

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

Present: - Councillor C A Cant (Chairman)  
Councillors E C Abrahams, P Boland, J F Cheetham, , C M Dean, C D Down,  
E J Godwin, R T Harris, S C Jones, J I Loughlin, J E Menell, M Miller and A R  
Thawley.

Officers in attendance: - W Cockerell, R Harborough, V Harvey, J Mitchell  
and J Pine

**DC58 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor R F Freeman.

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

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

Councillor Cheetham declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a  
member of NWEPPHA.

Councillor Menell declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a non-  
executive director of Uttlesford PCT.

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.

Councillor Cant declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as the Council's  
representative on the Uttlesford PCT.

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

Councillor Abrahams declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a  
member of Clavering Parish Council.

Councillor Godwin declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a member  
of Birchanger Parish Council.

**PRESENTATION FROM DIRECTOR OF ACOUSTICS, BUREAU VERITAS  
ON NOISE ISSUES RELATING TO PLANNING APPLICATION  
UTT/0717/06/FUL**

Stephen Turner the Director of Acoustics at Bureau Veritas gave a presentation to the Committee regarding noise issues relating to planning application UTT/0717/06/FUL.

The consultants appointed by the Council were asked to review the noise elements of the Environmental Statement published in April. They had attended two topic group meetings with BAA and its consultants and had advised on issues to be covered in the Environmental Statement.

The 2003 planning consent had imposed an annual movement limit of 241,000 ATMs and a noise cap by constraining the 57dB(A) Leq16hr (0700-2300) contour to an area not exceeding 43.6km<sup>2</sup>. The application now sought 264,000 ATMs.

The four scenarios considered were:

- Summer 2004 (base year)
- The 15+ application for which planning permission was granted
- A revised 25 mppa in 2014 scenario (202,000 ATMs)
- The G1 proposal (264,000 ATMs) (35 mppa in 2014).

He explained that air noise is defined as starting at take off when the aircraft was at the end of the runway ready for the take-off roll and stopping on landing when an aircraft turned off the runway. Ground noise came from the aircraft taxiing and manoeuvring into and out of stands.

The last few years had demonstrated a dip in the areas of contours; this could be partially related to the events of 9/11, but it was more likely to be because certain noisier aircraft had been banned from using UK airports.

At the request of the Local Authority some additional information had been provided; this included:

- For some of the scenarios, data regarding those living within the 54 dB(A) contour.
- Information in terms of Lden and Lnight.
- Some sensitivity testing regarding modal splits.
- Some sensitivity testing regarding usage of departure routes.
- An examination of LMax distribution at some locations.

One purpose of contouring was to estimate the likely reaction of the local residents. The data could provide an estimated percentage of the affected population that was likely to be highly annoyed by aircraft noise. The 54 -67 dB contour band would result in 6.6 % of people being highly annoyed and the highest band of 72-75 dB would result in 68.2% of people being highly annoyed. The proposals would give rise to a 44% increase in the number of

people likely to be highly annoyed over what would now be expected to happen in the 25 mppa 2014 case.

The contour results analysis concluded that in both cases it showed that nowhere was there an increase in average mode LAeq more than 2dB.

The diurnal impact analysis concluded that although in terms of the average mode results, the increase in noise impact would be kept to less than 2 dB, in certain hours at certain locations it could be higher. Of particular note it was expected that there would be an increase in departures during the evening. The impact would be diluted for populations affected only by certain routes but not for those who were affected by all departures.

The frequency of noise events by Lmax level had been plotted for six locations at points where the noise preferential routes and glide paths intersected the 57 dB Leq contour. Broadly speaking these indicated a pattern of more noise events, with a slight reduction in the noise level of each event (no more than 1dB lower except in one location). Therefore the impact was likely to be perceived as an increasing number of events and not offset by the aircraft being noticeably quieter.

Having met with SSE at the request of officers, Bureau Veritas were exploring the potential of measures that would enable maximum passenger throughput with the fewest number of aircraft and maximised the proportion of the quietest aircraft. Stephen Turner advised that the principles of SSE's idea were good. However, relying on QC as a means of characterising the sound energy of the fleet could distort the data because the QC points were allocated on the basis of discrete intervals.

The data on night noise contained some inconsistency. The Lden data (volume 16) suggested 40,815 movements per year in the night period (2300 – 0700); using the busy summer day data plus the quota movement limit gave 37,900 per year.

The air noise analysis concluded:

- In terms of average mode contours, the impact was not large
- In terms of % highly annoyed, there would be an increase of 45% over the situation with the revised 25mppa situation.
- In terms of diurnal pattern, there were some hours where the impact could be +3dB or more and was likely to be noticeable
- In particular locations the increase in the number of aircraft was likely to be noticed whereas the reduced noise from the individual aircraft was not likely to be noticed.
- Planning consent was granted in 2003 that included a contour cap of 43.6 sq km

The inference was that in sustainability terms it was to achieve 25mppa with 232,500 ATMs, and this noise impact was reasonable. BAA were now asking for 35mppa with 264,000 ATMs with an estimated contour area of 33.9sq km.

The ground noise assessment was based on a model developed for Heathrow Terminal 5. It looked at the baseline situation in 2004 and calculated the ground noise at 10 sites in the vicinity of the airport.

A sensitivity test was undertaken which addressed two issues; firstly tonality effects and secondly down wind propagation. BS4142 required that a 5dB penalty was added to the noise to account for tonality, and secondly the impact could be worse with downwind propagation, increasing ground noise by 10dB.

For both westerly and easterly operations, the effect of adding an extra 5dB(A) had been considered, which showed minimal impact. Adding an extra 10 dB (A) showed a higher incidence of moderate effects.

Overall the air and ground noise elements of the Environmental Statement had been reviewed. The headline conclusion of the Environmental Statement indicated there was not much of an impact but closer examination of the data revealed the possibility of a greater impact than was being declared. Consequently, further assessment of possible mitigation options was needed.

Councillor Godwin said as a resident of Birchanger she endured a high level of ground noise, which she described as horrendous. She said she was familiar with where the noise monitors were situated. She said the figures did not reflect the noise levels endured in Birchanger. She asked if the flights were counted in the shoulder periods. Stephen Turner said that monitoring points 7 and 8 included busy day data, however if these were not accurate it could be looked at further. Councillor Godwin said she would often hear a loud roar and suspected the noise echoed off the buildings and asked whether monitoring would pick up this roar. Stephen Turner said the roar was likely to be either the revolution of the engines as an aircraft started to roll, or the ground noise from taxiing aircraft.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether ground noise calculations assumed the use of Fixed Electrical Ground Power, as her observations from the recent site visit to Stansted were that it was not being used. Stephen Turner said that the calculations assumed that Auxillary Power Units would be used, not FEGP, therefore erring on the side of caution by representing the worse case. She further observed that turbo prop aircraft made a particular noise on engine start up and taxiing. She asked if they were taken into account in the ground noise assessment. It was confirmed that various aircraft types had been taken into account in the assumed fleet mix.

Councillor Harris remarked that, with the current closure of North Street in Great Dunmow to traffic, aircraft noise was now noticeable without the background level of road noise.

Councillor Jones asked if there was a similar proportional increase in area of the air noise contour for each dB increase. Stephen Turner that this was the case. Contours were conventionally plotted at 3dB intervals.

Councillor Thawley asked for an interpretation of the Government's position on the World Health Organisation's (WHO) community noise guidelines, the relevance of the 50dB Leq threshold, and at what noise level people were awoken from their sleep or prevented from going to sleep. Stephen Turner said there was misunderstanding of the guidelines. The guidelines indicated the likely community response to particular noise doses. Below 55dB, the majority of people, probably 80 to 90%, would not be highly annoyed. Above 50dB, probably 10% of people will be moderately annoyed. He said that everyone had different levels at which their sleep was disturbed, but generally below 45dB Lmax nobody's sleep would be disturbed. Between 45 and 55dB there would be some increase in disturbance. Above 55dB more significant numbers of people would be woken up by early morning arrivals for example. The WHO suggested 10 to 15 events of 55db was acceptable. The policy choice as to acceptable levels was a matter for decision makers. The average fire alarm would be about 85 to 90dB and an alarm clock was about 80dB. Councillor Thawley then said he used to live under a flight path for Heathrow airport and asked if any adjustments should be made to air noise as well as ground noise for tonality factors. He was told that the last major study of attitudes to aircraft noise was conducted in 1982; subsequently in 1990 the Government had decided to change the air noise metric from NNI to Leq. In 2001 it had embarked on a new a dose response study; however, he was sure that since many aircraft types had changed over the past two decades responses would have been found to change. Fan whine and rumble would be taken into account in the new study, which was currently at the per review stage. He did observe, however, that at 35 mppa Stansted would have a similar throughput to the number of aircraft movements to Heathrow in 1982 when the last study had been conducted.

Councillor Dean asked whether a continuous descent or a stepped approach caused more noise on the ground. Stephen Turner said one would be hard pressed to notice the difference on the ground although there was some theoretical benefit.

Councillor Menell asked about children's response to air noise. She asked if any research had been undertaken on this and whether the children could become ill or suffer adverse effects on their education. Stephen Turner said The Road and Air Noise and Children's Health (RANCH) Study had been undertaken to look at the learning at key stage two in schools. It was found that schools within the 66 Leq contour discerned a two month delay in reading ability. This report was available on the Defra website.

Councillor Cant said the noise from the new roads needed to be taken into account, and asked if it was. Stephen Turner said that for some people the road noise could mask the air noise, others perceived the combined impacts, and there was no constant pattern to people's responses. It was confirmed that air noise contours did not take into account noise energy from road traffic.

Councillor Harris referred to his experience of teaching at both Takeley and Little Hallingbury schools. Air noise at the former was not significant but disrupted activity in the playground at the latter.

**REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED ON PLANNING APPLICATION  
UTT/0717/06/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT AS AT 30 JUNE 2006 AND  
THEMES EMERGING FROM PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WEEK**

The Principal Planning Officer had prepared a document summarising the responses to consultation and engagement that had so far been received. So far over 1,200 responses had been received and it was estimated that a further 200 to 300 response had been received, and which were still awaiting reading and summary. A further supplement would be compiled, and all responses would then be collated into a final master document.

The document had been broken down into categories. The main themes which emerged from the supporters' representations were the encouragement of and contribution to economic growth and employment. Noise, climate change and road and rail infrastructure were the main issues from objectors.

Councillor Cheetham asked if a standard letter had been circulated amongst business supporters, because she had noticed a number of similar points that were being made. The Principal Planning Officer said that there had been no standard letter of representation, however many did have similar content.

Councillor Loughlin referred to pages 14 and 15 of the document and asked where the Chamber of Commerce and Industry had obtained the figures. She was told they had come from the Volume 5 of BAA's Environmental Statement.

Councillor Cant referred to Crawley Borough Council's experience of growth at Gatwick. Councillor Cheetham suggested the Committee visit the Gatwick area and meet the relevant cabinet members of the Borough Council and chief officers to explore its view of the impacts and the measures necessary to address these. Councillor Loughlin suggested this was unnecessary and if the Committee were to visit another airport it should be one similar to Stansted, in terms of location, neighbouring residential areas and throughput. The Executive Manager (Development Services) informed Members that Heathrow and Luton airports were very different to Stansted and that this Committee had visited Gatwick twice with previous applications. He asked what Members would want to gain from a site visit and the Chairman asked how many Members of the current committee had visited Gatwick, to which only two indicated they had. Members wished to gain a clearer view on the economic situation, sprawl into the community, employment types and how the airport had fitted in with the area.

Councillor Menell suggested that the Committee also visited the villages surrounding the airport such as Broxted and Great Hallingbury. Councillor Godwin proposed that the Committee visited the airport during the shoulder period. Councillor Abrahams said he thought it was more beneficial to visit villages within Uttlesford than to visit another area.

RESOLVED that

- 1 a site visit to the Gatwick area be arranged
- 2 a site visit to Stansted airport and surrounding villages during a night shoulder period be arranged.

DC61

**SUMMARY OF SUPPORTING INFORMATION SUBMITTED BY THE APPLICANT COMPARED TO SCOPING OPINION AND TOPIC AREAS WHERE FURTHER INFORMATION WAS REQUIRED**

The Policy and Conservation Manager had prepared a schedule indicating what information BAA had and had not submitted in response to the Council's Scoping Opinion. He said he had already sought clarification on some points from BAA.

Councillor Cheetham asked if there was any data on change in housing tenure particularly from owner occupation to private rented and household structure, to which he explained that these figures were only collected 10 yearly as part of the Office of National Statistics Census.

Councillor Godwin said asthma sufferers had increased in this area and asked if local data could be obtained. The Policy and Conservation Manager said this information was available but that its relevance to this planning application would need to be established. She also raised concerns about lack of continuous air quality analysers. Councillor Thawley suggested that an epidemiology study of the area over the last ten years was needed and a Quality of Life Capital assessment. He also said all stakeholders needed access to the study of Hatfield Forest.

The meeting ended at 5.10pm.