

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING of the DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 6.30 pm on 14 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 J Miller and A R Thawley.

Also present:- Councillor M A Gayler.

Officers in attendance:- W Cockerell, R Harborough, J Mitchell, J Pine,
M J Perry and M T Purkiss.

DC25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P Boland and C A Cant.

DC26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Cheetham declared an interest as a member of the Hatfield Forest Management Committee, the National Trust and NWHEEPA. Councillor Down declared an interest as a member of the CPRE, Councillor C M Dean as a member of the National Trust, Councillor Menell as a non-executive director of the Uttlesford PCT and Councillor Thawley as a member of CPRE and the National Trust.

DC27 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND PARISH COUNCILS

Brian Ross, on behalf of the Friends of the Earth, and Ray Woodcock, on behalf of Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council made statements and these are appended to these minutes.

DC28 PLANNING APPLICATION 0717/06/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT – ASSESSING THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

The Committee considered the Environmental Impact Assessment that had accompanied planning application UTT/0717/06/FUL which would enable the airport to grow to serve 35mppa from the existing runway. The statement was split into 16 volumes that comprised separate technical reports for 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 – the latest survey and other data for the existing operation of the airport.

The 25mppa case – how the airport is expected to develop, subject to existing conditions.

The 35mppa case – how the airport would develop if planning permission was granted.

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

Sensitivity testing – considering the make up of the aircraft mix and the passenger throughput that 264,000 ATMs could deliver.

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

(i) Volume 3 – air quality

Councillor Cheetham asked whether there were any statistics prior to the airport being constructed which would be useful for comparative purposes. The Principal Environmental Health Officer said that some maps and other statistics had been produced when the original planning application had been submitted and he would see whether there was any useful information in these.

Councillor Godwin pointed out that there was little monitoring being undertaken north-west of the airport, particularly around Birchanger Wood and she asked whether it would be possible to commission a fresh study with the monitors being spread more widely. Councillor Down added that there was continuous assessment at other airports, but not at Stansted. The Principal Environmental Health Officer said that it was important to distinguish between monitoring and modelling. The monitoring around Heathrow was undertaken to help refine the models because the models were not accurately reflecting the current situation. He would check that the model improvements as a result of the recent Heathrow work had been incorporated into the Stansted modelling. He said that the Council's continuous monitoring station at Takeley meant that some historical data was available. There were a number of diffusion sites along the old A120 which had been positioned to help monitor the impact of realigning the A120. A mobile monitoring station had been stationed near Brick End, Broxted for the last year where over flying took place and this site was more appropriate than the Birchanger area, which was mainly affected by the M11. Diffusion tubes were not very accurate but they showed emission levels to be well below action levels. There was no reason to believe that locations more distant from the airport would show a different pattern.

Councillor Cheetham said that monitoring should also take place at Mole Hill Green in Broxted. The Principal Environmental Health Officer said that the mobile site was being used at the worse case site which was currently at Brick End and this could be moved to the other end of the runway in the near future.

Councillor Harris asked whether diffusion tubes would pick up a one-off incident such as the discharge of aviation fuel. The Principal Environmental

Health Officer explained how the monitoring took place and said that it was likely that a fuel discharge would be picked up on the mobile monitor. Councillor Thawley said that it was important that any short term concentrations resulting from the density of air craft movements were picked up as the toxicity over short periods could be significant. He acknowledged that the Government concentrated on long term average emission levels and carcinogens. He also asked if the monitoring at Stansted verified the output from the model being used. It was confirmed that it did.

Councillors Down and Godwin suggested that the brief to consultants should include an assessment of BAA's assessment. Councillor Cheetham asked whether East Herts DC had monitors and whether we had access to that information. She also suggested that monitoring needed to be taken further out from Uttlesford as particles dispersed to a much wider area. The Principal Environmental Health Officer advised that gases emitted dispersed widely and would be absorbed into background levels.

Councillor Dean said that she was particularly concerned about the impact of poor air quality on airport workers and said that this should be looked at in the health impact study.

(ii) Volume 7 – Energy

Councillor Godwin asked whether officers were satisfied with the measures for insulation and the use of green energy. Councillor Cheetham asked whether there were any 'actual' figures more recent than 2004. Councillor Thawley said that he was concerned at the predicted increase in carbon gas emissions from vehicles and plant when other industries were being forced to reduce emissions. Councillor Dean said that there needed to be a commitment to using energy from renewable sources and Councillor Loughlin asked whether solar panels could be incorporated into any buildings.

Officers said that more recent information would be sought, but 2004 was a consistent baseline across the ES topics. It was also confirmed that there was an energy strategy and the use of solar panels was being looked at by the Council's Energy Surveyor and Energy Efficiency Manager.

(iii) Paragraph 10 – Nature Conservation

Councillor Godwin said that most of the land set aside for nature conservation in the application was small areas and the larger areas of grass land were being lost. She also asked when Pincey Brook had last been surveyed and suggested that the general air quality across the district needed to be surveyed, because of the increase in tree loss and disease. Councillor Cheetham asked whether there were any figures on the percentage of ancient hedgerow which would be lost. Councillor Dean asked whether other forests across the country had been tested and whether Hales Wood was over flown. The Principal Environmental Health Officer said that a study had been undertaken in Epping Forest and he had spoken to the researcher and it might be possible to get diffusion tubes placed in Hatfield Forest. Councillor Loughlin asked whether any research had been undertaken on mammals that died around the airport and Councillor Menell asked whether badger sets were active around Heathrow and Gatwick and whether there were any

skylarks present at those sites. Officers said that all these issues would be followed up.

(iv) Volume 13 – Waste

Councillor Thawley said that he congratulated BAA on the targets which had been set and hoped that they would be achieved. He also asked whether there was scope to explore extra facilities being provided to help recycling in view of the extra waste arisings.

Councillor Godwin said that effluent from planes did not appear to be included.

(v) Volume 14 - Water

Councillor Godwin said that she was concerned at the situation in Pincey Brook and asked what had been done to ameliorate problems. She also expressed concern at the effectiveness of the balancing pond C and the impact of pollutants in the balancing pond. The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager said that the Environment Agency imposed restrictions on discharges into the water system and advice would be sought from them. Councillor Cheetham suggested that meetings should be held with the Environment Agency and the water supply companies and the Planning Policy and Conservation Manager said that these bodies would be encouraged to take part in the meeting in August.

Councillor Down asked for clarification of the arrangements for grey water collection from the new terminal building and its re use on the airport.

(vi) Volume 15 – Construction

Councillor Dean asked whether account could be taken of the new buildings which would be needed for the increase to 35 mppa even though these were not included within the application. The Executive Manager, Development Services, said that it was appropriate to take these into account.

In response to a question from Councillor Cheetham about the permission for development to increase throughput from 15 to 25 mppa, the Executive Manager said that it was appropriate to have regard to the 2003 permission, because this was an application to vary the terms of the permission.

The meeting ended at 8.40 pm.

STATEMENT BY RAY WOODCOCK REPRESENTING STANSTED PARISH COUNCIL**Water**

I am a co-opted member of the Parish Council's Working Group, a Member of SSE and grandfather to two grandsons.

Water availability in East Anglia is a known problem. The Government DfT consultation report "The Future Development of Air Transport in the UK: South East" published in February 2003 states, when referring to Stansted: - "All options require engineering work, diverting or culverting to several rivers. The Environment Agency is generally opposed to culverting and such works are seen as significant impact".

"The extra passengers associated with additional runways add to the demand for water which may be difficult to meet, even with supply and demand management and waster saving technology".

As this statement refers to additional passengers it must also relate to more passengers using the existing runway.

EERA, East of England Plan, Non-technical Summary of the Sustainability Appraisal Report published in November 2004 states, **"Further development on any significant scale is likely to have serious negative impacts on water resources etc"**.

Surely increasing the use of the airport from 22.313 million passengers during the 12 months ending February 2006 to at least 35mppa, and more likely greater than 40mppa, is a significant development.

During a recent UDC meeting it was reported that water usage at the airport, at 25mppa, is expected to be 2.02 million litres per day increasing to 2.83 million litres per day at 35mppa. Surprisingly no water usage figure was given for the 12 months to February 2005 of 22.3 mppa.

Using these water usage figures, a 40% increase in water usage is expected from 25 mppa to 35 mppa. What are the plans to ensure this increase can be delivered and at the same time, continue to satisfy existing households without a reduction in water quality, pressure or interruption?

If there is a water shortage, what actions will be taken to protect water supplies to households?

A few weeks ago I wrote to Three Valleys MD asking a number of questions, no response has been received. I can only conclude that Three Valleys have not yet considered this issue or that it treats its customers with contempt. UDC, this is not one of those problems that can be put to one side to be forgotten later.

What are Three Valleys plans to satisfy the expected demand increase?

Where will the water come from?

Air Quality BAA EIA

I am speaking for Friends of the Earth, on the latest very optimistic Air Quality predictions in BAA's EIA, especially those relating to nitrogen oxides and nitrogen dioxide levels at 35 mppa and beyond. We ask the Council to rigorously question their accuracy especially those relating to vegetation in relation to Hatfield Forest.

Our reasons are twofold. 'Firstly the assumptions on future activities responsible for NOX and NO2 emissions are just that, subjective assumptions. They are - the changes in the aircraft fleet mix, the number of electric airside vehicles, the projections for airport related traffic and the use of auxiliary power units by airlines as well as reduced thrust by pilots taking off.

Fleet mixes for 35 and beyond include significant numbers of larger aircraft both for passengers and cargo. More modern aircraft may be less noisy and use less fuel but many emit more NOX, no plane has yet been developed that can satisfy all three requirements. The predicted fleet mix emissions forecasts are therefore essential but the information on this is only given as a reference in the EIA. We have been trying to get a copy of the three reference papers quoted by BAA without success.

The contour maps for NOX emissions at 35 mppa show that the BAA predicted statutory level of 30 micrograms per cu metre of air creeps over to the edge of Hatfield Forest and that the 25 mppa contour is not far away. It would not take many changes in BAA's assumptions about the factors I have listed to suggest that Hatfield Forest would be affected. This may not be a statutory offence as it is within 5kms of a motorway. But BAA themselves recognise in volume 10, nature conservation, para 10.4.4 that the "concentration is still relevant to possible ecological effects, ie it should be regarded as material to a planning decision.

Secondly, Stansted Airport has never had a full continuous measurement AQ assessment by BAA as have Heathrow and Gatwick, particularly with regard to the dispersal of emissions from the aircraft themselves. The DfT has set up a problem for the sustainable development of Heathrow with a panel of experts to consider the air quality situation notably the question for dispersion of aircraft emissions and the methodology of prediction. The modelling chosen is not the one used for this EIA. The committee is expected to report on Heathrow and on the question of emissions dispersion, we consider that Stansted should, at the very least, have a full an investigation as Heathrow, and that if the new method of modelling is considered better than that previously used the EIA predictions should be reviewed.

The White Paper (para 3.7) calls for the use of "local controls ... to manage the environmental impact of aviation and airport operations". For example (again , para 3.7):

- Applying increasingly stringent technical standards to limit emissions and noise at source;
 - Encouraging airport operators, airlines and air traffic managers to adopt the cleanest and quietest operational practices;
 - The withdrawal of the noisiest and dirtiest aircraft, and replacing them with aircraft capable of better environmental performance; to the cleanest and quietest aircraft"
- [NB not just 'cleaner and quieter']

The Council will presumably be formulating such local controls on aircraft emissions at Stansted and we would welcome an opportunity to comment on these in due course.