

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

Present:- Councillor C M Dean – Vice-Chairman in the Chair.  
Councillors E C Abrahams, J F Cheetham, C D Down,  
R T Harris, J I Loughlin, J E Menell and M J Miller.

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

**DC79 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P Boland, C A Cant, R F Freeman, E J Godwin, S C Jones and A R Thawley. Councillor C M Dean said that the Chairman was unable to attend the meeting due to a family bereavement and, on behalf of the Committee, expressed her sympathy and condolences to Councillor Cant and her family.

**DC80 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

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

Councillor C M Dean declared a personal interest as a member of the National Trust.

**DC81 PLANNING APPLICATION 0717/06/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT - UPDATE ON REPRESENTATIONS**

The Senior Planning Officer updated Members on representations which had been received from consultees and other groups. He highlighted that the Highways Agency had submitted some preliminary observations, but had asked for an extension of time until 30 November to enable its full submission to be made. However, he said that a further letter had been received from the Highways Agency saying that consultations with BAA were now moving apace and an extension of time might not now be required.

He also drew attention to the letter which had been received from the Stansted Airlines Consultative Committee. He also referred to the conclusions and recommendations submitted by SSE in response to BAA's health impact assessment.

He concluded that 139 letters of support for the application had now been received together with 1,293 letters of objection.

Councillor Cheetham referred to the comments from the Highways Agency and asked whether it would now be possible for officer recommendations to be made to the meeting of the Committee on 27 September 2006. The Senior Planning Officer said that there was no indication of the date on which the Highways Agency comments would be received, but he understood that consultations between the Highways Agency and BAA and consultants were now moving rapidly. He also pointed out that no responses had been received from any element of the rail industry.

The Executive Manager Development Services said that it would be inappropriate for the Council to make representations on a transport application without the benefit of any input from the Highways and Transportation Authority and the rail bodies. In addition, the regulation 19 notice was in the process of being served on BAA and there were further consultation periods built into this process. He said that it was unlikely that the Council would be able to make a decision until late November or early December. He said that a comprehensive position statement would be submitted to the meeting on 27 September to inform discussions and concluded that it was unfortunate to lose the momentum in dealing with this important planning application. In response to a further question from Councillor Cheetham, he said that officers would prepare a programme of meetings leading up to the final decision.

Councillor Menell expressed surprise that the Council would not be in a position to determine the application on 27 September and said that in the past it had been possible to make decisions without the benefit of all representations having been received. However, the Executive Manager Development Services said that this was one of the most important planning applications which the Council had ever considered and the responses which were outstanding were fundamental to the determination of the application.

DC82

## **PRESENTATION AND QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION WITH SSE**

Chris Bennett from SSE made a presentation on supplementary noise contour maps. He said that the environmental statement from BAA omitted several noise contour maps requested by the Council's scoping opinion and/or recommended by SSE. He emphasised that even the additional ("Australian") metrics did not cover all the problem areas and he pointed out that noise did not stop at the outer contour. He also said that all noise maps were based on a typical average day and did not take into account how noise affected individual people. He then demonstrated a 65-70 decibel single event and the impact which this had on normal conversation. He also displayed a map illustrating the number of events above 65 and 70 decibels during a 16 hour summer day based on 35mppa.

He concluded that:-

- Australian additional metrics provide a more intuitive illustration of likely noise effects.
- Modal split contour maps showed the effects on days when an area was actually being over flown.

- Both help to unscramble the averaging effects of LEQ maps and allow people to judge for themselves.
- Both should be provided by BAA as part of the environmental statement together with a clear listing of the input data and assumed parameters for each map.

Councillor C M Dean said that representations had been received from Ware and parts of Suffolk complaining about noise even though these areas were outside the LEQ contours. Chris Bennett explained how these problems were not taken into account in the averaging effect.

In response to a number of questions from Councillor Cheetham, Chris Bennett said that the Australian additional metrics related to air noise and did not take into account ground noise. He also explained that it would be costly to provide maps showing the increase in the number of people affected further afield, but said that it might be possible to do this through a GIS system. The Executive Manager Development Services said that the Council was not intending to undertake this work and would rely on the advice of its consultants.

In response to a question from Councillor Loughlin, Chris Bennett said that information on the decibel level when an aircraft was at full thrust prior to take off was not available.

Councillor Menell said that after reading the “erosion of the community” document, she had concerns about the impact of airport growth on local people and asked whether it was intended to visit the community to assess the impact of noise. The Executive Manager Development Services said that such a visit was planned for October.

Brian Ross then gave a presentation on surface access issues. He said that it was unfortunate that the S H & E Consultancy report had not sought to look more deeply into the BAA assumptions and projections and said that if these were underestimated the whole environmental impact would be understated.

He said that, in the application, BAA was asking for unlimited mppa subject to 243,000 PATM's. He added that BAA forecasting track record was historically poor and growth had been consistently underestimated. As an example, he said that the 2001 planning application had forecasted that 23mppa would be achieved by 2010/11 and this figure had already been reached. He said that the average number of passengers per aircraft was a key issue and pointed out that average aircraft size was steadily increasing at all major airports. Also, he said that BAA had used 81% load factor for the base case, but only 79% for 35mppa and only 77% for sensitivity. He said that in 2005, Ryanair had achieved 83% and Easy Jet 85%.

He said that BAA's assumption of only 5% increase in passengers per PATM by 2014 lacked credibility, particularly as Stansted had seen a 97% increase over the past 10 years. He pointed out that BAA had used its flawed analysis to argue that its proposal would only result in 10-11% more peak traffic in 2014 and had claimed that “the increased flows associated with 35mppa

(enhanced) case and the 40mppa sensitivity test would not seriously exacerbate conditions likely to prevail with 25 mppa”.

In concluding the presentation Brian Ross pointed out that:

- BAA forecast for 35mppa (or max 40 mppa) by 2014 was unreliable and understated the impacts
- What happened beyond 2014 – especially if R2 does not proceed
- All other impacts were derived from BAA core forecasts and were similarly unreliable
- Surface access was a key example. There could be an additional 25mppa not 10-15mppa
- In addition, BAA assumptions on transfer passengers and origin/destination appeared to have been deliberately contrived to minimise its stated surface access implications
- Even without reworking the surface access implications to reflect the very substantial under projections, BAA acknowledge that congestion problems would arise.

Members were then invited to ask any questions which had arisen on the previous presentations made by SSE at the meeting in July 2006.

Councillor Cheetham expressed concern about the claims that the 15-25mppa application predictions were underestimated and the 5% growth was not realistic and said that this needed to be highlighted. She asked officers to look at this issue in more depth. She also asked that more information be provided on transfer passengers.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether there was any further update on emissions trading and climate change. The Executive Manager Development Services said that this would be addressed in the position statement at the next meeting. Brian Ross said that it was unlikely that an emissions trading scheme would be in place until 2012 and even then it was unlikely that it would restrict aviation growth. He said that some people had argued that it was not the role of a local authority to consider climate change but he was confident that if the application went to a public inquiry this issue would be examined in detail. He also pointed out that the Regional Spatial Strategy would now take climate change into account. Councillor C M Dean asked whether the Kyoto Agreement was a material consideration and the Executive Manager confirmed that this was the case and added that Government advice on climate change was likely to be received in the Autumn.

In response to a question from Councillor Loughlin, Brian Ross said that the use of a base line water use of 1.69 million litres per day was unrealistic when a figure of 1.96 had already been reached.

Councillor Menell said that the following definition of sustainable development provided by DEFRA was very profound: “Development which meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs”.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether the predictions about the number of employees were realistic. Brian Ross said that he did not have an issue with the broad estimate of about 10,000 additional jobs. However, he had issues about where the people would be coming from and said that the numbers from north and east London had been underestimated. Also, the influx of workers from central and eastern Europe had not been addressed and as they often rented property in the Uttlesford area they were included as Uttlesford residents. He also said that that the proportion of Uttlesford residents employed at the Airport was estimated at 35% which seemed to conflict with the Council's aim to broaden the employment base and not have an over-dependency on one employer.

The Chairman thanked the SSE representatives for their presentations and for answering Members' questions.

The meeting ended at 4.10 pm.