

**EXTRAORDINARY DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE held at
COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 2.30 pm on
27 SEPTEMBER 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, J I Loughlin, J
E Menell and A R Thawley.

Officers in attendance:- M Cox, R Harborough, J M Mitchell, M Perry and J G
Pine

DC91 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor M Miller.

DC92 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared the following personal interests.

Councillor Thawley a member of CPRE and the National Trust

Councillor Jones a member of the National Trust.

Councillor Cheetham a member of CPRE, NWEHHPA and the Hatfield Forest
Management Committee

Councillor Menell a non executive director of the Uttlesford PCT until 1
October 2006 and a member of Littlebury Parish Council.

Councillor C M Dean a member of the National Trust.

Councillor Down a member of CPRE.

Councillor Loughlin a member of Stansted Parish Council.

Councillor Cant the Council's representative on the Uttlesford PCT until 1
October 2006.

Councillor Godwin a member of Birchanger Parish Council.

**DC93 PLANNING APPLICATION 0717/06/FUL STANSTED AIRPORT –
POSITION STATEMENT**

i) Officers' Report

The Committee received a report which detailed the current position in
relation to determination of the planning application. It explained the process
that had been followed for considering the application, the planning policy
context and the current position of the planning application. It also reported all
representations that had been received to date and set out the next steps.

The Executive Manager (Development Services) explained why the
application was not being determined today. When the application had first
been received a timetable of meetings had been set up and although today's
date had been provisionally intended to be the date for the consideration of a
recommendation on the application, this had not been guaranteed. The views
of a number of statutory consultees, including the Highway Agency, the rail

industry and Hertfordshire and Essex County Council had not been forthcoming in time and the Council could not determine the application without considering this information. Responses from the Highways Agency and correspondence between BAA and the Department for Transport Rail Group had recently been received but officers had not yet had a chance to assess the information. A formal request for further information had been sent to BAA under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999. The reply had just been received and would also need to be evaluated by officers.

The Executive Manager addressed comments that had been made about the application process and the report before members today. He said that the process had been as transparent as possible. The Council had adopted a unique approach, all the meetings had been web cast and there had been many opportunities for the public to make representations. He said that this report did not tone down environmental concerns nor was it biased. The report expressed no opinions; those that had been made were based on fact.

The Senior Planning Officer said that the current planning application was to vary condition ATM1 to a new level of 264,000 ATMs. It also sought to remove the condition on the number of passengers per year, currently at 25mppa. It did not seek a revised passenger cap but expected that the airport would grow to about 35mppa in 2014. The application did not seek permission for any additional physical developments that did not currently have planning permission although further facilities might be brought forward as the airport continued to grow as sought. He presented a summary of the planning status of all the proposals shown on the composite layout plan for the 25mppa case and the 35mppa case in 2014.

He said that in determining the application the Council would take account of the Development Plan, Government advice in circulars, Planning Policy Guidance(PPG) and Planning Policy Statements(PPS) any other national or regional guidance or policy, the views of statutory or other consultees, interested groups and organisations and public opinion

Members were advised that the scope of the decision to be made was to

- Refuse to vary the conditions as sought.
- Approve the development permitted under decision reference UTT/1000/01/OP without complying with condition MPPA1 (i.e. passenger throughput not limited to 25mppa) and varying condition ATM1 to lift cap on air transport movements from 241,000 to 264,000 a year whilst retaining the limit of cargo air transport movements to 20,500 a year.
- As above, but with any necessary adjustments to other conditions and obligations and any necessary additional conditions and obligations.

The Senior Planning officer then presented a summary of the representations that had been received to 19 September 2006. He outlined the consultation process, which had been as widespread and thorough as possible, and in the region of 1400 to 1500 letters had been received. The Committee was given details of the most recent representations that had been received from

Hertfordshire County Council and the Highways Agency. Members would be provided with further addendum of representations when they were received.

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager then outlined the planning considerations to be taken into account. The current development plan included the Essex and Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan 2001 and the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005. National policies were also relevant, in particular the Future of Transport – A Network for 2030, the Future of Air Transport White Paper and Sustainable Communities in the East of England – Building for the Future. Also relevant was Government policy on the UK Sustainable Development Strategy and climate change programme. Government policy could be summarised as supporting maximum use of Stansted's runway in principle notwithstanding the climate change implications of global aviation growth and the local environmental impacts such as noise and air quality, urbanisation pressures and surface access implications.

The Executive Manager concluded that the new information from the Regulation 19 report would be advertised and those originally consulted would need to be notified. The advert would be placed next week and there would be 21 days for representations. Officers would report in detail on all the additional information and it was likely that additional meetings would be required. It was expected that the application would be determined on 29 November 2006.

He said that the members of the Committee were well trained and experienced in dealing with large planning application. Any decision would be based on sound planning principles.

ii) Statement by member of the public

Peter Saunders from SSE addressed the Committee. He said that the Council should not be lulled into believing that this application didn't matter, in the light of the proposals for a second runway expected later in the year. This was an important application as it did not set a limit for passenger movements. Determining this application was not a question of balancing the environment with economy because it would have a damaging effect on the environment as well as local and national economies. He said that there was enough information to justify refusal and the application should be rejected without delay.

He asked for an airport master plan and information on carbon emissions and quality of life that had not been provided by BAA. He did not consider that the Regulation 19 letter had been strong enough as it should have asked for all the information required in the original scoping document.

He said that the position statement lacked balance; the SSE statement had been put on one side and not taken properly into account. He concluded that notwithstanding the policy considerations, the local authority could still reject the application for environmental reasons.

iii) Members' comments

Councillor Cant said that the report was not biased as it gave both sides of the argument. The Council would continue to be open and transparent, the new representations would be analysed and reported to members at future meetings.

Councillor Menell referred to page 6 of the report and the proposal for 12,200 extra parking spaces with Phase 5 North and ask whether underground parking had been considered. She was advised that this could be discussed with BAA during any reserved matters submission.

Councillor Godwin thought that the report glossed over the health impact of noise. She said that if a child's reading development was delayed by 1 week this must be cause for concern. She asked whether noise from reverse thrust had been taken into account as this was a major cause of sleep disturbance. She said the effect of noise varied considerably with the wind direction and asked if there were any figures pertaining to this. She also asked for information on the extension of urban blight to villages further from the airport and the effect on the local road network. She questioned whether the effect on the commuting public was being monitored as she understood that there were insufficient seats for rail commuters. She also asked for an explanation of the conflicting figures of the Government and SSE in terms of carbon emissions

Councillor Cheetham asked for clarification on the climate change information, in particular the figures relating to the significance of carbon emissions. She asked if there was any information on the impact of the proposed closure of the Coopers End Roundabout and whether the effect on the Birchanger roundabout had been studied.

In answer to a question from Councillor Thawley it was confirmed that the proposal for the Zone G car park was not part of the current planning application. He referred to the impact on local communities of multiple occupancy of houses for airport workers. He was aware of this occurring in Oakwood Park and asked if information could be obtained as to the extent of this. He said that it should be relatively simple to calculate the amount of CO2 emissions, and it was essential that there was a definitive answer on this.

Councillor Loughlin asked if anything could be done about the amount of water used by the hire car companies in cleaning and valeting their cars. She was advised that conditions could be imposed if a new application was received but these could not be imposed retrospectively.

Councillor Cant questioned the contradictory responses from the two water authorities. Councillor Dean asked if detailed information was available about the employment profile at the airport, and where the workers were coming from.

Members questioned the statement in the report about levels of carbon dioxide emissions. The Planning Policy Manager replied that it was important not to exceed 450 parts per million. At the current rate of growth this would not be reached for 50 years but the rate of growth was not stable. There were

many mechanisms available to the Government in limiting climate change, and it was not reliant on the planning system. The role of the planning system in contributing to the climate change programme was outlined in Government policy and included improved energy efficiency and distribution of development in ways that limit the increase in carbon emissions.

Councillor Menell expressed concern that the Heath Impact Assessment had not been mandatory. She was interested in the comments made by Stansted Parish Council. She noted the recommendations that had been made by the East of England Strategic Health Authority concerning action to monitor and mitigate the impact of noise, particularly on children, and wanted to be assured that this would be carried out. She was advised that the measures could form part of the conditions attached to the planning permission.

Other members asked if a meeting could be held with the Strategic Health Authority to discuss concerns about the Health Impact Assessment. However it was felt that it would be more effective for members to speak directly with the BAA consultants who had carried out the survey. It was noted that BAA would be holding a seminar for stakeholders who had participated in the community engagement phase of the HIA. This would be an opportunity for comment on the results of the HIA. It was confirmed that officer representatives would attend the meeting. The Planning Policy Manager said that this wasn't the appropriate meeting for members to attend and raise their questions but he would try and facilitate a meeting for members to ask questions of the consultants.

Councillor Godwin referred to the document from the Environment Agency that said that all of the rivers in the vicinity of the airport were being over extracted or over licensed. She asked if the traffic survey had included modelling that took into account increased housing in the area and the working patterns of shift workers.

Members asked officers to look at the alleged discrepancies raised by the Stansted Airlines Consultative Committee as reported in pages 18 and 19 of the report.

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending the meeting

The meeting ended at 4.30pm.