

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

Present:- Councillor C A Cant – Chairman  
Councillors E C Abrahams, J F Cheetham, C M Dean, C D Down,  
E J Godwin, R T Harris, S C Jones, J E Menell, M Miller and  
A W Thawley.

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

DC72

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P Boland, R F Freeman  
and J I Loughlin.

Members declared the following interests:-

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

Councillor J F Cheetham declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a  
member of CPRE, NWEPA and the Hatfield Forest Management Committee.

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

Councillor C D Down declared a personal non-prejudicial interest as a member of  
CPRE.

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

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

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

DC73

**PRESENTATION BY SH&E INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT  
CONSULTANCY**

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager introduced Chris Smith,  
Managing Director of SH&E, and Richard Holt, Director of SH&E, who then  
provided a presentation on air traffic forecasts.

During the presentation Dr Smith stated that three reports had been prepared  
over the past months: an initial report on forecasts, advice in relation to BAA's G2  
options, and an appraisal of the forecast material in the submitted Environmental  
Statement. Published information and desk research had been utilised. The  
forecasts appeared reasonable, but long haul might have been underestimated,  
and the proportion of passengers from outside the South East appeared to have

been overestimated. Comparisons had also been made with a report by another consultant, York Aviation, who had been appointed by the Stansted Airline Consultative Committee in 2005. Dr Smith said that this report criticised BAA's approach to forecasting, but York's arguments regarding demand had not been convincing.

SH&E had specifically been asked to comment on the number of transfer passengers. It was considered that BAA's forecast of the passenger transfer percentage increasing from 13% to 17% was not unreasonable as Stansted's route network developed.

Concerning passengers per Air Transport Movement (ATM), Dr Smith considered that the rapid increase experienced in recent years as the low cost carriers had replaced their fleets with larger aircraft would not continue. Little or no further growth in passengers per aircraft could therefore be expected from these airlines. Probably few long haul flights would be offered by aircraft of 250 seats and larger. Business class only services would have far fewer seats. On balance, BAA's forecast of an average of 144 seats per aircraft appeared reasonable.

In summary Dr Smith said that while some elements of BAA's forecasts were not quite correct overall they were reasonable. He anticipated that forecasting work would continue to be refined.

Councillor Godwin asked a question regarding the growth of regional airports and what effect this would have on the figures for Stansted. She also asked whether larger aircraft coming into the airport after 2009 would have an effect on the assumed fleet mix by 2014.

Dr Smith considered that there was possibly potential for the growth of some of the regional airports, such as Bournemouth and East Midlands although Norwich's potential growth was constrained because of its close proximity to Stansted,

With regard to the question of fleet mix in 2014 and larger aircraft using Stansted, Dr Smith said he would be surprised if 550 seat aircraft like to A380 would ever use Stansted. If they did, flights would be limited to one or two a day on feeder services to a Middle East hub. Other newer aircraft joining the fleet by 2014 would be of similar size to existing.

Councillor Thawley asked questions regarding the robustness of the survey data for the origin of passengers used in the study, had low cost carriers been taken into account with the 'cascade approach', and was there scope for airlines to push the cascades, and had sensitivity testing been carried out of higher passenger loads.

Dr Smith said that the CAA had long been aware of the issue of passengers staying close to the airport before their flight and questions asked in its surveys had been designed to eliminate any potential distortion from this factor. The CAA's data could therefore be treated as correct and robust, with minor

exceptions. In response to Councillor Thawley's query regarding the scope for cascading within the London airports system, Dr Smith said that this was a very complex process. The motivation for choice differs from passenger to passenger. Not all choices appeared to be logical. Revenue yield management policy was different from airline to airline. He drew attention to Easyjet's response to the market opportunity created by BA releasing slots at Gatwick post 9/11 as evidence of how airlines exploited this factor. Dr Smith said that this was complex and an ever evolving science. He said that BAA had engineered low cost carriers into Stansted and that it was an affluent catchment area. This was considered to be sound long-term strategic planning by BAA.

Councillor Cheetham asked Mr Smith two questions, one regarding any possibility of Ryanair shifting the base for some of its aircraft to Luton as part of a strategy of seeking airports with the lowest charges, and the second concerning the implications of mixed mode operations at Heathrow for growth of long haul flights at Stansted.

Dr Smith considered that Ryanair would not move to Luton as there was insufficient capacity and that it would have to pay much higher charges for additional landings than the rate it currently pays at Luton. Ryanair could not walk away from its primary UK base. Ryanair's business model involved close scrutiny of all costs but also achieving a high average yield per passenger. With regard to long haul flights Mr Holt said that mixed mode at Heathrow was most likely to change the Heathrow: Gatwick dynamic. It was likely to be associated with relaxation of restrictions on US-UK carriers, leading them to switch from Gatwick to Heathrow.

Councillor Jones asked if it was envisaged if changes in the level of landing charges would impact on the growth of low cost carriers and also if the situation could change at Norwich.

Dr Smith said that in the past strident advocacy by low cost carriers had pressurised airport operators into attractive charges. These were based on the marginal costs of additional passenger throughput and aircraft movements in the context of available capacity. Any revenue was good for the operator. However, the position was different if the provision of additional capacity had to be remunerated through charges. Work was being done for the European Airports Association on the average return on investments which showed clearly that charges would rise. It was a myth that low cost carriers' profits were based on securing low airport charges. They exercised control of costs across all elements of their business plans. Low cost airlines, for example, achieved high productivity because they enjoyed the advantage of non-restrictive labour practices. Airfares were not directly related to costs, but to market factors and the sales structures within organisations. Targets and yields distort the picture. On the subject of Norwich Airport, Dr Smith said that there were many factors against its use, such as inconvenience and cost.

A number of lengthy questions had been put in writing by the public and handed to the Chairman during the meeting. It was decided that these questions required written answers and officers would therefore respond in due course. The Chairman thanked Dr Smith and Mr Holt for their presentation.

DC74

## **PRESENTATION BY BUREAU VERITAS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT'S ASSESSMENT OF AIR QUALITY ISSUES**

Richard Maggs of Bureau Veritas introduced himself and Yvonne Brown to the meeting. Ms Brown then began the presentation by explaining that the company had been asked to review the air quality elements of the G1 Environmental Statement (ES) which had been published in April 2006, along with supporting documents. The scope of the review took in air quality, some elements of energy use and climate change. Supporting documents which had also been reviewed, included the QinetiQ report on aircraft engines and model test report and methodology report from AEA. The main pollutants of concern associated with airports were also included in the review and air quality standards. A key issue was whether the proposed expansion was likely to cause an exceedance of the air quality standards. Legislation was currently being reviewed under Clean Air For Europe (CAFÉ) programme and UK Air Quality Strategy. The outcome of reviews would affect air quality standards in the future.

The general outcome of the review of Volume 3 was that it was a generally thorough assessment when read in conjunction with the supporting documentation. However, details of road traffic data and assumptions made in the Air Quality assessments were inadequate and there were number of key issues and concerns. Volume 3 compared 25mppa and 35mppa in 2014. There was no comparison with the current situation. Background pollutant levels were expected to fall in the future and therefore if passenger capacity was reached in advance of 2014, impacts may be higher than assessed.

With regard to the key issue of model verification, it was surprising that reliance had been on one continuous monitoring site and seven months of data. The balance of source contributions could not be determined from the assessment. Model performance at roadside locations had not been addressed.

The ES indicated that there were 99 odour complaints during a survey undertaken in 2005, the majority of which were from Birchanger Green and Stansted. The findings were surprising in that locations were up to 4km away and not in prevailing south westerly winds. Odours may be of greater concern at other locations closer to the airport than indicated by the number of complaints received.

The overall conclusions of the review were that the air quality report was considered to be thorough overall. However further clarification should be sought on some issues.

Councillor Godwin said that she was concerned that the objectives for oxides of nitrogen for the protection of vegetation did not apply within a five mile zone of the motorway which included Stansted and Bishop's Stortford. She felt there was a need for more monitoring to the west of the motorway. She was aware of the apparent incidence of asthma and chest infections in Birchanger and Stansted. "Birchanger Green" in this context was a location 2 km from the airport and not the motorway service station. Odour complaints arose when the wind blows from the east with nausea being reported. She also asked what the air quality was likely to be to the north east of the airport in the Thaxted area for example, and in more distant locations overflown.

Ms Brown said that information set out in the ES provided a summary table of monitoring at road side sites, including Thaxted and Saffron Walden. The Council's Air Quality Management Strategy reported the situation away from the airport. Currently there was not a general problem. Background sites away from road traffic would be unlikely to show exceedences of objectives. Roadside and kerbside sites may show a different position. Regarding complaints about nausea, Ms Brown said that she was not aware of these and further information should be provided to determine potential problems. Extreme odours did cause nausea, but responses were extremely subjective. She was unaware of whether there might be alternative sources.

The Chairman asked a question regarding kerosene to which Ms Brown answered that further information on this would be useful. The human nose can pick up minute concentrations, far lower than levels giving rise to health impacts, although subjective responses could trigger other health problems. Monitoring of hydrocarbons would assist.

Councillor Dean remarked that parish councils in Birchanger and Stansted had drawn attention of their communities to the odour study. She then referred to employees working every day close to the runway and asked about the potential health impacts of air quality on airport workers. Ms Brown said this should be monitored through occupational health surveys. The ES and its review had focused on ambient air quality. Mr Maggs said that occupational limits were far higher and therefore it was highly unlikely to be a problem.

The Chairman thanked Ms Brown and Mr Maggs for their presentation.

DC75

**REPORTS OF REVIEW OF BAA AIR FORECASTS FOR STANSTED AIRPORT, FURTHER ADVICE ON STANSTED GENERATION 1 (AIR) TRAFFIC FORECASTS AND RESPONSE OF THE MEDICAL DIRECTOR, ESSEX STRATEGIC HEALTH AUTHORITY ON THE HEALTH IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager presented a report to Members containing advice that would be material to the determination of planning application UTT/0717/06/FUL Stansted Airport

The Council, working in partnership with East Hertfordshire District Council and Essex and Hertfordshire County Councils, had commissioned advice from consultants SH&E on the air traffic forecasts that underlie the environmental impact assessments as reported in the Environmental Statement.

A report had been prepared on the traffic forecasts as made available to the Council before submission of the application. A supplementary report had also been prepared reviewing the air traffic data as published in the Environmental Statement Volume 16, which also offered advice on the alternative view on forecasts expressed by York Aviation on behalf of the Airlines Consultative Committee.

### **Key Points of SH&E's Advice**

- 1 The likelihood of BAA's forecasts of 35 mppa in 2014 being exceeded significantly is limited.
- 2 The forecasts level of long haul traffic was considered to be too low, with potential for a worse noise climate than that predicted by BAA, but this degradation of the noise climate could be limited if routes were to be operated by new and quiet aircraft types such as Boeing 787 and Airbus A350. This view on long haul was made in the context of BAA's assumption about mixed mode operations not being permitted at Heathrow. If mixed mode was permitted at Heathrow this would reduce the number of long haul passengers at Stansted.
- 3 The proportion of passengers with an origin/ destination outside the South East, particularly from the Midlands, the South West and Wales, was unlikely to grow to the extent forecast, with the percentage remaining at 13% and not increasing to 16%.
- 4 BAA's assumption that the percentage of business passengers in the 35 mppa case would remain similar to the 2004 position was considered to be reasonable.
- 5 The hourly movements forecast for busy days looked to be a reasonable pattern by comparison with Gatwick at its current 32 mppa throughput. It should be robust enough to allow consideration of surface access requirements
- 6 Overall view was that the passenger forecasts produced by BAA for Stansted were reasonable. The forecasts in the ES were consistent with the forecasts in the detailed ten year capital investment plan published by BAA in May 2006.

- 7 There was some validity to York Aviation's assertion that historically BAA had failed to accurately forecast traffic growth at Stansted. However, spill of traffic from Heathrow to other London airports including Stansted would occur as new airlines to the London market sought slots and existing airlines at Heathrow with only very small slot portfolios at Heathrow sought to grow. Price sensitive passengers, generally those travelling for leisure purposes, will seek to use other London airports where fares are lower. Airlines such as BA and bmi were expected to switch slots to develop more profitable long haul services displacing routes from Heathrow.
- 8 It was not accepted that demand was as sensitive and elastic to increases in airport charges at Stansted as York maintained. Whilst this may apply to particular routes, this was not seen as being significant at the overall market level. The air fare was one component of the overall trip costs. This was supported by recent CAA research.
- 9 The York report needed to be seen in the context of being part of a negotiating position to persuade BAA not to increase its charges.

### **Medical Director's Advice**

Advice from the Medical Director, the Essex Strategic Health Authority, on the Health Impact Assessment was that, in general, the HIA was well written and structured. In particular it explained the methods used and the rationale for their choice, and had drawn on considerable expertise. It finds that the overall health impacts, positive and negative, of the expansion in use of the existing runway were relatively minor. The SHA agrees broadly with this conclusion, but had some concerns about the impact of noise, particularly on the cognitive development of children within the four schools identified within the 54 dB Leq contour. He had recommended that:

- 1 As an immediate measure, appropriate mitigation i.e. noise insulation, should be considered for those schools identified in this HIA as facing an increased delay in reading due to the proposed expansion of the airport.
- 2 Further modelling work should be carried out to establish the impact of all airport noise from Stansted, rather than just the impact of this proposed expansion, on the reading levels of children. As discussed this was likely to also have an impact on schools that fall outside of the 54plus dB Leq contour. This work should also make recommendations about mitigation measures. It was critical that this was undertaken prior to the submission of a planning application to build a second runway, so that the second runway HIA had a clear base case to work from.

- 3 That additional noise monitoring should be undertaken at schools. Section 7.3.5. of the HIA referred to this as a possibility for the four schools within the 54 dB contour. Additional measures should also be undertaken at schools within the 40-54dB contours. This would help to inform the G2 HIA, and would support the additional work suggested above.

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager advised that following the current restructuring within the health sector the Essex Strategic Health Authority had ceased to exist on 30 June and the responsibility for comment on the Health Impact Assessment had now passed to the East of England Strategic Health Authority. It gave its full support to Dr Watson's letter and was strongly of the view that the possible substantial deleterious impact of the airport on the four schools within the 54 dB Leq contour needed to be addressed. The Chairman asked Members for their views on the reports.

Councillor Godwin considered that noise impacts included various components there which had not been referred to. No-one was doing a proactive study on night noise and its impact of health. She had been disappointed with the letter from the Health Authority and said that a proper health study should be initiated regarding noise. She said that this should take account of the stress caused as a response to noise. She did not think that reduction in life expectancy was an adequate measure of health impact as decrease in functionality should also be taken into account. She noted the suggestion that employment opportunities had a health benefit, but observed that the jobs available were low pay. The HIA also indicated high rates of ill health in some groups in the study area.

Councillor Cheetham said that the reports should address wider aspects of noise and it should be discussed further with the Health Authority.

The Chairman referred to stress and a slow decline in quality of life which could be brought about by sleep deprivation. She said that she had a number of questions she would like answered.

After further discussion Members asked officers to arrange that a further report or presentation be made from the Health Authority.

DC76

## **UPDATE ON REPRESENTATIONS**

The Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer presented a report updating Members as to the summary of responses for planning application UTT/0717/06/FUL Stansted Airport.

Members welcomed the report.

DC77

**STATUS REPORT ON CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO PLANNING PERMISSION UTT/1001/01/OP**

The Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer presented rolling document updating Members on progress with planning conditions to this outline planning permission which had been granted on 16 May 2006.

Councillor Dean referred to the proposed visitor centre and said that Elsenham residents were concerned that nothing seemed to be happening. The Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer said there had been on site discussions concerning using the old control tower for the centre. These discussions were on-going.

Councillor Cheetham referred to landscaping in Hatfield Forest which should have been in mitigation. The Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer said that there had been no obligation for this and would require third party cooperation. Councillor Cheetham believed that this work had been a condition of the permission and asked that the position be established. The Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer said he would update Members further at the next meeting.

DC78

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The Executive Manager – Development Services informed Members that the date for the next meeting for this issue would be 13 September. He hoped that Members would then provide a strong steer as to a final decision.

The meeting ended at 6.00 pm.