

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel
Date: 24 January 2005
Agenda Item No: 6
Title: Revised Format for the Section 106 Agreement Monitoring Document re Expansion to 25mppa.
Author: Jeremy Pine (01799) 510460

Summary

- 1 Officers have produced a revised format for the monitoring document following comments from Members at earlier Panel meetings. Members are asked to confirm whether they are happy with this revised format prior to the preparation of a full monitoring report for the next meeting.

Background

- 2 During 2004, Members received their monitoring information by way of an A4 portrait style events diary and a colour-coded progress chart. Councillor Artus provided officers with a framework for a revised A4 landscape format, which would combine the two. Officers have looked at the revised format and have adapted it into a tabular document with 6 columns giving basic monitoring information in a more readable style.
- 3 It is intended that the document would be subdivided using the subject headings given in Schedules 4 and 5 of the S106 Agreement. This revised format can also be used to monitor compliance with planning conditions once development starts. A sample of the revised monitoring document based on the "Surface Access to the Airport" heading of the Agreement has been prepared and is attached for Members' comment. In the *Current Status* column, the following colour coding would apply:

- GREEN where obligations have either been completed or compliance is ongoing in a satisfactory manner
- ORANGE where actions towards compliance are underway in a timely manner
- RED where actions have stalled for whatever reason or have not been started
- BLACK where obligations have not yet been triggered

RECOMMENDED that Members confirm whether they are happy with this revised format prior to the preparation of a full monitoring report for the next Panel meeting.

Background Papers: None

SURFACE ACCESS TO THE AIRPORT

S106 Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Status
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 1	Public car park levy	From implementation date	Charge levy for use	Ongoing requirement	Not yet applicable
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 2	Staff car park levy	No later than 12 mths from implementation date	Charge levy for use	Ongoing requirement	Not yet applicable
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 3	Public and staff car park levies	Each financial year after imposition	Review amount of levies	Ongoing requirement	Not yet applicable
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 5	Public and staff car park levies	From implementation date	Use levy income to encourage travel by public transport and car sharing	Ongoing requirement	Not yet applicable
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 6	Staff driving to / from work	Unspecified	Reduce to 80% of all staff	31 December 2010	To be looked at in future versions of the Surface access Strategy
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 7	Bus / Coach study	Unspecified	Commission study re contribution to 37% PT mode share by end 2010	31 December 2003	Done
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 8	Bus / Coach study	Unspecified	Supply study results to UDC	31 December 2003	Done
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 9	Bus / Coach study	Unspecified	Implement study recommendations and provide up to £1m funding	31 December 2010	Ongoing. 2 express coach services introduced.
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 10	Surface Access Strategy	Unspecified	To provide UDC with an updated strategy	31 March 2004	Done
Sch 4, Part	Surface	Unspecified	To review and update the	31 December	SATF Working Groups

4 Para 10	Access Strategy		2004 strategy	2005 and then every 2 years	beginning consideration.
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 11	Surface Access Strategy	Before opening date	Implement strategy	Before opening date	Strategy launched at annual SATF meeting.
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 12	Travel plans	Unspecified	To encourage companies with more than 50 employees to introduce travel plans	Unspecified	Site-wide travel plan launched at annual SATF meeting.
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 13	Employee travel scheme	From 16 May 2003	Secure retention of scheme	Ongoing requirement	Scheme promoted in the new site-wide travel plan. Travel card can be purchased via the web or by phone or post.
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 14	SATF meetings	Unspecified	Convene SATF on an annual basis and related working groups every 3 months	Ongoing requirement	SATF and working group timetables are being adhered to.
Sch 4, Part 4, Para 15	SATF meetings	Unspecified	Invite SRA, Highways Agency and ECC to report relevant rail and highway demand data to SATF	Ongoing requirement	This information is being reported to the relevant working groups.

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel
Date: 24 January 2005
Agenda Item No: 7
Title: Meeting between Uttlesford District Council, Uttlesford Primary Care Trust, Essex Strategic Health Authority and Stansted Airport Limited
Author: Jeremy Pine (01799) 510460

Summary

- 1 This report asks the Panel to note the outcome of the recent annual health study meeting between UDC, UPCT, ESHA and STAL.

Background

- 2 Uttlesford District Council granted outline planning permission for the expansion of Stansted Airport from 15-25mppa on 16 May 2003. The outline planning permission is subject to a Section 106 Agreement, which places various obligations upon the airport operator that are triggered at times between the grant of planning permission and the end of 2010.

- 3 In relation to health effects, the obligation under Part 19 of the Agreement requires Stansted Airport Limited to:

1) During November 2003 and during November of each subsequent year to consult with the Uttlesford Primary Care Trust and UDC as to whether it would be appropriate to commission a reasonable and proportionate study into effects of the Development upon public health within 5 miles of the Airport Boundary

2) In the event that as a result of the consultations referred to in paragraph 1 of this Part it is determined that such a study is desirable to commission such a reasonable and proportionate study forthwith at its own expense and to report the results thereof to the Uttlesford Primary Care Trust and to UDC

3) To take all reasonable and proportionate steps to mitigate in accordance with Government guidance from time to time in force regarding noise and air quality any proven adverse effects on public health identified by the studies carried out pursuant to paragraph 2 of this Part as being a direct result of the Development

Actions

- 4 In accordance with the obligation, the 2004 annual meeting took place on 24 November at the District Council's Great Dunmow offices. At the Panel

meeting one month earlier, Members were informed of the impending meeting and asked to see the meeting note. A copy of the note is attached for information. All participants have agreed the content of the note.

RECOMMENDED: that Members note the outcome of the meeting.

Background Papers: See report

**NOTE OF MEETING BETWEEN UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL (UDC),
UTTLESFORD PRIMARY CARE TRUST (UPCT), ESSEX STRATEGIC HEALTH
AUTHORITY (ESHA) AND STANSTED AIRPORT LIMITED (STAL) ON 24/11/04
AT COUNCIL OFFICES, GREAT DUNMOW.**

PARTICIPANTS

David Barron – Chair of UPCT
Chris Butler – STAL
Christina Cant – UDC Councillor, UPCT
Will Cockerell – UDC
Emma De Zoete – ESHA
Graham Earl – STAL
Jeremy Pine – UDC
Glyn Pritchard – UPCT

1. Review of activity since last meeting.

Air Quality

1.1. STAL has published its Sustainability Report 2003/4 where targets are set and in which there are comments on actions taken, achievements and areas for improvement. The document is distributed widely and is available on BAA's website. Air quality is regularly monitored and most aircraft are now modern, e.g B737-800 Ryanair. Use of Fixed Electrical Ground Power (FEGP) is increasing, motivated by the introduction of a new charging regime. Fire training is moving away from wood and real fuel towards gas and computer control.

1.2. Of 8 key pollutants, STAL view NO₂ as the greatest challenge, although there are no designated Air Quality Action Areas in this location. There are health implications from high NO₂ levels, especially respiratory problems. NO is oxidised into NO₂, which produces nitric acid when combined with water. The 15-25mppa Environmental Statement identified the possibility of high levels of NO₂ at High House (near Coopers End) and Start Hill. The average from Oct 03 – May 04 was 30ug/m³ at High House, below the 40ug/m³ target. *STAL will check whether data exists for the airport's busy summer period.* Targets are set by WHO studies and are at a conservative level.

1.3. The 15-25mppa S106 Agreement on Air Quality requires diffusion tube data from 4 sites within the airport boundary and real time monitoring for 3 months each year until 2005 at High House, and then all year round. UDC have diffusion tubes at Thatched Cottage, Start Hill and at Rose Cottage, Coopers End, both close to the airport boundary, and undertakes long term monitoring of noise and air quality from its site at Priorswood Court, Takeley.

Track Keeping

1.4. Noise preferential routes (NPRs) are set for departing aircraft by the DfT. BAA monitors on track performance and confirmed that this has improved from 97.02% in 2001/2 to 98.73% in 2003/4. It was queried how this compared with other airports.

There is an ongoing debate over the width of the NPR swathes. Improvements are the result of technology and the setting up of committees (fines go to STAAC), with representatives of flight operational staff from the airlines to share best practice and identify poor performance. The most likely reason for poor track keeping is unfamiliarity with the airport, in which case the offending airlines are spoken to.

Air Noise

1.5. STAL has published its “Community Matters” consultation document on schemes for noise insulation and mitigation for noise-sensitive buildings and for home relocation assistance. The consultation period runs until 21 December 2004. The document covers two schemes:

- A noise insulation / mitigation scheme based on 63db(A) Leq or more, averaged over 16 daytime hours and based on 2002 contour,
- A home relocation assistance scheme based on 69db(A) Leq or more, averaged over 16 daytime hours and based on 2002 contour.

1.6. The noise insulation / mitigation scheme offers assistance to schools and other sensitive public buildings (such as hospitals) but it was noted by UDC that none lie within the qualifying area. The scheme could therefore be criticised for appearing to offer something but actually offering nothing. However, STAL is satisfied that the ground coverage is as per Government advice, and acts as a benchmark for the future. It was also noted that the scheme was currently a consultation document. There was concern that use of a 16-hour day was not a good indicator for schools, but STAL feel it is appropriate to use Government guidance for this consultation, esp as the morning peak of departures is over before schools start. There was also concern that Leq is an averaging tool, which does not adequately reflect the disturbance caused by peaks of noise. STAL pointed out that the requirement for domestic double glazing was based on the 66db(A) Leq, so the use of 63db(A)Leq for the scheme did take the added sensitivity into account.

1.7. There was a discussion about how disruptive noise is within buildings. The Essex Schools Service has commenced a wider study, but the results are not yet known. Published data indicated that the population within the 57db(A)Leq dropped from 5,700 in 2000 to 2,300 in 2001, corresponding to the phasing out of Chapter 3 aircraft. An increase to 2,300 in 2003 corresponds to the increase in movements.

1.8. The new ground run pen, required as part of the 15-25mppa S106 Agreement is now operational on time.

Use of Airport Paramedic

1.9. STAL presented figures on the number of calls Oct 03–04. Generally, there were about 3-4 calls per day, which was not thought to be excessive for the number of people (staff and passengers) being served. The number of calls that resulted in subsequent hospitalisation was queried. UPCT will try to provide more data.

Economic Benefits to the Area

1.10. STAL emphasised the economic benefits that feed through to the area and that there was a correlation between wealth and health. There was a £400m contribution to the local economy. STAL will share this information with ESHA.

2. Relationship between health impact assessment for 25mppa+ application and S106 obligation to consider a study into the effects of the airport development on public health.

2.1. ESHA had an input into the 25mppa+ scoping opinion, and has had discussions with STAL over the specifications for the HIA. There is now a working document that both are happy with, structured around *methodology, evidence base and process*. STAL is now close to putting the work out to tender, but there may be only a limited number of consultants able to take it on. ESHA will sit on the interview panel alongside STAL, who will appoint the consultant. The Health Development Agency will be invited to sit on the panel. A management mechanism has been agreed whereby both ESHA and external expertise will continue to be involved. STAL confirmed that the commissioning of the HIA was still subject to internal approval.

2.2. There have also been discussions around the preparation of baseline data relating to the obligation in the S106 Agreement. The specification for the HIA includes making recommendations for future data collection on the long term health effects. The main issue is what is to be measured – UPCT suggest the health of school children or general referrals to local GPs. ESHA agreed that this is mainly uncharted territory, the nearest equivalent being work undertaken at much larger airports such as Schipol, Munich and Heathrow. ESHA noted that further discussions are required with experts to recommend appropriate ongoing monitoring arrangements for a longitudinal study. STAL noted that a key role of the HIA was to determine the need for ongoing appropriate monitoring. This would therefore be an outcome of the study and should not be prejudged prior to the completion of the proposed study.

2.3. UDC confirmed that data had been collected as part of the 15-25mppa Environmental Statement and the S106 obligations on the environmental aspects that affect health, such as noise and air quality. UDC noted there is now a need to begin to collect medical data even if adverse effects may not be immediately detectable, this work should be able to begin within 6-9 months once the HIA had made its recommendations over the most appropriate data to collect. ESHA confirmed that there would be an opportunity for public involvement in the HIA as the public perception of the effect of the airport on health was important. STAL restated the need to not prejudge the requirement for ongoing monitoring since this was an outcome of the proposed study.

2.4. STAL sought confirmation that ESHA were not seeking to activate the S106 obligation at this time, ESHA's view was that any study started now would be a guess as to where efforts should be focussed. That decision would be more informed in 6-9 months time once the HIA had made its recommendations and that further discussions would be needed before the next annual meeting in November 2005.

2.5. STAL clarified the timescale for the production of the HIA. The current plan, subject to internal approval, is for the appointment of the consultant by the end of January next year, with the HIA being completed around the time the 25mppa+

application is submitted. STAL confirmed that the consultants will be asked to determine their programme for completion of the HIA through reference to the EIA programme.

2.6. ESHA confirmed that the HIA would identify mitigation as appropriate and an examination of other opportunities. STAL confirmed that it wanted a negotiated agreement re the 25mppa+ application. UDC consider that the HIA can identify what environmental and medical monitoring is required to take forward over the next few years – the S106 Agreement study is more locally focussed and only relevant to a 5-mile radius from the airport.

2.7. STAL stated it was possible that the HIA will not identify any reasons for ongoing monitoring, but UDC think such monitoring would be wise if there are aspirations for further development at a later date.

3. Future meetings.

3.1. The next annual meeting would be in November 2005. On the advice of ESHA, a meeting in about 6-9 months time would be arranged as per Minute 2.4.

Jeremy Pine
30/11/04

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel
Date: 24 January 2005
Agenda Item No: 8
Title: Measures to Address Blight
1) HOSS 2) Special Cases Scheme
Author: Will Cockerell (01799) 510581

Summary

- 1 This report advises Members of the terms of the Home Owners Support Scheme (HOSS) as approved in September 2004, which has now come into affect.
- 2 This report also advises Members of an additional scheme: "BAA Stansted Special Cases Scheme". This has been introduced by BAA Stansted to enable home owners with certain medical conditions to move away from the immediate vicinity of the airport.

Background

- 3 The Council commented on during public consultation on the HOSS arrangements in May 2004. It had concerns about the use of noise contours to define the boundary of the scheme, the particular contour selected, the division of communities so that some properties would be eligible and others not, the lack of reference to tenanted properties including those owned by the Council, and the need for a scheme addressing those affected by the potential maximum use of the existing runway as proposed in the Air Transport White Paper. The terms of the scheme as approved were reported to the Panel in October.
- 4 Stansted Airport Ltd consulted on a scheme in relation to maximum use of the existing runway between September and December 2004. Similar schemes were proposed for other BAA airports and the Council endorsed the comments of the Local Government Association Strategic Aviation Special Interest Group in response.

HOSS

- 4 The attached table analyses the approved HOSS against the comments made by the Council at the public consultation stage.
- 5 Discussions have subsequently taken place between officers and Stansted Airport Ltd about the homes owned by the Council within the site that BAA has identified for its second runway proposal. A proposal in respect of these properties is awaited from BAA.

BAA Stansted Special Cases Scheme

- 5 To qualify for the scheme medical evidence must be produced to show that the applicant is suffering from a medical condition which makes it necessary for them to move in the best interests of their health.
- 6 The property must lie very close to the proposed expanded airport boundary for the new runway, and as with the Home Owner Support Scheme there must have been every reasonable effort to sell the property and no offers to purchase the property within 15% of the Market Price.
- 7 There is a thorough process to determine whether the application and supporting evidence meets the published guidelines and there is no right of appeal.

FOR INFORMATION

Background Papers: BAA's Press Release Special Cases Scheme

APPENDIX

Points raised by UDC	BAA response
<p>The use of the 66dBA Leq contour for 2030 is reported to be based on a similar scheme used during the building of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link. An EU position paper on Transport Noise and Annoyance shows that at 65L_{DEN} 9% of people are highly annoyed by rail noise, a similar number of people (10%) are annoyed by aircraft noise at the much lower level of noise, 55 L_{DEN}. For the schemes to be comparable the trigger point for compensation should be the 55Leq contour not the 66 Leq as currently proposed.</p>	<p>The predicted 66dBA Leq in 2030 remains as the definition of the boundary of the scheme.</p>
<p>The contour suggested is presumed to be based on the long-term modal split of 75:25. However disturbance and annoyance is experienced on a daily basis where the most likely use of the runway is 100% in one or other direction and 100:100 modal split would be a fairer basis. The sole use of a day time 66dBA Leq is inconsistent with the recent consultation on noise insulation grants, which included the night time 57dBA Leq contour and the effects of ground noise in a composite contour.</p>	<p>The use of the 66dBA Leq is designed to address generalised blight not noise, which will be addressed in the future.</p>
<p>The proposed Leq contour produces arbitrary boundaries on the ground, particularly in Takeley, Duton Hill and Sibley's Green, which need to be resolved fairly for the local communities if the scheme is not to be seen as socially divisive and unfair.</p>	<p>It is important to make clear BAA's intention not to deviate from this definition.</p> <p>(The 66dBA Leq as predicted for 2030)</p>

<p>The consultation refers to owner-occupiers and makes no reference to landlords such as the Council, RSL's or private landlords, although deterioration in the capital value of the property and in market rent levels are likely as a consequence of the proposals. The Council has about 70 houses and bungalows and a sheltered housing complex and Day Centre within the 66Leq contour, and the future living conditions of our tenants are of considerable concern. I request that you respond to this specific omission when you finalise your scheme.</p>	<p>No Response, although acknowledged as a concern by some respondents</p>
<p>The principal reason put forward in the Consultation for introducing this voluntary scheme is the 'the <i>Future of Air Transport White Paper</i>, a new aviation policy' which also included government support for maximising the use of the existing runway capacity at Stansted. An equal case can be made for introducing a similar scheme, or extending the proposed scheme, to include properties which would be affected by the intensification in use of the existing runway. Again I request that you respond to this specific omission when you finalise your scheme.</p>	<p>No response, but new scheme called Home Relocation Assistance does address those houses subject to very high noise levels from aircraft using the existing runway.</p>
<p>The White Paper makes reference to the need for the airport operator to 'bring forward a scheme to address the problem of generalised blight' and you will be aware of some apparent evidence in the public domain that this is already taking place, and BAA Stansted should make it clear whether any additional scheme can be expected to address this much wider problem which cannot be defined by any particular noise contour.</p>	<p>Home Value Guarantee Scheme and Home Owners Support Scheme is BAA's response to the Government's request for us to address generalised blight.</p>