

**APPENDIX 1**

**BAA and Stansted Airport Ltd's responses to matters raised at the meetings of the  
Development Control and Licensing Committee on 24<sup>th</sup> June, 31<sup>st</sup> July and 16<sup>th</sup>  
August 2002**

**AIR NOISE**

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
<p>1. Negotiate charging regime with BAA designed to achieve the early phasing out of marginal chapter 3 aircraft</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stansted Airport's Conditions of Use already embody significant differential charges for Chapter 3 high (i.e. those whose certificated noise performance lies within 5 Effective Perceived Noise dB of Chapter 3 limits), the Chapter 3 base charge and the Chapter 3 minus charge for QC0.5 and QC1 aircraft. The Chapter 3 high charge is 10% more than the base charge.</li> <li>• Stansted Airport cannot ban the use of any aircraft. This is a matter for Government using its powers under the Civil Aviation Act or other legislation.</li> </ul>	<p>The recent Government consultation exercise covers this issue, and Officers consider that this is the appropriate medium through which this issue should be addressed rather than through this planning application.</p>	<p>10% additional charge for Chapter 3 aircraft is not enough to be an effective deterrent</p> <p>What is the percentage of marginal Chapter 3 aircraft, what times do they operate and on which NPR?</p>	<p>The noise related differential charges for chapter 3 aircraft are common across BAA airports at +10% for Chapter 3 high and -10% for chapter three minus. Charges are revised regularly and BAA will give an obligation to undertake a future review before April 2004 with the objective of reinforcing the incentives to reduce the use of noisier aircraft.</p> <p>The proportion of chapter 3 high aircraft is 15%, and the operate at any time and on any NPR</p>	<p>see Obligation 1.8</p>

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
1. Negotiate charging regime with BAA designed to achieve the early phasing out of marginal chapter 3 aircraft (continued)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Government published on 31 July its proposal that the Secretary of State for Transport should be responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- undertaking the noise assessments at the London airports;</li> <li>- setting out the environmental objectives at each airport for noise;</li> <li>- adopting a balanced approach to dealing with noise problems;</li> <li>- taking account of the likely costs and benefits of various measures available as well as airport specific characteristics;</li> <li>- ensuring that the measures taken are no more restrictive than is necessary to meet the environmental objectives for the airport and are not discriminatory between different carriers on grounds of nationality; and</li> <li>- proposing operating restrictions based on the noise performance of aircraft determined by the ICAO certification procedure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The Government's consultation period extends to the end of October. Members have the opportunity to respond to (a) the issue of rules and procedures for introducing noise related operating restrictions at Stansted, and (b) the proposal that the Secretary of State for Transport be defined as the Competent Authority rather than the airport operator.</p> <p>A report will be brought to a future meeting of the Environment and Transport Committee.</p>	Has BAA made representations to the Government seeking him to ban marginal Chapter 3 aircraft?	<p>BAA will discuss their response to the Government when it has been prepared</p> <p>At night BAA already classifies the summer night period at Stansted as peak for charging purposes. However the noise impact is controlled through the night quota and BAA have agreed not to seek an increase in this quota. Additionally there are now a significant number of new measures to control noise impacts that would be imposed as conditions or form obligations upon BAA should permission be granted</p>	This commitment is welcomed

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
2. Require BAA to apply for consent from DfT to ban marginal chapter 3 aircraft	Legislation does not enable the Applicants to ban any type of aircraft, consequently the mechanism to ensure achievement of this request is not in place.	It is open to the Council to make representations to the Government in this respect.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
3. Noise insulation grant schemes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheme to address the effects of the development should be in place as soon as possible</li> <li>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.</li> <li>A voluntary noise insulation grant scheme should be provided by BAA to help people not eligible for the statutory scheme</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The technical work reviewing the effectiveness of the 2 to 8 mppa scheme and designing the 8 to 15 mppa scheme is complete. Stansted Airport Ltd has offered to administer the consultation on this scheme on behalf of the Department for Transport in an effort to progress this outstanding issue as quickly as possible.</li> <li>Stansted Airport Ltd will urge the DfT to convene the technical team and carry out the design of a statutory 15 to 25 mppa scheme. Stansted Airport Ltd will commit funds to implement a statutory scheme at the earliest possible opportunity.</li> <li>Stansted Airport Limited would be prepared to use its financial provision for the statutory scheme that remains unallocated after applications have been processed to provide insulation to community buildings within the statutory scheme area on a voluntary basis. Not all eligible residential properties take up the insulation offer.</li> </ul>	It is acknowledged that there are provisions under the Civil Aviation Act to ensure that noise insulation of properties particularly affected by aircraft noise is carried out. Officers consider that the implementation of the 8 to 15 mppa scheme has been unnecessarily slow. The willingness of Stansted Airport Ltd to expedite matters is helpful. Its new proposals to carry out additional insulation work on a voluntary basis, while limited in scope, are helpful.	<p>BAA should make a commitment itself to make offers of insulation to eligible households by an agreed deadline.</p> <p>There should be a more extensive voluntary noise insulation scheme than required by statute</p> <p>Would the scheme extend to the edge of Newport?</p> <p>An explanation of how Listed Buildings would be insulated is required</p>	<p>The technical work for the 8mppa and the new 15mppa scheme has been completed by DfT with a contribution from BAA. If planning permission is granted it would release sufficient resource to allow BAA to carry out the consultation on those schemes for DfT to get the process moving. BAA would also be in a position to assist DfT with the implementation of the scheme related to 25mppa.</p> <p>Past experience has shown that not all those eligible for the grant actually apply. BAA has offered to use any residual monies from those</p>	No further comment

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
3 continued	BAA is not prepared to offer a voluntary scheme for residential properties over a much wider area than the statutory scheme. However, it will treat properties immediately outside the statutory scheme, so that, for example, all dwellings in a group or row of homes are insulated.			set aside for the treatment of community buildings and schools within the DfT scheme area. If no bids were forthcoming the residual amount would be added to the Community Fund. It would be for the Trustees to decide if this money was to be allocated to projects related to noise protection	

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
4. Night flights must not increase beyond current level/ must reduce over time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At Stansted, these are matters determined by the Secretary of State for Transport and not the airport operator.</li> </ul>	<p>Members will recall from the recommendation to the meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> June that Officers have sought to impose restrictions on night flights. Officers have been advised verbally by DfT that this is unacceptable. Officers have written to the Government Office for the East of England seeking clarification of the possible implications of the Council imposing additional restrictions by condition on any planning permission. A response is awaited.</p>	<p>Action by BAA to discourage night time activity to lower levels than those permitted under the statutory restrictions scheme.</p> <p>Higher landing charges for night time arrivals</p> <p>BAA to be asked to be asked to address retrospectively any inadequacies of noise effect measures if the Government subsequently accepts that community annoyance from air and ground noise is more widespread than it currently acknowledges</p>	See response to (1) above	<p>GoEast advise that it would not be possible to set conditions or obligations which conflict with the Secretary of State's requirements. Officers do not consider that the proposed conditions are in conflict with the Secretary of State's requirements and consider that it is reasonable to proceed with the conditions as worded.</p>

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
<p>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</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Controls need to be imposed by the Government.</li> <li>• New controls need to be subject to public consultation with the aviation industry and others as well as the local community.</li> <li>• The Government has previously considered setting maximum noise limits for landing aircraft, but has accepted the technical advice of its Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Committee (ANMAC) that they are not feasible. It has, however, accepted ANMAC's advice that there should be an Industry Code of Practice on Noise from Landing Aircraft. This was published in September 2001.</li> <li>• The Noise and Track Keeping Working Group (NTKWG) is a mechanism for raising problems based on evidence of performance with the DfT.</li> <li>• There are higher rate landing charges at Heathrow for landing in the night time period, but these were introduced to avoid the operational problems caused by long haul scheduled early morning flights arriving before time. Night time charges were raised to the peak rate charge so that there was no financial</li> </ul>	<p>In view of the key role of the Department for Transport, the Noise and Track Keeping Working Group should be used to pursue problems that materialise. There may need to a review of the landing charges structure at Stansted if a similar problem to that at Heathrow were to materialise. It is noted that at Gatwick, which has more long haul scheduled flights than Stansted, charging is on a similar basis to Stansted, that is there is a high season/ low season differential rather than by time of landing.</p>	<p>No further comment</p>	<p>No further comment</p>	<p>No further comment</p>

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
5 (continued)	incentive to land before the beginning of the peak rate charge at 0700 GMT.				
6. Compensation for reduction in property values and purchase of properties under flight paths.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Part One of the Land Compensation Act provides the statutory basis for compensation arrangements. Compensation is payable where there is a reduction in property values as a result of public works including an increase in the level of aircraft noise resulting from airport development.</li> </ul>	No further comment	BAA should seek to expedite matters	No further comment	No further comment
7. BAA to fund study of the effectiveness of LAeq as an indicator of disturbance from aircraft noise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is understood that the Government is currently carrying out a root and branch review of the issue of disturbance from aircraft noise including relevant indicators. This includes consideration of the night noise regime. Proposals for consultation are anticipated from the Department for Transport to fit the required timescale for draft revised night time restrictions to come into effect after Summer 2004</li> <li>Given that the work is already under way, BAA would not wish to fund a separate study, as this would duplicate work being undertaken by the CAA for the Government</li> </ul>	The importance of this issue is acknowledged. A study which includes this issue has commenced. In view of the DfT evidence to the Heathrow Terminal Five Public Inquiry that the statistical relationship between LAeq and perceptions of disturbance was weak, the conclusions of the Inspector about the adequacy of the Leq index and the prior initiation of a new study of aircraft noise and	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment



Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
		the perceptions of people exposed to it, Members may reasonably expect opportunities to pursue this issue directly with the Department for Transport within the next 12 to 18 months. It can also be pursued in responding to the Future of Air Transport in the UK consultation.			
8. Seek opportunity for UDC involvement in DfT's study to reassess attitudes to aircraft noise.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above</li> </ul>	See above	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
9. Targets need to be included in obligations, as opposed to reasonable endeavours.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BAA are happy to accept targets where they have control over their achievement</li> </ul>	Officers will negotiate and impose targets where possible	Achievement of targets needs to be transparent	No further comment	No further comment

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The DfT reviews aircraft ratings every six months at the beginning of each quota period. ANMAC's work programme includes monitoring actual noise levels of aircraft under various operating conditions. This includes measurements from the fixed and mobile monitors at Stansted. ANMAC is due to publish a report in November. Proposed ratings are subject to consultation.</li> </ul>	The mechanism exists for the Council to be involved in the QC rating system.	A joint approach with BAA may be an acceptable way forward	No further comment	Officers will pursue this.
11. Requirement to fund monitoring of air noise effects on residential homes and schools and funding for relocation of establishments for vulnerable people, if necessary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stansted Airport Ltd can and do respond to any concerns raised by schools or other bodies by investigations using mobile monitors. For example they have carried out considerable monitoring at St Elizabeth's school at Hadham and will continue to carry out such exercises where required. The Noise and Track Keeping Working Group coordinates such monitoring work. The results of such monitoring will be reported. No complaints from the Local Education Authorities concerning the effect of noise and pollution on schooling have been received.</li> </ul>	Monitoring arrangements will remain. Should pollution (noise and other) which is directly attributable to the airport become so great as to require relocation of schools etc. then this would have to be done in any event. It is not anticipated that forecast levels of activity arising from this application would result in such an eventuality.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
12. Avoidance of an early morning arrivals peak.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At Stansted, these are matters determined by the Secretary of State for Transport and not the airport operator.</li> </ul>	Officers have recommended a condition capping the number of early morning arrivals in the night shoulder period.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
13. Greater parity of landing charges at Gatwick, Heathrow and Stansted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The different charges reflect the relative strengths of market demand and the different capping levels set by the CAA as the London airports' economic regulator</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
14. Independent monitoring of air noise effects.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BAA carries out comprehensive environmental monitoring. This activity is rigorously scrutinised by Casella Stanger, a Registered Environmental Impact Assessor, and formally verified. Records such as engine ground running reports are available for inspection by the Council. BAA is not prepared to fund monitoring by another party.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

## GROUND NOISE

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
<p>15. Priority to be attached to reducing ground noise at source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FEGP to all stands</li> <li>• Controls on use of APU and GPU</li> <li>• Ground engine running at night should be controlled more tightly</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fixed Electrical Ground Power supplies are available at all south side stands for the passenger and cargo terminals. All new stands will be provided with supplies. Improvements will be made to existing provision where necessary and it will be maintained in good working order. There is a financial incentive to use FEGP rather than Ground Power Units.</li> <li>• There is a Director's Notice setting out procedures for the control of ground running of aircraft engines. All running must be in accordance with these procedures and must be approved by Airside Operations. Its location must be approved. There are permitted hours for running from 0700 to 2200 (0700 to 2100 on Sats and 0900 to 2100 on Suns and Bank Hols). Running on part power or high power must avoid early mornings and late evenings if at all possible. Running outside permitted hours is only allowed in exceptional circumstances and must take place in the FLS pen.</li> <li>• Controls are proposed over operations on Echo apron at night because of its close</li> </ul>	<p>These issues would be addressed by the Ground Noise Management Plan review offered by the applicant and approval by the Council of the FEGP management systems required by condition GN2. These systems will include measures to ensure that FEGP is used in preference to APUs when available. Similar arrangements are in place at Gatwick.</p>	<p>More positive proposals in relation to providing pre conditioned air than keeping the matter under review. Information required on the duration of aircraft on stands.</p>	<p>The need for pre conditioned air would be included in the review of ground noise management strategy, but dwell times (ie the time aircraft spend on stands in between flights) suggests there is little potential for its use at Stansted. Around 71% of waiting time is less than one hour, and 10% in excess of two hours</p>	<p>No further comment</p>

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
15 continued	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proximity to Molehill Green. Stansted Airport Limited will keep the provision of Preconditioned Air supplies under review.</li> </ul>				
<p>16. Attenuation measures required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bunding around ends of the runways.</li> <li>Molehill Green mound needs to be higher</li> <li>Landscaping around airport needs to be intensified/ more planting on open area of Molehill Green mound</li> <li>Protection for Burton End.</li> <li>Bunding/ noise walls to east of A, B, Y and Z aprons instead of blast deflectors</li> <li>Consider absorptive surfaces</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The height of the Molehill Green mound is adequate. It was high enough to take into account the taxiing noise generated by the aircraft with tail mounted engines operating at the time it was designed. These are no longer in service. Additional planting, however, can be done on the mound in the grassed area on part of the crest.</li> <li>Stansted Airport Ltd does not consider any additional bunds or noise walls would be effective in reducing ground noise noticeably. This is because their noise consultants advise that bunds or walls are only effective where the source of the noise and the receivers of that noise are close together. Bunds and walls become progressively and rapidly less effective as a means of containing noise when the source and the receiver become further away. The layout of the airport, in which buildings or proposed buildings bound the main aprons on three sides, contains noise from activities in these areas. No</li> </ul>	No further comment	<p>More information is required on the effectiveness of the wall at Gatwick Airport</p> <p>There is a gap in the bund at Molehill Green that needs to be filled</p> <p>There should be a tree screen at the SE end of the cargo area.</p> <p>There is a blast deflector but no noise wall</p>	BAA is advised that additional bunding to that already in place at the Airport will have little effect on the noise climate in surrounding communities. However they are prepared to consider this again with those representing the communities adjacent to the airport perimeter through the review of the ground noise management strategy. This will consider potential opportunities for effective bunding and screening and be complete by September 2003.	See obligation 2.3

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
16 continued	complaints about ground noise have been received from Burton End.				

## AIR QUALITY

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
17. Independent monitoring agency required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 14 above</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>45% of airside vehicles used by the major handling agents are electric powered, use LPG or low emission diesel.</li> <li>Stansted Airport Ltd considers that a review of health effects would need to be triggered by air quality assessments. Studies of much larger airports show no significant health effects.</li> </ul>	No further comment	The issue is not one of the effect of air quality but of noise and air quality on general health.. There needs to be a small cohort study of health of the population	BAA consider that the results of health studies at other airports and their own studies of environmental impact indicate that a further study of health impacts at Stansted would not be warranted. The health authority have reached the same view having considered be EA.	No further comment
19. Odour study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BAA will fund an odour study</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

## ECONOMIC EFFECTS

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
20. Set target of 25% air freight to use rail for surface access by 2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There needs to be a business case for using rail for cargo purposes.</li> <li>A high proportion of air freight is handled at Stansted by integrators. This means that efficient use is made of road vehicles – the number of trips is minimised.</li> </ul>	The SRA have commented on the possibility of freight by rail but it will need to fit in around passenger movements, and there is not much capacity at present. The headshunt facility required by SRA could have the potential to provide siding facilities in the future.	Using rail would contribute to reducing CO2 emissions, therefore there is a need for more rail use. The opportunity for provision of the necessary infrastructure needs to be safeguarded at this stage	The possibility of a future rail freight option is not precluded in the future by the current proposed rail improvements and BAA will not seek to change that position	There is scope to introduce a freight handling capacity if the need arises and if a business case can be made. See obligation 4.24
21. Initiatives to encourage air freight to relocate elsewhere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This activity is market driven and located at Stansted because of its strategic accessibility.</li> <li>Freight integrators operate to stringent environmental practice and use modern quiet aircraft.</li> <li>BAA will analyse the average QC rating of CATMs for comparison with PATMs and the average QC rating of night time movements.</li> </ul>	No further comment	<p>More Information required about the nature of air freight business at Stansted and when cargo aircraft fly.</p> <p>Outcome of BAA analysis on C/PATMs</p>	Cargo aircraft fly throughout the day. Most night time movements are passenger aircraft.	A breakdown of night time QC ratings is available for 17th July - 17th August.



<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
22. Initiatives to encourage companies supplying the airport to locate in Regeneration Areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Business Forum has an Inward Investment Sub Group to identify practical initiatives. It has also run a successful meet the buyers event to generate business between companies in the East of England and suppliers to the airport. A further event is planned for September 2002.</li> <li>A web site will be established through the Business Forum as a tool to facilitate business between on airport companies and suppliers.</li> </ul>	No further comment	Targets need to be set	No further comment	It would be difficult to set targets that would depend on the interaction of numerous bodies and agencies which are entirely outside the control of the applicant or the Council
23. Identify the principal freight interchanges in the SRA Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not a matter for BAA</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
24. BAA to encourage green tourism in the local area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Business Forum has a Tourism sub group. It is seeking to identify opportunities to raise awareness amongst air passengers of local attractions, to market the area to guests staying in the existing and proposed hotels on airport, to work with airlines to grow a winter travel market supporting local hotel occupancy rates when traditionally they have spare capacity.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
<p>25. Mitigate effects on tight labour market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding for teleworking</li> <li>• Funding for EDO</li> <li>• £Xm for recruitment and training initiatives</li> <li>• Travelcard scheme eligibility to include workers employed in Uttlesford/ East Herts/ Braintree/ Harlow</li> <li>• Additional funding for affordable housing scheme. Officers to give guidance on appropriate level of funding. Need for accommodation for rent to address those in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diversity in the local economy will be supported through EEDA's initiative to extend broadband access for potential teleworkers.</li> <li>• Sufficient funding is being offered to enable the training and employment promotion initiatives programmes to continue. York Consulting has endorsed BAA's programme as at the leading edge and representing best practice.</li> <li>• Some of the courses run by Stansted Airport Limited develop transferable skills which have wider relevance than addressing the recruitment needs of airport companies.</li> <li>• Stansted Airport Limited would be pleased to provide presentations to the Business Forum and share its experience of setting up the Travelcard Initiative. The Travelcard is only one element of its travel plan. The DfT has recently published guidance for companies on how to implement successful travel plans. This demonstrates that it is open to other large employers or groups of employers to negotiate their own schemes with transport operators.</li> </ul>	<p>The airport is already involved in a number of initiatives which address members' requirements. The travel card scheme is a discount that BAA have negotiated with local transport operators: it is not something they fund themselves.</p> <p>The additional funding for affordable housing is welcomed, and discussions are continuing with a potential housing association partner on the best ways of distributing those funds.</p>	<p>More clarity is sought on the nature and tenure of the affordable housing, in particular the definition of key workers.</p> <p>More funds should be provided, although the additional funding is welcomed</p>	<p>BAA has been exploring with Council officers and potential funding partners how BAA's contribution could be used to maximum effect. The principal value of BAA's contribution is in creating a flexible approach to affordable housing provision. It would be instrumental in attracting additional funding from other agencies, principally the Housing Corporation, and from individuals through assisted purchase. Government policy regarding affordable housing is to seek a multi-agency approach and to ensure delivery. It is expected that the Housing Corporation will endorse the</p>	<p>The further additional funding is welcomed.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stansted Airport Ltd is not prepared to fund an economic</li></ul>				
--	--	--	--	--	--

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
housing need.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development unit for the Council.</li> </ul> Funding for affordable housing will increase from £1.4 million to £2 million			approach outlined by BAA and this would bring significant benefits to the District, which in the past has had little success in attracting grant aid for housing.  Further consideration of the balance of funding for mitigation indicates that a further allocation of £200,000 can be accommodated, bringing the total to £2.2m;  With contributions from other agencies BAA expect the partnership approach to result in this being trebled.	
25a Impact of landside retail floorspace on vitality and viability of Bishop's Stortford or local centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There have been no objections from East Herts DC on the basis of the effect on shopping in Bishop's Stortford.</li> </ul>	The matter will be kept under review.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

## TRANSPORTATION

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
26. HA 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.	A sensitivity test required by the Highways Agency indicated that the M11 slips would still have capacity in 2018. It is not anticipated that the HA will remove the traffic signals or that there is compensation payable for disruption to business caused by congestion arising from the slips construction programme.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
27. Negotiate programme for provision of the new bus and coach station at the earliest opportunity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completion of the Zone A and B multi storey car parking is required before the new bus and coach station can be commenced in order to meet logistical requirements. The Zone B MSCP is projected to be complete in April 2005.</li> </ul>	It is acknowledged that adequate car parking capacity has to be maintained. The application for the Zones A and B multi-storey car parks is due to be heard at the meeting of this Committee on 12 <sup>th</sup> August 2002.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BAA is prepared, in principle, to provide up to £2 million to address such impacts where they are identified.</li> </ul>	This new commitment is welcomed.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
29. Commitment to review mode share targets to take account of future strategic projects and mechanism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stansted Airport Ltd will review the targets to take account of future strategic projects and proposes that the appropriate mechanism is the Transport Forum.</li> <li>• Stansted Airport Ltd is prepared to undertake a study of ways increasing the air passenger bus and coach mode share, taking total public transport mode share from 36% to 37% by 2010.</li> <li>• Stansted Airport Ltd will make financial provision of £1 million to cover both implementation of initiatives designed to increase the air passenger bus and coach mode share and improvements to local cycle and pedestrian access to the airport.</li> </ul>	The additional funding is potentially helpful.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
30. Safeguard potential for future east-west rail link	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safeguarding of land beyond the proposed head shunt agreed.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
31. Check current position on project to provide check in facilities at Liverpool Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cooperation of airlines is required to progress this initiative. At present there is limited interest. There has been a significant downturn in the use of the Paddington facility since September 2001 as a result of some of the airlines operating out of Heathrow no longer accepting baggage from remote checkins.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
32. Block parking in long stay car park to be pursued.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The extent and nature of on airport block parking arrangements at Gatwick are still being investigated.</li> </ul>	No further comment	Block parking will be required where possible	Block parking at Gatwick can represent up to 25% of the total on-airport long stay parking. It is centred on the south Terminal and is suited to holiday leisure passengers with fixed itineraries using charter flights. Currently 36% of Gatwick passengers use charter flights. At Stansted only 8% of passengers use charter flights and this is not expected to increase significantly. Overall therefore passengers' schedules are much less predictable than at Gatwick and as a consequence unsuited for block parking	It is considered that minimising the land take for surface car parking should be included in the obligation, and this would include block parking where possible
33. Keep use of BAA funded public transport services under review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
34. Fly parking study radius to be 5 miles. BAA to fund initiatives to address problems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed</li> <li>• Adequate financial provision will be made to enable agreed initiatives to address problems</li> </ul>	No further comments	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

#### **LANDSCAPING AND VISUAL EFFECTS**

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
35. More off site planting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreed where landowner consent can be obtained</li> <li>• Current proposals being explored include hedgerow/ tree planting along field boundaries at Duck End Birchanger and supplementary planting to the new A120 scheme at Parsonage Road Takeley, in addition to the agreed scheme at Hatfield Forest</li> </ul>	Stansted Airport's willingness to investigate additional opportunities is helpful.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
36. Evergreen planting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAA is taking an increasingly stringent line on dense planting proposals within the airport for air safety reasons.</li> <li>• Stansted Airport Ltd will consider the scope for including suitable evergreens in the species mix where planting takes place off airport.</li> </ul>	Appropriate species will be included in landscaping schemes	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
37. Planting should include some native specimen trees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing and proposed planting includes some specimen trees.</li> </ul>	This will continue	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment



## NATURE CONSERVATION

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stansted Airport Ltd is prepared to carry out monitoring in Hatfield Forest and East End Wood and the fen site within the airport boundary.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
39. Funding for remediation of effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessments suggest that there will not be any significant effect and therefore it is not appropriate to make financial provision for remediation at this stage.</li> </ul>	No further comment	Funding needs to be set aside, or some commitment made, for remediation of adverse effects on nature conservation if they materialise and are caused by the airport	No further comment	This is required in the recommended s106.
40. Investigate assessment of impacts on migrating geese in Hatfield Forest	The ES indicates that increased noise levels in Hatfield Forest affecting breeding birds may be a possible minor negative effect of the development . Its significance would be slight. Changes to bird migration are not identified as an effect.	The RSPB did not raise the issue in its representations.	Effects on the migration patterns of geese needs to be clarified	No further comment	No further comment

## ARCHAEOLOGY

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
41. BAA to be invited to fund museum displays in nearby communities (£3m start up costs plus running costs required)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stansted Airport Ltd proposes to establish a visitor centre on the north side of the airport in the Burton End area, where BAA owns land and property. There is a suitable building which could accommodate a permanent display and interpretation facilities, and storage of other finds in its range of outbuildings. A business plan would need to be drawn up to assess the revenue implications of projected income and costs. The visitor centre would feature other aspects of the airport besides archaeology. There are opportunities to establish nature trails in the grounds.</li> <li>A touring exhibition of display material could be funded from the proposed Community Fund.</li> </ul>	Community and Leisure officers have inspected the proposed premises to assess their suitability from a museum service perspective. With its views of the airport, the site is suited to accommodating a visitor centre. Discussions are continuing about accommodation for the archaeological resource centre and finds storage.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
42. Storage of finds from the airport needs to be addressed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above</li> </ul>	See above	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

## WASTE MANAGEMENT

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
43. 60% of waste arising at the airport should be diverted from landfill without use of incineration (except for food of foreign origin wastes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amount of waste recycled as a percentage of total arisings has risen from the 1998/9 base of 8% to 16.8% for the year 2001/2, exceeding the target of 15%. The stated target needs to be raised. Waste per passenger has reduced by 4.6%. The total arisings figure includes waste from 95% of on airport companies, that is those who use Stansted Airport Ltd's main contractor.</li> <li>Stansted Airport Ltd is committed in 2002/3 to increase the amount of waste recycled as a percentage of total arisings, to 20% by 31 March 2003.</li> <li>Further consideration will be given to a commitment to a longer term target within a range between 20% and an upper limit to be confirmed.</li> </ul>	This issue of specific targets can be pursued through the review of the airport waste management strategy.	Higher targets for the amount of waste recycled as a percentage of total arisings would be more challenging.	Agreed	This is incorporated in the recommended s106
44. MRF to be secured. Airlines should pay for separation of their wastes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to the contribution towards the capital cost of a Materials Reclamation Facility (MRF) offered (£350,000), Stansted Airport Ltd is prepared to make an additional contribution to its running costs, the sum to be confirmed.</li> </ul>	The principle of an additional contribution towards MRF running costs is helpful.	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
45. Financial contribution to waste reduction initiatives should be increased.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grants towards the capital cost of the MRF may be available from EEP subsidiary Remade Essex.</li> </ul>	This could be pursued through the review of the airport waste strategy	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

## ENERGY MANAGEMENT

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
46. Existing buildings suffer from significant thermal losses. Better designs required. Involve Building Surveyors.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stansted's Satellite 2 is the BAA Group benchmark building for thermal efficiency. It includes a Combined Heat and Power plant.</li> <li>• BAA's target is to achieve an increase in efficiency of 20% above Satellite 2 levels. Satellite 3 was designed to this standard. Its performance is currently being assessed.</li> </ul>	No further comment	Quantification of the thermal efficiency of Satellite 2	Awaited	
47. Compensation scheme for CO2 emissions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BAA is committed across its group to increase its purchase of electricity from renewable sources from 3.5% at present to 10% by 2010, and to achieve an absolute reduction in its company level of emissions from a 1998/9 base by 2005.</li> <li>• Gas is used to heat the terminal and offices.</li> <li>• BAA's corporate approach is to reduce emissions at source rather than make carbon tax payments.</li> </ul>	No further comment	Stansted Airport should seek to purchase a higher percentage of energy from renewable sources than the BAA Group target	No further comment	This is incorporated in the recommended s106

## WATER MANAGEMENT

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
48. There must be sufficient water supply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate water supplies are available by dedicated main from Sibleys reservoir. The local community will experience no change in the level of service from Three Valleys Water due to the expansion of the airport.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
49. Adequate safeguards to prevent pollution of Pincey Brook required.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The quality and quality of discharges into the Pincey Brook from the balancing ponds is controlled by the Environment Agency consent.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
50. Adequate safeguards to ensure that the development will not contribute to any repeat of flooding on the Pincey Brook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

## CONSTRUCTION

Member Request/issue	Applicant's response	Officer Comment	Further Member Comment 16/8/02	Applicant's Response	Further Officer Comment
51. Restrictions on access routes for construction vehicles – must avoid local roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BAA will impose controls on construction traffic routes though contract conditions, as it did for the Phase 1 and 2 projects. It will operate a “lorry watch” system again.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
52. Restrictions on hours of working	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Restrictions on hours of working will be agreed</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
53. Re-use of materials arising within development site where ever possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Material arising on site will be re used wherever possible. The contractor recycles 80% of construction waste which is removed from the site.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

**COMMUNITY TRUST/ ENVIRONMENTAL FUND**

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
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 e.g. in 2010 at 25 mppa, annual contribution in that year would be £2m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stansted Airport Ltd is offering to establish a fund financed by total contributions of £700,000 over 7 years, and fine income potentially totalling £200,000 over the same period. This is a similar level of contribution to the fund BAA has established at Gatwick. The Stansted proposal therefore represents a higher level of contribution per passenger. The fund would be for the promotion, enhancement, improvement, protection and conservation of the social, educational, environmental and economic well being of the wider community.</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	The Community Fund would be a matter for the Council and the Funds trustees, but Match funding could be attracted for projects supported by the Community fund, which would increase the total value of projects.	No further comment
55. Environmental trust needed in addition to community trust fund, with initial funding of £5m	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The company is not prepared to establish an additional environmental trust</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
56. Levy per passenger of £5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The company is not prepared to offer a passenger levy</li> </ul>	Planning legislation does not extend to seeking what would effectively be an alternative taxation regime and it is not possible to require a passenger levy	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

**MONITORING**

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
57. Independent monitoring of air, noise and other pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See 14 above</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment
58. Full assessments of effects at relevant points in development programme. Dates to be specified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stansted Airport Limited would agree to carry out comprehensive reviews in 2005 and 2009</li> </ul>	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment	No further comment

**FUTURE DEVELOPMENT**

<b>Member Request/issue</b>	<b>Applicant's response</b>	<b>Officer Comment</b>	<b>Further Member Comment 16/8/02</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>	<b>Further Officer Comment</b>
59. Applicant to be invited to enter into obligation not to seek consent for development beyond 25 mppa nor for additional runways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BAA is not prepared to enter into any obligation preventing an application for additional terminal capacity or runway capacity.</li> </ul>	No further comment	Some form of commitment is required	BAA is unable to give any undertaking on future runway and terminal capacity	No further comment