

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held at 2.30pm at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN on 6 JULY 2006

Present: - Councillor C A Cant (Chairman)
Councillors E C Abrahams, P Boland, 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: - V Harvey, J Mitchell, C Oliva and J Pine

DC53

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no apologies for absence.

Councillor Cheetham declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a Member of the NWEHPA, the Hatfield Forest Management Board and the National Trust.

Councillor Loughlin declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a Member of Stansted Parish Council.

Councillor Miller declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a Member of Great Dunmow Town Council.

Councillor Thawley declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a Member of CPRE and the National Trust.

Councillor Down declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a Member of CPRE.

Councillor Dean declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a Member of the National Trust.

DC54

REPRESENTATIONS FROM SUPPORTERS AND OBJECTORS

The Executive Manager (Development Services) thanked members of the public for attending the fourth meeting of the public engagement week. He said the Council had so far received over 1000 representations.

The Chairman then invited the speakers to make their representations.

Sir George Bull – Resident of Arkesden

Sir George Bull had been a resident in Arkesden for 33 years and was a frequent flyer having over 2 million British Airways air miles. He made the following points:

- He was not opposed to flying and had been flying since 1957.

- People who lived under the flight path for Heathrow airport were given a discount when buying a house.
- No major airlines used Stansted.
- Stansted was in the wrong location to be a major international airport as it had a poor infrastructure to serve the City and London.
- Stansted served budget airlines, what would happen when Green- led fuel restrictions come in and the growth of cheap travel declined?

He acknowledged the need for a major international airport, but Stansted was not suitable; he said the best long term option was to develop an airport in the Thames Estuary and in the interim expand Heathrow.

Mrs White – Resident of Wormley

Mrs White congratulated the Council for the open and democratic approach to the planning application. She then proceeded to show the Committee an arrivals map that illustrated a series of red lines denoting individual arrivals tracks, of which many met over Wormley. She said the number of night flights appeared to be increasing. On the night of the 28 April 2006 she went to bed at 11pm and heard a plane turning on final approach to Stansted, from then until midnight she counted 26 planes. She said each plane overhead was noisy for 1 minute 40 seconds, and there was then only 20 second break between planes, this caused a major disruption to sleep. Mrs White was also often woken up between 3am and 4am with cargo planes flying overhead. She finished by saying the lack of sleep was effecting her health and that sleep deprivation was a form of torture.

Councillor Godwin explained that the hours between 11.00pm and 11.30 pm and 6.30am and 7.00 am were shoulder periods and asked Mrs White if the noise in the mornings was as problematic. Mrs White said there was not as much aircraft noise in the mornings. Councillor Loughlin asked Mrs White if she or the Wormley Society had complained to Stansted Airport; Mrs White said she had not, but she had written to the Executive Manager (Development Services) at Uttlesford District Council. Councillor Cheetham asked Mrs White if there was a particularly bad time of year for aircraft noise. Mrs White said there were no real identifiable bad periods, however it had got considerably worse recently.

Michael Cuddeford – Resident of Pleshey

Michael Cuddeford made reference to the previous Stansted Inquiry. Graham Eyre's report stated unequivocally that 25 million passenger movements per annum was the maximum amount that could be considered, even though 25mppa would in itself be environmentally damaging. 25mppa was not chosen because it was thought to be the maximum capacity of the runway, but because it was the maximum capacity the local environment could sustain. For BAA to now submit an application in disregard of the findings of a public inquiry was extremely cynical. Mr Cuddeford said if he was asked to sacrifice his home, health and happiness to defend the country from foreign aggression then he would do it, but not so as someone else could have a cheap weekend abroad. No amount of money was worth the long term human cost that this

application would bring about. Not expanding would not put at risk any existing jobs. This area had one of the lowest unemployment rates in Britain, and many of the jobs created would likely be filled by East European economic migrants. The function of Uttlesford District Council was to serve the needs of the people who it represented. Mr Cuddeford ended by saying this application must be rejected.

Keith Hunt – Resident of Hatfield Heath

Having spoken to a number of people about the proposed application Mr Hunt was surprised it was felt that this planning application was a done deed. He did not view this to be so. When studying the Generation 2 BAA Airport Options before purchasing his house in Hatfield Heath last February, the Air Noise Contour Plan no.5 (the preferred option) indicated that Hatfield Heath came outside the 57dB Leq contour with regard to noise levels. Mr Hunt had experienced unacceptable noise levels; he said the plan was misleading. He felt the Council had a duty of care to the vast majority of residents who did not want this expansion. This expansion would contravene human rights and remove the right to enjoy ones property with the increased noise, air pollution and environmental problems. Mr Hunt concluded by saying enough is enough, turn the expansion plans down.

Robert and Jane Newman – Residents of Ware

Mrs Newman started by saying the town of Ware, where her husband and she lived was 12 miles from Stansted Airport. She then made the following points:

- Presently planes flew directly over the town during the daytime and evening, sometimes starting before 6am and not finishing until after midnight.
- The planes seemed to be no higher than 1,500 feet in the air and sometimes lower.
- When turning over Ware the noise was horrendous.
- You could not hear people talking, and all life stopped when planes flew over and it was often followed by another plane two minutes later.
- The planes would interfere with the television and radio and she could often hear the pilots conversations through the radio.
- The situation was intolerable.
- If the amount of flights increased, the area would be intolerable, and lives ruined.
- House prices would be affected and people's financial situation often depended on the valuation of their homes.
- The infrastructure had worsened, with the loss of fast trains on the Hertford East Line.
- Hac high concern over the carcinogenic effect of fuel that was released from planes.

Councillor Loughlin asked if there was a particularly bad time of day for the air noise. Mr Newman said it depended on the direction of the wind.

Jonathan Fox – Resident of Sawbridgeworth

Mr Fox started by saying that at school he remembered watching a programme on Climate Change and learnt that the growing aviation industry was the fastest growing contributor to climate change. Having looked on the Council's website he noticed that UDC were a signatory to the Nottingham Declaration on climate change, he said this committed the Council to tackling the causes and effects of climate change. BAA stated that full use of runway 1 was only a minor change but they were being disingenuous with the facts, as this proposal would result in an increase of passenger numbers from the current 22mppa to nearly 50mppa. It would also see an extra 80,000 flights per annum and 250,000 extra passengers travelling weekly. It would also result in an extra 5 million tonnes of CO2 entering the atmosphere. The Aviation Transport White Paper highlighted the fact that CO2 emissions from aviation would increase to 59/66 million tonnes by 2030, double the level of 2000. Mr Fox and his wife wrote to various bodies concerning the consultation on options for future development of air transport in the UK. The response from the Liberal Democrats referred to sustainability as not to cause long term damage to the environment and said "we should not leave future generations to pick up the cost of our current activities". The response from Bill Rammell said "If aviation takes no further action, CO2 reductions under Kyoto could be offset by 30% / 50% by 2012 simply through aviation emissions"; and the response from UDC said the Council was "Working closely with local organisations MPs and other local authorities to ensure this part of Essex remained as unspoilt as possible". Mr Fox concluded by saying the Council was in charge of an awesome responsibility, and it had to make a choice between the expansionist aims of the aviation industry and protecting the communities threatened by the large scale environmental destruction that full use of runway 1 would cause. He urged the Committee to reject this application.

Doreen Parsonage – Representative from the Wormley Society

The Wormley Society objected to the expansion of Stansted Airport. Wormley was located directly under the turning loop for aeroplanes descending for landing. Presently residents incurred a lot of noise from the large number of planes overhead. The noise was often late at night and in the hot weather residents could not have their windows open as it was too noisy. Televisions and radios would also receive interference. One evening she recorded 49 planes overhead between the hours of 9pm and midnight, plus another 13 between midnight and 1am. Members of the Wormley Society felt they were suffering enough from noise and lack of sleep and any further extensions would make their lives intolerable.

Timings of planes over Wormley

21.00	21.10	21.16	21.19	21.23	21.42	21.44	21.48
21.52	22.03	22.07	22.10	22.13	22.15	22.17	22.20
22.22	22.27	22.29	22.29	22.31	22.35	22.37	22.48
22.53	22.55	22.57	22.59	23.02	23.03	23.06	23.12

23.15	23.18	23.20	23.23	23.30	23.32	23.34	23.36
23.38	23.40	23.42	23.44	23.46	23.48	23.51	23.53
23.58	00.00	00.02	00.04	00.06	00.08	00.12	00.14
00.20	00.34	00.38	00.41	00.45	00.47	00.55	

Councillor Thawley asked if frequent flights over Wormley affected the value of homes. Mrs Parsonage said there were three houses on her street that had been on the market for several months and had not yet sold. Councillor Cheetham asked Mrs Parsonage if she had taken this matter to Stansted Airport, she said she had not, but had made contact with Stop Stansted Expansion.

Michael Stiles – Resident of Rickling

The presentation by BAA given to the Committee on 24 May identified the main points which were not included in BAA’s Environmental Statement. He outlined four issues.

1. The Level Of Uncertainty About The Effect Of The Changes Proposed – the information that BAA presented left an unacceptably high level of uncertainty. For example with the larger aircraft, 50 mppa could be handled on the existing runway if 264,000 commercial flights a year were permitted. There was no reliable information to clarify the effect on noise, air pollution, night flights, damage to health, greenhouse gas emissions, road congestion and pressure on rail services.
2. The Reliability Of Information – BAA had made its projections based on assumptions and had chosen not to provide certain information required in the Scoping Opinion. Assumptions included the projections of night flights, shoulder period flights and mix of aircraft.
3. The Presentation Of Information – BAA’s comparison of the projected 35mppa and 25mppa cases was based on fallacy insofar as the incremental impact argument was an implicit assumption that the present level of activity at Stansted was acceptable. This was not true, as the local population was already suffering from the detrimental effects of previous expansion to the current level of activity. BAAs Planning Statements points 2.43 and 5.59 contradicted themselves.
4. The Economic Power Of Stansted Airport - as a dominant economic power in the region Stansted Airport’s approach to the application had been to use its large resources to pursue its corporate objectives with little regard for requirements in the Scoping Opinion.

Mr Stiles then concluded with the following points, hoping the Committee would agree that:

- The only way of preserving any control over expansion would be to maintain strict conditions.
- The idea that BAA should be allowed to proceed without a limit on passenger numbers was completely unacceptable.
- The Committee should refuse the current application.

Dick Histed – South Suffolk Air Traffic Action Group (SSATAG)

Mr Histed emphasised how the application would be very environmentally and psychically detrimental to over a million people far beyond the borders of Uttlesford. In April 2004 he discovered hundreds of low flying commercial jets appeared in the skies, where previously there had been none; these all appeared with no public consultation. The rerouting of jets accessing Stansted meant that all of North and East Essex and most of Suffolk was now affected by low flying commercial jet aircraft. He said that if this had been a motorway there would have been procedures to object to the development; there was no accountability in the air. At a meeting with the Civil Aviation Authority and National Air Traffic Services he was told that an expansion of Stansted would necessitate a redesign of the airspace, spreading traffic even further into South Norfolk and the creation of a new holding stack over Cambridgeshire. The present operation was degrading the environment of over one million people with intrusive noise and atmospheric pollution. Mr Histed said that SSATAG were not against flying, but believed it was time to strike a balance between the provision of air travel and its detrimental effect on the surrounding environment. Suffolk used to be a by- word for tranquillity, but not anymore. The Government in its Rural White paper said that it aimed “to preserve all things which make the countryside attractive and special, which includes tranquillity”. If this application was approved it would be a direct contradiction of that aspiration. Since SSATAG was formed many people had contacted them saying their sleep had been disturbed, they could not relax in their gardens or enjoy quiet walks because of the noise intrusion of passing planes spaced at 30 to 45 second intervals. With fuel costs increasing, cheap flights were set to vanish and demand would decrease making infrastructure changes unnecessary. SSATAG urged the Committee to reject this and any further application to expand Stansted.

Councillor Loughlin asked if SSATAG had made a written representation to the Council. Mr Histed said that they had, as well as written letters to BAA, Babergh District and Suffolk County Councils. Councillor Jones said that at a meeting with BAA two years ago he was told that with the close of the American Airbase flight paths would change. Councillor Cheetham asked if the frequency of the flights were a result of a holding stack. Mr Histed said the Abbot stack was the holding stack over Suffolk and had recently increased in use. Councillor Thawley asked Mr Histed if any noise measurements had been taken in his area. He replied stating a sound survey had been undertaken and the results were in the written submission. Councillor Dean told Mr Histed that the Committee had heard a representation from EERA and had been told that the airport was a strong economic driver within Uttlesford; she asked he felt the same within Suffolk. Mr Histed said that local businesses did not feel the same way, and in fact only 1% of their business came from tourism. Many businesses who provided a tourist service actually felt that the airport was competition taking people away from visiting the area.

Pat Bruce

Mrs Bruce said that Essex was the driest county in the UK. According to the United Nations, East Anglia was classified as 'semi arid'. More than 20 years ago it was recognised that this area had a water problem. In March 2001 the Environment Agency produced a report entitled "Water Resources for the Future" which focussed on Government plans for an 800,000 population increase by 2025 for the whole of the region and said with careful water management, the demand for water might be met. This report was written when passenger numbers at Stansted were smaller. An increase to 35mppa or 40mppa would swallow that 800,000 increase many times over. With the proposed expansion of Stansted Airport and the Government's desire to build tens of thousands of new homes around the region there would be a catastrophe in the making. Mrs Bruce had written to Margaret Beckett and Alistair Darling in 2003 on the issue. The response received from the Water Supply and Regulation Division of DEFRA stated this demand in water would be hard to meet and no provisions had been made for the expansion of Stansted Airport. BAA had only one concern, to make money and had no interest in the water problem. The Environmental Impact Assessment provided by BAA had not fully answered 48 of the questions put by Uttlesford District Council. She concluded by saying UDC should reject the proposal as it would be impossible to reach a decision without being in full possession of the facts.

Councillor Godwin informed Mrs Bruce that the Committee had received a statement from Three Valley Water and were told that an increase in water usage anywhere in the region could be made with water savings.

Mr C Godfrey – Resident in Suffolk

Mr Godfrey said he could not add anymore to what previous speakers had said.

Mr Senior – Resident of Ware

Mr Senior said air transport was a luxury, life was not. He held concern over the health of the younger generation, water and infrastructure. Greater aircraft activity increased the chance of accidents. The Fire Service at the airport only held retained fire fighters, which was not adequate. In addition, Hertfordshire Fire Service did not have the capacity to cope with a major accident. Living in Ware, Mr Senior said aircraft would fly over every 1 minute 45 seconds. One day he had seen a plane flying so low that a microlite had flown above it. Mr Senior concluded by saying peoples lives were precious and should not be ruined by excess air noise.

Derek Winter – Resident of Elsenham

Mr Winter had been a Civil Servant all his life and in the 1950s he worked in the Air Force. During the 1960s the Government decided that aviation was going to be big in the future and had plans to make Stansted a large

international airport with four runways capable of handling 100mppa. He started working at Stansted Airport in 1964, and over the forthcoming years the plans and opposition to extend the airport were massive. During the 1960s Stansted was a training centre, thus many flights took to the air for training purposes as this was the time before flight simulations. About 2,500 residents of Uttlesford were employed at the airport and Mr Winter said he had recently spoken to schools about career opportunities at the Airport. The aircraft noise had diminished over recent years with newer aircraft. The proposals had been present for 40 years as had the same objections, but situations had changed. He said that his life had been improved by the airport and urged the Committee to approve this application.

Councillor Loughlin asked Mr Winter if the majority of residents wanted the four runways. He said that there was now no need for four runways as aircraft were now larger and carried more passengers. Councillor Cheetham asked if Mr Winter still worked for BAA; he said that he worked for a contractor. He also pointed out that due to the recent oil crisis the plans for the Thames Estuary airport had been dropped. Councillor Menell said that we were all much more aware of the fact that we were polluting the planet, which we were not aware of in the 1960's and we should do as much as possible to conserve energy. Mr Winter said many reports identified households as using fuel inefficiently, everyone was responsible, not just aviation. However the aviation industry was growing; China and India were building many new airports in their period of economic growth; if the rest of the world were doing it, why should we be any different. Councillor Dean asked if all the flight courses and noise levels were monitored. Mr Winter said that all flights were tracked to ensure they did not exceed the noise limits. He said that BAA actively encouraged any complaints; if they were not aware of the problems they could not rectify them. All complaints were logged and were presented to the Stansted Airport Consultative Committee. Councillor Thawley asked if the landing of the planes was getting quieter. Mr Winter said he was not a noise expert, but the arrival pattern was the most critical point of the flight and where possible the planes used a controlled descent.

Patricia Brobyn – Resident of Saffron Walden

Miss Brobyn said the noise disturbance in Saffron Walden from aircraft had increased recently and she could not sleep with the windows open. She said BAA had indicated that any expansion in passenger numbers would create more employment, however Uttlesford was well provided for in jobs and did not need extra ones created. Any new jobs would need additional housing, it would not benefit the lives of current residents, but would better the lives of Eastern European immigrants. This increase would be a strain on the hospitals, GPs and schools.

Councillor Loughlin informed Miss Brobyn that she was under the impression that Saffron Walden was not too badly affected by airport noise and asked when this increase in noise occurred. Miss Brobyn said last year she first noticed the increase, and one night in April she had a badly disturbed night's

sleep from the aircraft noise. The Executive Manager (Development Services) informed Miss Brobyn that there was no proposed airport housing.

Colin Turvey – Local Resident

Mr Turvey objected to this application. He said BAA had claimed to have held a consultation with local residents; this was not true as they had only offered display boards. Staff were not informed and unable to answer any questions. He had emailed and written letters to BAA but had not yet received a response and he said the consultation was a sham. He held particular concern over the following areas:

1. The air quality – driving westerly towards the airport there was a layer of smog surrounding the airport.
2. Public transport infrastructure – BAA treated this with contempt. They would expand the number of passengers and consider the public transport at a later date. The express rail link was an embarrassment, despite BAA saying it was satisfactory.

Mr Turvey concluded by saying BAA had provided a poor level of information and therefore the Committee had no option other than to reject this application.

Councillor Thawey asked Mr Turvey if he thought the smog was caused just by the airport or everything in the proximity. Mr Turvey said the air quality got worse approaching the terminal, the M11 was also a factor. Councillor Menell suggested the Principal Environmental Health Officer be asked if he had any statistics on the air quality around the airport. Councillor Godwin suggested the air quality was re-measured around the airport.

Essex Police Service

Michelle Dunn the Divisional Commander at Stansted Airport and Richard Tazzini the Director of Finance and Administration from Essex Police gave a joint response of behalf of Essex Police and the Essex Police Authority to the recent planning application submitted by Stansted Airport Limited (STAL) on the removal of the 25mppa cap at Stansted Airport.

Essex Police objected to the lifting of the current restriction on passenger numbers. This was based on significant concerns regarding the resources available to the Chief Constable that could allow for the limit of passengers to be increased.

Stansted Airport was the UK's designated airport for hijacks and no charge for the two incidents since designation had been passed to STAL.

Police officers were deployed at airports to deliver the major police functions identified by the Department for Transport (DfT) and these functions could be considered under four categories:

- Security and Counter Terrorism
- Public Safety / Contingency Planning
- Crime Prevention / Detection

- General Policing

In addition to providing a normal policing service, officers of the Airport Division also contributed to aviation security. The National Aviation Security Programme set out the specific aviation security responsibilities to police the airport. These were undertaken alongside those set out for the airport operator, the airlines and other control authorities; which were:

- Patrolling and dealing with all unlawful acts discovered or suspected.
- Protecting some high risk operations.
- Maintaining control of firearms in the possession of sky marshals, firearms, explosives and prohibited weapons discovered during passenger and baggage screening.
- Dealing with forced airside access. (Breaches of Security)
- Preventing, detecting and dealing with acts of violence including aircraft hijacks and directed assaults.
- Directing all immediate arrangements when a serious security incident occurred or was reasonably suspected to have occurred.

Essex Police were currently in dispute with STAL over the police budget which had not been agreed for this and the previous financial year (2005/06), resulting in the Chief Constable and the Chair of Essex Police Authority invoking the process of determination via the Secretary of State for Transport in November 2005.

Essex Police were facing a £2 million shortfall in its budget due to the refusal by the airport operator STAL to pay for the full costs of policing the airport. STAL had refused to reimburse in full last year's £6.7 million cost for policing, paying only £5.7 million, leaving a £1 million shortfall. STAL had also refused to settle up in full the estimated costs for this financial year.

The Chief Constable had reduced overheads and overtime and reflecting operational requirements had decided to increase resources by five Police Community Support Officers (PCSO's) and five police officers which would result in the same charge as 2005/06 of £6.7 million. STAL had offered to pay £5.7 million, a figure which was below the costs that they were paying three years ago.

If STAL continued to refuse to pay their policing bills the Chief Constable may have to ask the Police Authority to consider increasing the council tax in 2006/07 by 1.4% to cover the balance, a pressure that he considered should not fall to the local tax payer.

Currently Essex Police Personnel were situated in general office accommodation with other airport employees. This provision had become too small and the problem was most acute in relation to the custody facilities at Stansted. Currently there were 2 cells which were inadequate to deal with current and future prisoner numbers. As a consequence, prisoners were transported to surrounding custody centres which reduced the police officer presence at Stansted. The Home Office standards showed there should be 8

cells plus additional interview and consultation rooms, together with other areas for custody equipment storage.

It was Essex Police's assessment that for current passenger numbers and volumes of work at the airport the police establishment should be at 136 officers and 56 support staff. The current 2006/07 police establishment of 90 police officers provided for an absolute minimum acceptable level of policing and reflected the unwillingness of STAL to pay for police costs. Their current offer of £5.7 million would provide for 78 police officers and 16 support staff. This would require a reduction in the current number of police officers. Current intelligence indicated that Airports will continue to be an attractive target for terrorists. STAL were predicting record passenger numbers this year and had taken on an extra 80 security staff.

Parts of the Aviation Security Act, Police Act 1996 and the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 imposed a requirement on Local Police Authorities and Local Authorities to ensure efficient and effective policing was achieved and that crime was reduced. It was therefore reasonable for policing requirements to be taken into account by Local Authorities when determining planning applications.

Despite Stansted Division of Essex Police delivering a high level of performance for 2005 in terms of providing protective security, reducing overall crime by 5.5%, it was inevitable that demands for policing services would grow with increased flights and passenger numbers.

The number of persons arrested had shown a dramatic increase over the past three years with an increase of 54% from 2003 to 2004 and by 71% from 2004 to 2005 showing a total increase of 165% over the three years.

The responsibility of the Police in a major incident such as an air crash or terrorist attack could be summarised under four headings:

- Coordination and overall command of major incidents
- Protection and preservation of life
- Preservation of evidence
- Restoration of order

For Stansted Police to fulfil these obligations, adequate funding must be made available to provide the right number of resources and equipment to respond in the initial critical stages before wider police resources could arrive.

As Stansted's popularity would grow it would see more VIPs travelling through the airport, many of which required police protection.

Essex Police also sought reassurance that sufficient consideration had been given to the impact upon the road network / infrastructure and that suitable provision would be in place to cope with the additional road traffic volumes.

If the current shortfall in funding was not addressed in the near future it was likely that the Chief Constable and Essex Police Authority may be faced with

a choice between a rise in council tax or the reduction of neighbourhood policing elsewhere in Essex.

In summary, in increasing permission to grow to 35 million passengers without guarantees from STAL to resource the levels of policing judged necessary by the Chief Constable would only exacerbate the current shortfall in numbers and budget. This would effectively reduce the capacity of Essex Police to tackle increases in crime, provide adequate protective security including counter terrorism work and ensure future public safety.

Councillor Cant asked who would pay the interest on the outstanding £1million debt. Richard Tazzini said this was still in negotiation and the Police would be seeking to recover the lost interest. Councillor Godwin referred to the major police functions identified by the Department for Transport (DfT) and asked how much more each year would an extra mppa cost. Michelle Dunn pointed out that the level of officers at the airport was already less than the required, therefore policing was already 20%-25% below the average. The cost of police at the airport equated to 31 or 32 pence per passenger. Councillor Godwin then went on to ask how counterterrorism was funded. Michelle Dunn said that the Special Branch were responsible for counterterrorism and they were funded separately by the Home Office.

Councillor Freeman asked what would meet the concerns of the Police if the application was granted. Michelle Dunn said an adequate level of resources would be a must, however she suggested it would be a struggle to get the airport to acknowledge and fund the required resources.

Councillor Jones asked if BAA paid 100% of the policing costs. He was told that the dedicated police unit cost £6.8million, of which the airport had paid £5.8million, leaving a debt of £1million, which if failed to be paid would come out the police reserves.

Many Members showed concern over the £1million debt to be paid and they were told that if BAA did not pay the balance, then Essex Police could seek determination from the Secretary of State.

Councillor Freeman asked what percentage of Essex Police were stationed at Stansted airport. He was told that there were 3200 officers in Essex, of which 90 were located at Stansted airport.

Kevin Bently – Mosaic Publicity

Mr Bently stated he used Stansted Airport to fly out on business and for clients to fly in. Regionally the airport was a good employment hub for the East of England, which had created 20,000 direct and indirect jobs. Essex was unique as it was the only County that had one road from a port to an airport; the A120 led from Harwich to Stansted Airport. This corridor would be attractive to many more businesses, homes and workers. He understood the local residents' needs, but said if this expansion was not embraced the East

of England could fall behind in economic growth. If the region wanted to be a key player in business it would need to support this application. Mr Bently welcomed this application.

Councillor Loughlin asked Mr Bently how these passengers were leaving the airport on their way to parts of East Anglia. He said that people were travelling by a variety of methods to Cambridge, Colchester, Chelmsford and Suffolk. Councillor Godwin stated that a high number of tourists flew out of Stansted Airport but very few came in and had previously heard only 1% of tourism in Suffolk came from passengers into Stansted.

Councillor Menell asked Mr Bently if he was concerned with the pollution caused from aircraft. He said he was and he actively used public transport where possible.

Councillor Abrahams drew attention to Mr Bently's suggestion of more homes coming to the area and asked if he thought new houses were needed so that the jobs followed. Mr Bently said if the region was to keep growing economically then homes would be needed for people to move into.

Norman Mead – Parish Councillor from Great Hallingbury

Mr Mead started by saying he had been a resident of Great Hallingbury for 28 years. The village was home to 529 Registered Electors plus children, and it was situated south of the B1256 and Stansted Airport. Great Hallingbury was rich in environmental features and heritage items, for example 59 Listed Buildings. The parish had a wide spread, covering 5 square miles of an Area of Special Landscape Value. The village had an active church, a thriving private school, a popular hall, an hotel, a restaurant and pub; it also held many activities. In planning terms it could be described as vibrant. He considered it essential that this application be treated as stringently as normal full planning applications. The parish found it difficult to understand how the facilities approved for 25mppa could handle 35mppa. BAA's proposed removal of the 25mppa cap was wrong since major planning considerations such as employment, housing, transport and surface access requirements were directly related to passenger numbers. Aircraft load factors had increased dramatically over recent years. He considered it essential to maintain an mppa cap.

Aircraft noise held the greatest impact on the village and during peak times there was only a two minute interval between flights. The parish held further concerns over the modal split of runway directional operations, as this would reduce the true impact of noise as shown by the noise contours.

There had been a marked increase in road traffic through the village over the past year, which was not all airport traffic, but any increase in airport activity would exacerbate the situation. This alongside the lack of footpaths gave rise to a considerable hazard for pedestrians and other road users; they therefore would request a formal road survey be carried out to determine the origins and destinations of vehicles.

Property values in the village were adversely affected by existing air traffic levels. In 1992 residents received payments under the Land Compensation Act to cover the devaluation arising from the completion of facilities installed for a throughput of 8 mppa. Whilst further compensation was expected at the 15 mppa level BAA had claimed that the facilities for this level would not be completed until 2009, pointing out that compensation would be payable in 2010. This had produced a situation where currently 22 million passengers worth of property devaluing aircraft were operating from incomplete facilities for 15mppa. Parish Councils were entirely dependent on UDC to ensure that all BAA's figures were examined in detail. The environmental sustainability of the currently approved 25mppa had yet to be proven to their satisfaction. The gravest concern for the majority of residents was the effect on their quality of life and that of their children.

Councillor Cheetham asked Mr Mead if he could define the level noise from aircraft. He said that when a plane flew over it would interfere with the TV and radio and at night could not have windows open. Life was becoming intolerable.

Martin Bedwell – Resident of Hatfield Broad Oak

Mr Bedwell thanked UDC for the opportunity to make a statement to the Committee. There were many technical and political elements involved in the expansion of air traffic. If aircraft noise did the following, it was too intrusive:

- If conversation was interrupted in the open.
- If the enjoyment of radio, television and music was interrupted in a home equipped with double glazing.
- If a person was woken in the night due to aircraft noise.

He stated that the number of times that these incidents occurred was increasing and becoming closer together.

Mr Bedwell held further concern to the increased road traffic. Many of Uttlesford's roads were narrow country roads unsuitable for the traffic that they were now subject to. As a result road surface edges and verges were being destroyed and additional rubbish accumulated. He said he had moved to Uttlesford in 1988 aware of the outcome of the 1984 Inquiry. If this application was permitted Uttlesford would become like Hounslow. He concluded by saying he understood the arguments of housing, jobs and the economy, but for once we should take the opportunity to put quality of life first. He asked that this application be rejected.

The meeting ended at 5.40pm.