

29 May 2014

Dear Councillor

STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL

A meeting of the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel will be held at the Council Offices, Saffron Walden on Monday 9 June 2014 at 7.00pm.

Yours faithfully

JOHN MITCHELL

Chief Executive

A G E N D A

1	Apologies for absence and declarations of interest.	
2	Minutes for the meeting held on 28 January 2014 (attached).	p.2
3	Matters arising.	
4	Airports Commission – update.	p.10
5	Luton Airport expansion.	p.22
6	Southend Airport expansion.	p.31
7	Unilateral undertaking – update.	p.40
8	Any other business.	
9	Date of next meeting.	

To: Councillors K Artus, **J Cheetham**, A Dean, D Jones, M Lemon, K Mackman, D Perry, J Rich and J Rose.

Lead Officer: Roger Harborough (01799 510457)
Democratic Services Officer: Adam Rees (01799 510548)

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL OFFICES
LONDON ROAD SAFFRON WALDEN at 7.00pm on 28 JANUARY 2014**

Present: Councillors J Cheetham (Chairman), K Artus, A Dean,
K Mackman and J Rose

Officers Present:

R Harborough (Director of Public Services), J Pine (Planning
Policy/ DM Liaison Officer), A Rees (Democratic Services
Support Officer) and A Taylor (Assistant Director - Planning
and Building Control)

SAP14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Apologies were received from Councillors Lemon, Perry and Rich.

*Councillor Cheetham declared a non-pecuniary interest as a member of
NWEHPA.*

SAP15 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 29 OCTOBER 2013

The minutes were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

SAP16 MATTERS ARISING

Councillor Artus said, referring to SAP11 paragraph 2, that it was unlikely
that MAG would provide a copy of the Noise Action Plan to the Council until it
was published. He also said that it should include alternative noise metrics.

Councillor Cheetham said that the Airports Commission's report highlighted
the need for using multiple noise metrics when carrying out the Phase 2
shortlist assessments. This was encouraging.

Councillor Artus queried how effective the noise metrics would be as an
assessment tool. It might end up being the responsibility of councils to
progress this work in the absence of national guidance.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that there had to be a
combination of noise metrics used.

Councillor Artus said that the Airports Commission referred in the interim
report to looking at whether there was a case for lifting the existing
passenger throughput and movement restrictions at Stansted. The Planning
Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said he would be referring to this later in the
meeting.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether all planning applications for airport
development were classed as major infrastructure projects. The Planning

Policy / DM Liaison Officer explained it would depend upon the amount of extra throughput being proposed. Commonly, an extra 10mppa was assessed as a major infrastructure project which would be dealt with by the Major Infrastructure Planning Unit of the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Minister. Applications proposing less than an extra 10mppa (such as the recent application at Luton) would remain with the local planning authority.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether there were provisions to comment on the Airport Commission's interim report.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that there was currently no process for commenting on the report. He said he had sent an e-mail about the procedure that the Airports Commission would follow in looking at the case for the lifting of the planning restrictions at Stansted, but the response did not answer the questions he had raised. He would forward a copy of the email from the Commission Secretariat to Councillor Cheetham.

Councillor Dean referred to SAP12 paragraph 3 and said that the reduction in rail travel time was not the main issue. The focus should be on any increase in capacity.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that WARG's aim was a more reliable rail service by ensuring that travel times were consistent rather than journeys necessarily being quicker.

Councillor Cheetham said that she was concerned by the reduction in train services to Stansted. The National Infrastructure Plan 2013 had confirmed that a rail study would be carried out, in answer to one of the Airports Commission's short-term surface transport recommendations.

SAP17

DFT: NIGHT FLYING RESTRICTIONS AT HEATHROW, GATWICK AND STANSTED, STAGE 2 CONSULTATION

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that in April last year the Council had responded to a Stage One Consultation, which primarily looked at the scope of the proposed new restrictions. The current consultation was about the new restrictions which the Government was proposing to introduce, which would roll forward the existing restrictions until October 2017, with only minor modifications. The Government considered it sensible to not make any significant changes to the restrictions at this time pending receipt of the Airports Commission's final report and consideration by the next Government. Rolling forward the restrictions allowed for a business as usual approach, with only a high growth scenario impacting on the summer movement limit in 2016 – 2017. Even in that instance, the existing carry-over arrangements could be invoked by the airport operator to deal with any exceedances. The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that the Government proposed to extend the operational ban on QC8/16 aircraft to the late evening shoulder period. This represented only a minor benefit for local residents because of the very few flights that would be affected. The Government had proposed four environmental objectives for Stansted highlighted in paragraph 23 of the report. The Government supported trialling

of steeper approaches, but did not see the benefits of night-time runway preference schemes or displaced landing thresholds. The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said he was disappointed that the Government did not want to trial a respite period between 2am and 6am even though there had been other trials of respite periods. This was something that the Council should continue to ask for.

Councillor Artus said the momentum for reducing the number of night flights would be lost if the existing movement and quota limits were rolled forward. He said that Ryanair was looking to increase potential for long haul flights, which could involve more night flying. The Planning Policy / DM Liaison Officer referred to the draft reply to Question 6, which dealt with this point.

Councillor Cheetham said that despite pressing, it was possible that the Council would not get anywhere. She said because expansion of Stansted airport seemed unlikely beyond a single runway, which might be why Ryanair was looking at increasing its potential for long haul flights.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that the Manchester Airports Group (MAG) was looking at increasing long haul from Stansted as part of its business plan to 35mppa.

Councillor Dean said that the last sentence of the answer to Question 1 suggested that people moved around too much. He asked for an explanation of what was meant by the answer.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said he recalled that evidence presented at the Generation 1 planning inquiry had suggested that in a ten to fifteen year period around 30-40% of the population surrounding an airport may move away. This made it difficult to conduct health studies because, after establishing a base case, the sample size for later comparator studies was continually being reduced, limiting the statistical significance of the results.

Councillor Cheetham raised the issue of night time flights causing sleep deprivation.

Councillor Dean suggested following up on those who had moved. He said that sleep deprivation lowered people's ability to work effectively (especially those on night shifts) and should be considered a serious issue.

Councillor Artus said that a solution should be found to rectify this. He asked what time during the sleep cycle was considered the worst to be interrupted. He said he thought it was prior to entering deep sleep, i.e. quite early on in the sleep cycle.

Councillor Cheetham suggested that a new methodology be developed to better examine health issues. Sleep deprivation was causing an increasing amount of problems. She believed 4am to be the worst time to have sleep patterns interrupted.

The Director of Public Services said that the results had to look at long term exposure to living in proximity to an airport.

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that he would highlight the Panel's concerns in his response by amending the replies to Questions 1, 6 and 11.

It was AGREED that the response as amended be sent to the DfT by way of a letter signed by Councillor Cheetham.

SAP18

OXFORD ECONOMICS: ECONOMIC IMPACT OF STANSTED SCENARIOS (OCTOBER 2013)

The Planning Policy/ DM Liaison Officer said that at the last meeting it was agreed that officers would provide a summary of the Oxford Economics report. The Oxford Economics report had been commissioned by the London Stansted Cambridge Consortium (LSCC) and submitted to the Airports Commission for consideration as part of its Phase 1 work. The Oxford Economics report set out the economic benefits of four scenarios at Stansted, which were the 35mppa base case and three growth scenarios. The officers' report included the Airports Commission's comments on the growth scenarios. He said regarding scenario two (maximum use of the existing runway) the Commission would be looking at whether there was a case for lifting planning restrictions at Stansted airport. Regarding scenario three, the Commission had not shortlisted a second runway at Stansted, but this could be reconsidered after 2040/ 2050 if there was a case for a second net additional runway in the southeast at that time. With scenario four, the Commission had not shortlisted a hub airport at Stansted for a number of reasons. Looking at these reasons, there were a number that would probably also militate against the Isle of Grain option eventually being shortlisted. He said that the Oxford Economics report looked at tourism and said that increased passenger numbers on European flights could be dominated by outbound UK tourists.

Councillor Artus raised concerns about a post-35mppa expansion plan being mooted that the Council would have difficulty in refusing.

Councillor Rose asked if having 45mppa off the single runway was possible.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that it was possible.

Councillor Cheetham said that the infrastructure surrounding the airport would have to be improved to deal with the increase in passenger numbers.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that the existing planning restrictions on passenger throughput and air transport movements were so that the environmental effects of the airport would not exceed those modelled in the environmental impact assessment. These restrictions had been accepted by the inquiry inspector and, ultimately, the Secretary of State

when granting the planning permission. Any planning application for increased throughput would require fresh impact assessments to be carried out.

Councillor Artus said he had raised the issue of the resilience of the airport before. The maximum level of capacity that would be applied for in any new planning application would need to build resilience into it.

Councillor Cheetham said that filling up planes should be encouraged as a means of increasing passenger numbers. She said that it seemed that Sir Howard Davies was sceptical of hub airports and wanted to see a variety of airports expanded.

Councillor Dean said that the claim in the LSCC's covering letter that Stansted was crucial to international connectivity was wrong. He said that the covering letter undermined itself and asked what Essex County Council's position was.

Councillor Artus said that if there were demand for more long haul flights at Stansted airport there would already be more long haul flights.

Councillor Cheetham said that the County Council viewed Stansted as an economic driver. She reiterated her desire for a transport package to be part of any expansion.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said the Council was a member of the LSCC. He said that most of the work the LSCC does was through task and working groups and that the Council did not have control over the contents of the letter. The letter was signed by those who funded the report, which was why the report and letter differed in content. The LSCC position was to not hold a position on aviation expansion. He said Enfield Council was pro-growth and supportive of greater airport capacity.

Councillor Dean said that the Council should say that the covering letter had gone beyond its brief.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said that the Oxford Economics report was based purely on economics.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that the earlier drafts of the Oxford Economics report had exaggerated potential growth at the airport. This was likely due to misreading of the figures that BAA had provided for its Generation 1 and 2 expansion proposals.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Control said that any growth strategy would focus on business parks connected to the airport by rail.

Councillor Artus said that the issue went back to the County Council's focus on the first runway. He said there could be no reasons to disagree with expansion subject to appropriate improvements to infrastructure.

Councillor Cheetham said that in 2030 options would have to be looked at again. She also said that Essex, Hertfordshire and East Herts Councils had to look at what their positions would be on fully utilising the existing runway.

Councillor Dean noted that there was a danger of the decision making structure becoming difficult to understand.

Councillor Artus said that a statement should be made about the letter disagreeing with the report.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said that a statement had been made in the press release issued by the Council.

Councillor Rose asked whether Kevin Bentley had been looking at potential business support for a hub airport.

Councillor Cheetham asked if everybody could receive a copy of the statement. She said that the proposal of a hub airport on the Isle of Grain would never be possible due to European Union legislation relating to the protection of birds.

The Panel noted the report.

SAP19

SHORT TERM SURFACE TRANSPORT MEASURES RECOMMENDED BY THE AIRPORTS COMMISSION

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that the report was about four Stansted surface access recommendations which the Airports Commission had made in a letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The letter was attached to the report. The Government had confirmed in the National Infrastructure Plan that the recommendations would be taken forward. He said, in relation to recommendation six, that he had been invited by Network Rail to the first meeting of the Anglia Route Study Regional Group. This would provide an opportunity to brief stakeholders on the study and provide input. He would ask that the study looked at all benefits for passengers, as well as resilience issues.

In relation to recommendation nine, Councillor Cheetham said that there was pressure on road junctions at Braintree and that improving the infrastructure on roads would have to be looked at.

Councillor Dean asked why the previous Stansted to Stratford hourly service now started at Bishop's Stortford, and whether a second tunnel would be built to accommodate extra rail infrastructure.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that the service now started at Bishop's Stortford for timetabling and resilience reasons (the service now ran half-hourly). A second rail tunnel would only be built if there was a second runway at Stansted. In the meantime, MAG would make the argument that any increase in passenger numbers could be accommodated via longer trains.

The Director of Public Services said that improving infrastructure would drive demand for increased capacity at Stansted.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said that MAG looked at the issue of capacity differently to the Airports Commission. In Manchester 15% of passengers arrived via public transport. At Stansted the figure was 50%. He said that it was likely that MAG would develop an understanding of this difference.

Councillor Artus said that Airports Commission report did not look at who was paying for any improvements in infrastructure. He suggested that public transport was not as well connected moving northward and said that not all growth should come from London.

Councillor Cheetham said that having four platforms at Broxbourne was being looked at, but that any proposal for having four platforms at Tottenham Hale did not make sense because it was unclear how it could be expanded.

Councillor Rose asked how businesses perceived this issue, because Stansted had some of the fastest connections to London.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that MAG did not see Stansted as being just “London Stansted” (unlike BAA), rather as a regional airport which could have its own market for long-haul. Accordingly, efforts would be made to improve northbound public transport, particularly to / from Cambridge where there was currently a high incidence of “kiss and fly” car movements. He said that whilst in some respects rail connections from Stansted to London were very good, there were areas where they were not as good as they could be, particularly in relation to the lack of three or four-tracking. He said that Network Rail felt that it would be possible to have four platforms at Tottenham Hale, but expensive bridge works would be involved.

The Panel noted the letter.

SAP20

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Councillor Artus asked what had happened to the updates on Section 106 agreements and whether in future meetings updates could appear on the agenda again. The Planning Policy / DM Liaison Officer said that he would prepare a report for the next Panel meeting. It was likely that little had changed since the last report because the airport had not been growing.

Councillor Rose asked about the relaxation of planning restrictions at the Airport and how this would conflict with the Council’s policy.

The Assistant Director – Planning and Building Control said that establishing whether Council policy conflicted with relaxed conditions was important.

Councillor Cheetham asked whether the airport should be asked to attend the next meeting.

Councillor Artus said that there had to be a reason for asking them to attend and if someone was invited to attend it should tie in with phase two of the consultation.

Councillor Rose asked whether Network Rail should be asked to attend the next meeting.

The Policy Planning/ DM Liaison Officer said that he would invite Network Rail to the next meeting.

SAP21

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

A date during the second half of April was agreed, subject to when Network Rail would be able to attend.

The meeting ended at 8.15pm.

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

Agenda Item

Date: 9 June 2014

4

Title: Airports Commission - update

Author: Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy /
Development Management Liaison Officer
(01799 510460)

Item for information

Summary

1. This report updates the Panel on the work of the Airports Commission since it published its interim report in December of last year. The report deals briefly with the Inner Thames Estuary Feasibility Studies, the Appraisal Framework and in a little more detail with the Transport Select Committee's one-off evidence session with the Commission Chairman.

Recommendations

2. That the Panel notes the contents of this report.

Financial Implications

3. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

4. None.

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	The Commission undertakes formal meetings and visits, and engages with interested parties and members of the public, providing opportunities to submit evidence and proposals and to set out views relevant to its work. The Commission engages with local government to "build consensus in support of its approach and recommendations".
Community Safety	None.
Equalities	None.
Health and Safety	None.

Human Rights/Legal Implications	None.
Sustainability	Sustainability is a key issue that the Commission is considering.
Ward-specific impacts	There are district wide effects from the operation of Stansted Airport
Workforce/Workplace	Participation in the Commission's work has workforce implications depending upon the level of participation that is deemed necessary.

Situation

6. Following the publication of its interim report in December of last year, the Commission has moved on to Phase 2 of its deliberations. The Panel is aware of the interim report, so its conclusions will not be repeated in this report.

Inner Thames Estuary Feasibility Studies

7. In March, the Commission published its terms of reference for the four studies that it is undertaking on an Inner Thames Estuary hub option. On the basis of these studies, the Commission will decide whether the Inner Thames Estuary hub should be shortlisted as an option along with the Heathrow third runway, the "Heathrow Hub" runway extension and the Gatwick second runway options that are already proceeding to more detailed consideration by their promoters. The shortlisting decision will be made in September.
8. The four studies are:
- 1) Environmental / Natura 2000 impacts
- Natura 2000 is an EU-wide network of nature protection areas established under the 1992 Habitats Directive. The aim is to ensure the long term survival of Europe's most valuable and threatened species and habitats
 - 2) Operational feasibility and attitudes to moving to a new airport
- this includes potential airspace implications of operating a new hub airport, including the rationale for closures and impacts on UK and European airspace
 - 3) Socio-economic impacts
- this includes the effects of closing Heathrow, London City, Southend and any other airports
 - 4) Surface access impacts

Appraisal Framework

9. In April, the Commission published its Appraisal Framework as the first stage in the consideration of the shortlisted options for Heathrow and Gatwick. The Framework sets out in detail how the Commission expects scheme designs to be developed by their promoters, and how the schemes will be appraised. The Framework incorporates four inter-related elements:

i) the *Commission's objectives*, against which options will be assessed and on which its final recommendations will be based,

ii) an *updated scheme design* for each shortlisted option, to be used as the starting point for appraisal,

iii) a *business case and sustainability assessment* for each option, incorporating the information needed to make informed assessments against the Commission's objectives, and:

iv) a set of *appraisal modules* (sixteen in all), explaining the methodologies that the Commission proposes to use in assessing options. *Note: In relation to the noise module, the Framework says that take-off and landing noise will be assessed using a range of metrics, namely LAeq summer day and summer night, Lden and N70 day and N60 night "number above" frequency contours. This is welcomed by officers as it acknowledges that the use of averaging metrics, whilst still useful for historic comparison purposes, does not adequately represent noise disturbance as experienced by residents.*

On 14th May, each scheme promoter submitted a refreshed scheme design and more detailed technical information to the Commission.

10. The Commission intends that there will be a national consultation on its Phase 2 analysis in the autumn, although if the Inner Thames Estuary option is shortlisted that would likely run to a different timescale. Paragraph 1.5 of the Framework says:

"The Commission's intention is that, as well as informing its recommendations, these outputs can be used by the Government as a strong evidential base to support the delivery of its final recommendation, should Government choose to take this forward, for example as materials in the preparation of a National Policy Statement or Hybrid Bill, and/or to accelerate the resolution of any future planning application(s) by scheme promoters. Any decisions about national policy will ultimately be for the Government".

Transport Select Committee one-off evidence session

11. On 20th January, the Transport Select Committee held a one-off evidence session with the Airports Commission Chairman, Sir Howard Davies. The reason for the session (according to the Committee Chairman, Louise Ellman MP) was because the Commission had *"left the door open on building a new airport in the Thames Estuary, an option which we rejected given the available evidence"* (press release 17th December 2013). Last year, when the Committee scrutinised UK aviation strategy it concluded that there was no

practical alternative to expanding Heathrow.

12. Following the evidence session there was an exchange of letters between the Committee and the Commission. A copy of Sir Howard's letter to Louise Ellman dated 21st March is attached for information at the end of this report.
13. The letter confirms the Commission's view that closure of some other airports would be required for commercial and / or operational reasons if the Inner Thames Estuary option is built. The letter refers to background analysis carried out for the Commission by NATS. A summary of this work has been published on the Commission's website. In its analysis, NATS considers two Inner Thames Estuary options, one with an E/W runway orientation, and the other with an NE/SW orientation. Officers have compiled the following summary table from the NATS analysis, using NATS' rounded-up / down figures.

Configuration	LHR	LGW	STN	LTN	BMG	LCY	SND	Estuary	Total	Change
Baseline %	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	100%	N/A
Baseline ATMs	500k	250k	250k	250k	250k	100k	100k	N/A	1,680k	N/A
TE (E/W) %	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	100%	106%	+6%
TE (E/W) ATMs	0	250k	250k	250k	250k	0	0	800k	1,800k	+100k
TE (NE/SW) %	100%	0	100%	100%	100%	50%	0	100%	124%	+24%
TE (NE/SW) ATMs	500k	0	250k	250k	250k	50k	0	800k	2,100k	+400k
LHR3, LGW2 %	140%	200%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	N/A	144%	+44%
LHR3, LGW2 ATMs	700k	500k	250k	250k	250k	250k	250k	N/A	2,450k	+750k

Source: NATS Support to the Airports Commission, Issue 1, 25th November 2013

14. The baseline data is NATS' assessment of the maximum sustainable number of ATMs per annum at each airport based upon airspace capacity using existing ground infrastructure and after the LAMP investment has taken place. The baseline data assumes no capping of passenger numbers or ATMs, although NATS acknowledges that caps may exist at individual airports which will reduce effective capacity even if airspace could accommodate more.
15. Looking at the Inner Thames Estuary E/W option, this would necessitate closure of Heathrow, London City and Southend Airports on operational grounds. NATS' reasoning for this is: *"operating an East / West configuration would have a significant impact (on) Heathrow, which would not be able to operate as it currently does, due to the fact that both sites are roughly on the same latitude and both would operate runways in the East / West orientation. The same reasons / impact would exist for London City and the same impact would exist at Southend, which would be some 10 to 15 miles away to the north east and which operates a North East / South West runway orientation"*. At best, this option would only provide about 100k of net additional ATMs within the available SE airspace, far short of being able to accommodate the one net additional runway that the Commission says is required in the SE by

2030.

16. An Inner Thames Estuary NE/SW option would require the closure of Gatwick and Southend Airports and a 50% reduction in capacity at London City. NATS' explanation is: *"A North East / South West orientation would substantially reduce the impact on both Heathrow and City airports due as the arrival and departure flows would be de-conflicted. Such an orientation would however have a substantial impact on Gatwick; the impact on Southend would remain"*. This option would provide about 400k of net additional ATMs within the available SE airspace, more than sufficient to accommodate the one net additional runway required in the SE by 2030.
17. According to the NATS analysis, capacity at both Stansted and Luton would be unaffected by either of the Inner Thames Estuary options.
18. The NATS analysis also looked at a number of other options (including those which did not make the final shortlist) but also included a third runway at Heathrow and a second runway at Gatwick as a single package. The data for this is also included in the table. This package provides the most additional capacity of all of the options as no other existing airports would need to close or lose capacity for operational reasons. It does appear, however, that the data contains an error in the number of ATMs available at London City and at Southend, which should be 100k, not 250k. This error does not affect the overall conclusion. Notably, and perhaps significantly, (see paragraph 8 of Sir Howard's letter) the combined cost of extra runways at Heathrow and Gatwick is less than 50% of the cheapest Phase 1 estimate for constructing a Thames Estuary hub.
19. Sir Howard's letter also refers to demand forecasting, the presumption being that this is in response to concerns from M.A.G that the Commission's forecasts are underestimating the rate of growth at Stansted. Annual throughput at Stansted up to the end of April 2014 was 18.16mppa, a level last seen in October 2011 when throughput had been declining for about three years or so. The lowest recorded annual throughput was 17.33mppa in October 2012, so the growth since then is about 0.55mppa per year – a third of the rate that occurred between the opening of the terminal in 1991 and the start of the downturn in 2007-8. The latest growth prediction supplied to the Council by M.A.G is an extra 11mppa by 2023, taking total throughput to just below 30mppa by that date.
20. A simple extrapolation of M.A.G's latest growth prediction (which works out at about 1.22mppa per year) would result in the airport reaching its 35mppa cap by 2027. In the DfT's 2013 Aviation Forecasts, the constrained demand predictions for Stansted for 2030 are between 30.5mppa (low growth) and 35.3mppa (high growth). The nearest equivalent figures provided in the Commission's interim report for Stansted in 2030 are 21mppa (low growth) and 35mppa (high growth). Both the DfT and Airport Commission forecasts are presented using 10-year intervals, so it is not possible to say exactly when they predict 35mppa would be reached. If throughput increases as anticipated by M.A.G, growth would be at or perhaps just slightly above the

high growth scenarios predicted by both the DfT and the Commission.

21. Much of the growth at Stansted will be predicated upon the long term deals that M.A.G has recently sealed with Ryanair and easyJet. M.A.G has recently announced that Thomas Cook Airlines will fly long haul services to Orlando, Cancun (Mexico) and Las Vegas commencing in July 2015, but these services are initially only for a month. It still remains to be seen to what extent long haul services will become established at Stansted under its new owners.

Risk Analysis

22.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
<p>Stansted has not been shortlisted by the Commission for Phase 2 consideration, but part of the Commission's Phase 2 work will be to consider whether there is a case for lifting the planning restrictions on capacity as part of its overall strategy for optimising aviation capacity in the SE.</p> <p>The Commission has indicated that Stansted might be a suitable location for a second new runway in the SE after 2040.</p>	<p>2. There is some risk because a future Government may consider that any economic case for further SE airport capacity outweighs the environmental considerations.</p>	<p>3. Any increase in the capacity of Stansted Airport beyond 35mppa would have an effect on the district and beyond, including the quality of life of local residents.</p>	<p>Continue to monitor the work of the Commission and to respond when required.</p> <p>Respond to the future Government's draft National Policy Statement on aviation when it is published.</p>

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

To:
Louise Ellman
Chair
Transport Select Committee
House of Commons
London
SW1A 0AA

Sir Howard Davies
Chair Airports Commission
Sanctuary Buildings
20 Great Smith Street
London SW1P 3BT

email:
airports.enquiries@airports.gsi.gov.uk
Web: www.gov.uk/airports-commission

Date: 21 March 2014

Louise

I am writing in response to your letter of 11th February following the Transport Select Committee session, which I attended on 20th January. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to explain our conclusions so far.

I respond to your points in turn below:

1. The Commission is carrying out additional feasibility and impacts analysis on the option of an inner Estuary airport over the coming months, the work for which we published draft Terms of Reference last month. On the basis of that additional work, the Commission will decide whether an inner Estuary option should be short-listed in September. If the Commission decides that it should, then it will be taken forward in the same way as the currently short-listed options at Heathrow and Gatwick. Since my appearance before your Committee, I have had one meeting with the Mayor on 4th March. We discussed work on the Estuary option and other aspects of our programme.
2. The Commission's view is as set out in the interim report: that if a Thames Estuary airport were to proceed, the closure of Heathrow Airport would be likely to be required for commercial reasons, and the closures of Southend and London City for operational reasons. I believe my remarks to the Committee were consistent with that and they were certainly not intended to imply any alternative conclusion had been reached. I am sorry if I was unclear.

The airspace analysis informing the Commission's view on Southend and London City is published in the document *NATS Support to the Airports Commission* (see in particular page 43). This can be found on the Commission's website, by using the link 'Long-Term Options: Consultancy Reports' at the following webpage: <https://www.gov.uk/government/>

[publications/airports-commission-interim-report](#). The Commission's view on the need to close Heathrow for commercial reasons was informed by submissions from scheme promoters, discussions with stakeholders and the financial analysis set out in the document *High-Level Commercial and Financial Analysis of Selected Potential Schemes* (accessible on the Commission's website in the same way). It should be noted that NATS advice also indicates challenges in relation to the operation of Heathrow with a Thames Estuary hub in place, and that these could be significant enough to require the closure of the airport even if this did not prove commercially necessary.

3. The advice which NATS provided in respect of air space for phase 1 is set out in its report, *NATS Support to the Airports Commission*, and summarised in the Interim Report. In particular, Box 6d on page 189 of the Interim Report gives a broad indication of the potential airspace impacts of some of the proposals for additional aviation capacity in London and the South East. 'Appendix 2: Assessment of Long-Term Options' sets out the Commission's reasons for sifting out individual proposals.
4. The prime objective of the Commission's demand forecasting in the first phase of its work has been to understand at national and regional level the potential for future growth in demand for aviation. We believe that the forecasting approach used, which was informed by responses to the Commission's discussion paper on this issue, was entirely appropriate for this purpose.

There is significant uncertainty in any forecast, and this increases when forecasts are broken down to the individual airport level. Therefore it is important to look at the full range of potential outcomes, particularly where commercial factors may affect the level of demand at an individual airport. In the case of Stansted, this indicates the necessity of considering the Commission's high demand scenario as well as its central forecasts. This scenario shows more rapid growth in demand, with the airport reaching capacity around 2030.

The Commission also recognises the need to understand better the drivers and effects of competition between airports and airlines. As part of the ongoing appraisal of potential schemes, the Commission will consider this issue and will use its analysis in conjunction with the existing demand forecasting methodology to inform the recommendations in its final report.

5. I attach separately a copy of the summary and conclusions of a round-table seminar that the International Transport Forum, which is part of the OECD, held on this subject, at which the Commission was represented. I attended part. The papers for this seminar are available online at <http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/jtrc/RoundTables/2013-Expanding-Airport-Capacity/index.html>

6. The Commission's legal advice on air service access at regional airports was provided in the form of comments on draft text and therefore cannot be directly shared with the Committee. I attach instead a paper describing the current policy and legal context and the Commission's consideration of this issue. I trust this will provide the information you need.
7. In the second phase of its work, the Commission is continuing its dialogue with the airline sector. Members of both the Commission and its Secretariat have held meetings with both low-cost airlines and legacy carriers/airline alliances (including both SkyTeam and the Star Alliance). As for the former, we have met easyJet, Ryanair and Norwegian Air Shuttle. As part of the second phase of the Commission's work, we will be carrying out additional analysis on the factors that might influence future choices made by airlines and alliances as to where to locate services.
8. The estimated infrastructure costs generated by the Commission in the first phase of its work for each of the proposals still under consideration are set out in the table below. These include surface access costs and allowances for risk and optimism bias.

Scheme	Cost to 2030	Cost to 2050
Gatwick 2 nd Runway	£13-18 bn	£18-25 bn
Heathrow NW Runway	£13-18 bn	£18-25 bn
Heathrow extended N runway	£10-13 bn	£14-19 bn
Inner Thames Estuary	£82-112 bn	£93-125 bn

Additional information is provided in the 'Sift 3 Assessment Templates' published on our website.¹ The Commission will be preparing more detailed cost estimates for each of the short-listed options as part of the second phase of its work programme.

Please feel free to ask for any other details that you or your Committee need.

Yours Sincerely



Sir Howard Davies, Chair

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/airports-commission-interim-report>

Air Services Agreements at UK Airports

Introduction

The Committee raised the question of whether it would be possible and desirable for the UK to declare a unilateral “open skies” policy at regional airports, to facilitate their growth and enable them to open new routes.

The Commission received submissions suggesting this course of action in response to its call for evidence on the best means of making use of existing airport capacity, which it carried out during 2013. The Commission therefore examined this question as part of its work to prepare its Interim Report.

Background

For the most part, the air services market within the UK is already highly liberalised. The air services market within the European Union was liberalised over 20 years ago when the EU single aviation market was completed, and the market for services between the European Union and the United States was liberalised in 2007. The EU/US agreement means that EU and US carriers are free to operate between the US and any EU airport (including obviously any UK airport). Hence at present, a large number of routes operated from UK airports – and a significant majority of those operating at regional airports – are operated pursuant to either EU liberalisation or the EU/US agreement.

Under the EU single aviation market, UK carriers have the same rights within the rest of the EU as other EU carriers have within the UK. Conversely, the EU/US agreement does not place EU carriers on an equal footing with US carriers. So while US carriers may operate intra-EU flights (flights between EU Member States), EU carriers may not operate intra-US flights (flights between points in the US). Although this imbalance clearly places EU carriers at some measure of disadvantage, the Commission has not encountered any evidence to suggest that it causes significant harm to the UK’s aviation connectivity at present.

Even outside these cases, where bilateral air service agreements are in place with states outside the EU single market, the UK’s policy is already highly liberal and rights to operate direct point-to-point services (“third and fourth freedom services”) between the UK and another state will usually be granted – without restriction on which airports in the UK may be served.. Such bilateral agreements are normally (though not exclusively) founded on the basis of reciprocal rights for UK airlines.

As in the case of third and fourth freedom air services, the UK Government's position in respect of fifth freedom services (the right not only to operate into UK airports but also then to operate on to, and back from, a third country) is generally liberal, particularly in relation to regional airports. As recently as the 1990s policy was generally to refuse to grant fifth freedoms from UK airports, but since then policy has shifted towards liberalisation, beginning with a presumption in 2005 towards granting fifth freedoms from regional airports regardless of reciprocity. Regional airports, in this context, are those outside of the London & South East system (then defined as City, Gatwick, Heathrow, Luton and Stansted). However, one condition contained within this "general presumption" was that competition with UK airlines would not be distorted – for example, by an airline designated by another state to exercise the fifth freedom right being in receipt of state aid..

In 2011, the Government further extended its policy, so that the same presumption in favour of granting fifth freedoms that previously applied in respect of regional airports now applies in respect of Gatwick, Luton and Stansted. The general presumption, however, is still subject to certain caveats. These are articulated in the Government's 2013 Aviation Policy Framework as follows:

"...the grant of such rights would be subject to a case-by-case consideration within the context of the current position in the UK's bilateral aviation relationship with the country concerned (for example, we might not grant such rights if there were concerns that there was not a level competitive playing field in the market, such as if it were argued that the airline in question was in receipt of state aid that was distorting competition, or if the grant of such rights was felt likely to significantly diminish the possibility of securing a wider liberalisation that would deliver additional consumer benefits or if it was felt likely to result in significant and sustained disbenefits to consumers by restricting choice and value on a specific route)."

Commission's consideration

Submissions on this issue to the Airports Commission recommended that the Government should abandon these caveats in relation to the granting of fifth freedoms. Despite the UK's generally liberal policy, demand for fifth freedoms from less congested airports has remained extremely low. Some parties argued that this is because the UK's caveats are a disincentive for airlines to apply to operate for fifth freedom services. The ability of UK airlines to raise objections to the granting of fifth freedoms out of UK airports is also cited as a disincentive. However, the Government is not bound to give effect to such objections. Other parties have presented evidence that the commercial case for many fifth freedoms (especially from regional airports) is often weak and that this presents the real disincentive for airlines to take them up. It is also the case that the third country concerned has to agree to the operation of such services by a non-UK carrier.



Recognising the potential benefits that fifth freedoms could bring to connectivity from less congested airports, the Commission examined whether it would be possible and desirable for the UK Government to further liberalise its policy and sought legal advice on this issue.

The Commission concluded that the UK's current caveats in relation to the granting of fifth freedom rights were consistent with general principles of competition law and modern practice in the negotiation of liberal air service agreements. Whilst there was no specific legal barrier to the Government further liberalising its policy towards fifth freedoms by abandoning the caveats, to do so could be contrary to the general principles of liberalisation and the protection of commercial entities from unfair competition, especially through state subsidy. In the light of those broader principles, the advice to the Commission suggested that a decision to allow an airline to exercise fifth freedom rights when in receipt of state aid (in the form, for example, of capital injections, cross-subsidisation, grants, guarantees, or tax relief or exemption) would be objectionable on competition policy grounds, even though not as a matter of law, in particular to UK airlines, which do not benefit from state aid.

The Commission therefore concluded that a unilateral and unconditional "open skies" policy, including fifth freedom rights at all or any of the UK airports would have the potential to harm the UK's aviation connectivity in the longer term. This was because it could undermine the competitive market in air services, particularly through causing harm to UK airlines and creating the potential for state aid assisted overseas carriers to eliminate competition on certain routes and then exploit this to the detriment of passengers.

Although the Commission could not, therefore, recommend a unilateral open skies policy for regional UK airports, this does not rule out the granting of fifth freedom rights at regional airports on a unilateral basis where such competition issues do not apply and services would be operated on a competitive commercial basis. The Commission strongly supports the highly liberalised position that the Government has already taken on this issue, and would encourage any application for such rights to be considered with an open mind.

In addition, the Commission intends to return to the issue of aviation connectivity for the UK's regions as part of its work ahead of the final report and the Commission's draft appraisal framework notes that proposals for adding new capacity will be assessed in terms of their implications for overall national connectivity.

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

Agenda Item

Date: 9 June 2014

5

Title: Luton Airport expansion

Author: Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy /
Development Management Liaison Officer
(01799 510460)

Item for information

Summary

1. This report informs the Panel about the recent application for planning permission for expansion at Luton Airport.

Recommendations

2. That the Panel notes the contents of this report.

Financial Implications

3. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

4. None.

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	The planning application was subject to the usual statutory requirements for publicity which were undertaken by Luton Borough Council as the local planning authority
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	Officer time in preparing this report

Situation

6. Luton Airport occupies about 245ha, just over 25% of the area of Stansted Airport. It has a single runway with an east – west orientation that is 2,160m long, compared to Stansted's at 3,048m. All the ancillary development lies to the north of the runway, abutting the south eastern part of the town.
7. According to the Airport's 2012 monitoring report, passenger throughput was 9.63mppa, with 74,976 Passenger Air Transport Movements (PATMs). Stansted's figures for this period were 17.45mppa and 121,128 PATMs. Luton's principal operators are EasyJet, Wizz Air, Ryanair, Monarch and Thomson flying Airbus A300-600, A319, A320, A321, Boeing 737-800, 757-200 and MD-83 aircraft.
8. In 2012, Luton handled 1,945 Cargo ATMs compared to Stansted's 10,271.
9. In 2012, the busiest time of the day for annual average hourly movements was 07:00-09:00, with smaller peaks at 13:00-15:00 and 18:00-19:00.

Procedural issues

10. In 2012 the airport operator, London Luton Airport Operations Ltd (LLOAL) submitted an application for planning permission to Luton Borough Council (LBC) for infrastructure works within the airport boundary to increase passenger throughput. On 20th December 2013, the Council's Development Control Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions and a S106 agreement provided that the Secretary of State did not call the planning application in for his own determination. Previously, the Secretary of State had issued a "holding direction" on 18th November.
11. On 30th April, the Department for Communities and Local Government responded to LBC on behalf of the Secretary of State withdrawing the holding direction. The letter said:

"The Secretary of State has carefully considered this case against call-in policy as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement by Nick Boles on 26 October 2012. The policy makes it clear that the power to call in a case will only be used very selectively. The Government is committed to give more power to councils and communities to make their own decisions on planning issues, and believes planning decisions should be made at the local level.

In deciding whether to call in this application, the Secretary of State has considered his policy on calling in planning applications. This policy gives examples of the types of issues which may lead him to conclude, in his opinion that the application should be called in. The Secretary of State has decided, having regard to this policy, not to call in this application. He is content that it should be determined by the local planning authority".

12. The Secretary of State based his view principally on the definition of a nationally significant infrastructure project (NSIP) contained in the Planning Act 2008. NSIPs are submitted to and determined by the Secretary of State. For existing airports, expansion proposals do not constitute an NSIP unless passenger throughput would increase by at least 10mppa, which would not be the case here. The current capacity of the airport is between 10-12mppa, and consultants acting for LBC concluded that the development would increase this to somewhere between 18-20mppa by 2028-30. LBC is proposing a planning condition capping throughput at 18mppa, the level assessed in the environmental statement (ES). The decision not to call in the planning application is therefore unsurprising and is consistent with the view taken on Stansted expansion to 25mppa and to 35mppa, although the latter did end up at inquiry following refusal of planning permission.
13. In comparison to the DfT's and the Airports Commission's constrained demand forecasts, 18mppa by 2028-30 is slightly above the DfT's central forecast (16.7mppa in 2030) and matches the Commission's forecast (18mppa in 2030).

The proposals

14. Within the existing airport boundary, the proposals are as follows:
- i) road widening and future safeguarding,
 - ii) improvements to the public transport hub south of the terminal,
 - iii) construction of a multi-storey car park and pedestrian link to the western side of the existing short stay car park,
 - iv) extensions to both the mid and long stay car parks,
 - v) terminal improvements including an infill extension,
 - vi) construction of a new pier to the south east of the terminal,
 - vii) taxiway works, including extensions to the existing parallel taxiway, and
 - viii) rationalisation of aircraft parking areas.
15. The planning application is a hybrid one, with full details submitted for all the development except for the new multi-storey car park and link, the details of which are reserved for subsequent approval. The ES looked at potential impacts under a number of headings, namely:

Environmental issues and methodology

Air quality and climate

Cultural heritage

Ecology and nature conservation

Community and economic

Ground conditions

Landscape and visual impact

Noise and vibration

Traffic and transport

Water environment

In its scoping opinion, LBC raised the issues of climate change, third party risk

and throughput. The ES made an assessment of the development against a “no development” base case and also looked at the cumulative impact with other local developments, namely an employment area to the north east of the Airport, M1 J10a improvements to the south west and the proposed Sundon Rail Freight Interchange six miles to the north west.

Determination of the application

16. The Development Control Committee’s resolution to grant planning permission is subject to thirty planning conditions and a S106 agreement comprising eleven Heads of Terms. Perhaps of most interest to the Panel will be the planning conditions relating to air and ground noise and the Heads of Terms of the agreement. The detailed wording of the noise-related conditions and the draft Heads are included in an appendix to this report. The condition wording and the draft Heads have been taken from the published minutes of the Committee meeting. The other conditions relate to implementation, reserved matters, phasing, landscaping, design, environment, operational controls, drainage, transport and renewable energy.
17. There is far more detail included in the LBC officers’ report than can be included in a summary report of this nature, but the following comments can be made on the noise conditions, with reference where appropriate to the situation at Stansted:

Condition 11

i) A quota count regime to control night noise would be introduced similar to the one operated by the DfT at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted. The Panel will recall that last year it commented on the Stage 2 consultation for the new regime for Stansted, which is essentially a rolling forward of the existing regime for three years pending completion of the Airports Commission’s work and its consideration by a future Government.

The Luton regime would exclude QC2 or noisier aircraft during the night period (23:00-07:00) six months after development is commenced, with the eventual exclusion of QC1 as well, which would equate to 4% of existing night movements. This is a step further than the Stansted scheme, which contains a scheduling ban on QC4 aircraft during the night quota period (23:30-06:00) and an operational ban on QC8/16 aircraft during the night period (23:00-07:00). The 15-25mppa S106 agreement signed in 2003 reinforced the Stansted scheme as it existed at that time, as well as including further measures.

Existing controls on night noise at Luton consist of a noise contour and fines for exceeding noise violation limits.

ii) The limits on movements and quota points at Luton during the night quota period would be tighter than at Stansted where the proposed limits in the rolled forward regime are 12,000 movements and 7,960 QC points when the winter and summer period are aggregated. A future reduction in QC points (by 2028 in the Luton case) is not something that is currently being offered by

the DfT for Stansted, although the Council pressed for it in its consultation response.

iii) According to Luton’s 2012 annual monitoring report, only about 1.1% of all daytime departures exceeded 79dB(A) as recorded at the fixed noise monitoring terminals. A reduction in the maximum noise violation limit of the noisiest aircraft to 80dB(A) by 2020 should therefore be achievable.

Condition 12

A direct comparison between Stansted and Luton is not possible because different contour models are being used. Stansted does have a planning condition (Condition AN1 of the Stansted Generation 1 planning permission) limiting the forecast extent of the 57dB(A) Leq16hr daytime contour. The condition requires that the forecast contour is reported annually to the Council, and Luton is proposing a similar arrangement. Luton is also proposing restrictions via a 48dB(A) Leq8hr night-time contour. At Stansted, the proposed rolled forward DfT regime sets out a number of environmental objectives to limit night noise, one of which is based on the night quota period contours. The DfT has committed in the Aviation Policy Framework to produce Leq8hr night-time contours for Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted.

Condition 13

Stansted has four fixed noise monitors at both ends of the runway, and has established measures as set out in its Noise Action Plan 2010-2015. These include fining aircraft for exceeding daytime and night-time departure noise limits and for flying outside noise preferential routes.

Condition 14

These restrictions are similar to ones that have been promoted at Stansted via planning conditions and obligations over the years. Back in 1985, the Secretaries of State imposed a condition on the 15mppa planning permission limiting the use of auxiliary power units, ground power units and air start machines and requiring the installation of fixed electrical power.

Risk Analysis

18.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
None	None	None	None

- 1 = Little or no risk or impact
- 2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.
- 3 = Significant risk or impact – action required
- 4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

Luton Borough Council
Development Control Committee 20.12.13
Planning Conditions and Heads of Agreement

Planning Conditions

Noise

Condition 11

- a) Prior to commencement of the development details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority of a Noise Control Scheme which shall control the noise of aircraft both during the day (0700 - 2300) and the night (2300 – 0700) period.
- b) For the Night Quota Period (2330 to 0600) the scheme shall be based on the Noise Quota System count system (QC System) utilised by other UK Airports including Heathrow Airport.
- c) The scheme shall include sanctions in relation to operators of aircraft which land or take-off in breach of the QC System and shall include exclusion of aircraft movements with a QC value in excess of QC2 during the night time (2300 to 0700), 6 months and more after commencement of the development. An 'aircraft movement' shall be either a landing or take off by an aircraft.
- d) The scheme shall include details of the procedures to be adopted and shall include measures with the purpose of phasing out of night time (2300 to 0700) operations by aircraft with a QC value of greater than 1 on either departure or arrival.
- e) The scheme including the QC System shall be monitored and reviewed on a regular basis. Such a review shall take place, not later than the 1st and 4th year after introduction and every subsequent 5 years.
- f) For the Night Quota Period (2330 – 0600) this shall have the following limits incorporated into the scheme:
- (i) Total annual movements by aircraft (per 12 month period) shall be limited to 9,650;
 - (ii) The total annual noise quota in any 12 month period shall be limited to 3,500 which, using all reasonable endeavours, shall be reduced at each review until it reaches a point where it does not exceed 2,800 by 2028.
- g) For the Early Morning Shoulder Period (06.00 – 07.00) this shall have the following limit incorporated into the schemes:
- (i) Total annual movements by aircraft in any 12 month period shall be limited to 7000.

h) The actual and forecast total number of aircraft movements for the preceding and next 12 month periods shall be reported to the Local Planning Authority every three months.

i) Within six months of the commencement of development and in accordance with the approved Noise Control Scheme the maximum Noise Violation Limits (NVL) for all aircraft, as recorded by departing aircraft at the fixed noise monitoring terminals, shall be reduced to values which are determined by the noise classification of individual aircraft as follows:

Aircraft Classification on Departure	NVL (dBA)
QC 4 (daytime only)	85
QC 2	82
QC 1	79
QC 0.5 and below	76

j) Within six months of the commencement of the development, a progressive reduction in the daytime (0700 – 2300) maximum NVL by the noisiest aircraft shall be implemented, as follows:

- (i) 85 dB(A) from the date of the commencement of development
- (ii) 82 dB(A) from 1st January 2015
- (iii) 80 dB(A) from 1st January 2020

(Reason: To safeguard residential amenity. To accord with the objectives of Policy LP1 and LLA1 of the Luton Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.)

Condition 12

From commencement of the development hereby permitted the area enclosed by the 57dB(A) Leq16hr (0700-2300) contour shall not exceed 19.4 sq km for daytime noise, and the area enclosed by the 48 dB(A) Leq8hr (2300-0700) contour shall not exceed 37.2 sq km for night-time noise, when calculated by the Federal Aviation Authority Integrated Noise Model version 7.0.d (or as may be updated or amended).

Within five years of the commencement of development a strategy shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for their approval which defines the methods to be used by LLAOL or any successor or airport operator to reduce the area of the noise contours by 2028 for daytime noise to 15.2km² for the area exposed to 57dB(A) Leq16hr (0700-2300) and above and for night-time noise to 31.6 km² for the area exposed to 48dB(A) Leq8hr (2300-0700) and above.

From the 1st January 2014 forecast aircraft movements and consequential noise contours (Day, Night and Quota Periods) for the forthcoming calendar year shall be reported on the 1st December each year to the Local Planning Authority, which shall utilise the standard 92 day summer contour. (Reason: To safeguard residential amenity. To accord with the objectives of Policy LP1 and LLA1 of the Luton Local

Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.)

Condition 13

Within 6 months of the development hereby permitted commencing a Noise Control Monitoring Scheme for the airport shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted scheme or scheme review as applicable shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

- (i) Details of the fixed noise monitoring terminals and track keeping system (vertical and horizontal).
- (ii) Details of the complaint handling system.
- (iii) Sanctions to be imposed on infringement by aircraft in respect of noise limits and track keeping.
- (iv) Arrangements for the verification of the submitted information.

Within six months of either commencement of development or the approval of the scheme by the Local Planning Authority, whichever is the later the scheme shall be implemented as approved. Such a review shall take place, not later than the 1st and 4th year after introduction and every subsequent 5 years. (Reason: To safeguard residential amenity. To accord with the objectives of Policy LP1 and LLA1 of the Luton Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.)

Ground Noise

Condition 14

Before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced a scheme concerning ground noise associated with aircraft at the airport shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted scheme shall include, but not be confined to, the following:

- i) Measures to limit the ground running of aircraft propulsion engines within Luton Airport between 2300 and 0700
- ii) Preferential use of stands and taxiways for arriving/departing aircraft between 2300 and 0700
- iii) Steps to limit the use of auxiliary power units (including the provision of fixed electrical ground power to stands and or suitably quietened ground power units)
- iv) No ground running of aeroplane engines for testing or maintenance purposes between 2300 and 0700 and designation of areas for such testing between 0700 and 2300.

Within six months of either commencement of development or the approval of the scheme, (or whichever is the later) by the Local Planning Authority, the scheme shall be implemented as approved. A review shall take place, not later than the 1st and 4th year after introduction and every

subsequent 5 years. (Reason: To safeguard residential amenity. To accord with the objectives of Policy LP1 and LLA1 of the Luton Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.)

Heads of Agreement

- LLAOL to make a financial contribution towards improvements to the highway infrastructure;
- LLAOL to commit to provide, implement, monitor and review travel plans for construction, passengers and staff;
- LLAOL to instigate noise mitigation measures including a noise management plan, a noise insulation scheme and a noise insulation fund;
- LLAOL to commit to use reasonable endeavours to use local suppliers of goods and services from the local area;
- LLAOL to commit to the support of a skills training service;
- LLAOL to provide a contribution to a Community Fund for the benefit of community projects;
- LLAOL to provide a financial contribution for the environmental management of Wigmore Valley Park;
- LLAOL to safeguard a route to provide access to Century Park;
- LLAOL to commit to continue to operate the Consultative Committee, Noise and Track Sub-Committee and the Transport Forum;
- LLAOL to provide, implement, monitor and review a sustainability strategy for the improvement of the sustainability of the airport;
- LLAOL to provide an annual monitoring report to include information on noise, traffic and local employment outcomes.

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

Agenda Item

Date: 9 June 2014

6

Title: Southend Airport Expansion

Author: Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy /
Development Management Liaison Officer
(01799 510460)

Item for information

Summary

1. This report informs the Panel about the recent growth at Southend Airport.

Recommendations

2. That the Panel notes the contents of this report.

Financial Implications

3. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

4. None.

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	The 2009 planning application for a runway extension was subject to the usual statutory requirements for publicity which were undertaken by Southend-on-Sea Borough Council as the local planning authority
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None

Workforce/Workplace	Officer time in preparing this report
---------------------	---------------------------------------

Situation

6. Southend Airport occupies about 125ha, and is located immediately to the north of Southend-on-Sea and south of Rochford. It has a single runway with a SW – NE orientation that is 1,856m long. Passenger facilities are to the east of the runway adjacent to the railway running between London Liverpool Street and Southend Victoria. Ancillary facilities are located to the west of the runway. The Airport is owned by the Stobart Group and is operated by the London Southend Airport Company Ltd (LSACL).
7. The vast majority of the Airport lies within the District of Rochford, except for the extreme SW part of the runway and nearby hotel and car park development which lie within the Borough of Southend.

The runway extension

8. In 2010, planning permission was granted to LSACL by the Borough Council principally to extend the runway to the SW (on land owned by the Borough Council) by 300m to its current length. The extended runway became operational in March 2012. The proposals were locally controversial mainly because of concerns about increased noise and also because of prematurity pending the preparation of a Joint Area Action Plan for the Airport and Environs with Rochford District Council. Other concerns related to road diversions and the relocation of open space. Six houses were required to be demolished for aircraft safety reasons.
9. A “base case” assessment submitted with the environmental statement estimated that passenger throughput would be limited to 0.75mppa without the runway extension but with other developments taking place such as the new terminal building and railway station. In 2008, there were 816 passenger movements, 928 cargo movements and about 40,000 other movements (mostly business / private and flying club).
10. The runway extension will allow growth up to 2mppa to occur by 2020, equating to 53,300 movements a year. Larger aircraft (such as the Embraer 195, Airbus A310 and Boeing 737) can now be accommodated, with the applicant estimating the following split of movements:
 - 13,600 – UK and Ireland
 - 10,700 – budget European
 - 2,100 – cargo
 - 26,900 – business / private, flying clubs, training, military.
11. In 2011, Air Lingus Regional operated regular passenger services to Galway and Waterford in the Irish Republic, and there was a Flybe service to Jersey. EasyJet commenced services in 2012, with further destinations added in 2013. Air Lingus Regional has also expanded its route network to include Dublin.

The DfT's constrained central demand forecasts for Southend are for 1.5mppa in 2020 and 2.5mppa in 2030. The Airports Commission does not model Southend separately. Up to the year ending February 2014, throughput was 1mppa, a 40% increase on the previous year according to published CAA statistics.

Determination of the application

12. Planning permission was granted subject to fifteen conditions and a S106 agreement. All the conditions relate to local matters within the administrative boundary of the Borough Council. Operational controls are exercised through the S106 agreement to which Rochford District Council is also a signatory. Prior to this, there were no specific noise restrictions at the Airport although a 1999 S106 Agreement with Rochford DC did provide for:
 - i) best practice for engine testing
 - ii) a review of noise contours
 - iii) measures to reduce ground noise
 - iv) limitations on night-time helicopter flying, and
 - v) a periodic review of night flying arrangements.
13. Rochford DC was a signatory to the new agreement because it superseded the 1999 one. A summary of the provisions of the new agreement is included as the first appendix to this report. The second appendix is a useful summary of the current operational controls that have been agreed between the Airport and the two local planning authorities.
14. As with the previous report on Luton, there is far more detail included in the officers' report than can be included in a summary report of this nature, but there are some points that are worth highlighting:
 - i) The quota count system includes daytime restrictions as well, albeit that they are far more relaxed than at night. The system does not operate using a quota points ceiling, but uses ATMs linked to the Quota Count rating for individual aircraft. Similar to the DfT's scheme for Stansted, there are compensatory adjustments should monthly quotas be exceeded.
 - ii) A runway preference scheme is in operation both in the daytime and the night-time, the aim of which is to avoid overflying of Southend-on-Sea. The preference scheme operates with the prevailing wind however, which could make operations unsafe with a short runway when prevailing winds are strong. In these circumstances (there are others as well) the scheme is not implemented. The night-time target is that all ATMs should conform to the scheme, but the actual exception rate is 20%. The daytime targets are more relaxed, but are met. The Airport averages about 1.1 ATMs per night.
 - iii) The requirement for the operator to pay the public transport contributions is linked to mode share performance as throughput grows. The two main contributions are £150k in total, and there is a further payment of £50k per annum should targets continue to not be met. A passenger travel survey

carried out in October 2012 indicated that 29% of passengers at that time were using public transport to and from the airport, so it seems unlikely that the contributions would be triggered.

Ancillary development at the Airport

15. The Airport’s new railway station was opened in July 2011 giving a 5-minute travel time to Southend Victoria and a 55-minute travel time (or slightly longer during the peak) to Liverpool Street. Peak hour services are up to 7 trains per hour (tph) and 3tph off-peak. After 2019, passengers will be able to interchange at Shenfield for Crossrail. Shenfield is about 30 minutes by rail from the Airport. The Airport is also currently served by First Group’s X30 coach service which runs from Southend-on-Sea to Stansted Airport via Chelmsford. Journey time between the airports is about 80 minutes.

16. It is interesting to note in the Airport’s 2012-2013 annual report that the one surface access strategy target that was not met was: *“Airport to work with rail industry partners to seek improvements”*. The reason given for the unmet target is: *“The airport has failed to persuade Greater Anglia to provide trains that connect with the first and last flights of the day. Also, Greater Anglia has not made any significant improvements to the quality of the rolling stock or customer service provided”*. There are similar issues at Stansted regarding train connections with early and late flights. The main difficulty is the track repossession time that Network Rail requires each night for maintenance. Service quality has improved at Stansted because of the introduction of the new Class 379 rolling stock which is, of course, configured for air passenger use. Southend Airport has to rely on the existing rolling stock which is configured for commuter use.

17. A new control tower also became operational in July 2011.

18. The new passenger terminal was opened in February 2012, and in April of that year Rochford DC granted planning permission for an extension as Phase 2 of the growth towards 2mppa. The extension was opened on 7th April this year.

Risk Analysis

19.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
None	None	None	None

- 1 = Little or no risk or impact
- 2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.
- 3 = Significant risk or impact – action required
- 4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

Southend-on-Sea Borough Council

Summary of S106 agreement dated 30.4.10 relating to the planning permission for a runway extension

(words in bold are Southend's highlighting)

Annual Report	To be presented to the Southend Airport Consultative Committee (ACC) no later than 1 year after the opening of the extended runway and each subsequent anniversary after the opening date. To implement the reasonable requirements of the ACC and report on this to the ACC;
Notice	No less than 28 days prior notice of the commencement of the development, commencement of the runway and the opening date to be provided to the Council;
Passenger Throughput	To maintain records of passengers using the terminal and provide data to the Council on request;
Local Employment Opportunities	To use reasonable endeavours to ensure: employment opportunities are publicised locally; local labour is employed at airport; on-site training programmes are provided; airport is operated in accordance with Site Employment Strategy; and to report to the ACC annually on its employment and training programmes;
Quiet Operations Policy	<p>i) Noise Manager, responsible for co-ordinating and progressing delivery of Policy, to be appointed prior to commencement of development and to remain appointed thereafter;</p> <p>ii) Airport to use reasonable endeavours to ensure that all those whose activities at Airport have noise implications adopt and observe the QOP;</p> <p>iii) Public Noise Complaints Handling Service to be established prior to opening of the extended runway and thereafter maintained;</p> <p>iv) Details of Noise Monitoring System to be submitted to Council prior to commencement of the runway works and airport not to open the extended runway until the NMS has been approved and implemented;</p> <p>v) Property Acquisition and Sound and Thermal Insulation Grants Scheme – within 18 months of the opening of the extended runway to identify those properties that qualify for acquisition/compensation/mitigation and to carry out acquisition, or sound, thermal and solar attenuation works at its own cost;</p> <p>vi) Scheme to promote quiet ground operations at the Airport to be submitted prior to commencement of the runway works including a mechanism for review after 5 years and a mechanism for enforcement;</p> <p>vii) Night Noise Provisions including a Quota Count System to limit the type of aircraft and number of night time flights to be in place from the opening of the extended</p>

	<p>runway;</p> <p>viii) Runway 06 to be used as the preferred departures runway and runway 24 as the preferred arrivals runway from the opening of the extended runway;</p> <p>ix) Total air traffic movements (ATM) shall not exceed 53,300 per annum from the commencement of development;</p> <p>x) Total cargo related ATMs shall not exceed the lesser of 5,330 per annum or 10% of the total number of ATMs;</p> <p>xi) Best practice plan for aircraft engine testing to be submitted for approval prior to commencement of runway works;</p> <p>xii) No aircraft engine testing between 2000 and 0800 hours Monday to Saturday, between 1800 hours on Saturday and 0900 hours on Sunday, and between 1055 and 1105 hours on 11 November each year;</p> <p>xiii) From the opening of the extended runway: all aircraft with a maximum certified weight of more than 5.7 tonnes to use preferential routes; airport to use reasonable endeavours to ensure this and to impose fines in respect of non-compliance; fines to be spent on approved community projects;</p>
Air Quality Monitoring	Air Quality Monitoring Programme to be submitted to Rochford and Southend prior to commencement of development – to be reviewed at least once every 5 years and any significant adverse effects attributable to the airport to be mitigated by the airport;
Instrument Landing System	System for use in connection with runway 06 to be in place and operational prior to opening of extended runway and to remain in place thereafter;
Wake Vortex Scheme	Scheme to provide for the payment of compensation and/or carrying out of repair to properties arising out of damage from wake vortices by ATMs at the airport to be submitted prior to commencement of runway works and implemented once approved;
Replacement of land and facilities	<p>As soon as reasonably practical following completion of S106 agreement details of the following to be submitted to Southend for approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Details of replacement play facilities ▪ Proposals for laying out the replacement land as open land ▪ Programme of implementation to provide replacement habitat <p>Airport: not to commence development until details approved; to use all reasonable endeavours to substantially complete the replacement play facilities and replacement land prior to opening of the extended runway; to use all reasonable endeavours to substantially complete the replacement habitat within agreed timescale</p>
Replacement habitat and open	Replacement habitat contribution (£4,000) payable prior to opening of extended runway;

space contributions	Open space contribution (£14,000) payable prior to opening of extended runway;
Carbon and Environmental Management Plan	To identify appropriate proportionate and reasonable initiatives that the airport will implement to reduce carbon emissions and associated green house gases and overall environmental impact resulting from an increase in airport activities resulting from the development; plan to be submitted for approval by Southend and Rochford prior to commencement of development and implemented once approved;
Sustainable Procurement Plan	To identify measures to reduce the environmental impacts of the development through the procurement of sustainable goods and services at the airport; plan to be submitted for approval by Southend and Rochford prior to commencement of development;
Airport Surface Access Strategy (ASAS)	Details of Air Transport Forum (ATF) membership to be submitted to Rochford and Southend for approval prior to commencement of runway works; ATF to be set up at airport's expense within 1 month of approval; ATF responsible for reviewing and monitoring effectiveness of the ASAS on a regular basis; details of ASAS (including various provisions in relation to public transport infrastructure including penalty clauses for failure to meet targets in respect of public transport use) be agreed prior to commencement of extended runway works and implemented on opening of the extended runway;
Railway Station	Railway station, to be provided at airport's expense, to be substantially complete and open to public prior to opening of extended runway;
Section 106 Monitoring Contribution	£10,000 payable prior to commencement of development.
Public transport contributions	To be paid in the event that less than 20% of air passengers travelling to and from the airport use public transport at 1.5mppa throughput, and if less than 25% use public transport at 2mppa.
Use of old terminal building	Not to be used for passenger facilities 6 months after the opening of the new terminal.

London Southend Airport - Operational Controls Summary Table

Annual Operational Air Transport Movement (“ATM¹”)Limits

- Total Annual ATM limit of 53,300 excluding “Exempt” ATMs
- Annual Cargo ATM limit of lesser of 5,330 or 10% of total ATMs
- Annual Boeing 737-300 Aircraft ATM limit of 2,150

Night Flight Controls (2300hrs – 0630hrs)

- Night Flight Quota of 120 ATMs per month²
- No aircraft with Quota Count (“QC”) of more than 1.0 (EPNDB 92.9) or any helicopters allowed to take off or land in the night period^{1 & 2}
- No Passenger Flights³ to take off or land between 2300 and 0630 unless they are Delayed or Diverted, provided that up to 90 Passenger Flights per month may be scheduled to land during the shoulder period of 2300 and 2330hrs⁴
- If the number of ATMs at night exceed 120 there are provisions for compensatory adjustments in the Night Flight Quota for the following Quota Month.

Daytime Noise Restrictions (0630 – 2300hrs)

- No aircraft with QC of more than 2.0 (EPNDB 95.9) allowed to take off or land⁵, provided that up to 60 daytime movements of aircraft with a QC between 2 and 4.0 (EPNDB 95.9 - 98.9) undergoing maintenance are allowed in each Quota Year
- If the number of ATMs of aircraft of between QC2 and QC4 exceed 60 in a Quota Year there are provisions for compensatory adjustments in the Quota for the following Quota Year.

Take-off and Landing Procedures

Night Time (2300hrs – 0630hrs):

- All aircraft will take off towards and land from the north-east unless prevented from doing so for safety reasons.

Day Time (0630hrs – 2300hrs):

- All aircraft will take off towards and land from the north east where movement volumes and safety requirements allow
- Departing Aircraft shall follow the defined south-westerly and north-easterly Noise Preferential Routes⁶
- Fewer than 50% of landings in daytime to be from the south-west
- Fewer than 50% of all landing and departures in daytime to be over the south-west when assessed annually

¹ ATM means any rotary or fixed wing aircraft carrying out air traffic movements comprised of taking off or landing at the Airport. Each take off is one ATM and each landing is one ATM.

² Excludes certain prescribed aircraft movements namely “Delayed ATMs”, “Divered ATMs” or “Exempt ATMs” which have a QC of 1 or less and are approved by the Airport Consultative Committee. “Exempt” includes movements by police, military, air ambulance, organ transplant and official government flights. Compliance assessed annually not monthly. Delayed ATMs, Divered ATMs and Exempt ATMs with a QC of 1 or more shall count towards the Quota of 120 per month, those with QC less than 1 shall not count towards the Quota.

³ Passenger Flights means any ATM by a commercial passenger aircraft carrying passengers whether scheduled or unscheduled and excludes a) movements by aircraft carrying no passengers (e.g. for repositioning or maintenance) and b) movements by business jets or other business aircraft subject to private air charter.

⁴ Any such flights must have a QC of 1 or less and will be included in the 120 monthly night flight quota limit

⁵ Excludes “Divered” or “Exempt” ATMs

⁶ Excludes aircraft with a Maximum Certificated Weight of 5.7 tonnes or less

Air Quality Noise and Track Monitoring by the Airport Company

- Operate an Air Quality Monitoring Programme and Carbon and Environmental Management Plan
- Maintain Noise and Track Keeping System (including 2 fixed and 1 mobile noise monitors) and produce annual reports
- Maintain a Noise Complaints Service
- Instrument Landing System and Secondary Radar shall be installed and maintained

Monthly and Three Monthly Reports by the Airport Company

- Number of ATMs, cargo ATMs, Boeing 737-300 ATMs
- Number of Night Flights including Diverted, Delayed and Exempt from night quota limits
- Flights that did not follow the north easterly take off and landing preference

Ground Noise

- Quiet Ground Operations Scheme
- Best Practice Plan for Aircraft Engine Testing
- Engine Tests only permitted at the following times:
 - 0800 to 2000 Monday to Friday
 - 0800 to 1800 on Saturday
 - 0900 to 1800 on Sunday

Penalties

- Fining of airlines if they consistently fail to comply with the take off, landing, track keeping procedures or ground noise restrictions

Property Purchase, Noise Insulation, and Vortex schemes operated by the Airport Company

- Property Purchase Scheme offered to properties within 69dBA LAeq contour
- Sound and Thermal Insulation Grants offered to residential properties, schools and hospitals within 63dBA LAeq contour
- Repairs to any roofs damaged by wake vortex turbulence

Committee: Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

Agenda Item

Date: 9 June 2014

7

Title: Unilateral undertaking - update

Author: Jeremy Pine, Planning Policy /
Development Management Liaison Officer

Item for information

Summary

1. Planning permission for expansion to 35mppa (Generation 1) was granted on appeal on 8th October 2008 following a public inquiry. This report sets out the current status of all the obligations entered into by Stansted Airport Limited in the unilateral undertaking which forms part of that planning permission.

Recommendations

2. That the Panel notes the report

Financial Implications

3. There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Background Papers

4. None

Impact

- 5.

Communication/Consultation	None
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	Officer time in monitoring compliance with the obligations and preparing this report

Situation

6. The attached monitoring document sets out the current position with each of the obligations entered into by Stansted Airport Limited in the unilateral undertaking that it signed in 2008 when planning permission was granted on appeal for expansion to 35mppa.
7. Since the public inquiry, passenger throughput has dropped from a peak of just under 24mppa to 17.3mppa in the year ending October 2012. The significance of this is that many of the obligations have not yet been triggered because they relate to implementation. More details about what constitutes implementation are on Page 1 of the monitoring document.
8. Column 6 of the monitoring document (“Current Action”) sets out the current position irrespective of whether the obligation has been triggered. Status in column 7 is only recorded where an obligation has been triggered.
9. The last monitoring report to the Panel was on 10th January 2012. It was resolved that future reports would focus on the 2008 unilateral undertaking with reference back to the 2003 agreement only where obligations were ongoing. Officers will give a verbal update on the 2003 agreement at the Panel meeting.

Risk Analysis

10.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
That obligations are not complied with	1. Obligations are monitored by officers in association with STAL	2. Non-compliance could result in important mitigation measures not being implemented	Continue to monitor compliance with the obligations

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.

STANSTED AIRPORT 25-35MPPA EXPANSION (GENERATION 1) UNILATERAL UNDERTAKING

MONITORING DOCUMENT

UP TO DATE AS OF APRIL 2014

Implementation of the 35mppa planning permission will occur when:

- Passenger throughput exceeds 25mppa for a 12 month period, or
- Total air transport movements exceed 241,000 ATMs for a 12 month period, or
- Any material operation (as defined by Section 56 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act) is carried out pursuant to UTT/0717/06/FUL,

whichever is the earlier.

As of April 2014

- Passenger throughput is 18.1mppa over the last 12 month period
- Total air transport movements are 133,344 for the last 12 month period, and
- No material operations pursuant to UTT/0717/06/FUL have been carried out

Accordingly, UTT/0717/06/FUL has not been implemented.

SCHEDULE 2 – OBLIGATIONS OFFERED TO UDC

PART 1 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO AIR NOISE

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1	BAA Stansted Community Buildings Noise Insulation Scheme (CBNIS) and Home Relocation Assistance Scheme (HRAS)	Implementation date	Continue to offer schemes	Ongoing	Both schemes continue to be offered, having initially been derived from the 2003 Air Transport White Paper	N/A yet
	BAA Stansted Community Buildings Noise Insulation Scheme (CBNIS) and Home Relocation	Within 3 months of publication of the 2006 63dBA and 69dBA airport contours, and again within 3 months of	Review boundaries of CBNIS and HRAS, taking into account a night time noise insulation scheme as	2012	Boundaries were reviewed. The Government says it will continue to monitor the existing	

	Assistance Scheme (HRAS)	publication of the equivalent 2011 contours	provided for by SoS in connection with the night time restrictions at the airport		voluntary schemes, but does not intend to exercise regulatory powers in this area.	
--	---------------------------------	--	--	--	---	--

PART 2 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO GROUND NOISE

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1	Director's notices re use of air start units, ground power units and fixed electrical ground power	Implementation date	To issue and maintain notices	Ongoing	Director's notices are in force	N/A yet

PART 3 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO AIR QUALITY

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1. 1.1	Oxides of nitrogen and PM10 monitoring	Within 6 months of implementation	Monitor at 3 fixed sites, including a site in Hatfield Forest agreed	31st December 2020	Annual air quality monitoring of NOX and PM10 is carried out	N/A yet.

			with the National Trust		on behalf of STAL, using diffusion tube locations and an automatic monitoring site agreed with the Council back in 2003. The 2012 report was published in May 2013.	
1. 1.2	NO2 monitoring	Within 6 months of implementation	Monitor at 4 sites (discussed with UDC) and at 9 sites within Hatfield Forest (subject to agreement with the National Trust)	31 st December 2020	A transect study was carried out on behalf of STAL in 2012, which included a further 13 diffusion tube locations in and around the airport and Hatfield Forest.	N/A yet.
1. 1.3	Summary of PM10 and NO2 monitoring	Within 6 months of implementation	Provide annual summary to UDC	31 st December 2020	The annual monitoring report and transect studies are	N/A yet.

					available on STAL's website.	
1. 1.4	Compensatory schemes re effects of oxides of nitrogen on vegetation in Hatfield Forest	Within 6 months of implementation	Consider measures to compensate for annual mean levels above 30mg/M ³ - proportionate to that level caused by the development	31 st December 2020	The 2012 transect study did not identify any annual mean levels above 30mg/M ³ in Hatfield Forest.	N/A yet.
1. 1.5	Implementation of measures identified in 1. 1.4	Within 6 months of implementation	Use all reasonable endeavours to implement the measures	31 st December 2020	The 2012 transect study did not identify any annual mean levels above 30mg/M ³ in Hatfield Forest.	N/A yet
2.	Monitoring and summary results	Within 28 days of final results being available to STAL	Make results available to UDC	31 st December 2020	The 2012 transect study did not identify any annual mean levels above 30mg/M ³ in Hatfield Forest.	N/A yet

PART 4 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO SURFACE ACCESS TO THE AIRPORT

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1.	Driving to work	Implementation date	Use all reasonable endeavours to reduce car driving to work by airport employees to no more than 76% of the total.	31 st December 2014	69.9% achieved in 2011. Current surface access strategy target is to achieve and maintain 70% by 35mppa. This will need reviewing for the new access strategy.	N/A yet
2,	Public transport mode share for passengers	Implementation date	Consider means by which the non-transfer passenger public transport mode share can be increased to 43% by 2014, and how STAL can contribute	31 st December 2014	51.4% achieved in 2013. Figure is likely to be inflated because of the depressed UK leisure market, which is only starting to pick up again after the recession.	N/A yet

			to its achievement.		The SATF Steering Group is considering what targets should go into the new surface access strategy which will be launched in November 2014. One option is to have different targets for rail / coach / local bus rather than an overall single target	
--	--	--	---------------------	--	---	--

PART 5 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRAIN CAPACITY

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1.	Land and funds availability for additional platform capacity and	When required to do so by DfT	Make the land and funds available within the time that is specified	Ongoing	Land and funds not yet required	N/A yet

	ancillary development for enhanced rail services to the Airport					
2.	Monitoring of patronage on airport rail services	From 2008	Monitor and report to the SATF Rail Working Group. Details of monitoring to be agreed with the DfT and Rail WG	Ongoing	Details agreed with the Rail WG (DfT did not respond). Performance monitoring is carried out by Greater Anglia and Cross Country Trains and is reported to the Rail WG as part of regular quarterly updates.	
3.	Reporting of patronage monitoring	From 2008	Report data to DfT and SATF	Ongoing	Greater Anglia and Cross Country Trains performance data is reported quarterly to the SATF Steering Group.	

4.	Improvement of waiting conditions for Platform 2 passengers	Ongoing	Work with UDC to provide either a shelter or other such means. Report progress to SATF	Ongoing	Platform 2 shelter completed and open for use	😊
5.	Funding of improvement of waiting conditions for Platform 2 passengers	Ongoing	STAL to meet reasonable costs if the improvement can be provided unilaterally	Ongoing	Shelter was funded by STAL	😊
6.	Funding of improvement of waiting conditions for Platform 2 passengers	Ongoing	STAL to meet its proportionate costs if the improvement can only be provided with the co-operation of others	Ongoing	Co-operation of others was not required	😊

PART 6 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO EMPLOYMENT

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
--------------	------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	--------

1.	Supporting training and employment initiatives ratified by SAEF	1 st January 2010	Commit unspent S106 monies from 2003 agreement – paid in instalments as specified by SAEF	Payment of last instalment	£350K was paid by STAL under the previous agreement. £50k was donated to the Airport Employment and Skills Academy in 2012. 3 job fairs were held that year	
----	---	------------------------------	---	----------------------------	--	---

PART 7 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1. 1.1	Stansed Airport Business Forum (SABF)	1 st January 2010	Maintain the SABF	Ongoing	The SABF is being maintained	
1. 1.2	SABF	1 st January 2010	Maintain sub-groups as constituted from time to time	Ongoing	Sub-groups are constituted when required	
1. 1.3	SABF	1 st January 2010	To arrange SABF meetings twice a year,	Ongoing	These meetings are being held	

			and sub-groups three times a year or as required by SABF			
1. 1.4	“Meet the Buyers” event	1 st January 2010	Support and facilitate an annual event	Ongoing	The last annual event was held on 3 rd October 2013 at the Hilton Hotel	☺
1. 1.5	Regeneration and tourism support	1 st January 2010	Use all reasonable endeavours to identify and implement opportunities to support regeneration inward investment and tourism	Ongoing	The airport has recently supported a number of local events in Harlow, Braintree and Bishop’s Stortford.	☺

PART 8 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO THE COMMUNITY

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1.	Community Trust	31 st October 2011	Determine executive and admin arrangements	As soon as reasonably practical	The Stansted Airport Community Trust was	☺

			between STAL, UDC and EHDC		originally registered as a charity in 2005 following an obligation in the 15-25mppa agreement. Arrangements were rolled forward.	
2.	Community Trust funding	Within 3 months of exec and admin arrangements being agreed	Pay £100k (index linked) + 3x£100k further annual instalments into Fund	3 years after first payment	Payments are being made. Noise infringement fines (£13k to the year ending March 2014) also go to the Trust. Annual accounts are lodged with the Charity Commission.	☺
3.	Community Trust funding	When fund set up	STAL to administer in accordance with agreed arrangements	Ongoing	Grants are being awarded (£97.8k in FY 2012/13)	☺
4.	Unauthorised	Implementation	STAL to make	31 st December	Parking hotline	N/A yet

	airport related car parking	date	up to £20k /annum available for UDC and EHDC to enforce breaches of planning control	2015	being monitored by SATF Highways WG. Liaison takes place between UDC and STAL over evidence required for planning enforcement cases. In the meantime, the unspent part of the £50k that formed part of the 15-25mppa agreement remains available.	
--	-----------------------------	------	--	------	--	--

PART 9 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO VISITORS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1.	Archaeological finds	Implementation date	Make all finds available to the SW Museum	As soon as reasonably practical	None – will be relevant when any	N/A yet

			for inspection, and consider requests for temporary or permanent display		preparatory groundworks are undertaken	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

PART 10 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO WASTE MANAGEMENT

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1.	Stansted Waste Management Strategy	31 st December 2009	Review strategy every 5 years	Ongoing	Waste Management Strategy 2010 - 2015 published	☺
2.	Stansted Waste Management Strategy	31 st December 2009	Use reasonable endeavours to implement any strategy revisions	Ongoing	No revisions yet published	N/A yet
3.	Stansted Waste Management Strategy	31 st December 2009	Report strategy progress from time to time in the Corporate Responsibility Report	Ongoing	Progress with recycling and waste diversion targets reported in the 2012 report	☺

PART 11 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO ENERGY

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required	Completion	Current Action	Status
--------------	------	--------------	----------	------------	----------------	--------

			Action	Date		
1.	Stansted Energy Management Strategy	31 st December 2008	Review strategy every 5 years	Ongoing	Energy Management Strategy 2011 - 2016 published	☺
2.	Stansted Energy Management Strategy	31 st December 2008	Use reasonable endeavours to implement any strategy revisions	Ongoing	No revisions yet published	N/A yet
3.	Stansted Energy Management Strategy	31 st December 2008	Report strategy progress from time to time in the Corporate Responsibility Report	Ongoing	Progress with reducing CO2 emissions from energy consumption reported in the 2012 report	☺

PART 12 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO MONITORING

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1.	35mppa development impact study	Before 31 st December 2014	STAL to commission study re impact on air noise, ground noise, air quality, traffic flows, transport mode		Passenger throughput has dropped from 22.7mppa when the UU was signed to 18.1mppa in April 2014.	N/A yet

			share, employment levels, home locations of airport employees, visual impact, waste water and energy. Provide results to UDC once completed			
2.	Corporate Responsibility Report	Implementation date	STAL to publish an annual report audited by a registered assessor	Ongoing	Corporate Responsibility Reports published annually (last one was for 2012)	N/A yet
3.	Proportionate mitigation measures	From publication of study and reports	STAL to use all reasonable endeavours to implement measures identified	Ongoing	As required by the annual CRR reports	N/A yet

PART 13 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO WATER EFFICIENCY

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
--------------	------	--------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	--------

	Design of Satellite 4	Prior to construction	STAL to use all reasonable endeavours to agree water efficiency measures for Satellite 4 with the Environment Agency and incorporate them into its construction	When Satellite 4 constructed	Detailed planning permission granted in 1999 as part of expansion from 8-15mppa. Revised scheme approved in 2005. Demand does not yet require Satellite 4 to be constructed.	N/A yet
--	------------------------------	------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	---	----------------

PART 14 – OBLIGATIONS RELATING TO NATURE CONSERVATION

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1.	230k PATM noise / air / light pollution study on Hatfield Forest flora and fauna	8th October 2009	STAL to provide UDC with a proposal for the study, and use reasonable endeavours to agree its scope		Study not yet required as only 124,168 PATMs to end of April 2014.	N/A yet
1.	230k PATM noise / air /	230k PATM	STAL to commission		Study not yet required as	N/A yet

	light pollution study on Hatfield Forest flora and fauna		study		only 124,168 PATMs to end of April 2014.	
2.	Mitigation measures re levels of oxides of nitrogen exceeding 30mg/m ³ annual mean	After study published	STAL to consider appropriate mitigation measures proportionate to the extent that the development contributes to the measured levels		Study not yet required as only 124,168 PATMs to end of April 2014.	N/A yet
3.	Mitigation measures re levels of oxides of nitrogen exceeding 30mg/m ³ annual mean	After study published	STAL to use all reasonable endeavour to undertake the identified measures		Study not yet required as only 124,168 PATMs to end of April 2014.	N/A yet

SCHEDULE 3 – OBLIGATIONS OFFERED TO ECC AND UDC

LOCAL ROAD IMPACT MITIGATION RE 25 MPPA AND GENERATION 1

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
1.1.	Local road schemes	Implementation date	STAL to contribute up to £500k towards schemes within 5 miles of the Airport. (Payment details set out in paragraph 1.2 of the UU)	31 st December 2015	Money remains available when / if required. ECC alerted to the deadline for invoicing.	N/A yet
1.3.	Junction works	Implementation date	STAL to contribute up to: i) £610K or 30% of costs re A120/B1383 roundabout works ii) £130k or 21% of costs re A120/A1250 roundabout works iii) £60k or 23% of costs	31 st December 2018	Money remains available when / if required. ECC alerted to deadline for certification of practical completion.	N/A yet

			towards M11 J8 Eastern Approach works			
--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--	--	--

DEVELOPMENT OF AIRPORT PUBLIC TRANSPORT LINKS

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
2.	Contribution to public transport links	None	STAL to contribute up to £2m to airport public transport links. Measures to be managed by the Bus / Coach Working Group	Ongoing	Requests for start-up funding for new or enhanced services are evaluated by the Working Group, but there has been little recent activity due to declining airport throughput. STAL continues to subsidise some early / late local bus services via the levy on	

					car park transactions.	
--	--	--	--	--	------------------------	--

HIGHWAYS AGENCY SCHEMES

UU Reference	Item	Trigger Date	Required Action	Completion Date	Current Action	Status
3.	Strategic road network schemes	Implementation date	Enter into S278 agreements with the Highways Agency for: i) M11 J8 works ii) Priory Wood Roundabout works, excluding the widening works iii) Bassingbourn Roundabout works	Implementation of works governed by Generation 1 planning condition HA1 (to be completed by 8 th April 2010, or as otherwise may be agreed by the local planning authority)	S278 agreements signed. Works completed save for minor details on M11 J8 and Priory Wood Roundabouts.	N/A yet
4.	Highway widening scheme for Round Coppice Road / Priory Wood	8 th October 2009	Enter into S278 agreement with the Highways Agency for the scheme	Implementation of scheme governed by Generation 1 planning condition HA4 (triggered by	S278 agreement signed. Provisions for monitoring traffic flow have been	

				traffic flow on Thremhall Avenue and thereafter to be completed within a year)	installed.	
5.	A120 on-slip	8 th October 2009	Enter into S278 agreement with the Highways Agency for the scheme	Implementation of scheme governed by Generation 1 planning condition HA5 (triggered by traffic flow on A120 eastbound at Parsonage Road overbridge and thereafter to be completed within a year)	S278 agreement signed. Provisions for monitoring traffic flow have been installed.	

