

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

Present:- Councillor C A Cant – Chairman
Councillors J F Cheetham, C M Dean, C D Down, E J Godwin,
R T Harris, J I Loughlin, J E Menell, and M Miller.

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

DC33 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors E C Abrahams,
P Boland, R F Freeman, S C Jones, and A R Thawley.

Members declared the following interests:-

Councillor J F Cheetham a personal interest as a member of CPRE,
NWEIPA and the Hatfield Forest Management Committee.
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.
Councillor C A Cant a personal interest as the Council's representative on
Uttlesford PCT.
Councillor J E Menell a personal interest as a non executive director of the
Uttlesford PCT.

DC34 PUBLIC SPEAKERS

Irene Jones from Church End Broxted told the Committee about vibrations
from aircraft above her house. She said that they had been strong enough to
set off a key ring alarm that had been inside the house. She commented that
this was just a crude electrical devise and wondered what effect the vibrations
would have on human health.

David Barron, Chairman of Uttlesford PCT commented on the Health Impact
Assessment. A full copy of his statement is attached to these minutes.

Brian Ross spoke to the Committee on behalf of SSE and put forward views
on the Environmental Statement. A full copy of his comments is attached to
these minutes.

**DC35 PLANNING APPLICATION 0717/06/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT
SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL**

The Committee considered the Sustainability Appraisal for the proposed
Stansted Generation 1 development. It accompanied planning application
UTT/0717/06/FUL, which would enable increased use of the airport's existing
runway. The appraisal was undertaken in the context of the Air Transport
White Paper – the Future of Air Transport that said that the first priority in the

south east was to make full use of existing runways including the remaining capacity at Stansted.

The aim of the study was to appraise the extent to which environmental, social and economic considerations, as defined by relevant sustainability objectives, had been integrated into the proposed development associated with further use of the existing runway and to identify recommendations by which the proposed development could be enhanced, for BAA to consider. The scope of the appraisal was only a comparison between the 25mppa case and the 35mppa case as at 2014.

The Executive Manager Development Services presented details of the study and Members made the following comments.

Councillor Godwin said the public's perception of the impact of the airport, particularly in terms of noise and air quality, would vary depending on where people lived in relation to the airport. Councillor Harris added that the scoring system in the appraisal was too general and dealt with the issue from the perspective of the District as a whole. Councillor Cheetham said that there was mention of 'Director's Notices' within the document and questioned how binding these were on the airport users. Officers said they would take guidance from the applicant about the weight these directives carried and the possible penalties involved if they were not adhered to.

Councillor Dean said that the sustainability targets in the report were often subjective. The Chairman added that phrases like 'consider' and 'investigate' were often used in the report and these were not quantifiable or measurable.

The Committee then looked at the results of the appraisal under each of the Government priority areas and made the following comments.

i) Sustainable Consumption and production

At 'use natural resources efficiently' Councillor Godwin questioned the ability of the south east to supply sufficient water for the needs of the airport given the current climate conditions. She thought that in future it might not be practical to rely on local sources.

Councillor Dean referred to the objective 'to consider the feasibility of rainwater collection systems/grey water recycling for new buildings'. She thought that 'consider' was too weak and the airport should make a firm commitment to do this. She enquired whether grey water recycling was already taking place at the new terminal building and the percentage of recycled water that was used. Officers would clarify this, and also pointed out that at this stage the report was only making recommendations and the wording would be tightened later in the application process. Members were also advised that the recommendations in the report were opinions of BAA's consultants Entec and were open to challenge.

A number of members expressed concern at the implications of the growth of the airport for water supply, particularly in the light of other substantial developments proposed for the district. Councillor Menell asked for reports from the relevant water supply companies and the Environment Agency.

Officers confirmed that the application would not be determined without taking into account all the views of the statutory authorities; also the water sector bodies had been invited to the question and answer sessions.

Councillor Cant felt that the recommendations for recycling were too vague. She would like a clearer idea of what was planned and how it could be measured. Councillor Godwin asked if there were any figures for the current level of recycling at the airport. She thought that something should be done to encourage airlines to use different types of packaging, particularly as the problem with waste was likely to worsen with the increase in the number of long haul flights.

In relation to measures in place to source materials locally during construction, Members observed that whilst this reduced haul distances, it also resulted in adverse impacts locally from sand and gravel extraction. Members asked where minerals would be extracted and the quantities from each source.

Councillor Dean noted that BAA was a signatory to the published Sustainable Aviation Strategy and asked what BAA was doing practically to fulfil these goals and commitments. Officers would look into this.

Under minimise waste aiming for 'closed systems' Councillor Godwin asked for up to date figures for the existing operation.

ii) Climate change and energy

Members asked for further information on the trading of emissions. Councillor Cant understood that although the Government had set targets for reduction of emissions the airlines could trade emissions permits and continue to pollute. It was noted that an EU emissions trading scheme for aviation was not expected to be operational for years. No tariff had been set. Councillor Dean noted the dilemma that BAA could justify increased emissions through the Government's White Paper on Airport Expansion.

Councillor Godwin hoped that BAA would use energy generated from renewable sources and look towards more innovative ideas. Members asked what requirements could be put in place to ensure that energy efficiency measures were included in all new buildings at the airport and that existing buildings were retro fitted. Officers said that the built environment could be controlled by condition.

Councillor Godwin asked for an explanation of point 7.2 which referred to encouraging passengers to buy carbon offsets for their flights. Councillor Cant asked for an explanation of carbon sinks.

With regard to the use of sustainable transport Councillor Godwin said that BAA should consider the use of more environmentally friendly vehicles, (possibly electrically powered) for its own fleet of vehicles. Councillor Dean was surprised that there had been no specific mention of rail services in the report. Councillor Cant said that the current transport arrangements were not the answer. Councillor Menell asked why there was no park and ride facility for setting down and picking up passengers. Councillor Godwin said that

more work was needed on the cycle paths at the airport as the network was currently incomplete.

In terms of the reliance on road traffic, Councillor Godwin said that public transport needed to be provided at the times when people came to work, taking into account the often unsociable hours of shift workers. Members generally agreed that insufficient steps had been taken to increase the use of public transport to the airport. Councillor Cheetham said that the structure of rail fares should be looked at if rail services were to be used more widely. She said that at the moment it was more expensive for a family to travel to the airport from London or Cambridge by train than it was to take the car.

iii) Natural resources protection and environmental enhancement

In relation to light pollution Councillor Menell asked if underground parking at the airport had ever been considered. Councillor Godwin questioned whether some of the higher level lighting on buildings at the airport was necessary. Members felt that the amount of light pollution was significant now and was only likely to get worse with future development and asked for measures to control levels and types of lighting.

In relation to noise pollution, Councillor Godwin said that the noise from take off roll and reverse thrust was significant for the local community, particularly early in the morning. Also, the use of Auxiliary Power Units (APU) was disturbing and she asked if it would be possible to make the use of the Fixed Electrical Ground Power compulsory. The Chairman said that the real effect of ground noise had not been taken into account when the study only compared the differences in noise levels between 25mppa and 35mppa at 2014.

In relation to construction, Members asked that hours of construction be controlled and conditions be put in place to ensure that construction lorries did not travel through the villages.

Under 'maintaining the quality of ground water and surface water bodies' Councillor Godwin said that severe storms appeared to be becoming more frequent events and there should be measures to control surface run off. She referred to problems in the Pincey Brook being exacerbated.

Members commented that there had been a lot of archaeological finds at the airport and felt that BAA should help with the storing of artefacts and also display some items at the airport.

iv) Sustainable Communities

Councillor Dean said that the appraisal did not mention immigrant labour. She asked if there were any details on the numbers of immigrant workers at the airport and where they were residing. She commented that the Council had responsibilities to ensure that their interests were taken into account. She referred to properties in multiple occupation owned by BAA.

With regard to access Councillor Godwin said that the airport did not have a good record with regard to providing disabled access. Wheel chair and push chair access to satellite three was difficult and needed to be addressed.

Councillor Cheetham said that in relation to crime, fly parking in surrounding villages should continue to be addressed.

Councillor Godwin said that more affordable homes were required for airport workers and wondered how this would be funded.

DC36

PLANNING APPLICATION 0717/06/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT HEALTH IMPACT STUDY

The Committee considered the Health Impact Assessment that had been submitted in support of BAA's planning application for its proposed Stansted Generation 1 development. The aim of the study was to determine the potential health impacts of the proposed development on local residents, to identify ways to mitigate negative impacts and to maximise positive impacts and to inform the planning process.

The Executive Manager Development Services gave a detailed presentation on the background to the report, its methodology and findings.

Councillor Cant said that there was no base line data by which to compare the figures in the report. Information about the effect on health had been requested when the applications for the expansion of the airport to 8 mppa, 15mppa and 25mppa had been considered. This study was looking only at the variations between 25mppa and 35mppa at 2014. This difference was negligible, and there was no data by which to judge the changes in the effects on health since the development of the airport.

Councillor Godwin said that there were many inaccuracies in the report and a number of issues had been glossed over. Some issues had been excluded from the study that had a significant impact on local residents. These included odour nuisance from kerosene, and ground noise. She noted that small doses of PM2.5 had as large an impact as larger doses. She was also concerned about the implications of some of the statistics for the incidence of cancer, noting the high rates of cancer in males aged 1 to 4 in Harlow and in females aged 1 to 4 and 4 to 15 in Epping Forest. She said there was a contradiction in the figures on the effect on childrens' cognitive performance and health. The Ranch study had suggested that optimum cognitive ability had been delayed two months and not an average of two weeks. She said she would speak to officers with more details of her concerns.

Councillor Cheetham commented that the health indicators were subjective and very difficult to measure, also the report needed to cover additional areas. She questioned the claim of the economic benefit to the airport as the expansion didn't necessarily bring high quality jobs to the area. The HIA's comment on income needed to be read in the context of the average salaries of permanent employees at the airport in Table 12 of Volume 6 of the ES: Employment Effects.

Councillor Menell asked if the assessment of cognitive effects in children had relied on the Ranch study or if any measurements had been taken in the schools. She was advised that the methodology involved applying the findings from scientific studies of the effects of aircraft noise on the learning ability of children and extrapolating the findings to the numbers of children involved in the four schools affected in the Stansted area. Councillor Loughlin was concerned that the WHO had identified fetuses as a potentially vulnerable group to noise exposure and said that more information was required on the implications of air noise on fetuses. The Chairman was concerned that the report made a series of assumptions based on no comparable data.

The meeting ended at 5.15pm

Health Impact Assessment Of Stansted Generation 1

This is technically well prepared and presented, and is a competent piece of work.

It must be remembered that it only deals with the incremental effect of the proposed expansion, not on the total – about 10% in fact.

It touches on a number of issues

- Noise
- Pollution
- Road traffic
- Benefits
- Social capital

The **benefit** is from employment, and the main benefit would be from employment from less affluent areas

The work on **air pollution** has been well carried out, and shows that the background levels of pollution are severe. This equates to a 7 month loss of life to people in this region, although the effect of this current proposal would add only a few days.

The conclusion of the report is that this proposal would expect to add about 10 extra **road traffic** accidents a year, with 10% of those being serious/fatal. This would require extra efforts to minimise traffic, and it could be argued that ECC already has in place appropriate policies to assist this.

The report states that there are 2 main impacts from **noise** – one relates to annoyance to individuals, with unquantifiable health effects such as raised blood pressure. The other relates to the effects on the educational levels in children. A study at Heathrow on the effects of noise – and there are 4 schools in the Stansted area that would be affected – suggests that for every 1 additional decibel of noise, educational achievement is extended by 2 weeks, which seems a small increase.

However, this when added to the existing entire noise level, means a delay in education achievement of 6 months, which is significant

In the same vein, it must be recognised that this report deals only with the effects of this proposal, and although each proposed slice is trivial, the cumulative effect of the total is significant.

The conclusion is that although the individual effect are small, the expectation of the local population is significant – there is more health impact by worrying about the effects than in the additional effects themselves.

REPORT FROM CHAIRMAN - UTTINGSFORD P.C.T.
D. BARRON.

Statement by Brian Ross on behalf of Stop Stansted Expansion to Development Control Committee - 20 June 2006

Thank you Madam Chairman. I am speaking on behalf of SSE and I won't be speaking about the HIA today. We only received that report last week and we're not yet ready to comment.

Instead, I want briefly to take stock of where we are in assessing this application. Our team has been going through the ES for almost 8 weeks and we are now beginning to pull together our findings. Some key messages are coming through:

- 1. BAA has not provided the information necessary to properly assess the environmental impacts in a whole range of areas, including 48 items requested in the Council's Scoping Opinion (Nov 2004).**
- 2. In a host of other areas, BAA has not even provided the information we expected it to provide, based on the programme of work it set down in its own Scoping Report (July 2004).**
- 3. A theme running through almost every section of the ES is reams of analysis on unimportant issues whilst important issues are skimmed over or even ignored.**
- 4. There is also a consistent theme of underplaying the impacts – trying to present these as if it was like having one extra cornflake for breakfast!**
- 5. Certain parts of the ES are so superficial and flawed that BAA may well have grounds for a claim against its consultants for producing such shoddy work.**
- 5. When you read the ES, it takes you into a world of its own and it becomes easy to forget what this application is really about. You need to stand back from time to time and remind yourselves of the scale of what is actually being proposed.**
- 7. This is not a planning application for 35mppa. It looks to us that this is for about 40mppa by 2014, 45mppa by 2021 and perhaps even 50mppa by 2030.**

In summary, you simply don't have the information you need to properly assess the impacts and decide whether or not they are capable of mitigation, and, if so, what mitigation would be appropriate.

So where does this leave us in terms of an application which is due to be determined by this Committee within 16 weeks of its submission?

Let me quote directly from the Government's guidance note to local planning authorities on the subject:

"The planning authority cannot take the view that a planning application is invalid because it considers that an inadequate environmental statement has been submitted or because the developer has failed to provide any further information required ... However, if the developer fails to provide enough information to complete the environmental statement, the application can be determined only by refusal."

["Environmental Impact Assessment: Guide to Procedures", ODPM, para 51]

In other words, not only has the Council the right to refuse the application on the grounds of an inadequate environmental statement, it has no choice but to do so.

Time is marching on and we are keen to know whether the Council has yet advised BAA that the ES is inadequate and if and when BAA intends to remedy this?

Thank you.