

**SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AND LICENSING COMMITTEE held  
at COUNCIL OFFICES GREAT DUNMOW at 10.00 am on 16 AUGUST  
2002**

Present: Councillor R B Tyler – Chairman.  
Councillors E C Abrahams, W F Bowker, Mrs M A Caton,  
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 Chairman's invitation: Councillors R J Copping and  
R A Merrion.

Officers in attendance: Mrs L Bunting, R Harborough, J Mitchell, J Pine and  
R M Secker.

Members of the public in attendance: D Anderson, R Sibley and R Meloy –  
BAA; Mrs M Porter and Miss F Jarvis – Student.

**APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs C A Cant and  
Mrs J F Cheetham.

**APPLICATION UTT/1000/01/OP STANSTED AIRPORT**

The Committee received a report setting out BAA Plc and Stansted Airport Limited's response to the points raised by Members for officers to negotiate with the applicants. Extensive consideration had been given to the effects of the proposed development at the meetings held on 24 June, 24 and 31 July 2002.

The applicant's responses were then discussed in detail by Members.

**Air Noise**

- 1 *Officers had been requested to negotiate a charging regime with BAA designed to achieve the early phasing out of marginal Chapter 3 aircraft.*

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying reported that the Government's recent consultation exercise, which had been published on 31 July 2002, covered the issue of phasing out marginal Chapter 3 aircraft. Officers considered this issue should be addressed through the process proposed by the Government. The consultation period would continue until the end of October and Members had the opportunity to respond to the proposals put forward by the Government. A report would be presented to a future meeting of the Environment and Transport Committee.

- 2 *BAA should be required to apply for consent from the Department for Transport to ban marginal chapter 3 aircraft.*

The applicant's response to this was that legislation did not enable them to put a ban on any type of aircraft and consequently the mechanism to ensure achievement of this request was not in place. Officers commented that it was open to the Council to make representations to the Government in this respect.

In response to a question, the Principal Planning Officer advised that marginal Chapter 3 aircraft currently represented about 5% of ATMs at Stansted. It was expected there would be no marginal Chapter 3 movements at Stansted by the time 25 mppa was reached.

Members asked whether BAA had made representations to the Secretary of State asking him to ban marginal Chapter 3 aircraft. They felt that the company could also do more to discourage such movements in the short term through increasing the landing charge differential.

### *3 Noise insulation grant schemes*

In an effort to progress outstanding issues regarding noise insulation, Stansted Airport Ltd had offered to administer consultation on a scheme to address 15 mppa effects for the Department for Transport (DfT). It would also be urging the DfT to organise a technical team to carry out the design of a statutory 15 to 25 mppa scheme. Stansted Airport Ltd would furthermore commit funds to implement a statutory scheme for 25 mppa as soon as practicable and it was also prepared to use the financial provision for the statutory scheme that remained unallocated to provide insulation to community buildings within the scheme area on a voluntary basis. BAA however, was not prepared to offer a voluntary scheme over a wider area than the statutory scheme, but it would treat properties immediately outside the scheme. For example, all dwellings in a group of houses would be insulated.

Officers considered that the implementation of the 8 to 15 mppa scheme had been slow and the willingness of Stansted Airport Ltd to expedite matters was seen as helpful. The new proposals for additional insulation work on a voluntary basis were also helpful but limited in range.

Councillor Mrs Caton welcomed the offer of further insulation schemes. Referring to the insulation of community buildings, she considered that educational establishments were more worthy of being insulated against noise. She said that the school in Thaxted was outside the 57 Leq noise contour but the sound of aircraft overhead affected the children. Councillor Mrs Caton also asked officers for large scale maps of the noise contours to be provided for Members.

Councillor Mrs Godwin said she was still concerned about this issue and considered that Stansted Airport should commit itself to make offers of insulation by an agreed deadline. Councillor Merrion said there was no consideration of noise effect under NPRs. Contours based on Leq were discredited. Councillor Thawley welcomed the offer put forward but was disappointed that Stansted Airport were not prepared to offer a more extensive voluntary scheme. He said that noise was having an enormous impact on people living in the area and that statutory schemes would be

inadequate. He considered that Stansted Airport should go beyond the minimum required.

Councillor Bowker agreed with Councillor Mrs Caton in her concerns about the effect noise was having on school children and said he would be contacting the head teacher at Newport Junior School with a view to assessing this. Councillor Mrs Godwin suggested that it was difficult to provide appropriate and effective insulation to Listed Buildings. Councillor Green asked if there had been any public comment on lack of satisfaction with the insulation grants. Councillor Copping said that insulation measures assumed that residents kept their doors and windows shut.

- 4 *Night flights must not increase beyond the current level and must reduce over time.*

These matters were determined by the Secretary of State for Transport and not the airport operator.

Officers had recommended restrictions on night flights but had been advised verbally by the DfT that this was unacceptable. Officers had now written to the Government Office for the East of England seeking clarification of the possible implications of the Council imposing additional restrictions by conditions on any planning permission and a response was awaited. Members acknowledged that the Secretary of State imposed a cap on the maximum numbers of night time movements and a night noise quota system, but questioned whether there was action Stansted Airport Ltd could take to discourage night time activity. They asked that Officers should continue to pursue these issues. Councillor Mrs Caton said she was not convinced by verbal assurances and that an applicant could volunteer something if a condition could not be imposed. Councillor Mrs Dean asked whether the shoulder periods could be lengthened and Councillor Merrion remarked that early shoulder period flights were increasing.

- 5 *Increase scope of penalty scheme for infringement of air noise control measures to include controls on landing aircraft and increase the level of fines. Charges to discourage night time movements and action to involve DfT in discussions.*

The applicant's response had been that such controls needed to be imposed by the Government. Any new controls had to be subject to public consultation with the aviation industry and others as well as the local community. The Government had considered setting maximum noise limits for landing aircraft but this had been regarded as unfeasible. However, advice from the Aircraft Noise Monitoring Advisory Committee (ANMAC) had suggested an Industry Code of Practice on Noise from Landing Aircraft and this had been published in September 2001. It was felt by the applicant that the Noise and Track Keeping Working Group (NTKWG) was the mechanism for raising problems based on evidence of performance with the DfT. With regard to higher rate landing charges for night time landings, these had been introduced at Heathrow to avoid the operational problems caused by long haul scheduled early morning flights arriving before time. Night time charges had been raised to the peak rate charge so that there was no financial incentive to land before the beginning of the peak rate charge at 07:00 GMT.

Officers considered that, in view of the key role of the Department of Transport, the NTKWG should be used to pursue any problems that materialise. There may also need to be a review of the landing charges structure at Stansted if a similar problem to that of Heathrow were to develop.

Councillor Mrs Caton, who is a member of the NTKWG, stated that the Code of Practice was being implemented by the main airline operators at Stansted, but this did not affect the number of night time movements. Members considered that higher night-time landing charges were justified now.

*6 Compensation for reduction in property values and purchase of properties under flight paths.*

The Land Compensation Act provided the statutory basis for compensation arrangements. Compensation was payable where there was a reduction in property values as a result of public works including an increase in the level of aircraft noise resulting from airport development.

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying said that financial compensation was not an issue that could be addressed in determining a planning application. Councillor Mrs Godwin asked if BAA could do something to expedite compensation. She suggested that the Council should compile a database of property values.

*7 BAA to fund study of the effectiveness of LAeq as an indicator of disturbance from aircraft noise.*

The applicant understood that the Government was currently carrying out a review of the issue of disturbance from aircraft noise to inform the review of the night noise regime. As that work was already in progress, BAA would not fund a separate study, which would duplicate work being undertaken by the CAA for the Government.

Officers stated that this issue was being addressed in the context of national airports policy. 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, and the conclusions of the Inspector regarding the adequacy of the Leq index as an indicator, Members could reasonably expect opportunities to pursue this issue directly with the Department of Transport within the next 12 to 18 months.

Councillor Mrs Caton considered that BAA should be asked to address retrospectively the inadequacies of noise effect measures if the Government subsequently accepted that community annoyance was more widespread than currently acknowledged. The Head of Planning and Building Surveying said that he would pursue this further.

*8 Seek opportunity for UDC involvement in DfT's study to reassess attitudes to aircraft noise.*

Response as in 7 above.

9 *Targets need to be included in obligations, as opposed to reasonable endeavours.*

The applicant's response was that BAA would be happy to accept targets where they had control over their achievement.

Officers would negotiate targets where possible.

Councillor Copping expressed concern that targets would only be agreed where BAA had control. He sought targets where BAA had significant influence over outcomes and that it should be held to account over its performance, even if it did not have control. The Chairman stated that he hoped that Councillor Copping was wrong and that the Committee would make a balanced decision.

Councillor Green urged that these matters be moved forward through negotiations with BAA. He cautioned that the financial implications of measures had to be taken into account.

Councillor Thawley said that he would welcome negotiation with BAA but there would always be a caveat that there were limits to what it could commit itself to deliver. The Head of Planning and Building Surveying said measures would be in place to monitor performance against targets. This needed to be a transparent process with public reporting, on an annual basis where possible.

Councillor Mrs Godwin considered that Stansted Airport should fund a monitoring officer and agreed with the Head of Planning and Building Surveying that there was a need for a more proactive process. Reasons for failure should be made clear: the public wanted to know what goes wrong. Councillor Mrs Caton said that Environmental Services do look at noise and track keeping. Councillor Green asked if more money from fines could be used for this purpose and Councillor Mrs Loughlin asked if fines were high enough to reduce poor track keeping.

Councillor Mrs Dean said that she wanted to see more specific measures from BAA to reduce noise levels.

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying stated a comprehensive report would be prepared for the meeting of the Committee on 12 September setting out all the proposed measures to control the effects of the proposed development including noise.

10 *Pursue with DfT the allocation of aircraft to QC bands. Seek opportunities for UDC to be involved in review of QC rating system.*

The applicant had responded that the DfT reviewed aircraft ratings every six months. ANMAC's work programme included monitoring actual noise levels of aircraft under various operating conditions. Measurements from the fixed and mobile monitors at Stansted were part of the data collected. ANMAC was due to publish a report in November of its study of the QC classification review. This would be subject to consultation. The mechanism therefore exists for the Council to be involved in the QC rating system.

Councillor Thawley suggested that this was another opportunity where Stansted Airport and the Council could work together, but it was acknowledged that the Council had no particular expertise in this technical field, and if necessary it would need specialist advice.

*11 Requirement to fund monitoring of air noise effects on residential homes and schools and funding for relocation of establishments of vulnerable people, if necessary.*

The applicant's response was that Stansted Airport Ltd can and does respond to any concerns raised by schools and other bodies by investigations using mobile monitors. Considerable monitoring had been carried out at St Elizabeth's School at Hadham and it would continue to carry out such exercises where required. The NTKWG coordinated such monitoring work and the results would be reported. No complaints from local education authorities concerning the effect of noise and pollution on schools had been received.

Officers reported that monitoring arrangements would remain. Should pollution, which was directly attributable to the airport, become so great as to require relocation of schools etc, then this would have been done in any event. It was not anticipated that forecast levels of activity arising from this application would result in such an eventuality.

Councillor Mrs Godwin asked if the Council had its own monitoring systems. The Head of Environmental Services said that there was a fixed monitor in Takeley and new mobile equipment was being procured. Councillor Mrs Caton said that the monitoring at St Elizabeth's School had taken place over an extended period. She also confirmed that the NTKWG was able to include proposals for local monitoring in the work programme.

*12 Avoidance of an early morning arrivals peak.*

The applicant had responded that, at Stansted, these matters were determined by the Secretary of State for Transport and not the airport operator.

Officers had recommended a condition capping the number of early morning arrivals in the night shoulder period. The Head of Planning and Building Surveying referred to his earlier response that the Government's views on planning conditions imposing additional restrictions to those under the statutory night restrictions scheme were being pursued. He would report back in due course.

*13 Greater parity of landing charges at Gatwick, Heathrow and Stansted.*

The applicant's response stated that different charges reflect the relative strengths of market demand and the different capping levels set by the CAA as the London airports' economic regulator.

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying said that this matter could not be influenced through the planning system.

*14 Independent monitoring of air noise effects.*

The applicant stated that BAA carried out comprehensive environmental monitoring which was scrutinised by a Registered Environmental Impact Assessor. Records such as engine ground noise running reports were available for inspection by the Council. It was not prepared to fund monitoring by another party.

Following questions from Members, the Head of Environmental Services said that the Council and BAA's auditors had full access to the reports and records. Councillor Thawley felt that the issue was not the measurement of air noise, which he acknowledged was subject to scrutiny, but measuring how it was perceived by the community. This was not being monitored.

**Ground Noise**

*15 Priority to be attached to reducing ground noise at source.*

The applicant had responded that Fixed Electrical Ground Power supplies (FEGP) were available at all south side stands for the passenger and cargo terminals and all new stands would be provided with supplies. Improvements would be made to existing provision where necessary and this would be maintained. There was a financial incentive to use FEGP rather than the Ground Power Units (GPU). A Director's Notice setting out procedures for the control of ground running of aircraft engines, and all running must be in accordance with these procedures and approved by Airside Operations. Running on part power or high power must avoid early mornings and late evenings if possible. Controls were proposed over operations on Echo apron at night because of the close proximity to Molehill Green. Stansted Airport Ltd would keep the provision of Preconditioned Air supplies under review.

Officers stated that 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 system required by condition GN2. This would include measures to ensure that FEGP was used in preference to APUs when available.

Members commented that the applicant must offer more positive proposals in relation to providing Pre Conditioned Air than just keeping the issue under review. In this connection, they sought information on the duration of aircraft on stands between arrival and departure.

*16 Attenuation measures required: bunding around ends of 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 aprons A, B, Y and Z instead of blast deflectors; consider absorptive surfaces.*

The applicants considered that the height of Mole Hill Green mound was adequate and that it was high enough to take into account of taxiing noise generated by aircraft with tail mounted engines operating at the time it had been designed. However, additional planting could be done on the mound in

the grassed area on part of the crest. Stansted Airport Ltd does not consider any additional bunds or noise walls would be effective in reducing ground noise noticeably because its noise consultants advise that bunds/walls would only be effective where the structure was either close to the source of the noise or the receivers of the noise are close together. The layout of the airport, in which buildings or proposed buildings bound the main aprons on three sides, would contain the noise from activities in these areas. Stansted Airport Ltd had not received any complaints about ground noise from Burton End.

Councillor Mrs Godwin stated that she had been impressed with work to increase the height of bunds and the provision of noise walls at Gatwick and asked why this could not be done at Stansted. She said that there was a large gap in the bund at Molehill Green. She also considered that it was important that landscaping be retained in perpetuity. Councillor Mrs Caton said she was not convinced about bunding, but wondered whether there was a problem at Burton End. The Vice Chairman said that dense tree cover was effective in absorbing noise, and Councillor Green agreed. Councillor Mrs Godwin said that the airport was on a plateau, which meant that noise travelled a distance.

### **Air Quality**

*17 Independent monitoring agency required.*

Response as in 14 above.

*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.*

Stansted Airport Ltd considered 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. The Head of Environmental Services referred to mobile equipment which would be used as appropriate.

Councillor Thawley considered that Officers should continue to follow up this issue. He stressed that the required study of health effects should not focus solely on those triggered by poor air quality. He accepted that a large population study was not appropriate to the Stansted context and suggested that a smaller cohort study should be conducted.

*19 Odour study*

BAA would fund an odour study.

Councillor Mrs Godwin said that a study should be undertaken immediately and the Head of Environmental Services reported that work was in hand in dealing with this issue. In response to Members' questions about oily deposits on water bodies and external surfaces, he confirmed that previous investigations of samples had indicated that aircraft were not the source.



## **Economic Effects**

*20 Set target of 25% air freight to use rail for surface access by 2008.*

The applicant had responded that there needed to be a business case for using rail for cargo purposes. A high proportion of air freight was handled at Stansted by integrators which meant that efficient use was made of road vehicles, therefore the number of trips was minimised.

Officers considered that there was unlikely to be a demand for rail freight facilities and the adverse environmental implications of using road were not high. The Strategic Rail Authority had confirmed that the rail infrastructure works it had identified as necessary at the airport would not preclude the provision of rail freight facilities at a future date. Members suggested that if there was no demand for rail freight services at present, facilities should nevertheless be provided so that the infrastructure was available for use, or land should be safeguarded for the future provision of facilities. The Chairman sought more information about the nature of air freight business at Stansted.

*21 Initiatives to encourage air freight to relocate elsewhere.*

The applicant's response stated that this activity was market driven and located at Stansted because of its strategic accessibility. Freight integrators operated to stringent environmental practice and used modern quiet aircraft. BAA would analyse the QC rating of night time CATMs for comparison with night time PATMs.

*22 Initiatives to encourage companies supplying the airport to locate in Regeneration Areas.*

The applicant reported that the Business Forum had an Inward Investment Sub Group to identify practical initiatives and a web site would be established as a tool to facilitate business between airport companies and suppliers.

Councillor Thawley considered that this was a good initiative and welcomed the activity.

*23 Identify the principal freight interchanges in the SRA Strategic Plan.*

The applicant did not consider that this was a matter for BAA.

Officers advised that the rail freight priorities in the SRA's strategic plan were container and bulk transfers between the major seaports and large conurbations.

At 12.30 pm the meeting adjourned for lunch and reconvened at 1.15 pm.

## **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Abrahams, Mrs Caton and Merrion as they had had to leave the meeting.

## **APPLICATION UTT/1000/01/OP STANSTED AIRPORT continued**

### **Economic Effects continued**

#### *24 BAA to encourage green tourism in the local area.*

The applicant had responded that the Business Forum had a tourism sub group which was 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 the airport and to work with airlines to grow a winter travel market supporting local hotel occupancy rates when traditionally they had spare capacity.

#### *25 Mitigate effects on tight labour market by funding for teleworking; funding for EDO; recruitment and training initiatives; travel card scheme eligibility; additional funding for affordable housing.*

The applicant's response was that diversity in the local economy through greater teleworking would be supported through the East of England Development Agency's (EEDA's) enabling programme to extend broadband access. Sufficient funding was being offered to enable BAA's training and employment promotion initiative programmes to continue. Some of the courses run by Stansted Airport Ltd develop transferable skills which had wider relevance than addressing the recruitment requirements of airport companies. Stansted Airport Ltd would be pleased to provide presentations to the Business Forum and share its experience of setting up the Travelcard initiative. The DfT had recently published guidance for companies on how to implement successful travel plans which demonstrated that it was open to large employers to negotiate their own schemes with transport operators. Stansted Airport Ltd was not prepared to fund an economic development unit for the Council. It was prepared to increase its funding for affordable housing from £1.4 million to £2 million, to enable continued support for assisted purchase as well as an element of social rented housing as requested by Members.

Officers reported that the airport was already involved in initiatives which addressed Members' requirements. The travel card scheme was a discount that BAA had negotiated with local transport operators. It did not provide fares subsidies or financial contributions to employees towards the cost of the operators' Travelcard product.

Councillor Thawley welcomed the assurance from Stansted Airport Ltd that it would be happy to advise on the establishment of travel plans and partnerships with operators for other groups of employers and commented that the Council should be involved in an enabling role to ensure that schemes were implemented.

The additional funding for affordable housing was welcomed and discussions were continuing with Stansted Airport and a potential housing association partner on the best ways of applying the funding offered.

The Principal Planning Officer updated Members on these discussions. It was anticipated that the funding offered by BAA would enable a package proposal

to be put together with significant potential to attract funding from other sources, particularly the Housing Corporation, as the assisted purchase scheme element fitted well with its key worker housing strategic priorities. As a consequence, it was expected that a worthwhile scheme, including both social rented homes and equity loans, could be provided.

Councillor Miller considered that £2 million was still not enough and referred to the cost of housing. The Principal Planning Officer said that it was not appropriate to equate £2 million to the market value of new houses. It should be evaluated against the potential outcomes if it were used as a lever and catalyst for a partnership initiative. Councillor Mrs Godwin said that it was important to provide housing for rent for those on low incomes and considered that the whole amount should be spent on the rent sector. Councillor Thawley welcomed the increase in the amount but considered that it could be very much more. The Head of Planning and Building Surveying said that he hoped that Members could be provided with more information about the affordable housing scheme following further exploratory discussions.

*25a Impact of landside retail floor space on vitality and viability of Bishop's Stortford and other local centres to be assessed.*

Stansted Airport had responded that East Hertfordshire District Council had not objected to the development on the basis of the effect on shopping in Bishop's Stortford.

Councillor Mrs Godwin (speaking for Councillor Mrs Caton in her absence) said that Bishop's Stortford retailers might not be aware that shoppers from villages like Thaxted were going to the airport to shop. Councillor Mrs Loughlin did not consider that there would be much competition from the airport to surrounding towns.

## **Transportation**

*26 The Highways Authority to be asked to confirm when M11 slips were expected to be at capacity, whether it was envisaged that the signal control on the Birchanger roundabout would be removed and whether compensation was available for disruption during the slip construction programme.*

It had been reported by the Highways Authority that a sensitivity test had indicated that the M11 slips would still have capacity in 2018, assuming no airport development beyond that proposed in the current application. It was not anticipated that the traffic signals would be removed or that there would be compensation payable for disruption to businesses.

*27 Negotiate programme for provision of new bus and coach station at the earliest opportunity.*

It was reported that completion of Zone A and B multi storey car parking was required before the new bus and coach station could be commenced, to ensure that adequate short term car park capacity would be available during the construction period and safe temporarily relocated facilities could be provided for bus and coach passengers while reconstruction was carried out.

The Zone B multi story car park was projected to be complete in April 2005. Councillor Thawley considered that completion of the new facilities should be required by a date that took into account these logistical factors.

*28 Negotiate base line study of effects of airport related traffic on the local road network and contingency fund to address any significant airport related impacts post development.*

BAA had responded that it was prepared, in principle, to provide up to £2 million to address such impacts where they were identified.

Officers reported that this new commitment was welcomed. Members sought clarification that the applicant was offering to fund the base line study and post development monitoring.

*29 Commitment to review mode share targets to take account of future strategic projects and mechanism.*

Stansted Airport Ltd would review the targets to take account of future strategic rail projects and proposed that the appropriate mechanism was the Transport Forum. It was prepared to undertake a study of ways of increasing the air passenger bus and coach station mode share, taking total public transport mode share from 36% to 37% by 2010. Also it would 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.

Officers considered that the additional funding was potentially helpful.

*30 Safeguard potential for future east-west rail link.*

It was confirmed that the safeguarding of land beyond the proposed head shunt had been agreed.

*31 Check current position on project to provide check-in facilities at Liverpool Street.*

The applicant had responded that the co-operation of airlines was required to progress this initiative. At present there was limited interest. There had 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 check-ins.

Officers reported that this issue had been put on hold for the time being.

*32 Block parking in long stay car park to be pursued.*

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying advised that, following further investigation, it had been ascertained that there was some on airport block parking at Gatwick serving the South Terminal. However, this was associated with the leisure charter flight sector of the market, with passengers' cars being parked for standard eight or fifteen day periods. This market was not significant at Stansted. Councillor Mrs Godwin said that block parking

potential should be kept under review as it may need to become the standard practice for long stay at Stansted.

*33 Keep use of BAA funded public transport services under review.*

This had been agreed by the applicant.

*34 Fly parking study radius to be five miles. BAA to fund initiatives to address problems.*

This had been agreed and adequate financial provision would be made to enable agreed initiatives to address problems.

The Principal Planning Officer referred to a localised study by Stansted Airport Ltd on fly parking which was due to take place shortly in Takeley.

### **Landscaping and Visual Effects**

*35 More off site planting.*

It was reported that this would be agreed where consent from landowners could be obtained. Current proposals being explored were 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.

Officers had commented that Stansted Airport's willingness to investigate additional opportunities was helpful.

*36 Evergreen Planting*

The CAA was taking an increasingly stringent line on dense planting proposals within the airport for air safety reasons. Stansted Airport would consider the scope for including suitable evergreens in the species mix where planting took place off airport.

Officers confirmed that appropriate evergreen species could be included in landscaping schemes off airport.

*37 Planting should include some native specimen trees.*

It was reported that existing and proposed planting included some native specimen trees.

### **Nature Conservation**

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

Stansted Airport Ltd was prepared to carry out monitoring in Hatfield Forest and East End Wood and the fen site within the airport boundary. Members

acknowledged that monitoring of these sites would indicate whether airport development was causing adverse nature conservation effects or not.

*39 Funding for remediation of effects.*

The applicant had responded that assessments had suggested that there would not be any significant effect and therefore it was not appropriate to make financial provision for remediation at this stage. Members considered that some assurance about remediation should be given in the event that effects did become apparent.

*40 Investigate assessment of impacts on migrating geese in Hatfield Forest.*

It was reported that the Environmental Statement indicated that increased noise levels in Hatfield Forest affecting breeding birds could be a possible minor negative effect of the development. Its significance would be slight. Changes to bird migration were not identified as an effect.

Officers advised that the RSPB had not raised the issue in its representations. Councillor Mrs Godwin requested that officers should ascertain whether the RSPB had any concerns about the implications of the development for geese.

## **Archaeology**

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

Stansted Airport Ltd had responded that it proposed to establish a visitor centre on the north site of the airport in the Burton End area, where BAA owned land and property. 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 such as ecology besides archaeology. There were opportunities to establish nature trails in the grounds. A touring exhibition of display material would be funded from the proposed Community Fund.

Community and Leisure officers had inspected the proposed location to assess its suitability from a museum service perspective. With its views of the airport the site was suited to accommodating a visitor centre. Discussions were continuing regarding accommodation for the archaeological resource centre and finds storage. There appeared to be potential to reach agreement on this issue.

*42 Storage of finds from the airport needed to be addressed.*

Response as in 41 above.

## **Waste Management**

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

The applicant had responded that the amount of waste recycled as a percentage of total arisings had risen from the 1998/9 base of 8% to 16.8% for the year 2001/02 exceeding the target of 15%. Waste per passenger had reduced by 4.6%. The total arisings figure included waste from 95% of on airport companies, that is those who use Stansted Airport Ltd as main contractor. Stansted Airport was committed in 2002/03 to increase the amount of waste recycled as a percentage of total arisings to 20% by 31 March 2003. Further consideration would be given to a commitment to a longer term target within a range between 20% and an upper limit to be confirmed.

Officers reported that the issue of specific targets could be pursued through the review of the airport Waste Management Strategy.

Councillor Thawley welcomed the information and asked that officers pursue the indication about higher targets. Councillor Mrs Godwin said that targets should be reviewed annually and performance reported.

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

The applicants had responded that, in addition to the contribution towards the capital cost of a Materials Reclamation Facility (MRF) offered, Stansted Airport Ltd was prepared to make an additional contribution to its running costs, the sum to be confirmed.

*45 Financial contribution to waste reduction initiatives should be increased.*

Stansted Airport Ltd had responded that grants towards the capital cost of the MRF could be available from EEP subsidiary Remade Essex.

Councillor Thawley commented that Remade Essex did not give any grants, but acknowledged that grants could be available from other sources.

## **Energy Management**

*46 Existing buildings suffer from significant thermal losses. Better designs required. Involve building surveyors.*

The applicant had responded that Stansted's Satellite Two was the BAA Group benchmark building for thermal efficiency. It included a combined heat and power plant. BAA's corporate target for new buildings was to achieve an increase in efficiency of 20% above Satellite Two levels. Satellite Three had been designed to this standard and its performance was currently being assessed.

Councillor Thawley welcomed this information and asked for quantification of Satellite Two's thermal efficiency. The Head of Planning and Building Surveying said that he understood that Satellite Two exceeded the latest more stringent Building Regulation requirements.

*47 Compensation scheme for CO2 emissions.*

The applicants reported that BAA was 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. Gas was used to heat the terminal and offices. BAA's corporate approach was to reduce emissions at source rather than make carbon tax payments.

Councillor Thawley commented that Stansted Airport should purchase a higher percentage of its electricity from renewable sources than the BAA Group target.

**Water Management**

*48 There must be sufficient water supply.*

The applicant had responded that adequate water supplies were available by dedicated main from Sibleys reservoir. The local community would experience no change in the level of service from Three Valleys Water due to the expansion of the airport.

*49 and 50 Adequate safeguards to prevent pollution of Pincey Brook required and adequate safeguards to ensure that the development would not contribute to any repeat of flooding at Pincey Brook.*

The applicant had responded that the quality and quantity of discharges into Pincey Brook from the balancing ponds was controlled by the Environment Agency consent.

**Construction**

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

Stansted Airport Ltd had responded that it would impose controls on construction traffic routes through contract conditions as for the Phase 1 and 2 projects and it would operate a "lorry watch" system again.

*52 Restrictions on hours of working.*

The applicant had responded that restrictions on hours of working would be agreed.

*53 Re-use of materials arising within development site wherever possible.*

The applicant had responded that materials arising on site would be re-used wherever possible. The contractor recycled 80% of construction waste which was removed from the site.



## Community Trust/Environmental Fund

54 *Members' counter proposal was an initial contribution of £500,000 with additional annual contributions at a rate of 20p per passenger in excess of 15m passengers – e.g. in 2010 at 25 mppa, annual contribution in that year would be £2m.*

Stansted Airport had responded that it was offering a fund financed by total contributions of £700,000 over seven years and fine income potentially totalling £200,000 over the same period. This was a similar level of contribution to the fund BAA had established at Gatwick. The Stansted proposals therefore represented a higher level of contribution per passenger.

55 *Environmental Trust required in addition to the Community Trust Fund with an initial funding of £5m.*

The applicant had responded that the company was not prepared to establish an additional Environmental Trust.

56 *A levy per passenger of £5.*

The applicant had responded that the company was not prepared to offer a passenger levy.

Officers commented that planning legislation did not extend to imposing what would effectively be a new tax and it was not possible to require a passenger levy.

Councillor Mrs Godwin stated that, while she understood that it was not in the Council's powers, other countries charged between £5 and £10 per passenger towards the environmental costs of airports. If charges were imposed here it would enable a significant programme of measures to offset the effects of the airport on the area. She considered that the Council should start lobbying the Government for the imposition of a levy on landing charges hypothecated to benefits for the local area.

## Monitoring

57 *Independent monitoring of air, noise and other pollution.*

Response as in 14 above.

58 *Full assessments of effects at relevant points in development programme. Dates to be specified.*

The applicants had responded that Stansted Airport Ltd would agree to carry out comprehensive reviews in 2005 and 2009.

In response to Members' comments that more than two studies would be required to establish data trends, the Principal Planning Officer said that data would be regularly collected. The studies proposed for 2005 and 2009 would be comprehensive reviews of the effects of the development as it was implemented and the anticipated effects at 25 mppa. They would be in

addition to the ongoing collection of data and annual reporting already undertaken.

### **Future Development**

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

The applicant had responded that BAA was not prepared to enter into an obligation preventing an application for additional terminal capacity or runway capacity.

Councillor Thawley considered that, as a company, BAA could make that obligation. Whether the Government would be constrained by such an obligation was a separate issue. He said that he was disappointed by the company's response.

The Head of Planning and Building Surveying said that, in the context of the Government's current review of airports policy and consultation on the future of aviation for the next 30 years, it would be difficult to achieve such an obligation, but in view of the strength of Members' feelings on the issue, he would discuss the matter further with the applicant.

In conclusion the Head of Planning and Building Surveying said that he did not consider that any further special meetings were necessary and he would prepare a report for the meeting to be held on 12 September 2002 drawing together all the points which had been raised by Members in considering the application.

RESOLVED that officers negotiate further with the applicants on the points raised by Members during the meeting.

The meeting ended at 2.30 pm.