

**SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND LICENSING COMMITTEE held
at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 10.00 am
on 31 JULY 2002**

Present:- Councillor R B Tyler – Chairman.
Councillors W F Bowker, Mrs C A Cant, Mrs M A Caton,
Mrs J F Cheetham, R A E Clifford, Mrs C M Dean,
Mrs E J Godwin, R D Green, P G F Lewis, Mrs J I Loughlin,
D M Miller and A R Thawley.

Also present at the invitation of the Chairman:- Councillors R J Copping,
A Dean, A J Ketteridge and R A Merrion.

Officers in attendance:- Mrs L Bunting, F Chandley, W Cockerell,
R Harborough, J Mitchell, M Perry, J Pine, Mrs C Roberts and
R Secker.

Members of the public present:- P Bullett, D Bullett, Mrs M Porter, R Meloy,
C Bush, Dr P Dale.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The Chairman welcomed all to the meeting and explained that it had been decided that a time would be set aside for public speaking later in the meeting. Meantime, the conclusions set out in the Environmental Impact Statement produced by the BAA would be examined chapter by chapter.

Chapter 4 Air Noise

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read the conclusions at the end of Chapter 4 on air noise.

In answer to a question from Councillor Mrs Cheetham, the Principal Planning Officer explained that it was open to BAA to initiate proposals for charging to discourage the use of Chapter 2 hush kitted aircraft.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham, noting landing charges were less at Stansted than at Heathrow, considered that raising charges could be used as a deterrent to noisy planes.

The Principal Planning Officer said that this was an issue to be discussed with the applicant.

Councillor Mrs M A Caton stated that the phasing out of hush kitted Chapter 2 planes required legislation in this country and that progress could only be at 20% per annum because of the terms of the relevant European directive. It appeared that if reliance were placed on the government, it would take a very long time and therefore the Council should be doing all possible to ensure the phasing out of noisy planes.

Councillor R B Tyler summed up by saying that this would be a matter for negotiation with the applicant.

Councillor Mrs C A Cant referred to page 107 of the report to the committee on 24 June 2002 which suggested that it might be necessary for BAA to apply to the Government in order to invoke European legislation limiting and then phasing out the noisiest aircraft and that the Council might wish to require such an application as a condition of grant of the planning application.

The Principal Planning Officer affirmed that this was an issue that would be pursued with the applicant.

Councillor Mrs Godwin agreed that air noise was most important and emphasised that grants for insulation were sometimes given several years too late. It was important that insulation be offered early in the development. Bunds were needed urgently to insulate against ground running noise which had been particularly bad in the last few weekends. Night flights should not increase above current levels.

Councillor Tyler welcomed to the meeting Councillor A Dean who spoke about the conflict between profit and quality of life, mentioning the recent Government consultation on proposals for additional runways at Stansted. He felt it was important to assess what effects were reasonable and what were unendurable and also what conditions were reasonable or otherwise to be signed up to. He felt there should be a list of acceptable conditions and that the onus of producing such a list of conditions should be on the BAA. Officers had negotiated some conditions which were an improvement on the first ones but it was now up to Members to demand more. It would be wrong to take a decision on the application without the best possible conditions on the table. The Council's performance in this respect would give weight to its fight against additional runways.

Councillor R D Green said that the report submitted to the Committee on 24 July had envisaged quieter, cleaner planes, with reduced landing noise, but knowledge and experience was necessary to make the planes quieter. Stansted provided a great deal of work and was a beautiful airport well conceived by the planners. BAA had given much to the area and should be encouraged to continue a good job. The Council would be very unpopular if they did not provide for the air transport demanded by the population at large.

Councillor R Clifford asked what involvement the District Council would have as regards property blight to houses caused by the expansion of Stansted.

Councillor Mrs J Cheetham asked that officers discuss with the airport in the context of noise track keeping and air pollution, whether there should be an independent noise monitoring system for continuous review of these matters.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that there was independent auditing of the monitoring process, ensuring that audit trails were in place and reported information could be verified. Councillor W F Bowker complained that noise nuisance was already bad for Newport and prejudicial to school children, health and other matters. He asked about controls via the vectoring limits.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that planes could be vectored off at above 3,000 ft by day and above 4,000 ft at night. When vectoring was

carried out over 3,000 ft, this tended to spread the aircraft tracks between communities whereas if aircraft remained on Noise Preferential Route until 4,000 feet all planes on a particular route would fly over communities along its track. Noise Preferential Routes benefited some communities, but not others.

Councillor Thawley stressed the damage caused by air noise. Thaxed people were unable to sleep even with windows closed. Negotiation must be used to reduce the number of night flights. He considered that the airport could accept lower levels of night flights and that BAA should introduce a regime of charging which was stringent enough to reduce noise. There were questions as to whether Leq's were an effective tool in the assessment of community annoyance from air noise. It was suggested that the BAA should be invited to support a study to establish what did affect people's daily lives, taking into account, for example, the way noise peaks disturbed their sleep patterns. The applicant should be providing a voluntary scheme to compensate those outside the compulsory noise compensation scheme and purchase of houses under the flight path should be negotiated. Councillor Thawley stressed that officers should be given instructions to negotiate obligations covering these points

The Principal Planning Officer informed the meeting that the Department for Transport was studying the effectiveness of Leq as an indicator of annoyance and the Chairman asked that the Council should have an input into this study.

Councillor Mrs M A Caton sought noise limits for arriving aircraft and fines for breaching such limits, the amounts of fines must also be meaningful and punishing. She agreed with Councillor Thawley's comments on compensation and insulation. She understood that some aircraft were not correctly QC rated. Noise was a blight to some areas and further blight must be prevented.

The Principal Planning Officer explained that the Government classified the aircraft and he believed that the QC system was under review, but could not comment on whether there were incorrect ratings.

Councillor Mrs C A Cant referred again to page 107 of the report on the outline planning application which referred to the effects of noise on vulnerable groups such as school children, the elderly, those in hospital and nursing homes, which the report said should be given separate consideration in the light of the WHO guidelines for community noise. She asked that there be regular reviews of schools and homes where vulnerable people were resident.

Chapter 5 – Ground Noise

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Councillor Mrs Godwin considered that there should be bunds provided at the cargo bays and the ground running facility, as well as a noise protection wall such as that provided at Gatwick.

With regard to noise insulation, Councillor Mrs Cant thought that this should be provided in the right locations and in proportion to the predicted volume and put in place prior to the commencement of additional activity.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham said that, as the Airport was on raised ground, the resulting noise rolled down to Takeley. She considered that a noise wall or bunding should be provided to screen houses owned by BAA at Burton End, to protect Tye Green and to the south west of Enterprise House, where aprons were only equipped with blast deflectors.

Councillor Mrs Dean considered that the report made light of the substantial noise increase at Molehill Green. Measures should be investigated to reduce the level of noise disturbance. She also considered that the use of absorptive materials should be required by condition.

Councillor Clifford referred to acceptable noise levels and said that their measurement should reflect the context of the surroundings of a desirable rural area with significant architectural and historic heritage.

Councillor Thawley considered that fixed electrical ground power and pre conditioned air supplies should be supplied to all areas of the airport and penalties should be imposed for not using them.

Councillor Mrs Godwin referred to listed buildings and said that it would be difficult to provide conventional soundproofing to protect them.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham stated that other airports had a legal requirement for APUs to be switched off. She considered that fixed electrical ground points should be provided to all aircraft stands and officers should re-negotiate these matters.

Councillor Green said that these objections had, in principle, previously been considered. There were few objectors to the planning application and its determination needed to be taken in the context of national issues.

In response to Councillor Green, Councillor Mrs Cheetham stated that Members were trying to go through the document in a sensible way in order to make a reasoned decision. She considered that the SERAS matter was another issue for another day. The Chairman said that Members were trying to make quality decisions and it was imperative that the right decisions were made. Councillor Mrs Loughlin, also in answer to Councillor Green's comments, said that particular account needed to be taken of people living in the areas previously unaffected by noise, to gauge their views.

Councillor Merrion said that he took exception to Councillor Green's comments suggesting that Members did not know how the public felt and Councillor Mrs Cant said that the Committee was present to represent all people in the District. Councillor Clifford commented that of the 40 parish councils and communities within an eight mile radius of the airport, none supported the application.

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read the conclusions of the relevant chapter of the Environmental Impact Statement of the BAA.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham pointed out that York Consulting predicted less jobs would be created by the proposed development than BAA. The Principal Planning Officer advised that BAA had acknowledged that York Consulting's assessment of likely productivity rates could well be achieved and that its assumptions had been on the conservative side to assess the worst case in terms of testing labour demand against supply.

Councillor Clifford pointed out that the impact of increased demand from the airport might adversely affect small businesses within the area. Councillor Thawley asked officers to negotiate measures to mitigate these effects, eg support teleworking. He also asked that BAA consider funding an economic development officer post for the Council for the future. Such an officer might need to help local businesses if the airport grew.

Councillor Mrs Godwin suggested that assisted travel should be provided to enable people from North London to take up employment within the Uttlesford district other than on airport.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham anticipated pressure for low cost housing in the area if the airport expanded and other industries were not fed by north-east London resident employees. She asked that officers negotiate for a larger amount than the £1.4 million that the airport was offering. She hoped that more personnel from Harlow could be encouraged to work at the airport.

Councillor Copping considered the assessment of effects on the labour market questionable. He considered that a high proportion of the workforce required would be manual workers, eg baggage handlers, and that it would be a challenge to recruit, train and retain staff for these jobs.

Councillor Green referred to the previous employment history of Saffron Walden and stated that Saffron Walden's low unemployment depended upon jobs at the airport and commuting to London.

Councillor Mrs Caton pointed out that the sum offered for affordable housing would be shared with other district councils and that Members might need a guide to affordable housing to enable them to take a final decision. In addition, support needed to be offered to local firms.

The Chairman confirmed that the £1.4m had been felt by many Members to be a derisory sum.

Councillor Mrs Caton asked that officers liaise with the Council's housing department in this context. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that housing and planning officers of East Hertfordshire and Harlow Councils were liaising with housing and planning officers to explore the potential of BAA's financial contributions to achieve certain levels and types of housing provision.

Councillor Mrs Godwin stressed that housing should be for rental in perpetuity and not for purchase. Councillor Thawley referred to evidence on behalf of the Council at a recent public inquiry at Felsted, which had demonstrated that

only homes for social renting would address the circumstances of those in priority housing need in Uttlesford. His views had not been challenged at the time. He mentioned statements in the press from the Government about 50,000 affordable houses in the London/Stansted/Cambridge Corridor and asked that York Consultants be questioned about the impact of this. The Principal Planning Officer explained that the Deputy Prime Minister's statement announcing the provision of an additional 200,000 houses in the south east region did not make specific allocations but did mention 4 areas where such development might be concentrated, of which the London/Stansted/Cambridge Corridor was one. Moreover, the proposed housing was not all affordable. He further drew a distinction between the Deputy Prime Minister's statement which concerned the whole south east region and York Consultants advice which was specific only to the effects of the proposed Stansted development to enable 25 mppa.

Councillor Mrs Cant expressed concern that Uttlesford Council Tax payers might have to subsidise housing for residents originating from outside the district. Councillor Green suggested that 'affordable' was an unfortunate word and that low cost might be more appropriate.

Councillor Thawley suggested that Braintree District Council should be involved in discussions since they were very concerned with the problem. The Principal Planning Officer said, however, that that district had not raised the question of affordable housing in response to consultation on the planning application and appeared more concerned about transport links to the airport.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham suggested that the airport should hold a forum with local businesses to solve employment problems. The Principal Planning Officer explained that the airport had two forums, one for recruitment and training generally and one for dialogue with local businesses to involve companies in supplying BAA's contractors and on airport businesses .

Chapter 8 – Economic Effects

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read the conclusions to Chapter 8.

Councillor Green expressed regret at the economic demise of Saffron Walden and Dunmow. He considered that village schools should be retained and given special consideration in the airport/housing discussions.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham expressed concern that no cargo was travelling to the airport by rail. A rail freight siding was needed at the Stansted Terminal. She noted also that cargo tonnage had gone down in the last quarter. It, therefore, seemed that the planning application was envisaging a large area for reducing cargo and a lot of car parking area to support this. Low cost flights carried little freight at all.

The Principal Planning Officer agreed that the cargo tonnage had reduced from peak a few years ago. This was a result of some operators moving to new bases. In the short term, however, freight integrators were anticipating significant growth in business at Stansted there would be an increase in tonnage and in the cargo air transport movements. As Stansted's market mix

matured, however, and the number of scheduled long haul passenger services increased there would be additional increase in freight tonnage as cargo was conveyed in the belly holds of passenger aircraft. The Strategic Rail Authority had advised that the airport was not identified as a potential key rail freight interchange or port in its strategic plan. There was limited spare capacity on the rail access to airport for freight movements taking into account the level of air passenger and other user demand at present. It might be possible in the future to achieve some air freight surface access movements by rail if a business case for it exists.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham commented that the Council's consultant TRL had questioned the extent to which long haul scheduled passenger services would develop at Stansted and underestimated the growth in no frills short haul scheduled passenger movements. This could have implications for cargo tonnage.

Councillor A Dean suggested that the Strategic Rail Authority and the BAA should work towards 25% of cargo traffic to and from the airport being rail-borne by 2008.

Councillor Mrs Godwin suggested that there was a question whether freight and passenger traffic could be mixed on the rail network. She felt that problems would be eased if air freight were encouraged to move elsewhere to another airport. There was unemployment in North London and airport induced inward investment should possibly be encouraged elsewhere. In answer to a question from Councillor Clifford, the Principal Planning Officer explained that the timings of cargo air transport movements were a response to customer demands. There was a market for guaranteed delivery times.

Councillor Mrs Caton said that Members had previously been told that night flying was essential to the UK economy.

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying summarised the concerns of Members under Chapter 8.

Councillor Green regretted the closure of railways and supported the use of rail for heavy cargo.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham explained that it had become apparent that some companies needed regular deliveries because they did not stock goods on site any more.

At this point in the meeting the Chairman invited speakers from the members of the public present.

Mrs M Porter stated that most Saffron Walden people did not want another runway at Stansted. The largest group of workers were not employed on the airport but were commuters to London and Cambridge. There was also a large body of elderly people who did not work. Consequently the economic benefits to the local community were not readily apparent.

Councillor Bullett from Chrishall Parish Council said that he had been impressed with the variety of points considered and the discussion. His area

was not troubled by ground noise, but it was a very beautiful rural area which was increasingly troubled with air noise, suffering from increased noise day and night. He viewed with dismay the area adversely affected by air noise increasing two to three-fold. Some residents in his parish worked at Stansted, but all were concerned about the airport noise. He had lived in Chrishall for 17-18 years and the noise had become very noticeable during the last 3-4 years.

At 12.30 pm the meeting adjourned for lunch and reconvened at 1.35 pm.

APOLOGIES

An apology was received from Councillor R D Green as he had had to leave the meeting.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT - continued

Chapter 6 – Transportation

This item had been taken out of order to await the arrival of Highways and Transportation representatives.

The Chairman welcomed Mr Peter Chappell and Ms Julia Gregory from the Essex County Highways and Transportation Department to the meeting to answer questions on the transport aspects of the EIA.

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying then read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Members discussed aspects of the chapter in detail.

(i) Car movements at Coopers End roundabout

Councillor Mrs Cheetham asked whether the Coopers End roundabout access was to be left open or closed.

(ii) Revamping of coach station

Councillor Mrs Cheetham required clarification that this would happen. The Principal Planning Officer said that the current application did not include this work. This would be explored with the applicant.

(iii) Location of slip roads

A number of questions were asked about the M11 airport slip roads. Mr Chappell answered that this was a Highways Agency matter and said that he would ask them to confirm when M11 slip roads were expected to be at capacity.

(iv) Road, Rail and Local Transport

Members were concerned that currently, road, rail and local transport were at full capacity and Councillor Clifford said that measures must be approved and implemented in advance of development. Councillor Clifford also asked if local businesses would receive compensation for loss caused by delays on the M11. Mr Chappell answered that this was a Highways Agency matter but he would ask whether compensation was available for disruption to local businesses during the slip road construction programme. Councillor Mrs Dean said that there should be a range of incentives to use public transport, for example the facility to check in at Liverpool Street.

(v) Heliport

Members were concerned that an increase in helicopter movements would be intrusive and asked what controls over noise would be in place. The Principal Planning Officer said that he was not aware that the current application included expansion of facilities for helicopters. Councillor Mrs Cheetham said that BAA should be asked about increases in helicopter movements from the Airport and that the issue needed to be highlighted. The Chairman said that Members would have more information at a future meeting.

(vi) Traffic Lights at M11 Junction 11

In answer to a question from Councillor Mrs Godwin on the removal of the traffic lights at junction 11 on the M11, Mr Chappell said that the lights had improved traffic flows over the junction but he would ask the Highways Agency if the lights on the Birchanger roundabout would be removed at completion of works to the motorway.

(vii) Block Parking and Fly Parking

After discussion Members' view was that long stay block parking should be pursued and a fly parking study within a radius of five miles should take place. BAA were to be asked to fund initiatives to address any problems uncovered.

The Chairman thanked Mr Chappell and Ms Gregory for the benefit of their knowledge and they then left the meeting.

Chapter 9 – Third Party Risk

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Members then fully discussed this chapter. Councillor Mrs Cheetham asked if there was a more updated map available showing the risk lines and public safety zones. The Principal Planning Officer gave an explanation of the safety zones on the map. Councillor Mrs Cheetham said that the recent SERAS report had included 1:1,000,000 risk contours and the Principal Planning Officer said that he would investigate further.

Chapter 10 – Air Quality

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Members considered aspects of this chapter in detail.

In relation to the monitoring and remedial measures to be taken in 2003, Councillor Mrs Godwin stated that these measures should be taken now. Councillor Clifford considered that an independent survey should take place using state of the art monitoring equipment. Councillor Mrs Loughlin thought that the study should look at effects on general health. Councillor Thawley said that there needed to be a base line of health data in a wide radius from the airport, followed by a study into the health effects and remedial action at a number of locations during the next ten years.

Chapter 11 – Landscape and Visual Effects

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Members then discussed aspects of the chapter in detail.

Councillor Mrs Godwin considered that not enough landscaping works were being proposed. She said that Takeley needed to be screened from the Airport and more bunding and landscaping needed to be done. The M11 slip roads required screening and Birchanger village was particularly exposed. At night the lighting from the car parks was intrusive. It was considered that landscaping schemes should be retained in perpetuity.

After further discussion Members considered that more off site and evergreen planting should take place and, looking to the long term effects, planting should also include some native specimen trees.

Chapter 12 – Nature Conservation

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Members then discussed aspects of the chapter.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham was concerned about the effects on Hatfield Forest which was in close proximity to the Airport. Negotiations were currently taking place between BAA, English Nature and the National Trust regarding the monitoring of nature conservation effects. Councillor Mrs Cheetham considered that monitoring should start now. She also felt that other woodlands close by should be included in the study and monitored. Councillor Mrs Loughlin thought that any monitoring should take account of the effect on geese and other migrating birds and Councillor Miller said that similar considerations should apply to the nature reserve and habitats within the Airport. It was felt by Members that BAA should provide funding for remediation of effects.

Chapter 13 – Agriculture

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Members then discussed aspects of the chapter. Councillor Mrs Cheetham considered that employing block parking could save some agricultural land which would be lost by the development.

Chapter 14 – Rural Character

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Members then discussed aspects of the chapter in detail.

Councillor Mrs Godwin considered that the resulting build-up of traffic would inevitably change the area together with the introduction of noise and pollution.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham said that off-site planting and nature conservation would be essential if any attempt was to be made to retain and secure an airport in the countryside.

Councillor Clifford said that the character of the area would become urbanised and subject to dramatic change. Councillor Miller agreed that the area would no longer truly be rural as a result of housing and business developments. Councillor Mrs Caton considered that airport related activity would change the area and Councillor Mrs Loughlin said that the area around the Airport must be protected.

Chapter 15 – Archaeology

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Members discussed aspects of the chapter in detail.

Councillor A Dean stated that BAA should be invited to fund a museum and display facilities with a start up figure of £3m and finance annual running costs. Councillor Mrs Cheetham considered that there should be funding for displays around the district and Councillor Mrs Godwin said that there should be appropriate displays at the Airport. Councillor Miller said that restoration of artefacts from the airport site was underway in Oxford but that there was no money to display the finds or for storage.

Chapter 16 – Waste Management

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Councillor Thawley considered that a 15% recycling target was derisory. The Council's target of 60% recycling by 2007 should also be met on the airport (except for food of foreign origin). Councillor Mrs Godwin reinforced this view.

Councillor Mrs Cant said that one of the problems with high turnover flights was that there was no time for inboard cleaners to collect and separate waste. The principle of 'polluter pays' should apply and the airlines bear the cost of sorting waste and reclaiming recyclable material. Councillor Mrs Cheetham said that the target should apply to all businesses on the airport. Councillor Mrs Loughlin queried the arrangements for disposal of human waste from aircraft. Councillor Clifford considered that this country lagged badly behind the Continent in its performance on waste minimisation and recycling and we should try to learn from them.

Chapter 17 – Energy Management

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Councillor Thawley considered that the Airport should be asked to adopt more challenging targets for energy consumption. Combined heat and power needed to be examined, together with more energy efficient equipment. He also said that there should be compensation schemes in place for CO₂ emissions and more energy efficient design involving building surveyors.

Chapter 18 – Water Management

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Councillor Mrs Cheetham questioned whether the water supply would be sufficient to provide water for the airport and the local community. She also said that we must be satisfied that no pollution was possible in Pincey Brook.

Councillor A Dean referred to instances where a thin film was covering garden ponds and said that an investigation into the cause should be carried out.

Chapter 19 – Construction

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying read out the conclusions on this Chapter.

Councillor Mrs Godwin was concerned about the routes of construction traffic and said that clearly defined routes and times of use should be laid down. As far as it was possible routes should be kept to main roads. Councillor Mrs Cheetham considered that there should be heavy fines for contractors who did not adhere to agreed routes.

With regard to recycling, Councillor Thawley said that contractors should reuse materials on site where possible.

Other Issues

(i) Community Trust Fund

Councillor A Dean asked what discussion there had been regarding the Community Trust Fund. He considered that BAA should provide an initial £500,000 pa with a subsequent increase of 20p per passenger above 15m.

(ii) Retail Space

Councillor Mrs Caton considered that the amount of retail space at the Airport would have an impact on local town centres as, at present, local people were starting to use the Airport retail outlets as a shopping centre. The Principal Planning Officer said that the retail floor space included catering outlets, Bureaux de Change, car rental and onward travel and accommodation desks. The amount of shopping was proportionate in the context of the proposed passenger throughput of the airport.

(iii) Trust Funds for Local Communities

Councillor Clifford referred to the loss of amenity and quality of life and said that the local communities and parish councils want an environmental trust fund and a separate community trust fund set up, each of £5 million with a further £500,000 for the next ten years.

(iv) BAA Commitment

Councillor Thawley considered that BAA should commit themselves by legal agreement with the Council not to apply for planning permission for development beyond 25m passengers and not to apply for planning permission for additional runway capacity.

(v) Green Tourism

Councillor A Dean said that the Airport should be involved in local tourism and encourage people to visit Uttlesford.

(vi) Local Taxes

Members asked for the legal situation regarding the Council's powers to require levy on passengers using the Airport to be clarified. Reference was made to the landfill tax credit system which funded local environmental works. The Head of Legal Services said that the power to raise taxation was governed by statute. The Council had no powers to levy a passenger charge

(vii) Environmental Impact Statement

Members then discussed the practicality of commissioning a further environmental impact study. The Head of Legal Services said that the Council's consultants had examined the EIA in depth. There was no legal requirement for this Council to conduct its own assessment. This would have to be an extensive piece of work and could cost in excess of £1½m. The Council currently had no resources or experience of managing a consultancy

project of this scale and would need to engage managing consultants, adding to the cost. It would take many months. It was considered that the findings would be not materially different from those in the statement submitted by the applicant.

The Chairman considered that the issues had been well debated during the meeting but that a further special meeting would be required before making a final decision.

Members considered that there was not enough time to have all questions answered in an ordinary meeting and therefore this special meeting had been beneficial. Councillor A Dean said that he had found the meeting informative. He considered that it would be a waste of resources to commission a new environmental statement.

RESOLVED that Officers negotiate the following issues:

Air Noise

- 1 Negotiate charging regime with BAA designed to achieve the early phasing out of marginal chapter 3 aircraft
- 2 Require BAA to apply for consent from DfT to ban marginal chapter 3 aircraft
- 3 Noise insulation grant schemes:
 - Scheme to address the effects of the development should be in place as soon as possible
 - Government to be pressed to complete its review of the effectiveness of the 8 mppa scheme and to introduce a statutory scheme for 8-15 mppa effects without further delay.
 - A voluntary noise insulation grant scheme should be provided by BAA to help people not eligible for the statutory scheme
- 4 Night flights must not increase beyond current level/ must reduce over time
- 5 Increase scope of penalty scheme for infringements of air noise control measures to include controls on landing aircraft, increase the level of fines. Charges to discourage night time movements. Action to involve DfT in discussions
- 6 Compensation for reduction in property values and purchase of properties under flight paths.
- 7 BAA to fund study of the effectiveness of LAeq as an indicator of disturbance from aircraft noise.
- 8 Seek opportunity for UDC involvement in DfT's study to reassess attitudes to aircraft noise.

- 9 Targets need to be included in obligations, as opposed to reasonable endeavours.
- 10 Pursue with DfT the allocation of aircraft to QC bands – “some aircraft not correctly weighted”. Seek opportunities for UDC to be involved in review of QC rating system.
- 11 Requirement to fund monitoring of air noise effects on residential homes and schools and funding for relocation of establishments, if necessary.
- 12 Avoidance of an early morning arrivals peak.
- 13 Greater parity of landing charges at Gatwick, Heathrow and Stansted.
- 14 Independent monitoring of air noise effects.

Ground Noise

- 15 Priority to be attached to reducing ground noise at source:
 - FEGP to all stands
 - Controls on use of APU and GPU
 - Ground engine running at night should be controlled more tightly
- 16 Attenuation measures required:
 - Bunding around ends of the runways.
 - Molehill Green mound needs to be higher
 - Landscaping around airport needs to be intensified/ more planting on open area of Molehill Green mound
 - Protection for Burton End.
 - Bunding/ noise walls to east of A, B, Y and Z aprons instead of blast deflectors
 - Consider absorptive surfaces

Air Quality

- 17 Independent monitoring agency required
- 18 Base line study of health of population in relevant study area to include areas affected by aircraft noise and areas downwind of the airport
- 19 An odour study be undertaken.

Economic Effects

- 20 Set target of 25% air freight to use rail for surface access by 2008
- 21 Initiatives to encourage air freight to relocate elsewhere
- 22 Initiatives to encourage companies supplying the airport to locate in Regeneration Areas

- 23 Identify the principal freight interchanges in the SRA Strategic Plan
- 24 BAA to encourage green tourism in the local area
- 25 Mitigate effects on tight labour market
- Funding for teleworking
 - Funding for EDO
 - £Xm for recruitment and training initiatives
 - Travelcard scheme eligibility to include workers employed in Uttlesford/ East Herts/ Braintree/ Harlow
 - Additional funding for affordable housing scheme. Officers to give guidance on appropriate level of funding. Need for accommodation for rent to address those in housing need.
- 25a Impact of landside retail floor space on vitality and viability of Bishop's Stortford and other local centres to be assessed

Transportation

- 26 the Highways Agency to be asked to confirm when M11 slips expected to be at capacity, whether it is envisaged that the signal control on the Birchanger RAB can be removed, and whether compensation is available for disruption during slip construction programme.
- 27 Negotiate programme for provision of the new bus and coach station at the earliest opportunity
- 28 Negotiate base line study of effects of airport related traffic on local road network and contingency fund to address any significant airport related impacts post development
- 29 Commitment to review mode share targets to take account of future strategic projects and mechanism.
- 30 Safeguard potential for future east-west rail link
- 31 Check current position on project to provide check in facilities at Liverpool Street
- 32 Block parking in long stay car park to be pursued.
- 33 Keep use of BAA funded public transport services under review
- 34 A fly parking study be undertaken in a radius of 5 miles. BAA to fund initiatives to address problems.

Landscape and Visual Effects

- 35 More off site planting

36 Evergreen planting

37 Planting to include some native specimen trees looking to the long term

Nature Conservation

38 Monitoring of nature conservation effects to include all County Wildlife Sites as well as the SSSIs in the Stansted area. Base line study required as well as post development monitoring.

39 Funding for remediation of effects

40 Investigate assessment of impacts on migrating geese in Hatfield Forest

Archaeology

41 BAA to be invited to fund museum displays in nearby communities (£3m start up costs plus running costs required)

42 Storage of finds from the airport needs to be addressed.

Waste Management

43 60% of waste arising at the airport should be diverted from landfill without use of incineration (except for food of foreign origin wastes)

44 MRF to be secured. Airlines should pay for separation of their wastes.

45 Financial contribution to waste reduction initiatives should be increased.

Energy Management

46 Existing buildings suffer from significant thermal losses. Better designs required. Involve Building Surveyors.

47 Compensation scheme for CO2 emissions.

Water Management

48 There must be sufficient water supply

49 Adequate safeguards to prevent pollution of Pincey Brook required.

50 Adequate safeguards to ensure that the development will not contribute to any repeat of flooding on the Pincey Brook.

Construction

51 Restrictions on access routes for construction vehicles – must avoid local roads

- 52 Restrictions on hours of working
- 53 Re-use of materials arising within development site where ever possible

Community Trust/ Environmental Fund

- 54 Member's counter proposal is initial contribution of £500,000, with additional annual contributions at a rate of 20p per passenger in excess of 15 m passengers eg in 2010 at 25 mppa, annual contribution in that year would be £2m
- 55 Environmental trust needed in addition to community trust fund, with initial funding of £5m
- 56 Levy per passenger of £5

Monitoring

- 57 Independent monitoring
- 58 Full assessments of effects at relevant points in development programme. Dates to be specified

Future Development

- 59 Applicant to be invited to enter into obligation not to seek consent for development beyond 25 mppa nor for additional runways

DATE OF NEXT SPECIAL MEETING

It was decided that the next special meeting of the Development Control and Licensing Committee would be held on Friday, 16 August 2002.

The Chairman thanked Members for their endurance during the meeting.

The meeting ended at 4.25 pm.