

Monday 20<sup>th</sup> October 2025 – 14.00hrs. – Virtual via Teams

---

### **Members**

Mr M Routledge	Chairman
Mr M Reddington	LADACAN
Mr P White	SLAE (substitute)
Cllr J Timmis	Dacorum Borough Council
Cllr P Parry	BATPC
Cllr K Collins	Central Bedfordshire Council (Vice Chairman elect)
Mrs R Webb	BMKALC
Mr J Wilkinson	PAIN (substitute)
Mr A Hatch	ATC – NATS
Cllr R Brown	Hertfordshire County Council
Cllr N Shahanera	Luton Borough Council
Cllr V Malone	Central Bedfordshire Council
Mr C McDonald	STAQS (substitute)

### **Officers Representing**

Mr N Thompson	LLAOL- Chief Operations Officer
Mrs N Prior	LLAOL – Head of Flight Operations
Mr D Gurtler	Luton Borough Council
Mr P Donovan	Hertfordshire County Council
Mr O Connolly	Kings Walden Parish Council
Mr P Gilbert	LLAOL – Marketing Communications Manager
Mrs C Armstrong	LLAOL – Head of Guest Experience
Mrs A May	LLAOL - Flight Operations Manager
Mr J Keating	LLAOL - Community and CSR Executive
Ms F McGlone	Luton Rising

### **Noise Consultant & Secretariat**

Mr D Charles	Bickerdike Allen Partners
Mrs P Harris	Committee Administrator

### **Apologies for absence received from:**

Mr A Martin – LLAOL - CEO  
 Cllr D Rosario – HAPTC  
 Mr J Hale – STAQS (substituted by Mr C McDonald)  
 Mr G Breeze – PAIN (substituted by Mr J Wilkinson)  
 Mr J Morgan – SLAE (substituted by Mr P White)  
 Cllr E Moore - St Albans City and District Council  
 Ms L Symes - North Herts District Council  
 Mr J Richardson - Chamber of Commerce  
 Mr O Bigaignon - St Albans City and District Council  
 Mr O Jaycock - LLAOL – Director of Corporate Affairs  
 Mr N Bradford - LLAOL – Marketing Communications Manager  
 Cllr A Amjid - Luton Borough Council  
 Ms S Decker – EasyJet  
 Mrs L Hanlon – LLAOL – Community & CSR Manager

1.0	The Chairman welcomed attendees to meeting.	
2.0	<b>Minutes and Matters arising from LLACC Meeting 7<sup>th</sup> July 2025</b>	
2.1	The Chairman advised that draft minutes had been circulated for comment and the changes received had been incorporated in the meeting papers. The Chairman invited any final comments. No comments were made and the minutes were taken as a true record for publication.	<b>Admin</b>
2.2	<b>Matters Arising</b>	
2.2.1	Item 2.2.5 - LBC were going to look again at the Parking Strategy and the SLAE representative was going to update the committee on the evidence of fly parking in the Wigmore area. This had been done and the representative asked what the feedback was from the Airport and what where they intending to do with the information.	
2.2.2	LBC informed that the comments that were given at the last meeting were in the Parking Strategy and although it does not mention 'Fly Parking' it did refer to overspill parking. The LBC solution to deal with this was Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ). Although the residents of Wigmore had not voted for a CPZ, the parking strategy sets out the 3 different Wards where the CPZs were being considered. LBC also made reference to the weblink 'your parking space.com' where there were a number of residents in the local vicinity who offer up driveways for parking at a cost.	
2.2.3	It was also advised that some parts of Central Bedfordshire were also impacted by Fly Parking and this highlighted the problem was not limited to Luton. There had been some positive engagement between the parish that feel they suffered significantly with CBC and LLA to discuss.	
2.2.4	LLA noted they had a newly formed Airport Transport Forum which was made up of Airport, Local Authorities and Transport providers and as part of that there was a Highways working group which had been tasked to look at issues such as Fly Parking. However, it was felt that ultimately Local Authorities were best placed to deal with this issue with their enforcement policies. Further discussion ensued on how other airports dealt with similar situations.	<b>Chairman</b>
2.2.5	A member enquired regarding the bus service from the Aylesbury area and asked if there was any provision for an increased regular service from Aylesbury. The Chairman agreed to take the question to the next PSSC meeting.	
2.2.6	Item 3.12.4 – Reference was made regarding the reduction in noise and carbon emissions. It was suggested there had not been an adequate response from airlines to reduce both as there appeared to be no requirement on Airlines to deliver or respond to the requests.	

	LLAOL informed that they heavily incentivise airlines to bring in the newer quieter aircraft into Luton, which was why Luton had one of the most modern based-fleets across Europe. LLAOL cannot ban aircraft types that are within their planning conditions as Luton has a 24hr operating licence and must give free access, but do work with the slot co-ordinator and airlines to bring in the newest and quietest aircraft which are also more fuel efficient. With reference to the Airbus 321 NEO certification, Luton have tried to get a response from Airbus as to why it is not as quiet as expected from the level of the certification (this is not just common to Luton ) but Airbus would only speak with the airlines; however LLAOL has also flagged this discrepancy with the CAA and airlines. Nevertheless the A321NEO is still quieter than the CEO engined variant.	
3.0	<b>AGM Matters</b>	
3.1	<b>Election of Vice Chairman</b> – The Chairman opened the position for a Vice Chairman to the Committee: Cllr Keven Collins volunteered and was elected as Vice Chairman.	
3.2	<b>List of LLACC Members and Representatives</b> – Members were asked to inform the Administrator of any amendments to the current list of Members.	<b>Members</b>
3.3	<p><b>Sub- Committee Membership</b> – Any replacements or withdrawals should be advised to the LLACC Administrator. The extant sub-committees were:</p> <p><b>PSSC</b> – Members were advised that that Which? had decided not to support membership of ACCs in future. Mr Russell Kett who had been the Which? representative on the PSSC would remain on the sub-committee as a Frequent Flyer representative.</p> <p><b>NTSC</b> – No change</p> <p><b>Noise Insulation Sub-committee</b> – No change</p>	
3.4	<p><b>Dates of Future meetings</b></p> <p>The proposed dates of future meetings were agreed.</p> <p>It was also agreed that one meeting a year would be held face-to-face at the Airport.</p>	
4.0	<b>LLAOL Management Report</b>	
4.1	LLAOL advised on the figures for the quarter: there had been 5.1m passengers a 4.1% increase on 2024. This represented 95% of 2019 numbers. General Aviation demand was currently 3.2% higher than pre-pandemic levels and Cargo tonnage was 7.8k slightly down by 0.3% year on year.	

	<p>Rolling 12-month Passenger numbers to 30<sup>th</sup> September 2025 were 17.3m, +4.9% on the same period in 2024 and 96% recovered versus 2019.</p>	
4.2	<p>There was a strong operational performance throughout Q3 and YTD with average queue time at check-in and security of five minutes and four minutes in immigration.</p>	
4.3	<p>Customer satisfaction remains high – with 4 out of 5 passengers rating their experience as very good or excellent. ASQ score of 4.10 out of 5 in the ASQ survey (Global airport bench marking), with 82% overall customer satisfaction with 99% of passengers surveyed feeling safe and secure and 96% passengers feeling relaxed.</p>	
4.4	<p>Members were advised that LLA had been named finalists in several awards these included:</p> <p><b>UK &amp; International Customer Experience Awards 2025</b> – won a Gold Award for Best Customer Centric Culture – for our LLA Way strategy and Silver for best CX for Vulnerable Customers.</p> <p><b>Engage Awards 2025</b> - Best Customer Service Team recognising our Guest Experience Team and Best for Vulnerable Customers recognising our commitment to provide an accessible service for all.</p>	
4.5	<p>In September LLAO officially opened their assisted Travel Lounge which could accommodate up to 50 passengers and was designed to provide a comfortable, relaxing, dedicated space for those with assisted travel needs. It included a sensory space, adult changing facilities, flight information screens, charging points for wheelchairs and electronic devices, drinking water facilities and a range of seating options and had been designed with the input of our Accessibility Forum members.</p> <p>It was noted that Luton’s assisted travel service helped 47,048 passengers in Q3, (2.19% of departing passenger numbers). It was further noted that the number of people requesting assistance had increased by 40% with September 2025 setting a new record with 20,367 passengers using the service – a 20% increase on Sept 24.</p> <p>Members were informed that Luton had continued to meet all CAA standards since December 2022 and had been rated VERY GOOD in their Airport Accessibility Report for 2024/25.</p>	
4.6	<p>Within the terminal two new retail outlets had opened, Victoria’s Secret and Pandora, giving an even greater choice to the Airport’s growing range of retailers. The arrival of Wasabi had given even more choice to an already extensive range of restaurant offerings.</p>	
4.7	<p>Members were advised that Terminal Car Park 2 (TCP2) had successfully opened on Wednesday 24<sup>th</sup> September. This provided an</p>	

	<p>additional 1954 parking spaces for passengers and covered pick up and drop off facilities. It was noted that the TCP2 does include a sprinkler system. At the same time changes had been introduced to drop-off/pick-up facilities including an increase in the duration allowed from five to ten minutes.</p>	
4.8	<p>Members were informed that to further improve access for everyone and to encourage the use of public transport, the Airport was launching a dedicated Public Transport Investment Fund, with a commitment to invest £1.5 million in the first year of operation. LLAOL would be working in partnership with transport operators and local authorities to explore opportunities to develop and promote more sustainable modes of transport to the Airport.</p>	
4.9	<p>Members were advised that for the fourth consecutive year, LLAOL had achieved a top score of 100/100 for the 2025 GRESB assessment, retaining a 5-star rating for Environmental, Social and Governance performance and management. Members were reminded that GRESB is an independent, international sustainability framework that globally benchmarks major organisations and assets on their ESG management.</p>	
4.10	<p>LLAOL had successfully completed the third renewal to the Airport Carbon Accreditation Level 4 scheme. The scheme is a global carbon management certification programme for airports. The renewal validated the Airport's 2024 carbon footprint against their Net Zero roadmap, to ensure they were on track with their Net Zero plans.</p>	
4.11	<p>Members were informed that LLAOL had supported 17 local organisations this year through the Community Trust Fund and Greener Future Fund, benefitting an estimated 16,600 local people. <b>£163k</b> had been awarded through the grant funding process to projects including: Groundwork East – delivery of climate afterschool clubs for environmental awareness and behaviour change; Caddington Recreational Association – supply and installation of solar panels and storage batteries; and Stopsley Primary School Association &amp; Marston Moretaine V C School – for development of outdoor facilities at the two local schools.</p>	
4.12	<p>LLAOL hosted a visit from Her Royal Highness The Princess Royal on Friday 17th October at the Airport. HRH went on to visit one of the local schools in Tennyson Road and Tokko Youth Hub, two Luton-based beneficiaries of the Airport's work in the local community.</p> <p><b>Questions by members.</b></p> <p>Members congratulated the Airport on their many awards.</p> <p>Members referred to the increase in General Aviation and asked if this was replicated across the UK or just localised to Luton. LLAOL informed that Luton had always been a top GA base in the UK. It was</p>	

	<p>noted that with slots now becoming much tighter at Luton GA night flights were banned across the summer. However, Luton's location made it a popular GA airport as it was so close to London.</p> <p>LLAOL confirmed to Members that there was full fire suppression in the new TCP 2 car park that has been recently opened.</p> <p>Reference was made to the Public Transport Investment Fund and enquired if this would include working with Buckinghamshire to improve the inadequate bus service between Aylesbury and the Airport. LLAOL informed that local authorities were represented on the Airport Transport Forum and if Buckinghamshire were not then they should be invited. BMKALC agreed to make contact with Buckinghamshire Council.</p> <p>Reference was made regarding the increased DOZ charges for the Airport and it was asked if there were alternatives modes that could be used. LLAOL advised that the DART was available from Parkway and that there was a period of free parking in the Long Stay Car Park with a free bus service to the Terminal.</p> <p>Members asked if there were adult changing facilities at the Airport. LLAOL informed that there were showers within the MyLounge facility plus 2 further accessible facilities with showers in the departure lounge. Currently there were no such facilities in the arrivals area.</p> <p>Reference was made regarding the UK Which? Survey and the low scores being given. LLAOL explained that the survey had a very low sample size and was not representative of the passenger experience at the Airport.</p>	<b>BMKALC</b>
5.0	<b>Noise and Track Sub Committee 8<sup>th</sup> October 2025</b>	
5.1	<p>Members noted the report provided by Bickerdike Allen for Q2 of 2025.</p> <p>Total passenger numbers had increased by 3.5% and total traffic movements by less than 1%. The total movements in the night period, 23.00-06.59, were 9% lower when compared with the same quarter last year. The early morning, 06.00-06.59, movements were 6% higher than those in the same quarter last year.</p> <p>The airlines had achieved Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA), for 95% of all arrivals; this was 4% higher than the same quarter in 2024</p> <p>The noise monitor results showed most departures still produced noise levels in the range 70-76 dB L<sub>Amax</sub>. In this period (2025 Q2), two daytime departures, but no night-time departures, were registered at</p>	

5.2	<p>greater than 80 dB. Last year (2024 Q2), the comparable counts were one and one.</p> <p>There were two noise violations during the daytime and one during the night-time. LLAOL continued to work closely with the airlines to reduce violations. The night-time noise contour area had increased by 4.5% compared with the same quarter in 2024. It was noted that there were eleven track violations in this quarter due to poor track keeping.</p> <p>The number of complaints had decreased from 1,918 in the last second quarter to 1,004 for the same period in 2025. The number of complainants was 112 down from 123 in 2024. The number of new complainants was 33, down from 35. Complaints regarding westerly operations formed the largest percentage of complaints.</p> <p>Regarding the limit on early morning shoulder activity (12-month movements), the total for the preceding 12 months was 6,052 which was below the limit of 7,000. With respect to the limit on night quota activity (23.30-06.00) (12-month movements), the total for the preceding 12 months was 7,957 which was also below the limit of 9,650.</p> <p><b>The sub-committee had discussed the QMR.</b></p> <p>Regarding CDA, it was noted that the main airlines were performing well. This now included El Al whose performance had improved following engagement with LLAOL. LLAOL advised they were now focussing on private operators such as Signature whose performance was below the average. It was recognised that the lower performance was in part attributed to the greater number of pilots who were generally unfamiliar with Luton as they only flew in a few times a year.</p> <p>LLAOL presented some initial data on the comparative performance between the Airbus A321neo fitted with engines from the two suppliers, Pratt &amp; Whitney (PW1000G) and CFM International (LEAP). It was noted that the results suggested that those with the LEAP engine (predominantly operated by Jet2) were slightly quieter.</p> <p>The committee discussed the results, and potential reasons for the difference. It was noted that there were several questions that remain unanswered, such as if the LEAP powered aircraft were performing as expected, and if the difference between the engine types was expected. To date the initial exercise had not considered these aspects, but as more data was gathered, particularly for the LEAP powered aircraft, further analysis would be undertaken. Discussion ensued regarding the engine types and the need for caution when comparing data and variables to ensure comparability. Members noted that comparison of averages was only valid when comparing like with like as far as possible.</p>	
-----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Members were presented with the various reasons for go-arounds. The main reason for a go-around was 'Unstable'. 'Unstable' was declared by the pilot and related to the operational state of the aircraft not meeting certain criteria. It was noted that the number of complaints relating to go arounds was higher in Q2 than Q1.

It was confirmed that the go-around data related to all aircraft, but most were from commercial aircraft. Members asked if example track(s) could be provided. It was also noted that there was a standard missed approach procedure, although the precise route taken would depend on the presence of other aircraft, weather conditions etc.

Regarding complaints it was noted that 88% of complaints in the quarter were attributed to arrivals, and 2% to night flights. This contrasted with the focus being on reducing departure noise. A partial cause of this was the wide area from which the complaints arose, with many attributed to arriving aircraft from locations distant from the airport. A suggestion was to investigate whether in addition to detailing all complaints, it would be possible to filter out those from the local area and report them separately. LLAOL agreed to investigate.

The change in the number of dispensations and their causes was noted. In 2024 Q2 there were 430, with 88% attributed to passenger hardship. In 2025 Q2 there were 93 with 28% attributed to passenger hardship. LLAOL advised that the airport had been working with operators on the issue and had hired someone to specifically look at slot coordination as part of this activity.

The continued modernisation of the fleet was questioned as in 2025 Q1 42% of flights were by modernised types whereas in 2025 Q2 it was 40%. LLAOL advised that the modernisation of the fleet was expected to continue, but that airlines prioritised the use of their modernised types, so when the amount of activity was lower such as in Q1 the proportion of flights by modernised types could be expected to be higher.

The production of daytime noise contours was questioned. For the quarterly reports it was a requirement to produce only night contours. Those for that daytime period were prepared on an annual basis. Currently the contours were produced using the Federal Aviation Administration's INM software. Contours prepared for the DCO were prepared using the replacement AEDT software. The INM and AEDT software have much in common but AEDT has some new or revised data it uses, in addition to some extra features, so their outputs can differ to some extent.



5.3	<p><b>Airport Updates</b></p> <p><b>Runway Resurfacing</b> - LLAOL advised that a project to resurface the runway was to commence on Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> November. The intended hours were from midnight to 5.45am Monday to Friday. There would be a pause during the Christmas period with an expected finish in March 2026.</p> <p><b>Airspace Update</b> - LLAOL gave an update on the Government's progress in the creation of UKADS, a single guiding mind to coordinate and sponsor future airspace changes. As part of this there was an ongoing consultation on changes to the process for airspace changes.</p> <p>Separately LLAOL advised the AD6 Post Implementation Review had been published by the CAA, and the airspace change would remain in place with no changes required. In relation to the change, concern was expressed that the practice of aircraft being vectored, and thus using alternative routes, was not well communicated during the earlier consultation.</p> <p>Finally, LLAOL advised that they were working to remove any remaining reliance on VOR beacons. This was not expected to result in any change to aircraft tracks over the ground but still required a formal airspace change proposal under CAP1616.</p> <p><b>South Luton – Departure Proximity</b> - Analysis was presented of departure tracks from Runway 25, using data from 2017. The point aircraft commenced their turn to the south-west was being looked at. Factors that affected this included the aircraft type, their relative loads and weather conditions. It was found that heavier aircraft generally turned later, which would mean they were closer to some homes.</p> <p>There were no Questions raised by LLACC members.</p>	
6.0	<b>Passenger Services Sub Committee</b>	
6.1	<p>The last quarterly meeting was a tour of the airport facility, by members of PSSC and LLACC.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the Airport for facilitating.</p>	
7.0	<b>Luton Borough Council Report</b>	
7.1	LBC referred to the second table in the report and inform that the date on the second item was incorrect and should read 14.7.25 and not the 9.6.25.	
7.2	Local Plan Review was ongoing and a report was expected in the New Year on the next stage.	

7.3	Members referred to a recent meeting regarding the regeneration of the old Vauxhall site and enquired if there were any plans regarding Vauxhall Way. Currently this was single carriageway and it was asked if LBC might purchase land from Goodmans to facilitate duelling. LBC informed that in the LBC report there were items for discussion with the DfT including Vauxhall Way but there was nothing about compulsory purchase of land to enable this. It was not thought that a compulsory purchase order would be needed if duelling were to be pursued.	
7.4	There was discussion within the DCO regarding Green Horizons Park and it was suggested that much of Green Horizons Park would not be built if the DCO were approved. LBC gave details of other elements of the original planning permission to keep the existing planning permission live and further discussion ensued.	
8.0	<p><b>Correspondence Received</b></p> <p>BMKALC referred to a recent article in the Guardian newspaper regarding PFAS and high levels at UK airports with the largest concentration being at Luton Airport; although currently the levels were not illegal, the Environment Agency (EA) were monitoring all airports.</p> <p>BMKALC briefed further regarding PFAS and asked LLAOL why the contamination at Luton was greater than other airports; which agencies were Luton working with to investigate pathways between contaminated boreholes, drinking water supplies sewage treatment plant and the natural environment; and what steps were the Airport taking to minimise possible contamination?</p> <p>LLAOL informed that the EA had asked 24 airports to test their effluent for PFAS (mainly found in firefighting foam) as part of a Regulation 61 Notice. It was noted that Luton replaced PFAS in firefighting foam for a more environment friendly product over 10 year ago. It was further noted that current data had only come from initial preliminary screening and monitoring was ongoing. The Airport were working closely with the EA and industry experts to understand and monitor PFAS. It was advised that a high spike of PFAS was found in one of the lagoons which had some historical chemicals in it. It was a contained lagoon and the water in the lagoon was removed by third parties and there was no suggestion that water from that lagoon had fed in into the surrounding network.</p>	
9.0	<b>Any Other Business</b>	
9.1	LADACAN referred to Agenda Item 2 para. 3.12.5 of the previous LLACC meeting which referred to the 2024 Sustainability Report [P132-133] employment figures. However, the Member was having	

	<p>trouble interpreting them and asked for clarification on four points as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How does LLA ascertain which of the companies in the area around the airport have jobs dependent on the airport, and the jobs numbers?</li> <li>2. Employment figures for 2024 are up by 2,600 compared to 2019, but passenger numbers for 2024 were lower than in 2019. So is productivity going down?</li> <li>3. Transportation and Storage jobs are quoted as 7,300 in 2024, ie half of all jobs – but which jobs come into this category?</li> <li>4. Employment figures were derived from the Interdepartmental Business Register (IDBR), but how? Is there a published methodology showing estimates and uncertainty?</li> </ol>	
9.2	LLAOL agreed to provide more information in a direct response to the LADACAN member.	LLAOL
9.3	<p><b>Chairman’s Note</b> – LLAOL has provided the following answers to the questions above:</p> <p><i>This section of the report comes from Luton Council, so we reached out to them for the answers.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. LLA supply Luton Council’s Business Intelligence team with a list of businesses connected to the airport. Businesses that are part of the aviation industry and also those serving the airport such as car hire, hotels, bars and restaurants are included in the airport employment figure. Businesses near to the airport but where the business function is not related to the airport are not included.</li> <li>2. The Office for National Statistics measure economic activity with Gross Value Added (GVA) and the latest figures for Luton are for 2023. They calculate productivity per hour worked and per employee from GVA but not at a sufficiently granular level to measure productivity by industry for local authority areas. However, 2023 data shows that GVA for the air transport sector in Luton when adjusted for inflation was £877 million in comparison to £503 million in 2019. This was an increase of 73% and is an indication that productivity has not been falling in Luton in this sector.</li> <li>3. The categories are from the ONS’ Standard Industrial Classification Codes 2007 and Transportation and Storage includes: the provision of passenger or freight transport, whether scheduled or not, by rail, pipeline, road, water or air and associated activities such as terminal and parking facilities, cargo handling, storage etc. Included in this section is the renting of</li> </ol>	

	<p><i>transport equipment with driver or operator. Also included are postal and courier activities.</i></p> <p>4. <i>The ONS' methodology can be accessed in the links below. Luton Council's Business Intelligence purchase the annual IDBR data extract for Luton and believe these are the best data available for estimating employment at the airport.</i></p> <p><a href="https://www.ons.gov.uk/aboutus/whatwedo/paidservices/interdepartmentalbusinessregisteridbr">https://www.ons.gov.uk/aboutus/whatwedo/paidservices/interdepartmentalbusinessregisteridbr</a>  <a href="https://www.ons.gov.uk/businessindustryandtrade/business/activitysizeandlocation/methodologies/ukbusinessactivitysizeandlocationmethodology">https://www.ons.gov.uk/businessindustryandtrade/business/activitysizeandlocation/methodologies/ukbusinessactivitysizeandlocationmethodology</a></p>	
9.4	Members asked if a face to face LLACC meeting could be considered for next year. The Chairman agreed to progress the idea.	<b>Chairman</b>
10.0	<p><b>Date of Next Meeting</b></p> <p>19<sup>th</sup> January 2026 at 14.00 via Teams</p>	