

EXPLANATION OF SCOPE OF THE APPLICATION

The Executive Manager (Development Services) made a presentation giving an overview of application UTT/0717/06/FUL. The application was for “Extension to the passenger terminal: provision of aircraft maintenance facilities, offices, cargo handling facilities, aviation fuel storage, passenger and staff car parking and other operational and industrial support accommodation; alterations to airport roads, terminal forecourt and the Stansted rail, coach and bus station: together with associated landscaping and infrastructure as permitted under application UTT/1000/01/OP but without complying with Condition MPPA1 and varying ATM1 to 264,000 ATMS, Stansted Airport. The site was located in the parishes of Stansted / Birchanger / Elsenham / Takeley”.

The presentation was supplemented with a report prepared by the Principal Planning Officer, both to be made available after the meeting to members of the public on the Council’s website
<http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk/news/planning/stansted+airport+application+received.htm> .

The planning application was submitted by BAA plc and Stansted Airport Limited on 26 April 2006. Outline planning permission for development to handle about 15 million passengers per annum (mppa) had been granted by the Secretaries of State on 5 June 1985. The Council had permitted a further phase of development on 16 May 2003.

The Principal Planning Officer made reference to the site plan in the Environmental Statement pointing out the development assumed for 25mppa in 2014 and the additional developments assumed for 35 mppa in 2014, and which elements of this development had planning permission and which did not.

At the Council meeting on 16 May questions were asked about the possibility of holding a referendum on the application and whether the Council could refuse to determine the application because of insufficient information. It was agreed that these matters would be discussed by the Development Control Committee.

At the conclusion of his presentation the Executive Manager (Development Services) said the application could not be resolved by a referendum as there was no provision in law for determining applications by referendum, only in accordance with planning policy and material considerations. This planning application was no different to any other planning application and such a course of action would be an abdication of responsibility on the part of the Council.

As this was the first meeting in the series, Members would not be recommended how to determine the application at this stage. The Executive Manager (Development Services) reminded Members they had extensive training, knowledge and experience in determining planning applications and he said he was confident they would not be intimidated by any outside sources and would base their decision on sound planning grounds.

The Chairman then invited Brian Ross from Stop Stansted Expansion (SSE) to speak as an objector to the application. He explained that SSE had a team of 15 people looking at the assessment. The environmental statement had failed to tell us what are the impacts of the proposal. Fundamental matters had been ignored. Advice to the applicant in the scoping opinion had been ignored in 48 instances. There were no projections to 2030, no master plan for a two runway airport. He emphasised that the application was to remove the annual limit on the number of air passengers. He reminded the Committee that the government policy was to make best use of the existing runway. He agreed that the application could not be declared invalid because information sought in the Scoping Opinion had not been submitted. There was an option of refusing the application on grounds of lack of information, but he was not advocating immediate determination. He urged Members to go back to BAA and say that the Committee was minded to refuse the application unless the necessary information was provided.

Members of the Committee then put their questions to Officers.

Councillors Cant, Godwin and Cheetham asked the Executive Manager (Development Services) to clarify how the issue of a referendum on the application would be resolved. He said that this Committee's views should be in the form of a recommendation to Full Council. He repeated his advice that a planning application could not be determined by a referendum.

Councillor Cheetham asked for confirmation that the number of movements in the night shoulder periods and time and night flight noise would be taken into account. She also asked if the Committee had time to ask BAA for further information before a decision was made, within the planned programme. Members were advised that night flights and night noise would be looked at during the process of exploring the environmental impact assessment and formed part of the advice the Council would be receiving from its consultants. If the Committee was not in a position to make a decision on 27 September because they required information they would not make one.

Councillor Godwin asked four questions: why was there no increase in the number of movements forecast in the night shoulder periods? Had employee shift patterns been taken into account with the journeys to work assessment? Where had the monitoring locations for ground noise been monitored? She advocated alternative lighting strategies to limit light pollution from the proposed car parking. The Planning Policy Manager confirmed that the Environmental Statement addressed these issues and that these would all be looked at during the planned programme of meetings.

Councillor Menell asked how the local wildlife would be relocated. The Executive Manager (Development Services) said this would be covered under the environmental impact assessment.

Councillor Cant noted that the Environmental Statement compared 25mppa and 35mppa scenarios in 2014. She noted however that 25mppa was expected in 2008. She asked if there was information on the scale of effects

predicted in 2008. The Planning Policy Manager said this would be covered at a later meeting.

Councillor Loughlin asked about progress with the baseline study of Hatfield Forest, and East End Woods required by the 2003 obligation and asked how the annual mean concentrations of oxides of nitrogen had been determined. She was advised they were based on dispersion modelling. Councillor Dean asked a supplementary question about the rigour of such modelling. The Planning Policy Manager said the Committee would be looking at the quantitative data.

Councillor Thawley asked when all the consultant reports would be received. Consultants had been asked to provide a response by 30 June to the original instructions so that the Committee could take these into consideration during the meetings held in July and August. Further instructions were being discussed with consultants and the programmes had not been finalised. It was confirmed in response to Members' questions that the draft Health Impact Assessment had been submitted to the topic steering group, which had raised some issues that BAA was considering with its consultants ERM before publishing the final assessment. This was anticipated before the next series of meetings of the Committee. It was intended to consider the Environmental Statement in parallel with the Health Impact Assessment and the Sustainability Appraisal copies of the latter having been circulated to the Committee at the meeting. The latter reports would be made available to view or download via the Council's website in due course.

Members referred to a meeting with the Aviation Minister and asked if there was any update on progress with the Government's studies of air noise dose/response effects on communities and studies of rail route capacity on the West Anglia line. Officers confirmed that although a letter had been received from the Acting Minister, it contained no substantive new information.

Councillor Menell asked if Officers could identify the 48 items in the Scoping Opinion that Brian Ross had suggested the Environmental Statement did not address. Officers said they had compared the Statement and the Opinion and that all points that had not been picked up would be identified during the series of meetings.

Councillor Dean asked whether there had been any analysis of the extent to which labour demand at the airport would be supplied by international migration, and whether the net economic effect of the development on the economy of Uttlesford and the East of England had been assessed. The Planning Policy Manager said there was no indication of the nationalities of the predicted labour force in the report and commented that the Committee should look at the impact on not only Uttlesford and the East of England but also the effects on London.

The Chairman reminded Members and the public attending that the exploration of environmental impact assessment would be taking place on 13, 14 and 15 June.

Councillor Cant proposed that for the reasons stated by the Executive Manager (Development Services), the Council be recommended not to put the determination of the application to a referendum. This was seconded by Councillor Harris, and it was

RESOLVED to recommend to Full Council that for the reasons stated by the Executive Manager (Development Services) in his presentation, the determination of the application should not be put to a referendum.

The meeting ended at 4.15pm.