

Appendix 2

GENERATION 2 AIRPORT PROJECT AT STANSTED AIRPORT

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES RECEIVED SO FAR, PREPARED FOR THE STAAP MEETING ON 11/9/08

Regional / County / Borough / District Planning Authorities

Baburgh DC: Wishes to lodge an objection to the planning applications collectively referred to as the G2 Airport Project:

1. Impact of noise disturbance from increased movements. Whilst the precise impact will not be realised until the proposed airspace changes are established, it is anticipated that parts of the district will experience an adverse impact as a result.
2. Likely impact on traffic generation. No information on effect on roads in Babergh. Whilst the proposed travel planning initiatives and forecast proportion of passengers using public transport will reduce the potential impact of traffic generation, the volume of traffic is proposed to increase significantly as a result of G2. Car parking spaces are proposed to increase to 77,450 by 2030. Difficult to assess the impact of this on traffic generation beyond Stansted – concerned that this information is not included as part of the accompanying assessment, particularly the A131 through Sudbury.
3. Would inevitably lead to an overall significant increase in CO² emissions. BAA has set itself a target not to exceed the emissions levels from buildings and infrastructure from the 2006 level of 43,000 tonnes. However, the increase as a result of additional air passengers will impact the overall emissions, leading to a significant net increase. This is of concern given that planning objectives nationally and locally aim to reduce emissions and promote development which minimises impact on global warming. It also raises questions over compliance with the imminent Climate Change Bill. It sets out targets for significantly reducing UK emissions, which will have to include a proportion of international aviation emissions within 5 years. Not apparent how G2 will contribute to the achievement of this objective.

Braintree DC: Considered at the Cabinet meeting on 2/6/08. Would like to make the following comments:

1. Is opposed to the development of a second runway and associated facilities at Stansted Airport in view of its adverse environmental impact and its implications for climate change
2. That the application fails to address the infrastructure deficit to the east of the airport, including the completion of the A120 improvement

between Braintree and Marks Tay and the provision of high quality public transport links.

Chelmsford BC: Considered by the Planning Policy Committee on 21/5/08. Members resolved to oppose the provision of a second runway.

LB Redbridge: Wishes to register the following comments:

Transport: M11 Stansted traffic travels through Redbridge. Whilst this provides useful connections, it is likely that increased airport activity will have a knock-on effect for traffic congestion. In particular, an increase in congestion may occur at the junction of the A406 / M11 at South Woodford and at the A406 / A12 / M11 junction at Redbridge roundabout. Thames Gateway Bridge (still under construction) would further increase the through-flow of traffic from South London to Stansted. Mitigation could be by a direct bus link from Ilford to the airport, or rerouting the service from Stratford. Crossrail from 2017 will provide a faster link between Ilford and Stansted via Stratford.

Economy: OEF report shows that a new runway at Heathrow would increase UK GDP by £7bn / year by 2030, increasing to £13bn with a second runway at Stansted. This will have some impact on the borough due to its close proximity to Stansted. As part of the LSCP growth area, which aims to provide 20% of London's new homes and jobs, the expansion of Stansted will help to support this proposed growth. Direct and reliable public transport between Redbridge and Stansted will enable companies to locate in the borough in the safe knowledge that transport infrastructure exists to support growth and development.

Noise Pollution: Any increase in capacity will have an increase in aircraft movement and noise. Redbridge has some of the busiest airspace in the region. Many residents have concerns that the NATS recent consultation will result in certain areas having to experience increased noise and movements.

South Cambridgeshire DC: The Council's Cabinet considered a report on 8/5/08. Does not support a second runway, which would create serious environmental damage to the surrounding area and contribute to global warming.

The second runway – welcomes segregated mode due to reduced environmental impact

Air movements – Concerned that the capacity of the new runway is being designed to allow the use of larger aircraft. With the need for NATS to consider further changes to aircraft movements as a result of the second runway this could result in larger aircraft as well as larger numbers of aircraft overflying. In considering the current NATS consultation, the Council is concerned that the intermittent noise pattern of aircraft using the West Stansted hold will disturb communities and the implication of greater numbers of aircraft associated with a second runway will add to the disturbance.

Increased capacity – Insufficient information provided to fully assess the noise impact. Additional information requested from BAA in 2006 has not been

included. Requests that the wider noise implications of the second runway should be considered as part of the current application and that UDC should request the contour lines for 54 and 50dB Leq. In the absence of this information the Council has no option but to object to the second runway.

Infrastructure implications – Supports the improvements proposed to the M11, but recommends that further improvements are needed north of J14 since there will be significant additional traffic growth as a result of growth corridor development as well as the airport. This should be included in the G2 proposals. Does not support the scale of the increased car parking provision. Request that additional facilities for coaches and buses be planned for, and there should be more encouragement for passengers to have the choice to use coach services. Support the increase in rail capacity, but additional track capacity should be provided north of Stansted to serve the growth corridor and passengers from the north.

The Council requests that until such time as vital improvements have been made to road and rail facilities to serve the airport the proposed second runway should not be permitted.

Aviation

NATS: UTT/0400/08/FUL – objects due to conflict with safeguarding criteria. The description of development for Development Zone 7 does not take into account the presence of the existing radar tower which provides separation, approach and local control area functions. Construction of new buildings around this area is likely to impact on existing service integrity. Seeks conditions that no construction works take place within DZ7 until the radar tower has been removed from that location. Currently working with BAA to provide a new radar tower to the NE outside DZ7, allowing for the existing tower to be demolished.

The indicated construction volume for the new control tower (195m AOD) shows that its maximum height would exceed the safeguarding slope of the Stansted radar service by 51m. As such, it would have an impact on radar returns and the potential to obstruct surveillance of aircraft. There are no details of the building itself to assess the impact. More information on the exact physical dimensions of the tower would enable a more precise impact assessment to be undertaken. Seeks a condition that no structures are built above 143m AOD within the indicated volume until the existing radar service has been removed from its current location.

Will consider removing this objection, subject to planning conditions being agreed such that the integrity and service provision of the current Stansted radar service is maintained to its current level.

No safeguarding objections re UTT/0401/08/OP, UTT/0402/08/FUL and UTT/0403/08/FUL.

Stansted Airport Consultative Committee:

General Observations

1. Opposes in principle a second runway, and no comments should be seen as endorsing it. As the proposals have been pursued to a planning application, the following should be borne in mind:-
 - Operation should be in a segregated mode
 - Mixed mode would have to be subject to a separate planning application
 - The evaluation of the EIA must include consideration of full details of the environmental safeguards, including the mitigation of ground noise, proposed for Takeley and other nearby villages
2. Any proposals in either mode must acknowledge the effect extra flights will have SW of the airport
3. Any proposals in either mode must acknowledge the effect the enlarged airport will have on nearby communities
4. Any proposals must tie in with the NATS airspace review

Rail Strategy

5. The decision to consult separately on proposals to upgrade the rail system into London, and prior to Network Rail's proposals on its future regional rail strategy being released, was mistaken. The proposals are an integral part of the regional rail strategy and cannot be looked at in isolation. Any comments made have to be on the basis that the Committee would wish to see the regional strategy, and how the airport development fits into that strategy, before making any final observations.
6. The fact that track improvements, station improvements, upgrading of rolling stock and a move to 12-car trains will be required are agreed in principle. Further information is required on how the requirements of airport users and commuters can both be met without detriment to the needs of either. Timing is crucial. An improved infrastructure for both the Stansted Express and commuter traffic needs to be put in place as soon as possible and well before 2020 to 2025, when 12-car trains will no longer be able to meet anticipated demand.
7. No acknowledgement is given of the delays caused at level crossings at a number of locations. Additional rail traffic will increase these delays and an indication of how they will be alleviated would be welcome.
8. The rail proposals document concentrates on services to the south. No mention of improvements elsewhere, particularly to the east where it is felt that an expanded airport could justify the reintroduction of a rail line.
9. The introduction of a loop (3rd) line in places on the main route to London is supported.
10. Standard of Stansted Express rolling stock needs to be improved. Refurbishment is not adequate.

11. The rail authority should be pressed to make a more definitive statement about changes required, timescales and funding.

Road Strategy

12. Junction M11 8b is supported

13. Further data needed on what improvements are needed north of J8b. Documents to date are very bland on the subject. Concerned about a four lane carriageway narrowing to two north of J8b.

14. The Highways Agency should be asked to accept that there is a case for providing a junction between M11 J7 and J8. J7 location is inconvenient and leads to a considerable amount of traffic using other unsuitable roads to access either the airport or M11.

15. No mention of improvements to local strategic roads such as the A120 west of the M11. This is unacceptable – the regional impact will be far greater than suggested by the Highways Agency.

16. Whilst it is acknowledged that noise protection for Takeley is still under discussion, full details should be given in any subsequent applications.

17. Whilst there is some logic behind siting all local routes to the west of the airport, this will lead to increased travel distances for those living on the east. Consideration should be given to providing a peripheral route round the eastern boundary (should the environmental impacts be not too great) and / or tunnelling under the enlarged airport area.

18. Any roads should have noise suppressive surfaces.

Business/Economic

(None so far)

Emergency Services

(None so far)

Environmental

ANTAS (Association of North Thames Amenity Societies): Represents 22 amenity societies across Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire. Applications premature because demand has not reached a point where a decision has to be made, the G1 outcome has not been published and the resolution of how to accommodate the demand for extra capacity on the main rail line arising from the second runway is a long way from being completed. Rail capacity demands in the E of E Plan and the LSCP corridor also have to be taken into account.

Era of cheap oil is over – price of aviation fuel will follow a rising trend. This will reduce forecast demand growth. Economies of developed nations are under strain from the credit crunch. No certainty that UK spending power will return to previous levels. If BAA were split into smaller autonomous operating units, Stansted could be seen as a disbenefit from the financial outflow from tourism, not justifying high levels of investment in public transport.

Support the recent report of the Sustainable Development Commission calling for an independent inquiry into economics of aviation and its contribution to global warming before further expansion is required.

Beehive Residents Association (Leavenheath, Suffolk): Absurd for BAA to double its emissions and do further damage for profit. The South East will benefit more if the project does not go ahead. Recent increases in air and noise pollution and air traffic. Local roads cannot cope.

Bishop's Stortford Civic Federation: Object. Bishop's Stortford, a town of over 35,000 inhabitants, is the largest settlement close to the airport to be adversely affected by its activities. The objection is on 5 main grounds:

- The applications are premature
- The basis of comparison is flawed
- No evidence has been presented of need to support the applications
- BAA may be unable to fund the development
- The proposed development would be an unmitigated nuisance

The Vice-Chairman's conclusions are:

“There is no need for the G2 applications to have been made at this point in time, and strong arguments for concluding that they are both premature and, for all the volume of information, unsupported by relevant evidence. The longer term future of the airport may become clearer after the G1 application has been determined, after the outcome of the NATS study of the redistribution of airspace is known, after the studies on rail enhancements (and also on the road network) commissioned by the Secretary of State for Transport have been published and after the Competition Commission has concluded its investigation. Even if these leave open the possibility of further expansion of the airport the next step would clearly be not to do so by means of a second runway.

A better appreciation of the impact of the proposals could have been gained if BAA had based the application on a comparison with conditions at present. They have carefully avoided doing so but chosen instead an entirely artificial base case whose sole purpose appears to be to flatter G2 by apparently minimising its adverse consequences. BAA have presented no evidence of support from their customers for the proposals or of any urgent demand which could only be satisfied by the G2 proposals. Indeed, the current economic climate is bearing down heavily on demand for air travel while calling into question BAA's ability to fund the G2 proposals if planning approval were obtained.

In these circumstances it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that these are frivolous applications, made without any serious intention of implementing them should permission be granted. Instead their purpose appears rather to be to weaken through exhaustion and depletion of resources, both the opposition to airport expansion and the ability of Uttlesford District Council to give proper consideration to any future proposal for the development of the airport. The right course of action would be to invite the applicants to withdraw their proposals until resolution of the matters I have listed above makes it clear whether such applications would ever be relevant in the future and, if so, at what time. Failing that, the applications should be turned down as soon as possible. To do otherwise would simply subject surrounding communities to unnecessarily prolonged blight”.

The comments do not apply to the 2nd rail tunnel and 4th platform proposals which, arguably, are needed now even without further airport expansion.

Boreham Conservation Society: Strongly oppose. Enough is enough. For everyone’s sake, air travel must be discouraged. Cost to the planet is too great. We need the good agricultural land, the woodland, the peaceful villages and tranquil countryside to be preserved. All these and traces of our heritage would be sacrificed. The whole region is already suffering from overdevelopment.

Colchester & North East Essex Building Preservation Trust: Object in the strongest possible terms. Quite apart from the ecological damage, the Trust is concerned at the loss of so many fine buildings, many of which are listed. Can a country call itself civilised if it allows a runway to be built so close to that remarkable survivor, Tilty Church? Ironic if this environment was to be destroyed to satisfy the requirements of cheap flight airlines, which can only last in the short term.

Colne-Stour Countryside Association: Profound objection. Many members already affected by the noise and pollution from air traffic. Although the G1 Inquiry Inspector’s report has still to be published, we believe that Graham Eyre’s earlier inquiry comments are just as valid today. He stated that a second runway would be an “environmental catastrophe”---“an unprecedented and wholly unacceptable major environmental disaster”. The details of the current planning application clearly demonstrate that nothing has happened to justify any different conclusion now.

Noise and pollutants will be come intolerable to many living under the eastern flightpaths. Much of the area is designated of special landscape value. The upper Stour Valley is a continuous extension of the Dedham Vale and is just as beautiful, and is hoped in due course to be included in the AONB.

Highly questionable whether at the current time or in the foreseeable future there is a requirement for a second runway. Unacceptable risk through increased traffic and housing pressure that the picturesque historical villages

in the west of the area will be severely damaged if the application were allowed.

East of England Environment Forum: (On behalf of the following organisations in the East of England – CPRE, East of England Association of Civic Trust Societies, East of England Biodiversity Forum, Friends of the Earth, National Trust, RSPB, Sustainable Transport for the East of England, Wildlife Trust Eastern Region)

Share a concern that the proposals could have a significant negative impact on the natural and historic environment and on quality of life. Specifically concerned about the environmental impact of:

- Increased greenhouse gas emissions contributing to climate change
- Inadequate measures to offset greenhouse gas emissions and generate renewable energy on site
- Deteriorating air quality, affecting both people and wildlife
- Increased noise affecting residents and visitors
- Loss of countryside and landscape, visual impact
- Loss of cultural heritage, including historic buildings, landscapes and townscapes and archaeological sites
- Inadequate sources of water in the context of regional demand, the need for water use efficiency, and pollution of water including foul water drainage and surface run-off
- Increased pressure on existing transport networks and inadequate measures to reduce road traffic and improve public transport infrastructure and provision

Essex Green Party: Objects to all related applications. The proposals are reckless, selfish and totally unsustainable. BAA is incapable of facing up to the severe damage the proposals will cause and has continued to use misleading descriptions of its proposals in order to try to pretend that in some way building one of the largest airports in the world in the Essex countryside is acceptable.

Object to:

Loss of countryside, homes and listed buildings

Damage to woodland and habitats, especially the threat to Hatfield Forest

Increased noise pollution – already intolerable for many

Increased danger from the risk of air collisions

Increased road traffic and pressure to build more roads – BAA grossly underestimate local road traffic

Increased light pollution – this will widen over a much wider area affecting the rural character of the countryside well beyond the airport boundary

Massive increase in CO² emissions

Inevitable secondary development sprawling over open countryside

Increased air pollution and threat to human health and wildlife

Also oppose BAA's economic case for expansion. No way that a business model based on aggressively marketed cheap flights can be justified as an overriding reason for expansion. The local area has a strong economy.

Growth would require and lead to increased migration and commuting on an unsustainable basis. Much of BAA's profit comes from car parking and shopping. Inconceivable that under planning policy other businesses proposing to use large areas of car parking in the countryside would get planning permission due to the environmental impact.

Lack of a second runway does not prevent people flying, but would be a sensible decision to create a balance between the activities of a private company and the community and environment it operates in, albeit that BAA would still have a lot to do to minimise its current impacts.

Friends of Epping Forest: Assume that the adverse consequences of G2 will not have been overemphasised as the Non-Technical Summary has not been put together by an entirely independent source.

Will be a direct and harmful effect on the Forest from increased traffic generation, overflying and noise pollution. Collectively, these would adversely affect biodiversity and increase road-kill. There will be an effect on the wider environment and strain on infrastructure, contributing to the adverse effect on the Forest and quality of life.

Query Alistair McDermid's Plane Talk assertion in March 2008 that falling passenger numbers was a cyclical downturn in the national and world economy and that everybody predicts long term growth. Demand has been over-stimulated by cheap flights; now true costs are emerging, demand will diminish. Environmental costs of flying are similarly being realised and causing increased problems of noise, pollution, countryside destruction, traffic generation etc. Not opposed to flying as such, but the full costs, both financial and environmental, must be brought to bear.

Anyone who has visited Kew or Richmond cannot but be horrified by the thought of a 3rd runway at Heathrow, and by the thought that these appalling conditions might become the future for an area around an expanded Stansted. Future residents of North Harlow or Elsenham eco-town would doubtless not enjoy being subjected to noise and pollution associated with an airport larger than Heathrow at present.

Mr McDermid also denied that increased passenger numbers would cause huge congestion. He claimed that 40% of passengers already arrive by public transport and that this would increase to 50% (44% in the NTS). Wonder why in that case an expanded car park for 77,400 cars (not mentioned by Mr McDermid) is required. Perhaps because BAA makes large sums of money from car parking.

The NTS admits a number of adverse effects on farm holdings, the rural economy and air quality. It is clear that there would be large adverse residual effects on cultural heritage resources. BAA's long term commitment to CO² emissions relates only to the construction period and takes no account of increased aircraft numbers or traffic. Minor adverse effects from ground noise are shown at a number of locations. Construction would bring significant and

widespread adverse landscape effects. On occasion there may be moderate adverse visual effects for some locations not currently overflowed. Adverse effects would be significant on nature conservation – overall effect would be high owing to the wide variety of habitats and the scale of the project. Not impressed by the statement that G2 would have no significant noise change to Hatfield Forest – maps refer only to summer and segregated mode. A number of measures are set out in mitigation of these adverse factors, but they are not quantified and no convincing assessment is put forward to indicate how far they would be effective.

Garden History Society: Second runway will run in close proximity to Easton Lodge, a site of national importance included as Grade II in the English Heritage Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic interest. PPG15 advises that local planning authorities should protect registered parks and gardens in determining planning applications, and effect is a material consideration. Whilst the proposed development will be visually screened from the Lodge, there are still grave concerns about impact on the important designated landscape. Would cause a significant increase in the number of planes flying at low altitude over or near to the Lodge:

1. undesirable modern intrusion from the air traffic
2. accompanying increase in noise levels would be an intrusion on the character and integrity of its historic setting
3. possible that an increase in localised pollution would cause problems for the plant and wildlife within the gardens, creating practical difficulties for maintenance and having an effect on their appeal as a natural haven

Concerned that the consequent loss of quality of the visitor experience would have implications for ticket sales and thus commercial viability.

HACAN (Heathrow Association for the Control of Aircraft Noise): Wishes to register its objection.

Hadstock Society: G2 submission underestimates the effect on the environment within the whole locality, but especially Hadstock. The airport will become too large, allowing escalation of movements to an unacceptable level and pollution to beyond accepted EU levels. Would allow take offs and landings to continue without interruption, whereas currently there is some respite. Increasing noise levels and disturbance will be horrendous for those living under departure routes. Thought should also be given to those under arrivals paths. Also concerned about other pressures on the environment such as housing and schools.

Hadstock already suffers unacceptably high noise pollution from Stansted and Luton aircraft, which might be made worse by proposed airspace changes. What quality of life would the village have?

Ickleton Society: Completely opposed. Would result in a two-runway airport bigger than Heathrow. Would be severe and far reaching impacts on the local environment, contributing to climate change. In brief:

- More noise and interruption from overflying
- More road traffic and congestion
- Busier trains
- More pressure on water supplies
- Landscape impacts from the new infrastructure
- Pressure for more housing and consequent urbanisation
- Loss of historic buildings, countryside and rural character
- Loss of biodiversity, habitats, degradation of woodlands including Hatfield Forest
- More air pollution and health / environment related problems
- More emissions causing climate change
- More night flights

Kent Green Party: Objects. Is in conflict with Government policy on climate change. Cannot be realistically dealt with by carbon trading or emissions trading as the carbon price is set too low. Also question whether expansion is viable with oil prices over £125 / barrel.

Loughton Residents' Association: Further increase in passengers will inevitably mean extra pressure on local roads, motorways and rail routes, which will affect Loughton residents both in Loughton and in travelling within the wider area. In sufficient funding or attention has been given to dealing effectively with these aspects.

Nayland with Wissington Conservation Society: Objects. Represents over 200 people in Dedham Vale AONB. Reduced demand due to rising fuel costs would indicate a future reduction in airport size. Totally illogical to consider airport expansion when seeking ways to reduce carbon emissions. Ironical that if the runway goes ahead there might not be enough planes to make use of it. BP has reported that world oil production fell last year in spite of the increased price, suggesting that there is a developing physical shortage of oil.

Surrounding listed buildings and historic villages will be needlessly destroyed.

Saffron Walden Friends of the Earth: Brief reasons for objections (to be expanded upon):

1. Premature pending a decision on G1
2. Do not meet the standards laid down in PPS1 for sustainable development or for ensuring carbon neutrality. Will destroy community cohesion in a wide area. Any economic benefits cannot outweigh the disbenefits
3. Proposed transport improvements will not suffice to prevent excessive road and rail congestion
4. Water resources will not be adequate
5. Unacceptable damage to the area's ancient woodlands. Proposed mitigation – replanting young trees on agricultural land cannot be regarded as compensation or mitigation for such destruction
6. Neither can the loss of so many houses, including listed buildings, be remedied by attempting to rebuild a few on new sites

7. Increase in noise annoyance and stress from doubling the number of flights will intensify around the airport and extend into other areas which have to date been tranquil. While some attempt has been made to assess the impact of overflying aircraft as opposed to identifying the areas with average noise levels of over 57dB, the full extent of noise annoyance under flightpaths has not been recognised
8. There are no possible mitigation measures for the improvement of the admitted worsening by 2030 of the AQMA at London Road / Dunmow Road, Bishop's Stortford. Development should not be allowed when the extra traffic generated will aggravate an existing AQMA and prevent successful mitigation
9. In the absence of any agreed plan to include aviation emissions in the EU ETS, the implications of the additional greenhouse gas emissions from a doubling of flights must be material

Stop Stansted Expansion: Is an obvious and fundamental misrepresentation in the Environmental Statement in that it uses a 35mppa base case whereas the extant permission is for 25mppa. An airport masterplan has still not been submitted (although understand this is promised next month) and no economic justification has been submitted. The applicant has failed to provide sufficient information to enable a proper evaluation of the likely environmental effects of G2.

The details of the G2 applications have all the characteristics of a rush job rather than, as we are told, the result of more than four years of preparation. Initial review has identified the need for additional information which has been submitted to BAA in a schedule.

On the basis of the current information, it is already clear that the project would have catastrophic consequences for the local environment as predicted by Blake, Buchanan and Eyre at two previous inquiries and a Royal Commission. The proposal for a second runway is even less acceptable today when account is taken of the global environmental impacts and the absence of any economic justification.

The Ware Society: Objects to a second runway and any increase in flights:

1. Noise from approaching and departing aircraft already too high – will still be noise with the NATS re-route. Will get worse with a second runway.
2. Non taxation of aviation fuel gives an unfair advantage over other means of travel. Will impact on heavily used local roads.
3. Will result in an influx of workers who will require accommodation in an area already under pressure to provide additional housing. Will impact on Ware.
4. Will require enhanced infrastructure provision for which no plans have been made.
5. Blighting of surrounding countryside

Creation of an airport larger than Heathrow will seriously endanger the future of the town in terms of population growth, employment patterns and the semi-

rural nature of the first town north of London on the A10 to be separated from the ribbon urban development.

Wendens Ambo Society: Object:

1. Impact on air quality, noise levels, Hatfield Forest and the surrounding countryside
2. Would make Stansted and the M11 an area of urban sprawl
3. Complete lack of infrastructure to support expansion. Standing room only on peak hour trains. Commuter trains suffer at the expense of Stansted Express in the event of delays or congestion
4. Lack of need in the area for additional homes or jobs other than affordable housing
5. Economic argument is rubbish. Most of the flights are for holidaymakers and tourists leaving the UK to spend abroad. The few dedicated business traveller airlines have closed. Most inbound tourists go straight to London.
6. There is no need in the current economic climate. Likely to be issues finding builders who would be willing to commit to building the additional housing required

Health

St Elizabeth's Centre: Established in 1903 as a national centre for children and adults with severe epilepsy, associated neurological disorders and other complex medical conditions. Employs over 600 staff providing 24 hour care for 200 pupils, learners and residents at South End, Much Hadham. All bedrooms are equipped with a two-way audio monitoring system to help staff detect seizures and people's movement at night. It is a vital resource that has saved lives.

About 5% of aircraft in a 5 day monitoring exercise carried out last year overflew St Elizabeths. Intrusions from overflying aircraft have interfered with the audio monitoring system, triggering alarms making the system ineffective until residents have been visited, checked and their alarms reset. From 25 – 100% of alarms have been affected, putting an extra burden on staff, shutting down monitors for half an hour and reducing safeguards against risk.

Further expansion will increase the number of flights adversely affecting the care service. New NPR departures to the SW appear to shift the route closer to St Elizabeths. Oppose the proposed NPR for arrivals and departures to and from the SW and any expansion of the use of the airport.

Infrastructure

Fisher German: Government's Pipelines and Storage System may be affected. Site visit advised with GPSS operator, Unipen.

GTC Pipelines Ltd: Plans of location of apparatus supplied.

McNicholas Construction: No effect on KPN Eurorings apparatus.

Three Valleys Water: Includes the demolition of existing buildings and structures and the undertaking of earthworks which will affect the Company's water mains and other apparatus. Includes the demolition of a water tower which is an integral part of the supply system.

Leisure

British Waterways: No comments.

Essex Bridleways Association: Concerned about the stopping up of a lot of bridleways around the airport. Query the diverted route of bridleway 60 (Duck End) and the alternative route of the bridleway from the B1256 to Priory Wood roundabout. Noticeable that a lot of the diverted routes don't seem to connect with anything or be circular.

Essex County Cricket Club: ECCC own land identified as Molehill Green Cricket Club, which has been used for at least 70 years. Concerned at potential loss of a valuable facility and the effect upon cricket within Essex at a time when people are urged to become more involved in sport, particularly with the forthcoming Olympics.

Ramblers Association (Essex and Herts and North Middlesex Area): Represents 10,000 members. Has a long standing policy opposition to airport development for reason of damage to substantial amounts of countryside in terms of visual, air and noise pollution and the undermining of efforts to develop sustainable rural tourism.

The largely rural nature of the region is in danger of being lost forever if any airport expansion goes ahead. The current application is irresponsible in the extreme when the outcome of the G1 inquiry is still not out. UDC should postpone consideration.

PPS1 supplement on climate change states that "planning should contribute to reducing emissions and stabilising climate change". UDC should consider how this commitment should shape airport expansion decisions. Apparent that there is pressure in the East of England Plan for large scale infrastructure putting a strain on resources notwithstanding airport expansion. The proposal is a consequence of the 2003 ATWP which preceded the Stern Report and is therefore out of date in respect of climate change thinking.

Easy access to open green space is vitally important to individual and community health and wellbeing. The popularity of recreational walking is rising, and is the most popular recreational activity. Around 7m people walk in the countryside every weekend, contributing £6.14bn a year to the rural economy. Airport expansion invariably degrades the countryside and damages the walking experience. Are aware of members who no longer walk close to the perimeter of Stansted. Extra traffic will also be generated, leading to busier, noisier roads and increased parking outside the airport perimeter with inherent danger, obstruction and disturbance for walkers.

In the 3 months prior to the G1 inquiry, 15 led walks were organised that came from within the airport catchment area. Some walks starting from outside the flightpath would pass under it. In recent years, efforts have been made to promote walking within the area, reflecting national trends. All these programmes and initiatives are under threat from airport expansion. Walking needs to be seen as enjoyable and accessible as possible. It is difficult to classify walks taking place under increasingly busy flightpaths as quiet or enjoyable.

Allowing the proposal would increase pressure for further buildings. A large number of footpaths will have to be relocated, lost or will be so positioned that the quality of walking will continue to deteriorate significantly.

Redbridge London Cycling Campaign: Object. Cyclists rely on this part of Essex as a “green lung” for leisure rides. Cyclists will not welcome increased traffic on country lanes, increased use of land for airport car parking and further despoliation of the natural environment. Expansion would inevitably lead to a decline in cycle use in the area. Not appropriate or necessary at a time when we should be cutting back on emissions and encouraging non-polluting forms of transport.

Surface Transport Operators and Groups

First Essex Buses Ltd: Support as a key stakeholder working alongside BAA. The sustainable development of the airport and the need for a second runway is right for the region and the future. It will bring:

- Over 13,000 new jobs, with greater job security
- £billions of benefits to the local economy, including more opportunities for local and regional businesses
- Expanding route network to EU and international destinations, attracting inward investment, inbound tourism and travel choice
- Better public transport as investment is made in road and rail services
- Reducing environmental impacts, as land take is reduced by almost one half to that envisaged by the Government. Over 150 ha is to be reserved for nature conservation

National Express: Operate express coach services and the Stansted Express. Objective of all operators to further increase the percentage of airport customers and staff using public transport. This is challenging but achievable. Coach is the most environmentally friendly mode with average CO² figures of 30g / passenger km. One coach also removes one mile of traffic if people transfer from car.

Support very tough targets being set for public transport mode share. There must be a mechanism whereby if the airport fails to achieve the agreed targets, maximum passenger numbers are capped pro rata to the mode share. Essential that there are even more effective partnerships between BAA and transport providers. Quality of facilities is important. Coach and rail

facilities must be located at the most convenient points in the airport for customers, making them as easily possible to use compared to private car.

Draw attention to the report of the House of Commons Transport Committee dated 26 July 2007 "Passenger Experiences of Air". Key recommendations include (in summary):

- Public transport access must be integral to airport development. Local planning inquiries should not give approval to airport schemes that do not provide for good public transport access
- Investment in coach and bus facilities that are well placed, easily accessible and widely publicised to air passengers
- The only way, in the long term, to encourage public transport use is to reduce the ability to access the airport by car and to leave a vehicle. This will be difficult. Will be part of a broader strategy and will not yield short term results.

Sustrans: Objects. Increased air travel is not sustainable. Proposed local road changes do not adequately address walking and cycling. Contrary to Regional Plan expectations that transport should make an appropriate contribution to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. Health problems associated with longer distance travel compared to walking and cycling. East of England economy would benefit enormously if flying from Stansted were reduced and British people spent their money in the region.

Are involved with the Local Access Working Group, but are disappointed at the slow pace of improvements (whilst there have been some) and the apparently low priority given to cycling and walking. Still no continuous cycle route on airport land and some cycle facilities on airport are so poor as to be virtually unusable (particularly with regards to the surface). Little confidence that there will be a serious commitment to cycling as part of any airport expansion.

Given the volume of traffic on airport, there should be a complete off-road walking and cycling network following most road alignments, but with new dedicated links to make cycling and walking attractive, and also with special provision for cyclists who choose to use the roads. All surfaces need to be sealed and machine laid. It is essential that complete cycling and walking routes extending well beyond the airport are included within the orders published by the Secretary of State.

Can see some advantages in stopping up roads to through traffic, but are concerned that this will make enormous detours necessary for cyclists, rendering some trips unviable. Special provision and new routes for cyclists, walkers and horse riders are likely to be needed to minimise this, not squeezed into leftover space. Land take also needs to include sufficient space for high quality links with surrounding communities. Detailed comments are:

- *Start Hill Link* – Object. Increased traffic on local roads. No walking or cycling provision. Need a complete cycle link between Long

Border Road path and the Flitch Way along this alignment, but without the new road.

- *Bury Lodge Lane and Western Perimeter Road changes* – Object, no provision for cyclists or pedestrians. Suggest a 3m wide path set back 0.5m from the carriageway to link with Long Border Road path
- *Chapel End Link Route* - Object, no provision for cyclists or pedestrians. Suggest a 3m wide path set back 0.5m from the carriageway to link the School Lane reprovision with a new perimeter bridleway
- *Western Perimeter Road link to Chapel End* – Object, should be a bridleway, with suitable surfaces for horse riders and cyclists. Is an important cycle link to join up with the quieter roads to the east and airport employees.
- *Takeley road link with terminals* – Object to closure because there is no replacement walking and cycling link. Takeley is the most important walking link – maintaining a walking and cycling route approximately along the line of the existing road looks entirely feasible.
- *Bambers Green to Takeley road link* – Footpath link shown is inadequate. Should be a bridleway with suitable surfaces for horse riders and cyclists.
- *Bambers Green Harcamlow Way bridleway and School Lane link with Brown's End Road* - Object, should be a bridleway, with suitable surfaces for horse riders and cyclists. Is an important cycle link to join up with the quieter roads to the east and airport employees.
- *Birchanger M11 bridleway bridge* – Object, no details shown, nor a link to Bishop's Stortford. Plans need to show the existing link to the Long Border Road path. Plans need to show what will be done about the existing substandard bridge ramps. Plans need to show a new bridleway link, parallel with the M11 from the bridge to and across the a120 for cycling links to Stortford. This is a high priority.
- *Existing bridleway from across M11 bridleway bridge* – Object, surface inadequate for encouraging cycling and poor linkages to the Flitch Way. New link needed from the bridleway to Start Hill to link with the Flitch way and potential route into Stortford using the M11 underpass.
- *Links with neighbouring communities* – Object as the plans do not show high quality walking and cycling links. Land and funding needs to be secured for these at the earliest stages of delivery. Plans do not show how National Cycle Network Routes 11 and 16 will be completed by 2020 as required in the Regional Plan

Car travel needs to be restrained as much as possible so that rat-running is restricted and travel to the airport by car is cut to low levels. Minor road network to the east of the airport needs protecting. Needs to be a major programme encouraging non-car modes along the lines of Travelsmart.

Terravision: Support. Operate two of our most popular transfer services at the airport and are a member of the Bus / Coach Working Group. Recognise how committed the airport is to reduce environmental damage and have every

confidence they will develop a 2nd runway in an environmentally responsible manner.

Following the credit crunch, the new runway would boost the UK economy by £bns, thousands of new job opportunities and ventures for local and regional businesses. Would also mean increased road and rail investment, building on the airport's leading position for use of public transport.

Town/Parish Councils

Braughing (Royston): Absolute opposition. Submission before the G1 decision shows contempt for the local community. BAA misrepresented vital environmental data at the G1 inquiry. BAA's G2 justification rests on just 2 points:

- It considers the Government has given it a clear mandate in the 2003 ATWP
- Expansion is vital to the economy

Will result in a further 11m tons of CO² / year when the Government has pledged a 60% cut by 2050. 2006 survey found East Herts to be the 7th most desirable place to live in the UK. The airport's growing dominance over the wider community has begun to have an increasingly negative effect on tranquillity and quality of life. Air traffic over Braughing has gone from unnoticeable to every 1-2 minutes in 5 years.

Much of the current workforce is bussed in from East London or flown in from Eastern Europe. Further expansion will add to pressure on housing, infrastructure and water resources in the most populated county in the driest part of the UK. Could undermine the diverse local economy.

Stansted was one of the main contributors to last year's record £19.4 billion UK trade deficit on international travel and tourism. Airlines face an uncertain future. Five have gone bankrupt in the last 5 weeks and most are looking to restructure to mitigate rising oil prices. 2003 ATWP predicted growth rates of 6% haven't been realised (2% in the last 2 years). Falling passenger numbers at Stansted.

BA has admitted that sustained oil prices of \$120 / barrel would force a fundamental change in the industry. BA has said the days of cheap flights are over. American Airlines say rising fuel prices would result in fewer flights and jobs.

Complete destruction of 2.5 square miles of fine countryside and rich arable land. Major road building proposed. Would make Stansted larger than Heathrow today. At a time of soaring food prices and global shortages it would be madness to destroy productive farmland and increase dependence on imports.

BAA believes that wildlife habitats, ancient woodland and historic hamlets can be bulldozed away and recreated elsewhere. Complete lack of understanding

or appreciation for complex biological systems. New planting will support a wholly different habitat to the rich biodiversity of ancient woodland.

How can we expect other nations to do their bit if Britain cannot take a lead and halt its airport expansion programme? Graham Eyre commented in 1984 that a second runway would be an unprecedented and wholly unacceptable major environmental and visual disaster.

Broxton: Strongly object. Already suffers severely from the operation of the airport by way of air noise, ground noise, pollution, light pollution and traffic on local roads. Should the second runway ever be developed, the village would be situated between the two, and conditions would be intolerable. Would be in the middle of Europe's biggest building site for very many years.

- Contrary to the Government's declared aim of drastically reducing CO² emissions
- No economic justification, but are compelling economic reasons for not constructing the second runway
- Adverse effect on the heritage and environment cannot be justified
- Adverse effects on the local population cannot be justified and would probably breach human rights
- Huge land grab and diversions / stoppings up would severely affect local residents
- Rising oil prices and falling passenger numbers would suggest that a second runway would never be needed

Chrishall: Object in the strongest possible terms:

Agricultural land: To remove a large tract of agricultural land (78% of which is high quality) from crop production forever is unsustainable and frankly ridiculous. Currently the UK cannot support the whole population with home grown food. The world market will ensure that cheap foreign holidays will shortly become a thing of the past.

Air quality: BAA acknowledge that Bishop's Stortford and Saffron Walden would be adversely affected, as this is already happening. This is unacceptable.

Heritage and Culture: Many rural listed buildings would be destroyed and rural communities fragmented. Government is intent on destroying rural life in the SE. Rural communities are the life blood of Uttlesford. Would result in the complete urbanisation of Uttlesford and South Cambridgeshire to the point that their rural nature would be irretrievably lost.

Employment: Is a low unemployment area and people will have to be brought into the area to serve the expanded airport. Expanding airports is a way of providing work for unskilled labourers and immigrants. Employment should be located where the populations will benefit from them.

Noise: BAA does not acknowledge the effect of aircraft noise on low ambient noise communities. A level which would not be noticed in Central London would be horrendous in Chrishall.

Nature Conservation: BAA's documents set out what would be lost, but most importantly there will be a significant loss of interconnected habitat networks. BAA reports these will have "higher adverse significance". There will be a loss of 9 bat roosts and very rare plants. This cannot be condoned.

Successful relocation cannot be guaranteed – species are in a habitat for a reason.

Third party risk: No assessment of increase in risk in aircraft movements from London and Luton airports. Proposed NATS changes would result in more overflying – any aircraft can overfly Chrishall.

Transport: BAA refer to walking and cycling – this is complete nonsense. Unless they are going to remove the car parking sites people will continue to drive to the airport, increasing pollution and emissions. Changes to existing infrastructure will mean an increase in greenhouse gases through the construction phase and during its operational life. Government continues to press the population to reduce emissions, but expansion will increase UK emissions significantly.

Climate change and peak oil: Neither issue considered by BAA to any great degree. Highly questionable to allow a vast expansion based on predictions of consumer demand which have been extrapolated from the “cheap flights boom” (itself based on unsustainable cross-subsidy). Many airlines are adding fuel surcharges. Stansted has lost all 3 of its Trans-Atlantic carriers. Passenger numbers are falling. Ryanair will be reducing its fleet by 10% next winter and are moving new routes to Luton. If Ryanair leave Stansted, the very survival of the airport may be in jeopardy.

Climate change is the biggest threat to humanity. Completely unacceptable that one industry is allowed to pollute at the expense of everyone else.

Economic impact: BAA gives the false impression that flying people out of the country is a good thing. Economically, this sounds the death knell for UK tourism. Much is made of the employment benefits – this is a low unemployment area so the only people to benefit will be unskilled workers who will have to travel into the airport.

Cressing: Wish to support Essex County Council and other local authorities in opposing the second runway. At a recent Council meeting a proposal to this effect was passed unanimously.

Elsenham: Strongly opposed, and also to any infrastructure development which will facilitate G2 provision

Farnham: Is against airport expansion in terms of increasing flights or G2. Until the last 5 years, the parish rarely experienced noise or visual intrusion. Currently, noise and visual pollution and therefore intrusion are far more noticeable.

With prevailing south-westerly winds, Farnham Green and parts of the village are the main areas affected. With a north-easterly wind, incoming flights pass over the village. With an easterly wind, noise pollution is largely from ground noise, and this is a significant intrusion for Farnham Green. The outlook is very bleak. Overflying or rural areas is a more significant intrusion due to the ambient noise levels.

Would result in catastrophic damage to the countryside, with raised noise levels over the entire county. Road traffic levels would soar, exacerbating the

lack of planning for suitable infrastructure. Planning applications for housing, business parks, warehouses, hotels etc would follow. Light pollution, already bad, would become severe.

Concerned about the huge increase of emissions, impacting on climate change, nature conservation and the ecology of Essex. Expansion would at a stroke cancel out all the efforts of Essex residents, local authorities and businesses to tackle climate change.

Finchingfield: Support the position of UDC and ECC. The benefits of the service provided by the airport, up to the limitations existing at the end of 2007 were appreciated by most, however, any further expansion in either passenger numbers or in further infrastructure was unwelcome. The positives were far outweighed by the negatives of pollution, noise, loss of properties, and destruction of communities. In the present climate the benefits often cited by BAA, jobs, tourism, business opportunities etc are more in doubt than ever.

Gestingthorpe: Object. Approach noise impacts upon everyday life when the wind is in the prevailing direction. Although the noise of each individual plane is not unbearably loud, for long periods the village suffers frequent overflights which are intrusive and disruptive. Can be every 2 minutes with additional noise from nearby stacked aircraft. NATS proposals would remove the stacking, but would concentrate arrivals into a narrower band centred on the village, making noise worse in the centre of the village without any increase in activity. Increased flights would lead to more severe disturbance and many more villages would be spoilt.

History has justified residents into believing that Stansted would remain a small airport.

The area remains tranquil when the wind is in the east and between flights when it is in the west. Noise also disturbs those coming to enjoy the countryside. Since 2002, routing aircraft over rural areas has contravened the European Directive on Environmental Noise. Government and the aviation industry have failed to consider local people:

1. stacking remains over the land
2. approaches and departures are not fanned out
3. night flight period to remain only from 23:30-06:00
4. night flight limit for the future is greater than current usage
5. is to be no control over flights in the shoulder period
6. BAA ignores WHO guidelines re 50dBA, refusing to publish realistic predictions for the contour
7. BAA has tried to deceive residents by referring to thresholds for perception of increased loudness and unjustly applying them to increases in Leq caused by increases in numbers of flights (when it can only be applied to increases in loudness of each flight). Each extra flight causes distress.

Background noise very low in rural north Essex between flights, making aircraft noise very intrusive. Particularly distressing for those who moved into

the area for tranquillity. Residents are disturbed by very noisy night flights, especially at the end of the night when it is difficult to get back to sleep.

Current usage requires dualling of the A120 between Braintree and the A12 and the improvement of its junctions with A131N and with the B1018. Any increase in usage of Stansted Airport would require the A120 between Stansted and the A12 to be of motorway standard. BAA's unwillingness to invest in infrastructure improvements and refusal to commit funding in advance of intensification of use are valid reasons for refusal.

Total effect of emissions is much more than CO² alone. Particulates emitted seed the evening cloud, which from an extra night time blanket keeping in the heat of the previous day.

Great Chesterford: Additional flight and passenger capacity would cause a severe detrimental effect on local infrastructure. Motorway already over capacity. Local rail service has already deteriorated due to the limited capacity being diverted for airport use and this will only get worse. Local housing and welfare structures could not cope with the increased workforce. Additional flights would create overflying being a detriment to the enjoyment of the environment. Many councillors have strong feelings about the loss of greenfield sites, listed buildings and CPOs and will be making objections personally.

Great Easton and Tilty: Formally objects. Totally unsustainable. Already affected by expansion proposals since 2004. Position makes the Parish probably the most significantly affected, acknowledged by BAA in the non-technical summary (environment, noise, community and visual intrusion). Parish has been affected by the woefully inadequate Home Owner Support scheme. Effect on quality of life through buy-up of properties by BAA. Will suffer from increased noise due to proximity to the second runway. Also subject to increased ground noise, substantial light pollution, reduced air quality and increased carbon emissions. Also affected by the stopping up of local roads, closure of footpaths and bridleways. Great Easton, Duton Hill and Tilty and the immediate surrounding areas would be changed beyond all recognition.

Great Hallingbury: Are strongly against the proposals, but await the G1 decision before submitting full comments.

Great Waltham: Objects. Does not accept the premise that airport expansion in the SE is needed. Loss of 442 ha of prime agricultural land is deplored, particularly given worldwide food shortages. Additional CO² emissions will prevent the UK meeting its Kyoto obligations. Loss of historic buildings. Takes no account of the need for additional road and rail infrastructure. Many communities will be affected and eroded by additional noise.

Hadstock: Objects. The operation of such a large airport would overwhelm the surrounding rural area and its communities.

Hatfield Broad Oak: Concerned at applications being accepted without full flightpath details and the anticipated mode of operation. These will have a huge effect on the parish. Unable to make a full submission until these details are submitted. Applications should be rejected on grounds of incomplete information and returned to BAA.

Hatfield Heath: Overview provided – more detailed response will follow. Concerned at prematurity re G1.

Lies directly under Clacton and Dover NPRs, and suffers noise blight due to ever more frequent flights, particularly the large cargo aircraft that take off on a shallow trajectory. Airport operates close to capacity early morning and evenings, so additional flights will have to encroach on the working and school day. To go beyond 25mppa will impose a dramatic reduction in quality of life. Equivalent continuous noise level measurement is flawed. Spot noise levels and the number of events above a noise threshold should be considered. Noise causes acute discomfort in rural areas due to the low ambient noise levels.

Is on the A1060 / B183 crossroads. Are seeing an increase in road traffic serving the airport, with attendant increases in air pollution, noise and road safety risks. There is a primary school and large green adjacent these roads. Area also seeing initial signs of off-airport parking.

Concerned with the present practice of no independent measuring of key metrics.

Haverhill: Supports, noting the benefits already brought in terms of increased business and employment opportunities. Would like to see money for at least 3 years for an airport – Haverhill express link at least 2-hourly between 0500 (dep Haverhill) – 0000 (dep airport), as well as at other major airport shift change times.

Henham: Totally opposed. Happy to live with the current airport and its ancillary transport movements, but support professionally advised opposition to expansion of flights or a second runway.

Little Canfield: Are aware of the frustrations suffered by local residents from the operation of the airport in its present size. Complaints about noise from overflying, air quality, road and rail congestion, concerns over climate change, health and erosion of the community. The thought of extra burdens by doubling the size of the airport is mind boggling and should not be contemplated. Most people can just about stand the airport as it is today. Enough is enough.

Little Hallingbury: Are strongly against the proposals, but await the G1 decision before submitting full comments.

Moreton, Bobbingworth & The Lavers (Ongar): Will have a dramatic effect on residents. ATWP growth predictions grossly exaggerated. Do not believe

there is scope for Stansted to grow by 160% from 25mppa to 65mppa. Concerned at the magnitude of the proposals – what happens if the venture fails? It is imperative that an investment guarantee is obtained, if necessary backed by the Government, before planning permission is granted. Expansion will increase the net loss to the UK economy, and this alone should render the project unacceptable. Effect of increase in staffing and material supplies.

A130 upgrade working well, but the road will need widening to support growth. M11 is already at or above capacity. 2-lane north section will need widening, but the Government has said this will not happen, the inference being all new business will come from the south. This is utter nonsense. M25 upgrade is overdue. Gridlocks result in local rat running.

Recognises BAA's promotion of coach and rail travel and car sharing, but this will not reduce the growth impact significantly. Income from car parking and shopping does not incentivise reducing car journeys. Detrimental effect from off-airport car parks.

Imperative that an independent survey of water consumption is carried out before planning consent is granted for any major development in the region.

BAA must use World Health Organisation noise values and compensate those living within that profile before planning consent is granted. Concerns about smell of unburned fuel, and impacts on Hatfield and Epping Forests. Government not taking a strong approach to limiting global warming.

Concerns as to whether Air Traffic Control can manage the volume of flights safely. Also concerned about possible mechanical failure and pilot error. A full risk assessment must be carried out by an independent authority.

Much Hadham: Horrified reaction – would result in an airport about the same size as the current Heathrow.

Might never be built given the weak economic and financial case for it. Fall in passenger numbers compared to Jan – April 2007. Stansted is permanently an airport serving UK residents going on holiday and is therefore an economic drain. Several different reasons for declining passenger numbers – strength of the Euro, rising basic costs and the increase in airport charges. Ryanair and Easyjet cannot absorb losses indefinitely and must start increasing headline fares and not just disguising charges. Likely outcome is a continued reduction in passenger numbers. BAA's latest figures predict 22.7m in 2008 (-4.7%), 23.3m in 2009, 24.4m in 2010 and 26.2m in 2011.

There would be a considerable increase in noise. At the G1 inquiry, the PC produced evidence of the annoyance caused to residents by the existing pattern of flights to and from Stansted. A second runway would produce dramatic increases in the loss of tranquillity and in the reduction in the quality of life.

Devastating indirect effects would include:

- Increased congestion on the Cambridge – Liverpool St line and on local roads
- Destruction of many listed houses
- Increased pollution of Hatfield Forest
- Greater pressure on shopping facilities in Bishop's Stortford
- Increased likelihood of the construction of at least 10,000 houses north of Harlow
- Increased urbanisation in the area of Bishop's Stortford

Rushden & Wallington (North Herts): Object for the following reasons:

1. Planes landing at Luton Airport and taking off from Stansted fly over the two villages, plus planes from other airports. Additional planes from Stansted will make lives intolerable as a result of the substantial increase in noise and pollution
2. Will be increasing pressure on the already crowded roads with the substantial increase in traffic travelling to Stansted. A507 mentioned as a single carriageway road with many tight bends already incapable of supporting the existing traffic which includes many heavy lorries
3. There is no necessity for extra jobs. North and East Herts are already prosperous with high employment. Additional jobs will simply draw in labour from elsewhere

Sawbridgeworth: The full impact of going to 25mppa has not yet been manifest, increasing to 35mppa should not be allowed for the following reasons:

1. existing substantial transport infrastructure in Essex and Hertfordshire
2. rail capacity inadequate for increases in numbers, pushing more road traffic through Sawbridgeworth
3. concern when comparing present / proposed flightpaths. Will interfere with education at Leventhorpe, Mandeville, Fawbert and Barnard, Reeding and Spellbrook Schools
4. concern at height of planes at present and in the future
5. NATS website not particularly user friendly. Could be an improvement if aircraft keep to the centre / north of the Buzard sweep flying R23 to SE while taking off

Saffron Walden: Object in the strongest possible terms for the following reasons:

1. Premature before the G1 decision. The 2003 White Paper states that the second runway should not be built until the existing capacity is met
2. Strongly object to the destruction of 450 ha of Grade II agricultural land, the destruction of 73 houses, including a number of listed buildings and the increase in capacity to 68mppa in segregated mode. If permission were granted, mixed mode (83mppa) would follow. Falling passenger numbers indicate there is no demand for a second runway
3. Detrimental urbanisation of an attractive rural area. Existing figures suggest 74% of passengers come by road, resulting in an additional 1 million passengers on the existing road network, which would not be

- able to take it. Railway capacity is currently inadequate and cannot be increased because of bottlenecks
4. Would produce huge amounts of additional noise, disturbance and pollution through the inevitable urbanisation. Extra 11m tons of CO² / year. Some of the effects are-
 - local and regional air noise
 - rail congestion, with priority given to Stansted Express
 - community severance and erosion of community networks
 - re-shaped road networks, increased fly parking and rat runs
 - loss of listed buildings, historic buildings, homes, heritage, countryside and rural character
 - light pollution (construction and operational)
 - influx of site workers
 - ground noise and air quality impacts (construction and operational)
 - continued house blight
 - compromised nature conservation and ecology, including the loss of most of Philipland Wood and the degradation of Hatfield Forest
 - major setback to efforts to combat climate change
 5. NATS proposals would have a considerable effect on the town

Thaxted: Opposes. Already subject to unacceptable noise both day and night, pollution and overuse of inadequate country roads. Any further increase in airport capacity would completely destroy the environment of this beautiful and formerly peaceful corner of Essex.

Pollution is also a problem. Statistics show an increase in CO² emissions contrary to Kyoto. Aircraft pollution was not even included in those statistics, so the present state of pollution is much worse than it appears. Marked increase in respiratory ailments, with worrying numbers of schoolchildren using inhalers – practically unheard of a few years ago.

Roads to the north and east of Thaxted are already inadequate for current traffic levels, let alone any increase due to airport expansion. Is a prime agricultural area and should be treasured as such. Other objections include proposed destruction of large numbers of ancient monuments and Grade 1 and 2 listed buildings.

Tilty Parish Meeting: Draw attention to the environmental quality of Tilty, and the view that would be replaced by the end of the new runway. Draw attention to Graham Eyre's comments in 1984:

"..the construction and operation of a second runway and all the structural and operational paraphernalia of a modern international airport as we know the animal in 1984, would constitute nothing less than a catastrophe in environmental terms".

This remains true 24 years later. Prime agricultural land, ancient woodland and charming villages will be destroyed to provide a facility which may not be required in 20 years time. In 1984, the environmental objections were based primarily on rural location. Now, the acknowledged contribution that aviation makes to climate change adds a global context.

Tilty would be some of the worst affected victims. Blight has already had an effect on communities and way of life. If a second runway is built, this part of the countryside would be devastated. Places like Tilty are irreplaceable.

The evidence on which the ATWP was based was gathered in the 1990s. The world has dramatically changed since, and the case for expansion is not sustainable.

Widdington: Opposed.

- Levels of noise and interruptions from overflying will increase
- Increase in road traffic and consequent local congestion
- Increase in fly parking
- Even more crowded trains
- Even more pressure on water supplies
- Detrimental effect of extra car parking on the landscape
- Air pollution will increase, with health and environmental related problems
- Increased emissions speeding the effects of climate change

Concerned that the current restrictions on night flights would again come under the spotlight.

A petition from the Local Recorders of Uttlesford containing 20 signatures has been received, objecting in the strongest possible terms. Would destroy a beautiful area, including many listed buildings and ancient woodlands, and completely alter the character of the countryside and villages of this district which the Recorders help to conserve and care for.

A petition to Chairman of DC Committee containing about 150 signatures from teachers, parents and pupils of High House Day Nursery has been received. Requests some assurance that the future of the Nursery will be considered. Hope that an alternative location can be found on or near its present location.