) that the thematic analysis of complaints does not distinctly identify the theme of "aircraft noise in what were previously regarded as quiet rural areas with low ambient background noise levels" because this is apparently considered by the report's authors as a "universal concern applicable to almost every complainant". This is an appalling disregard and dismissal of what is clearly the major concern for residents. Also, on page 10 of the same document (sections 5.3.3 and 5.3.4), there are comments that the number of complaints reduced after the PIR period ended; given that there was a defined period with a deadline within which residents were able to complain, this comment is meaningless. In addition, on page 14 (section 7.3.2), it is stated that "Most complaints came from areas newly overflown"; this strength of feeling should not be ignored.

I would also like to comment about compensation for the residents effected by the flight path changes. For some, the only escape would be to move away from the area. Please provide details as to the compensation available for those whose prior quality of life has been obliterated and also for those who have no escape option other than to move home. It seems reasonable for residents to be compensated for the loss of peace and tranquillity, poor quality of life, likely negative impact on property values, and costs of moving house due to this unwanted, unbearable disruption.

Thank you for reading this message. I feel very strongly about this issue. Aircraft noise in a (previously) quiet rural village is omnipresent and draining. This has been imposed without due engagement of residents and it would appear that any objections, concerns or complaints have been dismissed and effectively ignored. For example, I believe the PIR reports published on 11th July are of a dismissive, smug tone, especially regarding complaints, and apparently claiming no significant changes to noise or pollution levels seems disingenuous to me. I therefore object to the expansion of LLA. Please take my feedback seriously.

Yours faithfully,

Sara Hammond