

## Development Control Committee 16 August 2006 , item 4

**Committee:** Development Control

**Agenda Item**

**Date:** 16 August 2006

**Title:** 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

**4**

**Author:** Roger Harborough, Policy and Conservation Manager, 01799 510457

Item for information

---

### Summary

This report introduces advice that will be material to determination of Planning application UTT/0717/06/FUL (Stansted Airport).

### Background Papers

Planning Application files

### Situation

- 1 The Council, working in partnership with East Hertfordshire District Council, Essex and Hertfordshire County Councils, has commissioned advice from consultants SH&E on the air traffic forecasts that underlie the environmental impact assessment reported in the Environmental Statement.
- 2 Two reports have been prepared: one on the traffic forecasts as made available to the Council before submission of the application, and a supplementary report reviewing the air traffic data as published in the Environmental Statement Volume 16, which also offers advice on the alternative view on forecasts expressed by York Aviation on behalf of the Airlines Consultative Committee.
- 3 Key points in SH&E's advice are as follows:
  - The likelihood of BAA's forecasts of 35 mppa in 2014 being exceeded significantly is limited.
  - The forecasts level of long haul traffic is however 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 is made in the context of BAA's assumption about mixed mode operations not being permitted at Heathrow. If mixed mode is permitted at Heathrow this would reduce the number of long haul passengers at Stansted.

## Development Control Committee 16 August 2006 , item 4

- The proportion of passengers with an origin/ destination outside the South East, particularly from the Midlands, the South West and Wales, is unlikely to grow to the extent forecast, with the percentage remaining at 13% and not increasing to 16%.
  - BAA's assumption that the percentage of business passengers in the 35 mppa case will remain similar to the 2004 position is considered to be reasonable.
  - The hourly movements forecast for busy days looks 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
  - Overall view is that the passenger forecasts produced by BAA for Stansted are reasonable. The forecasts in the ES are consistent with the forecasts in the detailed 10 year capital investment plan published by BAA in May 2006.
  - There is some validity to York Aviation's assertion that historically BAA has failed to accurately forecast traffic growth at Stansted.
  - However, spill of traffic from Heathrow to other London airports including Stansted will occur as new airlines to the London market seek slots and existing airlines at Heathrow with only very small slot portfolios at Heathrow seek 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 are expected to switch slots to develop more profitable long haul services displacing routes from Heathrow.
  - It is not accepted that demand is as sensitive and elastic to increases in airport charges at Stansted as York maintains. Whilst this may apply to particular routes, this is not seen as being significant at the overall market level. The air fare is one component of the overall trip costs. This is supported by recent CAA research.
  - The York report needs to be seen in the context of being part of a negotiating position to persuade BAA not to increase its charges.
- 4 The Medical Director's advice on the Health Impact Assessment is that, in general, the HIA is well written and structured. In particular it explains the methods used and the rationale for their choice, and has drawn on considerable expertise. It finds that the overall health impacts, positive and negative, of the expansion in use of the existing runway are relatively minor. The SHA agrees broadly with this conclusion, but has some concerns about

## **Development Control Committee 16 August 2006 , item 4**

the impact of noise, particularly on the cognitive development of children within the four schools identified within the 54 dB Leq contour. He recommends:

- 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 is likely to also have an impact on schools that fall outside of the 54plus dB Leq contour. This work should also made recommendations about mitigation measures. It is critical that this is undertaken prior to the submission of a planning application to build a second runway, so that the second runway HIA has a clear base case to work from.
- 3) That additional noise monitoring should be undertaken at schools. Section 7.3.5. of the HIA refers 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 will help to inform the G2 HIA, and would support the additional work suggested above.