



Monday 19<sup>th</sup> July 2021 – 13.00hrs. – via Team Meeting

#### Members

Mr M Routledge	Chairman
Cllr D Barnard	Hertfordshire County Council
Mr M Nidd	LLATVCC
Mr J Hale	STAQS
Mrs R Webb	BMKALC
Mr P White	SLAE
Mr D Godfrey	PAIN
Mr A Lambourne	LADACAN
Cllr D Franks	Luton Borough Council
Cllr J Timmis	Dacorum Borough Council
Mr D Healey	NATS
Cllr P Brazier	Buckinghamshire Council
Cllr P Clark	North Herts District Council
Cllr D Mitchell	St Albans City and District Council
Cllr P Parry	Beds Ass of Town & Parish Councils
Cllr J Gardner	Stevenage Borough Council
Cllr C Poll	Buckinghamshire Council

#### Officers Representing

Mr Neil Thompson	LLAOL Operations Director
Ms N Morris	LLAOL - Noise & Airspace Performance Manager
Mr D Vazquez	LLAOL - Head of Sustainability
Mr G Sweedy	LLAOL – Operations Manager Surface Access
Mr D Williams	LLAOL – Deputy head of Digital & Car Parking
Mr N Bradford	LLAOL - Communications Manager
Mrs C Armstrong	LLAOL - Head of Passenger Services
Mr D Gurtler	Luton Borough Council
Mr D Wilson	St Albans City and District Council
Mr C Hall	LLAL
Ms L Grufferty	LLAL
Mr P Donovan	Herts County Council
Mr A Wong	LLAOL Airspace Performance Assessor
Ms L Symes	North Herts District Council
S Mendham	Dacorum Borough Council
Antony Aldridge	LLAL

#### Noise Consultant & Secretariat

Mr J Charles	Bickerdike Allen Partners
Mrs P Harris	Committee Administrator

## **1.0 Apologies for absence and substitution**

### **1.1 Apologies for absence from:**

Mr A Martin – LLAOL CEO  
 Mr S Shearer – Freight Operator DHL  
 Mr M Ryles - Airline Representative (Wizz)  
 Mr J Richardson - Bedfordshire Chamber of Commerce  
 Mr D Woodbridge - Airport Union Representative  
 Cllr E Perry - Central Bedfordshire Council  
 Mr C Sheffield - Buckinghamshire Council  
 Cllr J Graziano - Kings Walden Parish Council  
 Cllr D Bowater - Central Bedfordshire Council  
 Cllr S Clark - Herts Ass of Parish & Town Councils  
 Ms L Attrup – LADACAN  
 Cllr A Brewster – Hertfordshire County Council  
 Mr M Turner – LLAL Service Director  
 Mr G Olver – LLAL Engagement Director  
 Mr S Lain – Luton Borough council

## **2.0 Minutes and Matters arising from LLACC Meeting 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021**

### **2.1 The Chairman enquired if there were any changes or objections to the minutes from 19<sup>th</sup> April 2021. None were raised and the minutes were accepted as a true record of the meeting.**

The Administrator undertook to have the Minutes published on the website.

**Admin**

### **2.2 Matter Arising**

4.1.5 – LLAOL advised that Carbon Reduction was a big topic for the Airport with landing and take-off emissions representing around 50% of the Airport's total emissions. They continued to collaborate with partners, in particular easyJet and Wizz Air, to improve performance. Previous updates had been primarily based on information passed to the Airport by easyJet. LLAOL sought guidance from the Chairman regarding a possible presentation from easyJet to help members understand the easyJet programme better. The Chairman suggested that it could be included as an agenda item at a future meeting as members wanted more detail on what airlines were intending to do. It was noted that easyJet had a globally recognised programme which many other companies used. The challenge the airlines had was that these were not local schemes and mitigation activity usually took place far away from Luton. Mitigation and offsetting were very complex issues but it was felt more information on the schemes would be welcomed by the LLACC. LLAOL did reiterate that the airport had their own programme to offset/reduce their own (non-aircraft) emissions and targets which they had to meet by no later than 2026 but hopefully sooner. LLAOL undertook to arrange an update from easyJet and Wizz Air on how they were planning to offset their emissions for the next meeting.

**LLAOL**

Following a comment regarding the NEO aircraft, LLAOL noted that, as published in the quarterly report, Wizz A321 NEOs were responsible for 13% of movements during Q1 this year which was the second highest category of aircraft movement at Luton.

Further comment was made regarding the Government's policy on transport decarbonisation in their paper A Better Greener Britain and their Jet Zero strategy which was currently being consulted on.

### **3.0 London Luton Airport Report**

- 3.1** Members noted the slight upward trend in passenger numbers between April and June but recognised that forecasting passenger numbers was still very challenging with the situation changing weekly. Over the period April to June just over half a million passengers travelled which was only 11% of the pre-pandemic levels in 2019.
- 3.2** Members were advised on a new airline FlyOne that had commenced operations to Chisinau, Moldova at the end of May.
- 3.3** Members noted the increase in General Aviation traffic returning to 50% of 2019 levels by the end of the quarter this was partly due to the Euro football Tournament.
- 3.4** Covid safety continued to be the prime focus of LLAOL and in June, the CAA and Public Health England (PHE) conducted an audit of the Airport's Covid safety measures. The Airport received positive feedback with signage and arrival and immigration areas being described as best in class.
- 3.5** LLAOL advised that they had decided to retain all their current Covid safety measures at the airport, including the requirement to wear face coverings, to maintain the safest environment possible. LLAOL also informed that at the end of Quarter 2 they had restarted their Customer Service satisfaction survey (ASQ).
- 3.6** Airport Carbon Accreditation Scheme - Following an independent external verification in June, the Airport had now been accredited to level 3 of the ACI Europe Airport Carbon Accreditation (ACA) scheme and this had been achieved just 18 months after the Airport had joined the scheme; it formed an important part of their carbon reduction journey. The audit also involved an in-depth verification of the Airports carbon footprint, as well as a review of their Carbon Management Plan.
- 3.7** Members were advised that following a three-day external audit, the Airport also achieved recertification of their Energy (ISO50001) and Environment (ISO14001) management system for the next 3 years.

- 3.8** The Airport continue work on their Airspace change programme (AD6). All the consultation responses had been categorised and analysed, the final design had been adapted and was formally submitted to the CAA on 25<sup>th</sup> June and was awaiting their final decision. The Airport also announced that they had formally restarted their Airspace Change Proposal (FASI-S) and Stage 2 work would continue throughout 2021.
- 3.9** Members were advised that over the past months the Airport had loaned a bus to the Local Authority to help with their Covid testing and vaccination programme around the local community and this initiative had been extended for a further 3 months.
- 3.10** Members noted that in the Community Foundation report there were 3 projects that matched the criteria for ‘Healthy today, skilled tomorrow alleviating poverty’ and had been awarded grants. There were more applications with decisions pending, including 20 from the St Albans area.
- 3.11** Members enquired what powers did the Airport have to enforce Covid measures if passengers refused to wear face coverings. LLAOL advised that it was still regulation to maintain social distancing which could be mitigated by wearing a face covering on board aircraft and between the aircraft and the Immigration Line. There was also Government guidance recommending the wearing of face coverings in crowded places such as transport hubs and Luton did have the powers within their Byelaws to enforce measures where necessary.
- 3.12** Members enquired regarding the ongoing works on Terminal Car Park 2. LLAOL stated that they were unable to give details as there was an ongoing dispute between the contractor regarding the works but commented that it was in everyone’s interest to open the car park as quickly as possible as passenger number increase.
- 3.13** Members enquired regarding the arrival passenger experience at Luton and whether it was similar to that being experienced at Heathrow. LLAOL advised that passengers arriving at Luton had not been impacted to the extent as those at Heathrow and other airports. It was noted that Luton did not have any red listed arrivals and was therefore much less challenging. Luton had had the occasional queue of 1 hour. It was advised that Border Force process was very good at Luton and systems had been upgraded allowing the checking of locator forms to be carried out automatically. E-gates had also been upgraded.

#### **4.0 AMR**

Members discussed the AMR and comments were discussed as follows:

- 4.1** What was the purpose of the AMR and what did it achieve? The current AMR content was, in part, a condition of the Airport's most recent planning consent and was also listed in the Section 106 Agreement for the 2014 planning Consent. It allowed LBC, as the Local Planning Authority, to check that the Airport were complying with the Planning Conditions. LBC briefed further on the requirement of the AMR and advised that it was also part of the Legal Agreement. It was noted that data in many parts of the AMR was provided by LBC. It was further noted that the AMR was discussed at the LBC Overview and Scrutiny Board with the latest report scheduled for debate on 2<sup>nd</sup> August.
- 4..2** Members suggested that as the report was a factual document it should report the good as well as the bad. It was suggested that in previous AMRs it did not report correctly on the breach of the Night Noise Contour which was one of the Planning Conditions. LLAOL stated that the actual contour areas were published but agreed it had not stated that this was a breach. LLAOL stated the document had been improved and the wording and language used was much clearer.
- 4.3** It was noted that nothing had been reported in the AMR regarding the delays and cost overruns for the DART which were recognised as material events in the life of the Airport, nor anything in the Capitalisation Directive resulting from the funding of the Airport. LLAOL advised that information regarding the DART and the Capitalisation Directive related to LLAL (the airport freeholder) and were therefore nothing to do with the operating company.
- 4.4** LBC informed that there would be a short, written report by one of the senior managers of LBC airport company (LLAL). It was important to note if anybody wanting to ask questions on either the short report or the monitoring document the Overview and Scrutiny meeting would be held in public and, although not a public meeting, members of the public were welcome to attend and questions would be permitted by the chairman, advance notice of attending would be appreciated. LLAOL informed that they would be attending the meeting.
- 4.5** LLAOL referred to the AMR and advised that the format changed after the 2014 planning consent where there was a commitment to produce the AMR within much tighter timescales and took the decision regarding the information to included based on several discussions with the NTSC over many years. The current report reflected the legal requirements and the collective wisdom of the NTSC/LLACC about what should be included.

- 4.6** The NTSC did pay close attention to the AMR as a means of sustaining visibility of the trends in some key monitoring indicators. There was a lot of data produced that was considered very valuable and important to the NTSC and other groups.
- 4.7** It was reiterated that in the Legal Agreement it stated that the requirement for the AMR was based on the performance is of the Airport Operator not the freeholder (LLAL) and was quite specific about what should be included. Other elements were more discretionary, but it also gave links to items such as the Quarterly Monitoring Reports; Noise Action Plan etc.
- 4.8** Reference was made regarding the 3 sperate noise plans: the Noise Management Plan, the Noise Control Scheme and the Noise Action Plan. These various requirements had been explained ex-committee by LBC and it was suggested that these should be added to the AMR. LLAOL gave further explanation for each of the noise plans. The Noise Action Plan stemmed from an EU Directive and was based on the ICAO Balanced Approach; consistent with other airports it had approximately 50 targets with different timescales and was reported on in the AMR. The document was renewed every 5 years and was submitted to DEFRA for approval. The Noise Management Plan was a requirement of the planning permission. The Noise Control Scheme was also based on planning consent and was the strategy to reduce the Noise Contour Area.
- 4.9** It was asked if clarity regarding the wording of the Night Noise Contours could be given to explain they were an average value. LLAOL explained the difficulty of changing the wording due to the number of algorithms that need to be taken into consideration.
- 4.10** Reference was made regarding slot allocation and members were briefed on the current situation regarding airlines applying for slot capacity through an independent body - ACL. It was noted that Luton was a fully level 3 co-ordinated airport and were at the same level as other major UK airports. LLAOL stated that because of Covid the normal slot rules had been waived for this year.
- 4.11** Further discussion ensued regarding the breach of Noise Contours and actions and steps being taken and possible mitigation measures.
- 4.12** With reference to LLAL and the DCO in the AMR it was asked if further reference to decarbonisation could be included in future documents. LBC agreed to look where this might fit within future AMR's. It was noted that Airport did publish separate reports on the topic including a standalone Sustainability Report which was published annually. Members were advised that if they had any views/feedback regarding sustainability to contact the Sustainability Team at the airport.

**LBC**

**Members**

## 5.0 Surface Access

**5.1** The Chairman referred to the comments raised at the last meeting regarding surface access and the need for a potential outcome by having a separate working group. Essentially there are three areas that need to be discussed

- Issues today (where are the pinch points, what can be done, what can be helped)
- How does 19mppa impact
- Major changes that need to happen under the DCO if it comes to fruition

**5.2** Members were advised that the Airport did have an Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS) which formed the basis of what is worked on and it had been in place since July 2000. The report was published on line and focuses on the strategy regarding public transport and how to get people to move to other modes of transport. The main aim was to deliver a more sustainable transport system and to promote and encourage sustainable options for both employees and passengers while reducing the impact of surface access to the airport on the local community. The document was updated approximately every 3 to 4 years.

**5.3** A presentation was given on the sustainable transport modes; efforts to reduce single mode traffic; improvements to ground services for passengers using other modes of transport; increasing EV charging points; and ongoing lobbying with the local council for improved cycleways.

**5.4** Members noted that more ambitious targets had been set in the next ASAS report that focused on more sustainable transport modes.

**5.5** Members questioned the road access from the east to west direction which seems to be a main concern – what improvement from bus services could be expected? LLAOL informed that discussions with operators were ongoing and would update again at a future meeting. Members were advised that a sustainable transport plan was a statutory requirement and required consultation with a consultation group. It was also advised that a full transport impact assessment had been carried out for the 19mppa application and although road access and congestion to the east of Airport was often mentioned anecdotally it had not been raised as a key pinch point to be addressed. Members further mentioned the impact of traffic on the villages with the increase in traffic from Aylesbury to the new link road M1 11A. Further discussion ensued regarding the impact of cars around the surrounding villages in Buckinghamshire and North Hertfordshire areas. LLAOL confirmed that the DART would replace the bus service from Luton Parkway to the Airport.

**LLAOL**

**5.6** Airport Car Parking Spaces were discussed, and it was stated by LLAOL that Luton has the lowest number of spaces per passenger when comparing with other UK major airports.

**5.7** Further questions and discussion ensued regarding available data in relation to the east west surface access particularly in relation to the 19mppa application. LLAOL advised that a full traffic impact assessment and a full travel plan was submitted as part of the application and was in the public domain. It was reiterated that it was important to ensure the information was the public domain and then to look at secondary questions arising from the documents.

**5.8** Members were advised that a model shift was expected with the opening of the DART and it should play an important part in the ultimate shift to public transport as the Airport grew.

Members were briefed further on the traffic related issues, and it was stressed that while the Airport was a major employer in the area not all traffic growth was related to the expansion of the Airport and there was a need to recognise that background traffic was intensive and re-growing; issues could not just be levied on Airport usage and growth. The key was to strip out the background traffic and assess the additional impact of the Airport – it was felt this was one of the roles of the Highway Authorities for consideration within their local transport plans.

**5.9** LLAL referred to the DCO and the growth of the airport and stated there had been a significant amount of modelling work carried out. They were in constant dialogue with all the immediate highway authorities who had input on how the model was built. The modelling would be carried out in 3 phases: as at 2029 where the belief was there would be 21.5m passengers transiting through the existing terminal; then when growth to around 27m passengers transiting through 2 terminals had been achieved; and finally looking at 32m passengers in the future, say 2040 and beyond. It was stressed that all the modelling, all the assumptions and all the planning was based on the best available data and LLAL would be proposing an ongoing monitoring program to respond to interventions as work progressed. As part of the travel planning work, a workshop was being planned for later in the year and all affected local authorities and key stakeholders would be invited.

**5.10** The Chairman suggested that a subgroup be set up to look at the data provided to date and get an expert report drawn up that LLACC members can consider. This group would need both LLAOL and LLAL input as well as expert advice from the neighbouring Highway Authorities. LLAOL agreed to consider how this might be achieved.

**LLAOL**



## **6.0 Report on Noise & Track Sub Committee from 9<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

- 6.1** The total passengers served had decreased by 89.4% and total traffic movements decreased by 77%. The total movements in the night period, 23.00-07.00, decreased by 71.1% from those for the first quarter last year. The early morning movements were fewer by 81.4% than those in the first quarter last year.
- 6.2** The airlines had achieved Continuous Descent Approaches (CDA) for 79% of all arrivals, which was less than in the same quarter in 2020 when it had been 88%. The noise monitor results showed most departures had still produced noise levels in the range 70-76 dB LAmax. In this period there had been no daytime departure and no night-time departures registering greater than 80 dB. There had been no noise violations. The night-time noise contour area had decreased by 67.6%. The Airport had issued two track-violation fines, due to poor track keeping by GA traffic.
- 6.3** The number of complaints had decreased from 1,368 in the last first quarter to 1,075 for the same period 2021. The number of complainants were fewer at 54 in the first quarter of 2021 compared with 117 in 2020. The number of new complainants was 13; in the same quarter in 2020 the number had been 20. Complaints about westerly departures still formed the largest percentage of complaints. It was also noted that the reduction in complaints correlated with the reduction in aircraft movements. Runway usage was 63% westerly operations this was different from last year where during Q1 there were 90.5% westerly operations.
- 6.4** Regarding the limit on early morning shoulder activity the total for the preceding 12 months had been 1,796 (limit 7,000). The limit on night quota activity – 23.30-06.00 total for preceding 12 months was 3,402 (limit 9,650). The figures again reflected the impact of the ongoing pandemic.
- 6.5** NTSC Members had discussed the quarterly report in detail particularly the vectoring height on easterly departures. It was noted that the vectoring of departing aircraft over Stevenage in the future should be rare with RNAV routes but would still occur for arrivals. The possible inclusion of the ICCAN suggested table of ‘the most complained about aircraft movements’ in subsequent QMRS was discussed and it was seen as useful to be trialled. That said, concern was expressed that the main community impact was due to regular flying not just occasional unusual aircraft movements. The possible separation of complaint records from major repetitive complainants was discussed with the aim being to give a fairer, less distorted, representation of the complaint landscape while still retaining data on all complaints.

- 6.6** There was a long discussion, which was technical and useful but ultimately inconclusive, with 2 representatives from Wizz Air to discuss the performance of the Airbus 321 NEO and why it did not seem to be achieving the expected noise reductions when operated from Luton. Wizz had now got Airbus involved and their experts, Wizz and the Airport team would continue to investigate. It was hoped that at a future meeting there would be an explanation as to why the A321NEO was not giving the benefit expected.
- 6.7** Luton Airport 19 mppa planning application [21/00031/VARCON] - It was reported by LBC that a revised ES Chapter 8 NOISE document and a Carbon Reduction Plan had been published on the 24<sup>th</sup> May 2021, and a public consultation was in progress up to 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2021. No firm date was given for the critical deciding meeting.
- 6.8** AD6 New Arrival Arrangements – members noted the AD6 and await the outcome from CAA on whether they agreed with the new proposal.
- 6.9** FASI-S – the re-organisation of flight paths in southern England was recommencing and LLAOL had obtained funding and approval to restart work on Stage 2A Option development (completion planned for November 2021) and then Stage 2B by March 2022. Further dialogue with stakeholders would occur and ACOG were to be invited to the next NTSC meeting to set out their role in the broader airspace reorganisation strategy.
- 6.10** NADP Trial - LLAOL advised on the proposed trial on a new Noise Abatement Departure Procedures (NADP) at the Airport. It would involve two key operators, operating either Boeing 737 or Airbus A320 family types, for periods for their westerly departures. It was noted that there had been various issues with the noise monitors and the trial was delayed until September.
- 6.11** The Annual Monitoring Report was noted with issues to be raised at the LLACC.
- 6.12** For background, it had been noted that the decision following the Stansted Airport Inquiry had been issued. The Leeds Bradford and Southampton applications - it was reported that for both these airports where permission was about to be given by the relevant planning authorities, the Secretary of State for Transport had requested delays to formalizing the approvals.
- 6.13** Future Aircraft for Luton Airport - It was noted that studies were on-going on use of hydrogen as a future fuel for easyJet aircraft. Mention was also made of the new airships, which had a very low carbon footprint and noise footprint. Such were being developed in Bedford by Hybrid Air Vehicles Limited, e.g. the Airlander 10.

## **7.0 Report from Passenger Services Sub Committee from 9<sup>th</sup> June 2021**

- 7.1** The Chairman reported the PSSC much of which has already been discussed with the Airport Report, including Border Force and Surface Access.

Gates and vetting Passenger Locator Forms. It was noted that there were currently no issues with the process but there was potential for it to be an issue in the future.

## **8.0 Luton Borough Council Report**

- 8.1** Members noted the Luton Borough Council Report.

## **9.0 Correspondence Received since March 2021**

- 9.1** Members noted the correspondence.

## **10.0 Any Other Business and Next meeting Dates**

- 10.1** DCO update – LLAL briefed members further on the progress of the DCO following the review of the last consultation. The first phase of the development would now be for 21.5m passengers but the timing was within the existing concession period. The next Phase of the works would start around 2033 with the second terminal coming online in about 2037 and this would see the airport capable of taking around 27m passengers. By the late 2030's early 2040's works would continue to reach a capacity of 32m passengers by the mid 2040's. It was noted that a further consultation would take place early in 2022 and this would be a statutory consultation followed by an application to Government in late summer 2022. It was anticipated that the examination of the application would run into 2023.

- 10.2** Dates for the Next Meeting – All meetings will be via Teams

PSSC – 15<sup>th</sup> September at 10.30

NTSC – 8<sup>th</sup> September at 14.00

LLACC – 25<sup>th</sup> October at 13.00