

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.30 pm on 27 FEBRUARY 2006**

Present:- Councillor P A Wilcock – Chairman.
Councillors C A Cant, M L Foley, E J Godwin, G Sell,
A R Thawley, and A M Wattebot.

Also present:- Councillors M A Gayler and A J Ketteridge.

Officers in attendance:- W Cockerell, R Harborough, J Pine and M T Purkiss.

SA33

APOLOGIES AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors K R Artus,
J F Cheetham and A Dean.

Councillor Thawley declared an interest as a member of CPRE and the
National Trust, Councillor Lemon declared an interest as a member of the
National Trust and Councillor Wilcock declared an interest as a member of
CPRE.

SA34

DRAFT RESPONSE TO THE BAA GENERATION 2 DOCUMENT

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager submitted a draft response to
the Stansted Generation 2 consultation.

He pointed out that BAA had asked for responses to its consultation document
by 24 March 2006. It would take into account responses to this consultation in
deciding which two-runway airport layout it would seek planning permission
for when it submitted its planning application in 2007.

He stated that although a non-statutory stage in the planning process, it was
an important part. It was essential that the Council used this opportunity to
begin to set out its concerns on the detail of the proposal that it would be
expected to address in its case at the Public Inquiry into the proposals before
the Government determined BAA's application. He said that non-engagement
in the consultation, or simply stating the Council's opposition in principle to the
proposals would substantially prejudice the Council's position at the Inquiry.

He emphasised that the Council's response whilst proposals were still at a
formative stage should indicate those matters that the proposals must address
in so far as they related to the scale, extent and location of the proposed
development.

He concluded that a draft joint response from Essex and Hertfordshire County
Councils and East Hertfordshire and Uttlesford District Councils had been
prepared by officers of the four authorities and this was submitted for
discussion. He said that the aim was for the four authorities to have a joint
case at the Public Inquiry and this would require the four authorities to have
compatible positions.

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager then went through the draft response in detail and highlighted the most important elements of the draft response.

Councillor Sell pointed out that the residents of Burton End had been campaigning against a second runway because the effects would split their community and he considered that tougher wording was needed within the response. He also suggested that the reference to reduced rail service issues needed to be strengthened as there were already capacity problems and these would be exacerbated by full use of the existing runway and the construction of a second runway. There was no reference in the consultation document to proposals for additional infrastructure capacity. Councillor Lemon agreed that rail issues were important and said that he had recently attended a BAA road show and had asked about this issue. He pointed out that One railway had stated that Liverpool Street was already at full capacity.

Councillor Godwin said that the LEQ contours were grossly inaccurate as were the estimates of the population affected by air noise. She pointed out the problems with ground noise at Birchanger and Takeley and added that the proposals would put more people into the area of blight. She also referred to the need for public safety zone implications to be addressed, the effect of de-icing fluids and the problems caused to buildings by vibration from aircraft. She concluded that a Health Impact Assessment was essential.

Councillor Cant said that she was deeply concerned at the proposals. She said that the tone of the draft response was good and pointed out that a balance needed to be struck between making the case of total opposition to the second runway and addressing some of the issues of detail. She asked whether failing to raise all detail issues at this stage would prejudice the Council's case and what was said later at the Inquiry. The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager said that he did not feel that the response should be too comprehensive, particularly as there was not much detail in the consultation document. Councillor Cant also referred to the judicial review concerning the Aviation White Paper and the position of a second runway and said that attention should be drawn to this. The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager pointed out that the review had been to challenge the principle of national policy prescribing support for a particular scheme. A planning application would need to be specific about the proposed development.

Councillor Gayler said that more information was needed regarding LEQ issues and said that the Council was opposed to the extension of car parking which would have a detrimental impact on Burton End.

Councillor Thawley said that there was insufficient information on modal splits for journeys to and from the airport and the implications for car parking. He also suggested that the words "and the wider community" needed to be added after the words "local communities" at the end of page 6 of the response. He concluded that the proposed runway would cut across the grain of land and this would have an impact on water supply and natural and other resources.

Councillor Ketteridge said that he agreed with the comments regarding car parking. He said that when the airport was originally built it was claimed that it

would not have a detrimental visual impact and, whilst the terminal fitted in well, the hangar building was intrusive. He said that the original emphasis regarding the airport was for “an airport in the countryside”. This and the principle of avoiding high rise development should be reiterated. Councillor Wilcock suggested that reference should also be made in the response to the comments of the original inspector, Graham Eyres, stating that a second runway would be an “environmental disaster”.

Councillor Wilcock also suggested that in relation to surface access effects, any increase in air passenger throughput should be accommodated on the rail network and not on the roads and he suggested that this could not be achieved for a second runway. Councillor Lemon added that the M11 and other local roads could not cope with increased traffic and a recent incident on the M11 had grid locked the area for over seven hours.

Councillor Gayler said that the proposals would significantly worsen air quality and the response to this needed to be strengthened.

Councillor Wilcock referred to the report of the cross national RANCH study published in 2005 on the effects of aircraft and road traffic noise on children’s cognition and health and a note from LB Hounslow on the effects of Heathrow on education in the Borough. The Panel were advised that the Health Impact Assessment would be reviewing the implications of all published studies on such issues in appraising BAA’s proposals for increased use of the existing runway. There would also be a HIA of the second runway proposals.

Councillor Foley added that there was a growing weight of evidence that airports were an unhealthy place to live by and the studies would be useful in emphasising this point. Councillor Gayler agreed and said that the response should include our concerns that there is a significant effect on health and air quality from airports and there was growing evidence from a number of studies to reinforce this point. Councillor Sell said that there was sufficient evidence to show that there was an impact on school children and there were a number of schools that would be affected in Uttlesford. He suggested that some data was needed on the impact on schools at present as this could be used as a benchmark. Councillor Foley said that background noise in Uttlesford was far lower than around most other UK airports and this was an important factor in determining the level of annoyance caused by aircraft noise. He also referred to concerns about night noise.

The Principal Environmental Health Officer (Environmental Protection) reported that he had discussed the feasibility of a long term health study with the team responsible for the UK input into the RANCH study and it had confirmed the potential. Professor Stansfeld, had suggested that two schools should be identified in the District, one which was affected by aircraft noise, one which was not and comparisons should be made over a period of time. Councillor Wattebot suggested that observational work on the impact on the behaviour of school children should be part of any studies undertaken. It was agreed that officers would report further on the scope for a long term study.

Councillor Cant concluded that the impact of a second runway would mean total devastation for large parts of the District and this could not be mitigated.

The Planning Policy and Conservation Manager responded to the points which had been made at the meeting and said that the draft response would be amended and strengthened as appropriate and a revised draft would be submitted to the Member workshop on 20 March 2006 and to the Extraordinary Council meeting on 21 March 2006. He clarified that it was not intended that there would be one response from Uttlesford on behalf of the four local authorities but that each council would determine its own response based on the core draft content.

SA35 **OTHER ISSUES**

The Chairman reported that progress on the runway 1 issues had been set out in the recent Member briefing and a full page article would be attached to Uttlesford Life which would enable the public to respond to BAA. He said that at the last STAAC meeting, he had set the record straight about this Council's opposition to a second runway. He also reported that SASIG was taking a more proactive stance in challenging the Government over the development of the Aviation White Paper.

SA36 **NEXT MEETING**

It was agreed that the meeting scheduled for 6 March 2006 should be cancelled and that the draft response would be considered at the planned workshop and Extraordinary Council meeting. The next meeting of the Advisory Panel would be held on 24 April 2006.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm.