

**EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held at  
COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 2.00 PM on  
13 JUNE 2006**

Present:- Councillor C M Dean – Vice Chairman in the chair  
Councillors E C Abrahams, J F Cheetham, C D Down, R F  
Freeman, E J Godwin, R T Harris, S C Jones, J I Loughlin, J E  
Menell, M Miller and A R Thawley.

Officers in attendance:- M Cox, R Harborough, J M Mitchell, M J Perry and  
J G Pine.

**DC22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor C A Cant.

Members declared the following interests:-

Councillor J F Cheetham a personal interest as a member of CPRE,  
NWEEPA and the Hatfield Forest Management Committee.

Councillor A R Thawley a personal interest as a member of CPRE and the  
National Trust

Councillor C D Down a personal interest as a member of CPRE

Council C M Dean a personal interest as a member of the National Trust.

**DC23 PUBLIC SPEAKER**

Chris Bennett from SSE spoke to the Committee about 3 issues of concern in  
BAA's Environmental Statement . These were BAA's suggestion that an  
increase of 3dB LAeq would not be perceptible relating to noise data, use of  
planning conditions based on QC point allocations, and his suggestion that  
the fleet mix sensitivity test would involve 40 mppa rather than 37.5 . He  
would submit a full written statement.

**DC24 PLANNING APPLICATION 0717/06/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT  
ASSESSING THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT**

The Committee considered the Environmental Statement that accompanied  
planning application UTT/0717/06/FUL, which would enable increased use of  
the airport's existing runway. The Environmental Statement was split into 16  
volumes with separate technical reports for each of the specialist topics. In  
order to assess the environmental effects of the proposal, STAL had  
developed a number of development cases which were used to assess the  
data in each topic. These were:-

Baseline - 2004 data reflecting the existing operation of the airport.

The 25mppa case – how the airport was expected to develop up to 2014 if the  
existing conditions remain in place

The 35mppa case – how the airport would develop up to 2014 if the planning  
permission was granted

The primary assessment case – the comparison between the 25 and 35 mppa cases

Sensitivity testing – considering the effects that could be brought about by changes to the assumed aircraft mix, and the passenger throughput that 264,000ATM's could deliver.

The Executive Manager Development Services and the Planning Policy and Conservation Manager presented details of 5 of the volumes and Members made the following comments.

**i) Volume 16 – Air Traffic Data**

Councillor Cheetham asked if an independent consultant would be verifying the forecasts. She was particularly wary about the assumption of an increased number of long haul flights as this had been envisaged as part of the 25million application and had not materialised. She questioned the number of cargo movements (CATMs), which were not assumed to increase further in the 35mppa case compared to 25mppa in 2014. She was advised that BAA was forecasting an increase in CATMs from 12k to 21k, which would approach the 22k limit under the permission granted in 2003. BAA had not applied to vary the CATM limit. She asked whether there would be increased cargo arrivals in the period 0400 – 0600.

Councillor Jones noted that there was no proposal to increase the number of night flights but asked what guarantee there was of this, as he had attended a recent presentation that indicated that cargo freight operators would prefer to operate during the night. Officers said that the airport was restricted by the night time quotas recently announced by the Secretary of State for the period to 2012.

Councillor Godwin noted the proposed increase in the number of flights within the shoulder periods. These flights were the most disruptive to local residents. She asked if the number of night flights in the shoulder periods were monitored.

Councillor Thawley questioned the basis of the arrivals / departures figures presented in the statement. Officers confirmed that the figures for 25mppa – 2014 predictions had been based on new assumptions but would check whether the 2004 figures reflected observed data.

Councillor Dean mentioned the reference to the increased attractiveness of shoulder period and off peak slots for the development of new services. She also asked whether helicopter movements were included. Officers confirmed that they were included in the 10,000 non-ATMs.

**ii) Volume 2 - Air Noise.**

Councillor Cheetham asked officers to seek an explanation from the consultants of PPG 24's advice that aircraft noise of 57dB LAeqT was equivalent to noise of 55dB from other sources because of ground reflection effects. She also asked for clarification that the Lmax profiles predicted changes at six specific sites, noting that the points were at varying distances from touchdown and take off roll.

Councillor Freeman referred to figure 24 and noted that this referenced the location of each site A to F for which LMax profiles were provided in the Statement. Councillor Thawley pointed out that the area under the graph curves was a key indicator of total noise energy likely to be experienced.

Councillor Dean drew attention to the effect on the noise figures of the proposed change in fleet mix.

Councillor Cheetham asked if the public could ask questions or if they had to be fed through Members. The Executive Manager – Corporate Governance explained that Council procedures did not allow for public questions. Councillor Thawley said that the rules had to be adhered to but had no difficulty with notes being fed to him. Councillor Thawley referred to the figures which showed the LMax distribution at a single departure and said it would have been more helpful if the figures had been based on observed measurements rather than modelling. He also queried whether air frame noise was included. He asked if there was any new survey data on community annoyance and how this related to LAeq and LMax levels. He also asked about the Noise Preferential Routes and was advised that BAA had assumed no change to the existing routes.

NATS had a phased programme of reviewing airspace management on a sector by sector basis. It had plans to review the London TMA north sector in due course to facilitate increased capacity at Stansted, Luton and London City airports. Its website set out proposals for a process of consultation and environmental appraisal of any changes. He was also informed that there was no LMax information for locations closer to the runway although BAA had been asked to provide information for a wider spectrum of points. Officers agreed to clarify with the consultants whether the noise profiles included landing aircraft as well as departures.

Councillor Cheetham asked if any data had been produced for a different modal split to the long run average 76% westerly and 24% easterly. She was advised that there was one sensitivity test that assumed a 86%/ 14% split. Councillor Godwin said there appeared to be discrepancies between Figure 8 and Volume 16 regarding departure movements profiles in terms of time of day. Officers said they would seek clarification.

### **iii) Volume 8 - Ground noise**

Councillor Jones queried the assessment that the ground noise from increased surface access would be imperceptible, in the light of the predictions of the number of vehicle trips in the 35 mppa case.

Councillor Cheetham commented that when Members had toured the airport they had noted that only one plane had been plugged into the Fixed Electrical Ground Power. It was understood that the low cost operators, as they had tight turn round times, tended to use their own Auxillary Power Units. Councillor Thawley said that there should be a mechanism to require airlines to use the FEGP. He sought an explanation of “moderate negative impacts” as indicated on P29. He was advised that the statement explained the criteria that BAA’s consultants had used.

Councillor Godwin asked whether the ground noise data took account of the intense noise of engines running on full thrust before take off. Officers agreed to clarify this with the consultants. She observed that the Birchanger monitor seemed to be shown in the wrong place.

Councillor Loughlin asked what “where practicable” meant on P27 in relation to minimising disturbance from ground noise. She asked what STAL’s strategy was. Who decided what is practicable.

Councillor Dean was concerned that there was no mention of Burton End on the assessment summary matrix on P29. It was not good enough to say that just because a location was already exposed to ground noise that mitigation was not required. It was confirmed that ground noise at Burton End exceeded benchmark levels in both the 25 and 35 mppa cases, but no new measures were proposed under the new application. Officers would be addressing this issue.

#### **iv) Volume Archaeology**

Cllr Godwin commented that there were a number of listed buildings located on the perimeter of the airport and asked if there had been any studies into the effect on buildings of noise vibrations. Officers agreed to look into this. Councillor Thawley asked that particular attention be paid to Thaxted Church as it was likely to suffer increased intensity of vibrations. Members were advised that English Heritage had been consulted on the application.

Councillor Cheetham mentioned that finds were ultimately handed over to the Saffron Walden Museum and asked if funding of storage and exhibition of material was provided. She asked if any type of find could stop development.

Councillor Menell also asked whether BAA assisted the museum in the upkeep and storage of the archaeological finds at the airport. The Council’s Solicitor said that there had been provision in the 25mppa planning obligation for a contribution to an Archaeological Resource Centre.

#### **v) Landscape and Visual Impact**

The Committee assessed the photographs of landscape views taken by the STAL and concluded that the visual impact seemed to be greater at night. Members also noted that the Parsonage Road Overbridge presented new views of the airport not available in 2002/3.

Councillor Cheetham suggested a site visit to assess the views not shown in the photographs and also to see the airport at night. She particularly referred to Hatfield Forest and Warish Hall Road. It was also suggested that Members should assess the noise impact at the sites that had been identified to the far north and south of the airport. Councillor Loughlin supported an evening visit to look at the effect of lighting.

Councillor Godwin thought that the low level lighting should be adopted more extensively and questioned whether lighting was really required on all buildings, especially the hangars. She would also like to see the planting of

more tall trees. She was also concerned about the “sea of cars” effect in the car parks and the effect of reflections from windscreens when passing the long term car park along the M11.

Councillor Menell likened the lighting of the airport to a forest fire. She asked why underground car parking could not be provided to eliminate the eyesore.

Councillor Harris likened the effect to a failed sunset that spoiled the skyline. The day time effect was reasonable, for instance viewpoint 11 in Figure 8. He asked for the use of cut-off luminaires in new car parks and whether there were powers to insist on these being retrofitted in existing car parks. The Executive Manager Corporate Governance advised Members that the powers in Clean Neighbourhoods Act to address problems with lighting did not extend to major transport infrastructure.

Councillor Dean asked what could be done to insist on measures to alleviate light pollution from the car parks. She was advised that a lighting strategy could be sought through the legal agreement and a structural landscaping scheme could be required as a condition.

Councillor Thawley asked whether need for further long stay and short stay car parking had been proven. Officers said that there had been no discussion yet on the details of the proposed long stay car parking that had been granted as part of the application for 25mppa.

**vi) Volume 12 - Third Party Risk**

Councillor Godwin asked for more information on the location of wake vortex strikes and whether they were in the Public Safety Zones. She also reminded the Committee that the Korean Air crash had occurred outside the PSZ.

Councillor Harris asked whether more accidents could be expected in the PSZ through increased air traffic. Officers advised that PSZs were based on the statistical probability of an individual permanently present on the ground in the locality being killed in a crash.

Councillor Thawley asked whether wake vortex strikes were sensitive to the aircraft mix. Could more long haul flights lead to more strikes?

Councillor Dean asked whether actual wake vortex strike figures were available. She felt that there was a lack of information in the relevant volume.

The meeting ended at 5.30pm.