

**EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held at
COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 2.30 pm on
15 JUNE 2006**

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

Officers in attendance:- R Harborough, J Mitchell, J Pine, M J Perry and
P Snow.

DC29 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors E C Abrahams,
C A Cant and J I Loughlin.

DC30 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Cheetham declared an interest as a member of the National Trust,
the Hatfield Forest Management Committee and NWHEEPA.

Councillor Down declared an interest as a member of the CPRE.

Councillor Thawley declared an interest as a member of CPRE and the
National Trust.

Councillor C Dean declared an interest as a member of the National Trust.

Councillor Menell declared an interest as a non executive director of the
Uttlesford PCT.

DC31 STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Ken McDonald, a resident of Stansted Mountfitchet, made a statement as
appended to these Minutes.

**DC32 PLANNING APPLICATION 0717/O6/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT –
ASSESSING THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT**

The Committee considered the environmental impact assessment that had
accompanied planning application UTT/0717/06/FUL that would enable the
airport to grow to serve 35 mppa utilising 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 that 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 25 mppa case – how the airport was expected to develop, subject to existing conditions.

The 35 mppa 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 makeup 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 three of the volumes and Members made the following comments.

(i) Volume 11 – Surface Access

Councillor Thawley asked about the effect on the figures produced of passengers alighting before Liverpool Street and the Executive Manager (Development Services) said that he would obtain clarification.

Councillor Godwin said that she saw, on a daily basis, a different picture from the one presented in Volume 11. There had been a large growth in traffic and extensive queuing on the A120 westbound in the early evening and eastbound in the morning. She said that passengers were having to compete for seats on the Stansted Express from the word go and particularly between 8.00 and 9.00 am. No reference had been made to the major impact on local roads in the environmental assessment. A number of HGV lorries were using local roads to access the airport site as well as a significant number of airport staff who often worked a complicated split shift system coinciding with peak traffic periods.

Councillor Jones asked whether the statistics included rail journeys from London to Stansted and whether they incorporated journeys from Cambridge and further north. The Executive Manager (Development Services) confirmed that the answer was yes to both questions. Councillor Jones also asked about the effect of the airport upon the regular rail service.

Councillor Cheetham queried what would happen if the Coopers End access were to be closed. This would have a knock-on impact on the Birchanger roundabout. She asked what would happen in relation to the Section 106 Agreement with the Strategic Rail Authority if trains were to carry 12 cars. She said that some stations would be unable to cope with trains of this length and there was no money to provide fresh infrastructure. The consultant should be asked to check the position regarding the provision of extra passenger capacity.

Councillor Thawley asked about the evaluation of parking need and whether this had been tested off site. He was sceptical about the prospect of rail

platforms being extended. He referred to a visit to the Department for Transport when he was told that there would be studies on traffic impact and asked when this could be expected. He asked about the meaning of the phrase “fit for purpose” used in the environmental assessment and he was told that it referred to the model being used and not to the data itself. He then asked whether BAA had used national or local data for modelling purposes. He agreed that it was encouraging that a higher proportion of passengers was now using public transport but he said it was nevertheless true that a lot more people were not using public transport and it had to be questioned whether the cost of this was too high. Stansted Airport had become a transport hub in the sense that a lot of non Stansted Airport related traffic was going in and out of the site. He said that traffic peaks would have to be spread as it was unlikely that many employees would use local roads and this would increase the periods of congestion on the M11 and other trunk roads. Finally, he asked what was the possibility of a flyover being constructed from the A120 going north.

Councillor C Dean asked about the provision of 12 car trains and said that One Rail was not currently able to provide 8 car trains at times as a result of capacity problems. Accordingly, she wondered whether the extra cars could be accommodated at Liverpool Street. She said that there were no trains at Stansted Airport before 5.00 am and more trains needed to be provided for shoulder flights. She also referred to an increase in airport related traffic on local roads that were being used as rat runs.

In responding to these comments, the Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer said that the consultants could examine the effect of passengers alighting at intermediate stations. The County Highways Authority was aware of queuing on nearby roads and the data provided as part of the environmental assessment would be examined with this in mind. He confirmed that 12,000 additional car parking spaces had already been approved but not yet provided. He thought that the “fit for purpose” models might incorporate some use of national data. It was correct to say that Stansted Airport was being used as a transport hub and it was only right that local residents should derive some real benefit from this activity. He confirmed that peak traffic hours were now extending over a two to three hour period and said that he would try to obtain information about the prospect of a flyover. In response to a question from Councillor C Dean, he said that it was unlikely that BAA would seek to close the Coopers End access as the local road network was not becoming congested as a result. In any case, BAA would be required to give a year’s notice of such an intention.

Councillor Menell referred to unlawful parking outside the airport perimeter and said that the 12,000 additional car parking spaces were a necessity. She asked what was generating the extra local parking and felt that a comparison of charges should be made with other airports.

(ii) Volume 5 – Economic Effects and Volume 6 – Employment and Housing Effects

Councillor Godwin said that the Environmental Statement had glossed over the balance between people and jobs and said that less skilled jobs in the

area remained hard to fill. Many of the figures used were speculative and gave rise to further questions.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether there was a breakdown of categories of jobs provided on the airport site and about the impact on the local economy of the close proximity of an international centre. She asked whether these aspects were being analysed by the Council's consultants. The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager confirmed that the consultants had not been asked to advise on employment and housing issues. Officers would first wait for the Committee's final conclusions.

Councillor Cheetham said it was important to know what were the economic benefits as against the likely disbenefits.

Councillor Thawley said that Stansted Airport was not meeting its full demand and that the planning decisions were intended not to meet the demand but to control it. He said it was important to know whether the provision of business transport at the airport was contributing to the economy of the United Kingdom as a whole and said that the case should be based on the impact on the local economy.

Councillor C Dean said that the demand for cargo traffic was the same at 35 mppa as at 25 mppa and that the increased capacity being sought appeared to be solely for passengers. The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager said it was the case that cargo traffic would not increase and that the figures provided included leisure trips as well as business flights.

Councillor Jones asked whether the data shown for cargo flights took account of corresponding lorry movements. The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager confirmed that it did.

The Executive Manager (Development Services) said that he would be in a position to confirm the starting times for meetings during the week beginning 4 July at next Tuesday's meeting.

The meeting ended at 4.15 pm.

BAA's planning application for full use of Stansted's runway.

Statement by Ken McDonald, resident of Stansted Mountfitchet, to Uttlesford District Council Development Control Committee 15 June 2006

- - - - -

I would like to give you just one or two pointers as to how wary you must be when reviewing the Surface Access Environmental Assessment. I have produced copies of this statement so you will not have to take notes.

BAA's whole presentation focuses on just one slice of the proposed growth – a 40% increase from 25mppa to 35mppa. But what we should be looking at is a 100% increase from today's 22mppa to a more realistic maximum use of 45 – or even 50 - mppa in due course.

Within its overall forecasts, BAA has neatly allocated different rates of growth to passengers from different origins. Table 6.2 on page 83 shows how they have allocated the expected total growth from the year 2004 through to 35mppa - an overall growth of 67%.

67% does not actually show on this table because transfer passengers have been omitted. Transfer passengers have been assumed to grow by 124%.

That leaves only a 59% growth in passengers that will require surface access.

Of the surface access passengers, those coming from Central London or going to Central London are forecast to grow by only 33%, with the balance made up of high rates of growth for other areas – areas that, coincidentally, have less crowded surface access routes to the airport.

There is no historic basis for assuming tourists from and to London should grow so slowly or that transfer passengers might grow so fast. Table 4.2 on page 28 shows that for the last 4 or 5 years London passengers has been growing faster than those from other origins.

The Transport Assessment goes on to describe the computer models that have been used to generate forecasts of road and rail usage. May I remind you that, no matter how good the computer models, if you feed garbage in you will get garbage out.

I'd like to end with a quote from Essex County Council's draft Local Transport Plan [2006-2011 Paragraph 4.7.1]:

"Serious concerns remain that there will be a repeat of the previous three phases of growth at Stansted which have each been based on forecasts and planning assumptions that later transpired to be so different in reality that the transport impacts were seriously misunderstood and not properly planned for"

I don't envy the burden that has been placed on your shoulders, but I wish you all a good afternoon.