

EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 6.30 pm on 5 JULY 2006

Present:- Councillor C A Cant – Chairman
Councillors J F Cheetham, C M Dean, 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:- R Harborough, J M Mitchell, C Oliva, J G Pine and C Roberts.

DC51

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor E C Abrahams.

Members declared the following interests:-

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.

Councillor M Miller a personal interest as a member of the Great Dunmow Town Council.

Councillor J I Loughlin a personal interest as a member of the Stansted Parish Council.

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

DC52

PLANNING APPLICATION 0717/06/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT – PUBLIC SPEAKERS

1 Mrs Mitchell and family – Great Easton

Mrs Mitchell explained that she and her three children objected to any further expansion of Stansted Airport. Mrs Mitchell's children attended Great Easton School. The children were concerned that plane emissions would kill plants and leave no food for animals. They disliked the smell of aviation fuel from the planes and the noise from the planes hurt their ears when they were in the playground where they could not hear themselves think. They could not talk to friends because their friends could not hear them. They were scared that fuel would drop on the wild animals and kill them, and that there would be no trees for the ladybirds to live in. The children thought planes were really stupid because they woke people up.

(No questions)

2 Irene Jones – Broxted

I am addressing you as an individual member of the public and representing

my family. I live at Peacocks which is part of The Maltings, Broxted and which is 4 kilometres from the end of the runway to the north-east of Stansted Airport.

I would like to show you something. (Ms Jones showed a poster of a Public Meeting dated 1964)

We found this in our out-buildings round about 1979/1980. Our find had pertinent relevance at that time because we had just been thrown into the maelstrom of having to cope with another proposed expansion of the airport.

When we moved into Peacocks in 1977 we knew there was an airport close by. We knew there had been an application for a large expansion in the past but that it had been rejected save for a small concession for growth. (Doesn't that sound familiar?) When we arrived in Broxted there was a throughput of 250,000 ppa, with permission to grow to 2mppa. We were very naive in assuming that this was the end of the matter.

So when, in 1978 plans were put forward for further expansion of airport capacity in the south-east, we were very worried and upset. When Stansted was chosen to take this increased capacity we were angry and felt betrayed.

This was the beginning, for us, of the constant battle to make ourselves heard. The frustration of feeling we didn't count. Our quality of life was under threat and so was the beautiful countryside we had chosen to live in. I became very involved with NWHEEPA, the Stop Stansted Expansion of that time. I gave evidence at the Public Inquiry. (She showed a copy of evidence). This is my statement, dated March 1982.

Let me read a little of it to you. I outlined my upbringing in an urban environment and my longing to live in the country I go on. ..

"It took many years to finally achieve a rural life style. Now that I do live in the country, I have found many bonuses that I had not anticipated.

People care about one another. There is always time to exchange a greeting. No old person goes lonely or uncared for. A walk in the churchyard is not an unpleasant experience. There is a sense of security and continuity. The spirit of those buried there is still alive in the families and activities that go on in the village.

The quiet is tangible. Walking the lanes at night, I can sense the crops growing. You can hear the stream running its course a quarter of a mile away. The air is so clear that at night you can often see the Milky Way in detail.

It is very exciting to watch a thunderstorm pass across the horizon. You can understand that the light travels faster than sound.

Any weather is an experience if you live in the country. You can enjoy the wind, the mist, the rain, the snow, as well as the sunshine, because the

weather is part of the environment as well as being a crucial factor to the farmer and his crops." How have things changed since I made this statement?

There is no longer uninterrupted peace and quiet. "Tranquility" is the word used today. I realise how much we have lost because last Christmas Day, for a couple of hours in the afternoon, someone switched Stansted off! I took my dog along the lane opposite my house and realised I could hear the stream flowing. There had been a few flights, but the background noise had gone. I felt quite bitter, (not a feeling for Christmas Day), knowing that that silence would probably be the last I enjoyed, knowing that permission had been granted to increase the numbers beyond what was in place on that day.

I was astonished to hear at one of the meetings recently that a Health Impact Assessment is not a mandatory requirement of a planning application. Noise is NOT an 'annoyance' as suggested by BAA in their HIA. It has adverse health implications. It is very distressing. It has taken me twice as long to compose this presentation as it should because I have had to cope with the noise of overflying aircraft. If my home were a place of employment, the Health and Safety Executive would prosecute me.

Another change is the loss of the bright starry sky .A previous Managing Director of the Airport referred to it as " a rosy glow" when I said I regretted the loss of starlight. He failed to understand that his "rosy glow" had destroyed something special.

The natural environment is very precious to me. The countryside is being eroded by construction and development and by pollution. Those promoting airport growth insist they are doing their best to mitigate against damage to the environment. But it is only a tick list; keep traffic off this road: save that tree; attend another meeting, say the right words, then apply for more parking space, , oh, don't worry , we'll move that meadow' .It doesn't work like that. The countryside is an organism. Its integrity must be protected.

The most recent change is the way our community is being destroyed. Some people have had to move away. I don't blame them. Life must go on. But sadly, in order to do so they have had to sell, to BAA, who see property, not homes. Some houses are simply boarded up. Others are being let, unfortunately not to new families but to passing strangers. No one cares for the gardens or the upkeep of the buildings. No one stays long enough to care.

I started my presentation with my poster, 1964. Major development was averted. In 1982, following the Public Inquiry, we managed to hold growth back to 8mppa, (the airport had asked for 2 runways and 50mppa). A few years later and nod of the head in the House of Commons and we had 15mppa. The rules were changed. We had expected another public inquiry for permission to go to 25mppa, but the Government decided to use local planning laws and avoid the cost in time and money of a public inquiry .I attended those hearings and pleaded that you refuse permission. We know the outcome.

So, why are we still here? We are asking you to keep the cap on growth because, if you don't the Airport will achieve what it wanted in the first place. I will have given half my life trying to stop what is, already, a catastrophe. No perceived economic benefit to a wider community can compensate me, my family or my neighbours for the misery we live through now. A misery made worse by believing no one is listening, no one cares. I can't even complain about low flying, noisy planes. I am under the flight path, being so close to the runway, they are over my head, they are not 'off swathe'. My complaints are invalid.

I have heard enough evidence at these meetings to be sure that there are sound reasons for you to reject this application. I ask that your Officers advice you wisely. I beg you, give me something to look forward to.

Questions

Councillor Cheetham asked how many homes in the village had been sold by owner occupiers and were now rented. Mrs Jones did not have those statistics but said she was aware that the families had moved away. Houses were boarded up, verges uncared for, transient people moved in and drives were clogged up with cars. In answer to a question whether the effect was reversible she agreed that it could be and referred to what happened after 1985 when BAA sold off property that it had earlier acquired for a second runway. People would need to feel secure to come and live in Broxton but it would be possible to rebuild a community if the 25 mppa limit were retained. She added that the migrant workers were airport workers or tenants of letting agents working on behalf of the airport. She felt that provided the houses were not destroyed the community could recover. Councillor Thawley asked her to expand about her direct experience of the health impact and she explained that she had become ill during a period of easterly airport operations when extensive overflying of her home had resulted in stress requiring medication. She could cope now but was concerned about the distress which must be being caused to the vulnerable elderly such as those with Alzheimers and mothers with young children. She also referred to the demands on the health service placed by migrant workers and foreign aircrew.

3 Keith Turner – National Trust

Keith Turner objected to the application on grounds of noise and air pollution. The ES had identified three sensitive receptors: a primary school, community college and residential home, but failed to consider the noise impact on Hatfield Forest. Hatfield Forest would receive noise levels at an increased frequency of one every 106 seconds. Levels of nitrogen deposits in the forest were twice damaging levels, although he acknowledged that most of this was on account of background levels and that the EU NOx limit value for vegetation protection did not apply within 5 km of the M11 . He asked that BAA be required to submit information on the noise contours for dB levels below 54, as they would affect the Forest, and to supply the results of the

study they had carried out about the noise, light, and air quality impact of the airport on the flora and fauna surrounding the airport.

Questions

In answer to questions he said that 850 veteran trees in the forest were dying back, but that was only to be expected. It was difficult to attribute this directly to the impact of the airport, hence the importance of obtaining the results of the BAA study of lichens and mosses in accordance with BAA's obligations under its s106 agreement to give time series information about the degree and pace of change in the Forest. All the three woods of special scientific interest around the airport showed similar high levels of nitrogen. Asked about evidence of insect populations, he said that carbon gas emissions would have a climate change effect over Europe, which would affect Hatfield Forest. The environment could not adapt quickly enough to climate change. Finally he suggested that the assessment of third party risk should take account of the potential impact of air accidents on nature conservation. He referred to the effects of the Korean Air plane crash about five years ago and the subsequent debris recovery operation. He confirmed that the Forest was one of the oldest hunting reserves extant in the country.

4 Stephanie Newman – Sawbridgeworth

Stephanie Newman explained that her objection to BAA's expansion plans was that it involved increased CO₂ production. Climate change was the single greatest threat to the planet. The Government, having promised to cut industrial emissions by 12.5% was promoting massively larger emissions from planes, with the burning of more fossil fuel, and increasing road congestion and noise pollution, which was also bad for the animals and songbirds and increased pressure on housing. The oil used could no longer be afforded and there were national safety concerns with any airport. The area had low levels of unemployment so any argument based on economic prosperity to the area was unconvincing. The appeal if any was a shortsighted one of satisfying demand, but the aviation industry already enjoyed enormous subsidies.

Questions

Members asked officers to take on board the point that the proposals would contribute to an increase in the net outflow of tourism expenditure from the UK.

5 Peter Lockley – Aviation Environmental Federation

Peter Lockley spoke about climate change and the importance of living within environmental limits. Planning Policy Statement 1 and the UK Sustainable Development Strategy provided the national policy basis for taking climate change into account in planning decisions. The Government reliance on proposed emissions trading to address the impacts of its support for increased air transport was deeply irresponsible. He congratulated the UDC for signing up to the Nottingham Declaration on Climate Change.

Questions

In answer to questions he explained that the Government's target was to limit the increase in average temperatures to 2%. This was a permanent objective. He commended the Kyoto protocol targets as laudable. He said that it seemed the Departments of the Environment and Transport did not talk to each other and aviation was not contained within the Government's targets. The UK had a commitment to no more than 2% temperature increase but did not begin to have a policy to limit aviation growth. They envisaged trading in emissions with the power or cement industries but it was necessary to make cuts in emissions, not redistribute emissions between industrial sectors, or the problem would be pushed onto the Third World. He could not estimate the potential emissions savings of substituting rail for air travel but confirmed that a high speed train emits less CO₂ than a plane. It was noted that the period of cessation of flights following 9/11 had enabled scientists to quantify the effects of condensation trails.

Members found Mr Lockey's talk most useful and asked him to send them a copy of the powerpoint presentation he had given and written information.

6 Suzanne Walker

The enemy increaseth every day:

We, at the height, are ready to decline. There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; Omitted, all the voyage of their life

Is bound in shallows and in miseries. On such a full sea are we now afloat, And we must take the current when it serves, Or lose our ventures.

JC A 4ScIII 215

The previous permission (UTT/1000/01/OP) was not given willingly UDC tried to get the best deal they could wrest from an aggressive commercial takeover.

You know the environmental catastrophe that would result in from exceeding the limits that were set in 2003.

The tide is turning: Global warming has been accepted as a greater threat than terrorism.

Witness the constant stream of visitors to the Mayor of Saffron Walden's "Water Day"; the people of Uttlesford want sustainable development - not OBLITERATION

There is a tide in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune; Omitted, all the voyage of their life

Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

Do not condemn future generations to the shallows of miseries .

7 Ray Woodcock

Ray Woodcock stated that his permanent address is in Stansted Mountfitchet, but he was now living in Manuden short- term.

He was speaking on behalf of my two Grandsons, Alfie and Sidney, they are 6 and 2 years, living in Stansted. What is being discussed here will affect their lives much more than mine. The airport is such a long-term problem; remember the young members of our community are totally reliant on us adults making the right decision.

During the past few days I've listened to this meeting, its quite frustrating for me, as a member of the public, when we are not allowed to put questions to the speakers, its even more difficult for me bearing in mind that many of the committee have not or only asked one or two questions to probe and understand some of the difficult issues being presented.

During yesterdays meeting a number of points were made that I wanted to respond to, I now have my opportunity and therefore I've split my original presentation into two parts.

The issues raised yesterday and some of my experiences.

The Ramblers Association:

Was asked, and I paraphrase, do you know of the effects on Wildlife? The answer given "I'm not sure but they seem to adapt". This is of course incorrect, if animals can adapt to what Humans create for them why is the Bird population so dramatically reducing?

LOW COST FLIGHTS; the term has often been mentioned. Mr. O'Brien was surely more accurate; the flights at Stansted are LOW FARE. The flights are not LOW COST they are subsidised by the taxpayer and also by many overseas Local Authorities in terms of subsidised airport charges.

Capacity of the runway at Stansted; it was very interesting what Terry Morgan said at the STACC meeting held on the day BAA submitted its planning application. He reported 35MPPA but mentioned 40MPPA far more often. Its clear what BAA's intention is, the sky's the limit for passenger numbers. It's easy to estimate passenger movements, 264K flights and assume passenger loading per flight of 150 equals 39.6 million.

Surface access improvements via rail; it is well known that many stations between Stansted and Liverpool St. Station cannot handle 12 carriage trains. Also the Government will need to heavily invest to purchase the required number of carriages to achieve longer trains; you know better than I how Government is restricting large investments.

A British Rail report published in 1982 identified that significant improvements in the track are necessary to handle the expected airport passenger demand. For a variety of reasons BR did not support the use of Liverpool St. Station as the London terminal they considered St. Pancras was much preferred. it was not to be

Fuel Costs:

It was said that the cost of aviation fuel has dramatically increased during the past 12 months. Many air carriers such as Ryanair buy their fuel well in advance, the spot market price may have increased but what has happened to Raynair's and Easyjet's actual fuel costs?

Employment:

We heard that Stansted is a major employer; I would like to know what the DEMOGRAPHIC spread is of employees is at the airport? BAA should have this data split, Local, London, and Overseas. Is it really bringing jobs to our local community of the sort they want?

Water: BAA's usage at 21 mppa was 1.69 m ltrs/d; they forecast 2.02 m ltrs/d at 25mppa and 2.83 m ltrs/d at 35mppa. That's a 40% increase over the current level. Where will the water come from and I'm not thinking via a pipe? Three Valleys Water said that BAA has adequate capacity I hope you noticed that the reference related to the airport's water distribution system, e.g. pipe/pump capacity.

Also, is the 2.83 m ltrs/d related only to BAA's water demand, does it include the industrial undertakings on the airport?

Some of my Experiences

My qualification for talking with you this evening has been gained by meeting 1000's of people in our region and as far as Stratford St. Mary and Ipswich.

I've knocked on even more doors selling Community Calendars, answering issues raised by people visiting Stop Stansted Expansion's Information Trailer. I've talked with over 900 young people at Junior and Senior schools and Colleges in Fyfield, Colchester, Harlow, Bishops Stortford, Claire and many other places.

The people I've spoken with range from 8 years to 93 years; they come from many walks of life, they are quite a representative bunch of our community.

Talking with these people about the airport has given me a reasonable understanding of what the majority in our Community think about expansion of Stansted. The majority, just like the surveys I've seen, keep saying **OUR COMMUNITY DOES NOT WANT THE AIRPORT TO EXPAND**; it's big enough as it is.

People fear what it will do to their environment, health, homes and increasingly Climate Change.

So often they say, it's good what SSE is doing but the Government and the power of BAA have already decided that expansion will happen even though

we don't want it. That's pretty damning. Of course there are some who support expansion, a few notable cases are: -

A gentleman from Stebbing did not understand that a second runway at Stansted would increase the airport's capacity. I want another runway at the airport; he said it won't affect me.

Then the little girl at one of the schools I visited, she doesn't want the airport to expand but added, my dad does, he does lots of business at the airport. And the gentleman, in Much Hadham, I tried to sell him a Community Calendar; there were 516 children just a few feet away, well within hearing distance? His interest in the airport, I do OK business with the airport, I don't care about what happens in the future or the environment, he added he was not interested in the children's future either. I don't want the airport to expand said one of the kids.

Then gentleman in Saffron Walden, his medical helper asked me into his home to talk with him, he is a Paraplegic paralysed from the neck down, permanently in bed. He told me of his concerns, he was a pilot before his accident; he is totally opposed to airport expansion on the grounds of its harmful environmental effects. And another pilot who flies from Stansted, his concern is the pressure put on him by the low price carrier he flies for; he occasionally takes a few days off to properly re-charge his batteries otherwise he said he might

make an error resulting in an accident I

These are just a few of the people I've spoken to.

When people like Cllr Bernard Engel, who is supposed to represent the people who elected him, said on Monday that he supported some expansion at the airport, and he had not held a survey, he needs to talk with people in Bishops Stortford/ East Herts., I have and most don't want expansion.

At various meetings in Stansted Mountfitchet I've asked what considerations have been given to the road leading to Mountfitchet High School, it's used every morning and afternoon by children going to and returning from school. Church Road, has experienced a major increase in road traffic in recent years, its traffic going to and from the airport and M 11, it's a rat-run, it's the result of the changes at junction 8 on the M11 to cater for airport traffic. At sometime, when the children are larking about, and I think as they walk home, letting off steam after their day at school, one will go into the road, an accident occurs, a child is hurt. This is a situation waiting to happen; it's just a matter of when. I can't believe the road is acceptably safe, as a Parish Council member has told me.

Roads like this one, and I'm sure there are many, must be considered, it's too easy to close our eyes to potential major incidents for the sake of low fare air journeys; remember it may be your child or family who is affected next time .

Mr. David Barron summed it up on 2nd June he reported," The conclusion of the report is that this proposal (the expansion of the airport) 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". What are these policies?

Last Dec. I was given the opportunity to attend a meeting in Hounslow, West London, it was organised by school teachers, they are extremely concerned about the effects the thousands of planes going into and out of Heathrow have and BAA's wish to change the flight pattern at the airport. A scientific study has shown that aircraft and road traffic noise could impair cognitive development in children, specifically reading comprehension. REF The Lancet.

Already schools in that area have noise shelters in playgrounds. They try to give the kids the opportunity to hear each other when talking in the open-air during breaks. These noise shelters are supposed to reflect the noise away from the kids, what an environment for children to grow-up and develop in. This aircraft noise does not mean a short burst of noise for a few seconds then a pause, it means continual increasing then fading noise with NO RESPITE.

Some of the schools have double-glazing to attenuate the noise but this is effective only if the windows are closed, what happens during warm days? Remember, at times flights there are every 45 seconds, is this what you want at Stansted?

The issues I've raised may not be the sort that Planners have a statutory requirement to consider.

I would remind those present that common sense and imagination is what we should expect and not always "Statutory Rights".

Be brave with your decision concerning maximum use of the runway at Stansted airport.

Consider what the community has told you in the various surveys and Referendum that UDC has commissioned.

Above all if in doubt decline the application and define the reasons.

8 Ann Corke

Ann Corke, Thaxted Resident stated "No one is denying the unfortunate fact that climate change is underway. Nationally all political parties are accepting the need to take measures to reduce the impact of climate change and contribute to the sustainability agenda.

Experts agree that currently the world is using the resources of at least 2 planets, some say 3. Clearly this cannot continue. Uttlesford District Council is a good example of a local authority that takes its responsibilities towards the environment and sustainability seriously. Its work on recycling along with exercising controls on energy use through planning and building regulations to aid sustainability are very good examples of its achievements.

What if all the good work this council is doing was negated in one decision. Unfortunately should the expansion of Stansted airport be approved, that is precisely what would happen. In terms of damage to the environment, we all know what is the single largest polluter. It's not energy use of buildings, it's not a lack of recycling. No, it is air travel. With regard to government pressure to increase night flights, we have recently heard from the results of a study conducted by the London Borough of Hounslow that 1 night flight is equivalent to 12 day flights in terms of the impact on Global Warming.

One can well understand the needs of BAA to continue to ensure it is able to provide increased profits for the benefit of its shareholders. But that can never compensate for the loss of our precious environment. In Uttlesford District we have some of the best countryside in Essex. We have lovely villages, a great footpath network, country lanes where we can still cycle. We have an enviable environment. However, BAA continue to slowly but surely through stealth, to take this away from us. Whether it be increased flights and pressure this places on our roads leading to demand for further environmentally damaging road building. Or whether it is simply the increase in carbon emissions through increased flights. It is all leading to a permanent loss of amenity, one that if BAA is allowed to take away from us will be lost forever.

Chairman, in conclusion, I urge you to put the considerations of the environment of Uttlesford first, along with your contribution to reducing climate change. Please do not negate all your good work in one foul sweep. Please bring an end to BAA's plans to expand."

Members asked officers to provide an explanation as to why night flights had a greater impact on climate change than flights during daytime.

9 Colin Hodges – WRASE

Colin Hodges, Chairman of Ware Residents against Stansted expansion spoke in support of a petition:

"The residents of Ware and neighbouring villages are very concerned about the noise generated by low flying aircraft over our town. In order to reduce the impact of this disturbance on our community we would like to request the following.

- 1) No aircraft to overfly our town at less than 4000 feet.
- 2) Continuous descent approaches (CDAs) to be introduced for western

approaches to Stansted in order to reduce noise generated in line with industry codes of best practice.

3) BAA Stansted and associated bodies to introduce systems to measure and monitor compliance with items 1 and 2 above and for the results to be made available to the public.

We thank you for listening to our serious concerns and for supporting changes that will bring significant benefit to our community. "

A petition of about 357 signatures was attached to this representation.

Members asked for confirmation of the extent of CDA use of runway 05 and the impact of Heathrow departures on the scope for greater use of such procedures.

10 Peter Riding

"Madam Chair & Members

BAA is asking for permission for 264,000 air traffic movements per annum. I would like to focus your attention on the impact this would have at just one place should the committee agree to BAA's application.

Members will know that, for an average of 2 days out of every 3, planes landing at Stansted fly right over Thaxted and its church. In my remaining four minutes I would like to try to simulate what this would actually mean for the people of Thaxted. I obviously can't demonstrate the full noise effects so you will have to use your imagination. So what follows is a greatly speeded up representation of what BAA would like to happen over Thaxted for 2 out of every 3 days throughout the year." Peter Riding then played his recorded presentation.

At this point the meeting was adjourned for a break of ten minutes (8.40 pm). The next speakers were permitted to speak out of turn as they had travelled further than others.

11 Geoffrey Riesel

Mr Riesel explained that he was a member of the London Chamber of Commerce and Industry. He was responsible for and the Chairman of Radio Taxis and lived in Essex. He believed that a limited increase of 241,000 to 260,000 passenger movements would be alright spread over a number of years and would bring a welcome boost to jobs and business prosperity. He thought the British economy was a knowledge based one so many relied on travel by plane. Demand for plane travel increased at the rate of 4% per annum. Noisy engines should be discouraged and the train promoted for travel.

Questions

Mr Riesel confirmed that he had only limited business connections with Stansted Airport. Sometimes his members conveyed passengers to the airport.

12 Clive Thomas – Sudbury

Mr Thomas began by supporting the web casting of these meetings and engagement of the business community. He explained that he represented the Suffolk Institute of Directors and Chamber of Commerce and Industry and was a businessman running a recruitment firm and living in Suffolk. He found that Stansted, particularly the US route, was used very strongly. The airport opened up European markets and was not just used for leisure. BAA seemed to him to have done everything to mitigate the inevitable environmental effects. The business community wanted to see the expansion which would boost employment etc. He asked the Committee to agree to the application.

Questions

Mr Thomas felt that although employment levels in the area were currently high they would not necessarily be so in 2010 or 2020. Whilst the type of employment in the Airport itself was limited, the warehousing and logistics jobs which were provided by the distribution companies around the airport provided a lot of employment, which was needed at all levels. It was necessary for housing growth to be supported by job growth. He felt that global warming was a complex issue the causes of which were on a different scale to increased activity at Stansted alone.

13 Simon Ward – The Colne Stour Countryside Association

Mr Ward explained that he represented about 500 members of the Colne Stour Countryside Association, an organisation that had been established for forty years. Their concerns were increased road traffic, bypasses, rail stations etc and increase in the noise from planes. In his area six or seven passenger carrying planes were often seen in the sky at the same time as they queued to turn into the Abbot stacking area. He asked whether the expansion was necessary, even though it might create jobs. If not, he argued, the residents should not be paying for the development, and he made the following points.

- (a) The new Spanish owner might decide to operate in a different way from BAA; or they might sell the firm.
- (b) There was further uncertainty due to the fact that BAA was under a preliminary Office of Fair Trading investigation regarding monopoly.
- (c) Further to the global warming issue, the European Union was considering tax on aircraft fuel which provided further uncertainty.

He therefore asked the Committee to refuse the application.

No Questions

14 Michael Belcher

I represent the Residents of Burton End who are listed in our letter to the Council dated 27th June in which we outlined our objections to this application. (I can supply further copies of our letter if required.) Stansted Airport is located next door to Burton End so we are very much in the front line.

["The development of an airport at Stansted with a capacity in excess of 25 mppa would constitute nothing less than a catastrophe in environmental terms."]

"If I believed that a grant of planning permission for an expansion of Stansted to a capacity of 15 mppa would inexorably lead to an airport development in the future to an unknown capacity, I would, without hesitation, unequivocally recommend the rejection of BAA's current application."

So said Inspector Eyre at the public inquiry in 1984. Sadly his words have proved all too prophetic because this is precisely what the so called Stansted Generation 1 planning application will lead to if it is approved -the inexorable development of the airport in the future to an unknown capacity. The very title Generation 1 implies that there will be a Generation 2 and probably a Generation 3 and 4 as inevitable as the sequels to a ghastly Hollywood blockbuster movie.

The committee heard yesterday from the Airlines Consultative Committee that this G1 application represents nothing less the G2 development by stealth, and the ACC warned against determining it in isolation from the G2 application which is due to be submitted next year. In our letter to the Council we make exactly the same point. Burton Enders have more cause than most to fear this drip, drip approach to the development of Stansted Airport because the next phase -G2 -involves the destruction of half the properties in our village (many of which are Grade 2 listed) and the loss of an entire community .

The Residents of Burton End believe it is time for their Council to take a stand and say "enough is enough". In all probability the G2 application next year will be called in by central government so this could represent the last opportunity for our local Council on behalf of local people to put a stake in the ground by rejecting this application. Without wishing to over-dramatise the matter, this is an historic moment for the Council. Your decision will have consequences far beyond what is contemplated in the current planning application.

We heard yesterday from BAA that their planning application is "entirely consistent with national policy". We disagree. Here is a quote from the Government's White Paper to explain why we disagree:

"Ensuring easy and reliable access to airports, which minimises

environmental, congestion and other local impacts, is a key factor in considering any proposal for new airport capacity. The Government expects airport operators to develop appropriate access plans, and to contribute to the costs of the additional infrastructure or services needed. "

Reliable access by train, as one of the Members pointed out yesterday, is non-existent. The London to Cambridge line is plagued by cancellations and delays caused by inadequate infrastructure. Contrary to the Government's expectations, BM have put forward no plans to develop access by public transport and, to judge by their avoidance of the committee's questions yesterday, they do not intend to contribute a penny to the costs of the additional infrastructure needed. As in so many other instances their words and their actions differ.

Far from behaving in an environmentally responsible manner they intend to use existing planning permission to build a further 14,200 car parking spaces (an increase of 50%) from which they will no doubt expect to derive substantial income. It is of course far easier to justify investment which will produce a decent return than one which merely represents a cost. Given their claims yesterday of the high level of public transport usage by passengers travelling through Stansted, one is entitled to ask why they need so many additional parking spaces and why Stansted has one of the highest ratios of parking spaces per million passengers of any airport anywhere in the world. The admission by BAA yesterday that car park charges are used to subsidise landing charges begins to reveal what is really going on here. BAA know that they need to attract more airlines to make the expansion of the airport viable, and in order to keep the costs down for the airlines they need to build ever bigger car parks. The Council should ask itself whether it wants to be held at least partly responsible for allowing what BAA have privately acknowledged would eventually become the biggest car park on the planet.

In its letter of 14th December 2005 the Council called on BAA to relinquish some of their existing permitted public car parking provision. The Residents of Burton End fully endorse this stance and believe that now is the time to translate these fine words into actions. We also believe that BAA should be required to make better use of the land within the existing airport boundary by building properly screened, decked car parks, including underground parking, in order to reduce the need for future land take. Additionally, there should be a requirement to install lighting systems that reduce the amount of light pollution which currently disfigures the night time sky.

In the same letter the Council also called on BAA to extend immediately their HVGS and HOSS compensation schemes to all local residents suffering generalised blight as a result of the Generation 2 proposals. The whole of Burton End clearly falls into this category and we therefore urge the Council to use this opportunity to reinforce that message.

Whilst the Residents of Burton End are opposed to any expansion of Stansted Airport beyond the existing approved 25 mppa limit, we repeat the request in our letter to the Council dated 16th February 2006 that, should

approval be given to BAA to increase capacity beyond this level, it should include a *condition in perpetuity* prohibiting any re-siting of the North West boundary beyond its current position. Such a condition should apply to all future expansion plans.

No Questions

15 Mr D Stokes – Sawbridgeworth

Mr Stokes considered that there was no need for additional flights. The Government claimed to be impassioned about the environment but it was the CO2 emissions from planes which contributed to global warming. Stansted was a cheap airport providing flights for frivolous purposes eg “to improve your beer belly”. It was necessary for us to become responsible people. There should be a tax on air fares. Passengers would then be fewer and the requested extra capacity would not be needed. He felt many flights were unnecessary and there was as much money flowing out of the country as in due to the availability of cheap travel. He asked for the application to be rejected.

No Questions

16 Melissa Cowley – Manuden

Ms Cowley said that she thought more information should be put out to explain that the application was not a runway application. Now that she was aware of BAA’s intentions it was clear that previous applications had been the lead up to an environmental catastrophe. Her concerns were as a mother for the future of her children ;noise pollution; asthma; temperatures rising so fast. The arguments for rejection were so strong yet the Council seemed not to have gone that way in the past. She urged them to influence the legacy to the younger generation; the constituents would be behind them whatever the cost.

Questions

In answer to a question Ms Cowley said that the Uttlesford District Council should commission an expert on the links between plane emissions and asthma.

Ms Cowley also submitted written observations as follows:-

Ladies and Gentlemen

I heard about tonight’s meeting through SSE and am sure that the vast majority of Uttlesford residents will have little or no understanding or knowledge of this application and will be confusing it with the second runway. I suggest there is a need for more information from the UDC.

I live in Manuden and am here as an individual.

In 2002, a previous incarnation of this committee met to vote on BAA's application to increase the number of passengers using Stansted Airport from 15 to 25 million passengers per annum. Five members voted in favour of the application, three against and three abstained. Two, including the chairman, didn't even attend the meeting. The conditions placed upon the Airport were so woolly that they would be laughable if they didn't have such serious consequences. In hindsight, I am sure many would agree that, now we know BAA's true intentions for Stansted, this application should not have been allowed to become the rollover that it did.

At the last Public Inquiry, Inspector Graham Eyre, stated that the expansion of Stansted beyond 25 million passengers per annum would be an environmental catastrophe. It is this environmental catastrophe that we are now discussing.

Hopefully by now you will have had representations from experts who will have given you far more detail than I can on the arguments for rejecting this latest planning application - on the fact that aviation is the fastest growing source of greenhouse gas emissions and set to eclipse other forms of transport if allowed to grow unchecked; on the fact that aviation creates an economic deficit; on the fact that more people across wider swathes of our region will be more greatly affected by noise and pollution; on the fact that local employers are struggling to find employees to fill positions; on the fact that our roads and rail system are already struggling to cope with the influx of passengers and employees to and from the Airport. The list goes on and on, but I wanted to talk to you today as a mother.

I have four boys aged 8, 7, 5 and 2. They have lived in this area all their lives - as indeed have I (with the exception of 8 or 9 years). Luckily, given that we live in an area with one of the highest incidences of asthma in the UK, only one of them has so far shown any tendency. They are all pretty healthy.

But I fear for their future. The skies are getting ever fuller, the noise is becoming increasingly intolerable, the traffic on our roads is getting worse by the day, communities are being ripped up because of the blight caused by the threat of airport expansion and our quality of life is being constantly eroded. We have no idea exactly which pollutants are being chucked out by aircraft using the Airport and even less idea as to what impact they are going to have on our health. On a global scale our planet is rapidly spinning out of control, with temperatures rising so quickly it looks unlikely that we will be able to halt it unless drastic action is taken right now.

BAA's application to remove the limit on the number of passengers using the Airport is not purely a lifting of conditions as they would have us believe. It will have a profound impact on all of us living around the Airport - and beyond. It is generally agreed by industry experts that BAA's purchase by Ferrovial will mean that the second runway will never get off the ground, but it does make it far more likely that the company will try to maximise use of its existing assets.

The capacity of that single runway could be stretched to handle up to 50mppa and not the 35mppa BAA would have us all focus on.

So where do we go from here? To us laypeople it all looks so easy. BAA 's arguments in favour of expansion simply don't stack up. The arguments in favour of rejecting the proposal are so strong we can't believe there can be any need for discussion. And yet we are all left with a feeling of impending doom that the BAA gun being held to Uttlesford's head will win the day- despite the fact that we don't even know if it is loaded and the fact that the Council seems to have failed to stockpile any weaponry of its own.

There is an ancient Indian proverb: Treat the earth well; it was not given to you by your parents; it was loaned to you by your children. We do not inherit the earth from our ancestors, we borrow it from our children.

Ladies and gentlemen, you are here today because you have been voted in by the residents of Uttlesford to represent us, and to safeguard our health, wellbeing and quality of life. But the decision you are to make on this latest planning application will have far reaching consequences for generations to come. You are in the privileged position of being able to influence the legacy that we will leave for the children of Uttlesford – and further afield.

You have a moral obligation to stand firm against the might of BAA.

So what if they take us to Public Inquiry – let them. So what if they threaten to cancel any planning gain on the table – we don't want to be bought off. If it takes another referendum to give you the mandate to turn this application down then organise one. If it takes hiring expensive consultants to uncover the real truth behind BAA's anything but independent studies then hire them. Do whatever it takes to do the right thing by your constituents. You will find that we are right behind you if you do.

Dear Sirs

I do not think that expanding the aeroplanes time is a good idea.
It will be very noisy.
It will pollute the areas which is bad for children and adults health.

It will also lead to global warming which is not very good for everything including plants, animals etc.

Thank you

Cameron age 8

17 William Chastell – Broxbourne

Mr Chastell said that he spoke as a resident of Broxbourne and an ordinary citizen. He objected to the destruction of villages by BAA. and commented that ;

- (a) the application was unsound and unsustainable, the consultation documents lacking fundamental information, eg the inadequate information about impact of pollution on the environment which should have been assessed by the accelerating damage to trees and woodland, and the question how it affects crops and people.
- (b) Impact on health was very important, eg quality of life; retarded growth of children living near airports.
- (c) Additional surface transport would become essential whereas BAA said no further infrastructure was necessary. Local train services would be depleted and road improvements would be required of a size creating devastating damage to the environment.

He thought BAA should be made to comply with the requirements of the original s106 agreement before any application was considered. The Council's focus should be on the quality of life now and in the future.

No Questions

18 Gary Pearce – GMB London Region

Mr Pearce spoke on behalf of GMB Union. He said he represented about 3,000 employees at the Airport in roles across the job spectrum from IT, management to manual workers and he believed the expansion would improve employment there. He asked the Council to investigate whether the expansion would be good or bad for the local economy.

Questions

When asked about the effect of growth on immigration into the area, he replied that there had been an increase in European foreign workers, mainly through Ryanair because of its operations to eastern Europe but that otherwise most workers were of British nationality.

19 Belinda Irons – Chrishall

Ms Irons criticised the BAA air traffic forecasts. Sustainability she felt was not addressed in their plans as they gave no consideration in them to carbon emissions. The Government did not try to predict global effects: their policy was out of date and out of touch with climate change since it took no account of new information received about it.

It was ridiculous for BAA to say the expanded air travel would have no impact on the environment. High levels of NO2 were being read already now in Saffron Walden and Stansted expansion was bound to increase this

air and travel pollution. The Government took the line that the polluter should pay but this particular polluter seemed to be exempt from paying.

Further, the effects and cross-effects of these pollutants were not being assessed. She was concerned also that the possibility of an air accident seemed to be being glossed over. Noise pollution in Chrishall was already bad and it seemed unlikely that BAA would invest in “new” quieter aircraft.

She believed the Government should be challenged over the high pollution levels. Employees at the airport were likely to be drawn from London, not from the rural parishes, and most of the flights were low cost holiday flights.

She suggested that if the Government were unwilling to tax aircraft fuel, the local authorities should put tolls on roads leading to the Airport.

She added that government support for industry should be revisited to eliminate anti-competitive exemption from taxes being given to particular industries selected by Government.

She asked also that the Local Plan Policy be reviewed and that a policy limiting use of the Airport be incorporated in it.

Ms Irons also submitted written observations as follows:-

BAA Presentation:

Thank you for allowing the opportunity for community consultation. I wish to object to the BAA Stansted planning application to remove passenger limits and vary flight numbers.

I have read both consultation documents, and the Health Impact Assessment provided by BAA. There are three main themes in the documents:

Sustainable development, negligible impact and economic growth.

Firstly, expansion of the airport and its activities is not sustainable in environmental terms. Any industry which is excluded from the carbon emissions calculations has carte blanche to expand regardless of impact. BAA states that air transport carbon emissions will be catered for 'in an overall reducing total'. Air transport is set to become the biggest emitter of carbon if it is allowed to expand unchecked. The Governments 'predict and provide' White Paper on aviation does not predict the scientific scenarios of severe climate change with associated desertification, drought, environmental refugees, sea level rise as ice sheets melt, the collapse of the gulf stream. The Government is out of date with current scientific analysis of the situation and out of touch with popular and scientific understanding of this issue. This cannot go unchallenged. Climate change is the biggest picture.

Secondly, the consultation documents state throughout that any environmental impacts will be negligible, giving the impression that air travel has no impact on the environment. Calculations within the documents state there will be percentage increases in a number of known pollutants including NO2 nitrous oxide. The recent Essex County Council transport document states that Saffron Walden is reaching levels of NO2 which will require monitoring for the community's good health. If the additional predicted 14% increase from aviation, plus the increase attributed to increased vehicle movements to the airport are included, it will mean that Saffron Walden residents will be subjected to significant air pollution. I believed that the Government's stand on pollution was that the 'polluter pays' -it would appear aviation is exempt. The science behind the consultation document ~ needs to be challenged as it repeatedly states that any effect related to expansion will be negligible. Yet in the Health Impact Assessment it states that environmental impacts will be adverse. The cumulative and synergistic effects of pollutants have not been addressed. If the environment were a listed building, BAA would be the subject of Council enforcement.

I am very concerned that the risk of accidents is glossed over -I live under the flight paths and stacking circles for Stansted, Luton, Cambridge, Duxford, Military jets and helicopters are virtually a daily occurrence as are private aircraft and helicopters. It takes one inexperienced pilot to miscalculate the situation and Chishall will be wiped out. Noise pollution in Chishall is already problematic. According to BAA this is unfortunate and unavoidable. New aircraft should be quieter. New aircraft cost a lot of money and I cannot see bargain bucket operators investing in new when the old work but are noisy. The World Health Organisation recommends a limit of 50 decibels whereas the British Government are allowing a higher number of decibels at 57 which is 5 times noisier than WHO. I believe the Government should be challenged over this unacceptably high level.

Thirdly, BAA states that an increase in flights will bring increased work and prosperity to this area. An area which already has one of the lowest levels of unemployment, and the highest levels of prosperity in this country. Workers will be recruited from north and east London, not this area. The increase in aviation is economically unsustainable as it is based on tax concessions and subsidisation. No other transport industry has such an unfair advantage over its competitors. This is anti-competitive. The bulk of flights are low fare holiday flights, not related to business.

I would like Uttlesford District Council to take a firm stance and stick to its original planning consent. Enforce the limit on passenger numbers and flights.

In addition, I would like Uttlesford to challenge the Aviation White Paper as aviation is an environmental polluter, it is anti-competitive, and it is environmentally unsustainable.

If Central Government will not take action to curb aviation and its unacceptable pollution, I strongly urge Uttlesford District Council to impose

local taxes such as tolls on the M11 and the A120, and environmental tax on every flight out of Stansted. This could then be spent on energy efficiency measures throughout Uttlesford District to offset the carbon emissions produced by the aircraft.

I would urge Members of Parliament to press the Transport Minister to revisit the Aviation White Paper, and reassess its anti-competitive support for the industry .

20 Catherine and David Morse – did not attend

21 Terry Grace – did not attend.

22 Edward Elmer – Bishop’s Stortford

Mr Elmer spoke as a local resident of Stortford asking the Committee to reject the application on the basis of everything they had heard at the meeting. It was unsustainable. The document produced by BAA was very unconvincing and he wished to protest also about the previous application. The implications were vast. Hertfordshire was one of the worst areas for asthma and he asked the Council to reject the application as by a polluting applicant.

Questions

Mr Elmer confirmed that he would have liked his own local Council to consult him on this subject and he thought it was awful that he had been unable to express his feelings on the matter due to being outside Uttlesford.

No Questions

23 Jackie Dean

“As a resident of Great Easton I am asking tonight
That you give us
The people of Uttlesford A FAIR DEAL.

My worry
Is that in striving to show
How fair you are to THEM, You will be wholly unfair To US.

I ask that you be
As firm and decisive
With Stansted Airport
As you would be with me
With plans to extend my home Or business.

If I put in a plan
That would make
My neighbours' lives Hell- You would reject it.

If I ignored
Or refused your request
For further information - I would be refused.

If my business projections
Were based on a single product (budget flights, for example) With% of that
product From one provider, You would say that I had all my eggs In one
basket.
My plans would be Unsustainable.

You would be particularly wary If that one provider
Suddenly announced That it intends to
Scale down its business with me - As Ryanair has with Stansted.

YOU are accountable to us. Your decision impacts On all of US
And future generations.
Your choice is plain and clear. You either protect US
From an "environmental catastrophe", By rejecting the airport's application - Or you
DON'T .
A failure to protect us now Would make any promises
For our future quality of life Nothing more than just HOT AIR.
In summary: It is my personal fear that the councillors on the Development Control
Committee will strive to cast aside any personal prejudicial judgement to such an
extent that they might, in so doing, give the applicant an unfair advantage over the
wishes over the wider community of Uttlesford.
I ask that the Committee rejects this application on the grounds that:
1. It has not provided the requested information.
2. The development would have a detrimental effect on the environment and impair
the amenities of its neighbours.
3. The expansion is unsustainable.

Please ensure that you maintain a true and fair balance on a decision that could
mark the beginning of the end for this beautiful district.

No Questions

24 John Mitchell – did not attend

25 Davis Willingham – member of Linton Parish Council but representing himself

"I myself am a native of New York City and know from growing up under the
flight paths of three airports just what it means to live in a place blighted by air
traffic.

My daughter is not yet five and yet even she asks why so many planes are always in our skies. I have no wish to see her raised in the kind of environment I recall so well from childhood, one characterised by road and air congestion, noise and air pollution.

There will be an enormous additional burden placed on the local housing market, with an inevitable knock-on effect to local facilities from schools and hospitals to shops and available childcare places.

The projected expansion takes no credible account of current thinking as regards future oil production, which anticipates a constant increase in price against a background of ever-scarcer and more-expensive-to-extract reserves. An increase in cheap flights might very well cost the earth. There remain, of course, the natural safety concerns associated with any airport, particularly in light of the Korean Air 747 freight plane crash in Hatfield Forest in 1999. These concerns can only grow along with the increasing air traffic.

As regards aviation industry claims that airport expansion entails economic prosperity for the surrounding area, the opposite has been shown to be the case. This area already has low levels of unemployment and those jobs expansion would bring will in no way compensate for its many negative aspects.

The predict-and-provide approach to transport planning has been widely discredited in the area of road transport because it has been shown to actually generate more traffic. The same is true of aviation. Planning only to cater to growth in demand is short-sighted, unsustainable and totally illogical. As evidenced in the long-running and widely supported campaign in the local media against the expansion of Stansted Airport, this proposal flies in the face of the vast majority of opinion in the area, which firmly DOES NOT want the airport to grow to such a level.

To add insult to injury, this area's residents and all other UK taxpayers will be putting their hands in their pockets for the privilege of inflicting this damaging expansion on themselves by way of the enormous, unrealistic and economically nonsensical subsidies enjoyed by aviation fuel.

The proposed expansion of activities at Stansted Airport will be of benefit ONLY to BAA and its shareholders and I earnestly ask you to reject it .

BAA wants to maximise the capacity of its existing runway. It is claimed this dramatic escalation of activities to handle up to one-quarter of a million extra passengers every week is necessary to meet projected demand.

However, the fallout of such an expansion will be far more than monetary. There will be a dramatic increase in the level of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Climate change is the single greatest threat and challenge the world faces in the foreseeable future. Last Thursday , the BBC reported that the UK

government had promised to cut, by 2012, carbon emissions from big business by 12.5% on last year's levels.

A major obstacle to that goal is that aviation is the fastest-growing contributor to climate change. One recent independent projection anticipates that if aviation continues to grow at the present rate, it alone will account for the entire emissions budget for all sectors of the UK economy within the next 30 years.

Surely a rational society should be collectively seeking ways to reduce our CO2 output, not increase it by allowing airports to recklessly expand solely for the financial betterment of a small minority of shareholders?

.It will also place an intolerable and ultimately unbearable burden on the local transport infrastructure.

The vast majority of those using the airport arrive via road, not rail (again burning more fossil fuels) This area's roads were not designed to handle such a load, nor does the enhancement of the airport's accesses from Junction 8 of the M11 make any significant contribution to alleviating the congestion on the many A and B roads in the area.

As a resident of Sawbridgeworth for 13 years, I have witnessed the increasing road congestion and am firmly of the opinion that the network will prove seriously inadequate when it comes to shouldering the additional burden the proposed expansion will entail.

Another issue is that the noise pollution already experienced will increase in both frequency of occurrence and volume. This has been proven to be a factor in increasing human stress levels and is equally damaging to the local wildlife, especially to songbirds currently in population decline. This airport's current activities already have a negative impact on the local environment and ancient woodlands alongside the communities in which we live.

Just six months ago, a close friend remarked to me that her daughter's third articulate word, after 'mummy' and 'daddy', was 'plane' because they are such a familiar and increasingly regular sight from her garden."

26 Chris Bull – Ramblers Society

"Good evening. My name is Christopher Bull. I am speaking on behalf of Uttlesford Ramblers although the views expressed are my own I am Essex born and bred; I have lived in Essex all my life and have lived in the Uttlesford area for just over 21 years.

Throughout my life, enjoyment of the countryside and country pursuits have been significant elements.

Over the years I have noticed a steady increase in the number of people using the countryside as a resource for exercise, relaxation, sports and

hobbies.

I believe this to be a result of the greater pressures put on us all by our work-life and consumer life styles.

There is so much pressure; to compete; to perform; to maximise effort; and to strive for ever greater efficiency.

It seems fairly certain that life-pressures will continue to increase and as they do, the need for access to quality countryside will grow proportionately.

For many, many people the countryside (the raw uncommercialised free-to-access countryside) offers an escape, an opportunity:

to get away from mechanical from noise to get away from hustle and bustle, to taste clean air, to flee crowds and traffic jams to regain our senses

Indeed, this is how we preserve our sanity. But, what of future opportunities to continue to enjoy this resource?

Well, BAA and government departments appear to want to destroy by stealth a huge area of quality countryside in the South East, one of the most densely populated areas of England.

Not just a huge airport, but, equally massive airport related industry and/just to put the lid on it, they want to urbanise the M11 corridor, requiring massive infrastructure.

Clearly, they're not planning to leave us much, are they?

Everyone should be aware by now that behind the spin of government and behind the obfuscation of BAA's weasel words, their agenda is to massively expand Stansted Airport.

I don't just mean within the constraints of this or what they refer to as their "Preferred Proposal" which in itself might well be called massive expansion. No, we cannot doubt that they will come back again and again until they get their four runways with passenger quotas that would make Stansted the biggest airport in Europe.

Expansion is the life blood to a commercial facility such as Stansted. It is an appetite that can never be satiated.

In fact to feed the monster now will only whet its appetite. Expansion of market share. Expansion of revenue. Expansion of profits. Expansion is the easiest way to grow shareholder value.

Expansion is the easiest way to grow profit.

The management of BAA has absolutely no obligation to the ordinary people of this area The BAA management's agenda is to ruthlessly exploit to the maximum this corner of England.

If BAA gets its wish, we will never be able to turn the clock back. What we

lose we will lose forever.

The **permanent** destruction of creatures and their natural habitat, laid waste under concrete and tar, smothered by foul air, driven away by noise and disturbance.

I have walked in several countries other than England, and I have walked throughout this country and other parts of Britain and Ireland. As beautiful and interesting as all these places are, I have seen a greater variety of wildlife in this locality than anywhere else. It amazes me that this abundance can tolerate the pressures of living in such close proximity with humans. But, this shouldn't be taken as a sign of unlimited tolerance. It may well be that incremental environmental pressure represented by the ambitions of BAA will prove just too much and cause the collapse of the local fauna and flora. Imagine our countryside barren of bird song, never offering the pulse quickening sights of nature's wonderful creatures and plants. It could happen.

The human species has done so much damage to this planet that it is quite possible that the next generation will find life extremely challenging, so hostile will the environment be. We must show them that we tried to lessen the damage.

We have an opportunity now to say enough is enough and no more. We can stand in defence of nature and our right to enjoy it.

We can take a stand to defend our right to a decent quality of life. We can choose to defend the diversity of the local fauna and flora. We can choose to preserve what is beautiful in the hope that future generations will be able to enjoy their heritage. Please do all you can to bring a permanent cessation to the expansion of Stansted Airport. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to present my case.

27 Lizzie Sanders – Littlebury

Good evening Madam Chairman and committee members

You can see how it is Mr and Mrs Fly have always loved holidaying in Portugal, sitting on sun-kissed beaches, eating fresh sardines and drinking local wine. The countryside where they stay is a bit wild and unspoilt, here they can get away from it all -for years it has been their special place. But these days one holiday a year isn't really enough. They'd like to come more often so they purchase an apartment in the new development nearby, which has been built for people just like them.

Having spent the money the Flys justify the purchase with regular visits, because of the low cost of flying. It's just lovely for them.

The high cost to everyone else though, is that the Flys are making a regular contribution to the pollution of Uttlesford air, Portuguese air, and points in

between.

Equally compromised is the countryside of the wild, unspoilt and special place they chose since their new second home will require the full infrastructure of roads, and a panoply of shops, hospitals, leisure centres, and amenities with which to service it.

In a few short years the result will be just as desirable to get away from. Mr and Mrs Fly will be looking for another wild, unspoilt, special place and guess what? The developers and airlines will be right there beside them.

Frequent flying is causing the deterioration of many destinations, and not just ours.

Do businessmen really need to fly to meetings abroad, now that there is video conferencing? No, they just like it.

Should the Ladies group fly to Vienna for lunch - just because they can? No, they just like it too.

Should we be buying flown-in strawberries in December? No! And they don't even taste good.

Are we all children who cannot see the consequences of our actions?

Expanding airports and more and more flights will increase carbon dioxide emissions, diminish the fragile beauty of our countryside and villages through increased housing and traffic, disturb sleep, challenge health, not just here, but in other parts of the world too. While government gives lip service to the problems of global warming it is caught like a rabbit in the headlights when it comes to actually doing anything about it because of the way that the electoral system works.

It is undecided as to policy. In 2003 its Energy White Paper set out a strategy for tackling global climate change, with tough targets for greenhouse gas emissions while the very same year Alastair Darling stated that he was convinced that the country's future prosperity depended on the development of air transport over the next 30 years. Patently politicians are not taking responsibility at the very least, by talking amongst themselves. Therefore we must work to make sure there is a viable future. We should take responsibility if they won't.

And Mr and Mrs Fly need to learn to love Port Merion instead.

We need you to be brave and maybe just a bit radical and fly. Fly in the face of Government policy for an increase in air travel, I pray, Ma'am, and committee members, dig your heels in, and say NO to this application citing the Government's own 2003 Energy White Paper.

Be vocal about it, locally and nationally. Pay for a fight if necessary .

We need you to do this because the issues are bigger than any of us. And, it is our children and their children who will be left with the results of your decision making.

Will they inherit an environmental mess, delivered through lack of courage and foresight, or will it be like the Uttlesford we now know?

You do this because The Uttlesford 2003 manifesto said that we would become known as a part of the country that it would be unacceptable to destroy by a multi-runway airport, and because in the 2003 referendum 89% of respondents said NO to the expansion of Stansted airport.

And you should do this because you have a wonderful opportunity. That is your mandate to be bold in deciding this application.

As our representatives, be wise, be courageous, and please say No!

28 Ian Bruce – Pleshey

I strongly object to this BAA planning application because:

(1) It imposes no maximum number of passengers using Stansted and thus, with increasingly large aircraft being built, the runway might end up handling 50million or even 100 million passengers a year.

(2) Without further BAA investment proposed in road or rail, the only way even the 35 million that BAA mentions could be handled is by unacceptable methods like using the airport extensively at night or those of us living in the area now providing that investment.

(3) So far as the Environmental Impact Assessment is concerned, the submission to UDC ignores no fewer than 48 of the items requested by UDC -hence the large gaps make it impossible to assess the full extent of the impacts.

(4) Any significant increase in flights would negate all Government policies to reduce global Warming.

The results of expansion would include:

More noise and interruption from over flying
More road traffic and congestion. Busier and more crowded trains

More pressure on the region's already inadequate water supplies. Landscape impacts from the extra parking that would be built. More air pollution and health/environment related problems. More adverse effects on Hatfield Forest. More pressure on night flights. More damage to the region's tourist industry. More global warming

A lowering of the quality of our life in this region.

In conclusion: I urge UDC to reject this application on the grounds that expansion of any airport in the United Kingdom should only be considered as part of an integrated national strategy for air transport which pays full regard to the wider environmental impacts of growth in commercial aviation. It is also imperative that those who require additional infrastructure should pay for it. Otherwise those of us who live here now will have to pay for it by paying more for less (if any) use of scarce resources like water so that the airport can operate.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Bruce

Copy: Cllr Christina Cant, Westside, The Downs, Stebbing, Essex CM6 JRA

Ian Bruce objector - 5 July 2006

"Good evening Madame Chairman. My name is Ian Bruce and I live in Pleshey which is about 10 miles from the airport and in Chelmsford. My comments are about how the proposed expansion will affect the area as a whole not just to Pleshey. We have quite enough aircraft noise and air pollution at the moment without that almost doubling as it would if the limit on air traffic movements is increased to 264,000 per year and the limit of 25mppa is removed.

I say 'almost doubling' because currently there is 1 ATM about every 120 seconds. Increasing the ATMs to 264,000 per year would allow 1 ATM about every 80 Seconds, i.e. an increase of about 50%. However, aircraft are getting bigger and that would further increase the noise and air pollution they produce -hence 'almost doubling' it.

It would be difficult to schedule all the ATMs into 80 second slots. With the inevitable delays we can expect more aircraft in the night which is totally unacceptable. Removing the limit of 25mppa would have catastrophic effects on road and rail traffic. It would also increase the number of people working at the airport and in associated industries. This, in turn, would increase the infrastructure needed outside the airport -more houses, schools, roads, rail capacity, hospitals and services like water.

BAA claims that the passengers would rise to 35mppa and that would only require - minimal increases in infrastructure. I believe that without a limit the rise could be around 150mppa and the 35mppa figure is merely the theoretical maximum that could be handled without extra infrastructure by scheduling extra flights in the 'slack' periods of the day. Further increases might need planning permission only when more airport buildings were needed. These could be forced through on the basis of government policy of 'making maximum use of the existing runway.' As the airport became bigger further infrastructure needs would be hidden as being required by the community so BAA would argue against having to pay for them.

Why do I think the number of passengers would increase so alarmingly? If there were no passenger limits, 264,000 ATMs a year, 227ppf(passengers per flight) would carry 60mppa (roughly the current load at Heathrow). An all 747 airport at 450 ppf could carry 119mppa (roughly 2 Heathrows) and an all A380 could carry 153mppa in a normal configuration of 580 passengers. The latter might be unlikely but if the 25mppa limit were removed we could easily have one, or even two

Heathrows in say 20 years time~ with only one runway! I There is no way the present local infrastructure could handle that and the environmental impact would be catastrophic.

This may sound an unlikely scenario but BAA has only one remit: to make money and if allowed to do the unlikely, it will. I therefore propose that Uttlesford rejects this application.

It appears to some that BAA are asking for an increase of merely 10% in ATMs from 241,000 to 264,000. In fact it is about 35% from 196,000 (10% more than at present) because the passenger numbers may currently only increase by about 10% from 22.5mppa to 25mppa.

Post Meeting Question: How would Uttlesford control the numbers if having passed the application, BAA decided to use all the available 86000 ATMs for 7478 with 450 passengers per flight to carry an additional 38.7mppa taking the total to over 60mppa i.e. to another Heathrow?

29 Robert Church – Cherry Green Broxton

“Thank you Chairman, I wish to formally object to this planning application because as residents my family and I experience at first hand the damaging effects to our lives caused by the last increase in passenger and flight numbers.

This has resulted in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance caused by airplanes,

- a; taking off
- b; landing
- c; over-flying.

As a consequence of this noise and disturbance, we suffer from sleep deprivation and it is impossible to catch up on sleep with an early night or a lay in due to the air traffic rush hour which has now grown to an intolerable level. The daytime noise and disturbance level is also currently intolerable. I would support a decrease in flight and passenger numbers to alleviate our suffering, I could not support the increase as proposed in this application for extension.

Furthermore if allowed, the obvious increase of damage to the local and global environment would be totally unacceptable,

I object to the increase in toxic particulates to the atmosphere,

I object at increased waste matter generated by expansion, leaving Essex to dispose of it within our waste quota.

I object to the light pollution and the increased energy demand,

I object to the greater demand put upon our scarce water supply by this

environmentally unsustainable application.

I object to the loss of amenity by seeing and hearing airplanes in greater numbers. For no reason other than environment damaging cheap flights.

I object to our police force being stretched in deployment to the airport and the airport not paying for its share of costs, leaving us to foot the bill from the council tax.

I consider that this application is insensitive to the protection afforded us by a planning condition because;

I understood from the last planning application that my family and I as community members were protected from further expansion by the placing of a condition that limits passenger and flight numbers, these conditions were made in order to protect us within the local community by its representatives at council.

Therefore we would feel betrayed and violated if this application to vary or remove the planning condition that serves to protect us is allowed by the council.

In conclusion then, for the reasons stated i believe the case for refusal is immediate and compelling and that this application should be refused.

Yours most sincerely

Robert Church and Family

30 Liz Woods – Widdington

Ms Woods was concerned because so much was at stake. She asked that the application be turned down for sound planning reasons of irreversible damage which would happen to the rural character of the area, the countryside and its communities. She felt the only way to preserve these things was to say “No” with no deals or compromises.

31 Maggie Sutton

“I will leave it to the experts amongst us to continue to highlight the reasons why further expansion of Stansted Airport both nationally and locally is totally unacceptable.

I want, for just a few moments, to reflect on my own very personal view. I am very aware the issue does affect people living a lot further away already. I want people to listen to this and realise my story could one day be similar to theirs.

Eleven years ago my husband and five small children came to live in the village of Broxted. We had lived on the outskirts of London in a semi detached home in a very urban environment. We wanted, for our children the experience of the space, appreciation of the outstanding natural beauty, the benefit of small schools, short waiting lists and no queues.

We got all that and much more. We discovered people generally had much more time for us in school, at the shops, in our village and beyond. We made fantastic friends and neighbours.

But for the impact the airport has brought to our family over the last four years our children have had the opportunity of a most wonderful childhood living here in, Uttlesford which will hopefully serve them for the rest of their lives. Expansion plans bring the promise of a great many changes. What of the children still to come? Will they be afforded the same benefits or will the impacts THEY receive be too great.

Our new home was now a listed period cottage in a few acres of land which enabled us to acquire sheep, ducks, chickens and rabbits as pets. We believed we had found a most charmed life.

We were aware that we were moving near to an airport but at that time it served only half the number of people it does today and we in those days, we hardly noticed a plane. We had absolutely no idea of the threat and anxiety we would one day suffer. One which would continue for many years to come. Our lives started to fall apart at the announcement of approval for expansion of Stansted to 25 million passengers per year. Our neighbour started to become an ever growing, greedy noisy out of control monster from that time forward.

At the time of the White Paper announcement we were to learn THAT our neighbour/that monster wanted our home as well. Our home, those views, our community all now under threat.

These days -in the summer months, with the wind in a certain direction planes take off over Broxted and our lives become a living hell.

Over the last three weeks when the weather has been so wonderful the planes have been taking off overhead. With the need to open windows and the airport at its most busiest time the noise has been absolutely intense. The airport actually springs to life at 5 am each morning with start of excessive ground noise followed shortly by a never ending line of loud roaring planes. From that moment onward it is impossible to sleep.

This goes on all day and even as night falls the airport continues to hum in the background as we fall asleep.

At these periods we never get complete, unbroken sleep during the night. There are always, during the very early hours of the morning, several large and noisy planes ready to wake us from that sleep.

We suffer greatly from airport related traffic through our villages day and night. There is much to be done to address this -least of all operating traffic calming measures and, as a result, a great many locally accidents on our tiny lanes occur.

Fly parking is much worse than UDC can ever imagine. People park at private local addresses, in local roads, in fields, and in a great many public house car parks. This brings traffic to our region which goes on from early morning until late at night. Our lanes are constantly used by speeding airport cabs cutting through the villages.

Large haulage lorries often find their way onto our tiny lanes taking trees and overhead cables sometimes with them as they pass. Small industrial airport related units are springing up in our villages leaving broken road signs and corroded verges in their path.

The community we loved has been torn apart. People who can escape... WILL escape. OR is there really any escape from what has already been put in place?

Like the tide coming in – it might one day reach others much further afield!

The application before you is inadequate. Most of the requirements, assurances and promises made at the last application are unfulfilled. Already I fear much is out of control in our District and BAA must be held to account.

The application must be turned down. Because of it we here in Uttlesford have heavy hearts. We look to you UDC not to sell our souls.

In response to questions, Maggie Sutton stated that the community had changed over the past four years. All the nearby properties to her home were now owned by BAA and were let and sub-let to tenants. The lives of her children revolved around SSE and they had observed change in their environment.

The meeting closed at 10:30pm