



Uttlesford District Council

Chief Executive: Dawn French

SUPPLEMENTARY PACK

Planning Committee

Date: Friday, 24th January, 2020

Time: 11.00 am

Venue: Council Chamber - Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden,
CB11 4ER

Chair: Councillor S Merifield

Members: Councillors G Bagnall, M Caton, P Fairhurst, R Freeman, G LeCount,
M Lemon (Vice-Chair), J Loughlin, R Pavitt, N Reeve, A Storah and
M Sutton

ITEMS WITH SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION PART 1

Open to Public and Press

2 UTT/18/0460/FUL - Stansted Airport

3 - 166

To consider whether to approve the issue of the decision notice for
UTT/18/0460/FUL – Stansted Airport.

- Public Statements – including all written public statements as submitted following the Committee meeting on 17 January 2020.



Uttlesford District Council

Chief Executive: Dawn French

For information about this meeting please contact Democratic Services

Telephone: 01799 510369 or 510548

Email: Committee@uttlesford.gov.uk

General Enquiries

Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden, CB11 4ER

Telephone: 01799 510510

Fax: 01799 510550

Email: uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk

Website: www.uttlesford.gov.uk

John Farrow

Intro

Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for the providing this opportunity to speak this morning. My name is John Farrow, i am a local resident and I have worked at the airport for 26 years.

My view is it is vitally important for our community that our council approves the airports application to grow to ensure we maintain the great standard of living Uttlesford enjoys as a place to live and work both now and into the future.

Stansted airport is a huge contributor to our community

Just recently the airport outlined its plans to invest a further £35 million to help ensure that Uttlesford remains one of the best places in the UK to live, work and do business.

This investment would see funding for local transport schemes; new bus routes, improving our roads, upgrading J8 of the M11, as well as many more schemes that would invest in our community.

The airport delivers substantial benefits not only to Uttlesford, but to the wider Essex and East of England economies. The airport currently employs 12,000 people employed in over 200 business's at the airport, this includes over 2,000 Uttlesford residents.

Uttlesford's population is ever growing, where are all our new neighbours going to work if the airport isn't allowed to grow?

Further growth will generate many more jobs at the airport and millions of pounds of additional economic and social benefit to our community.

Constraining growth would also have an adverse knock on effect to the wider business community in Uttlesford with many business reliant on the airport to do business, therefore the impact of constraining growth is far more wide reaching than just on the airport itself. It is clear to me that constraining future growth, would damages business and in turn damage our community.

I question why we would seek to compromise this continued investment in or community?

Would we really want to damage the future prosperity of this community when it is clear to see how other less fortunate councils struggle to maintain critical social and community services and assets?

IT WOULD BE SAD TO LOSE
THE OPPORTUNITIES NOT MAINTAIN
THE APPS I HAVE
HAD TO GROW
MY INCOME +
ENJOY THE
ASSOCIATED
BENEFIT

John Ferron

As well as working at the airport, I am fortunate to live in Uttlesford, the airport providing me the opportunity to live and bring up my family in the lovely town of Great Dunmow.

As a proud resident, and one that was supportive of the changes and improvements proposed by this council in their manifesto during the 2019 local elections, I am disappointed that our council leaders have since chosen to engage on what I can only imagine to be a hugely expensive further challenge to the airports planning application when it was clear from the previous exercise that the application was appropriate, this view validated by experts. I do not recall a challenge to the airports application being part of this manifesto

AND WOULD QUESTION IF THAT IS WHAT OUR COMMUNITY WANTS AND OUR MONEY TO BE SPENT ON
It is my view and personal preference that whatever costs we as tax payers are currently incurring on this challenge is immediately stopped and the money diverted to more worthy causes in improving our community.

Investing our money in more social care and support services should be the priority. Looking after our elderly, caring and providing better services for our disabled neighbours and those less fortunate than ourselves, funding activities for our youth population to get them off the streets and out of trouble, fixing the ever growing number of pot holes in our roads and generally improving our infrastructure and investing in more Police officers is surely money better spent than engaging in repeated challenges to the proposed growth of our largest investor to our community.

From both a commercial and personal perspective, I would ask the panel to support the application.

Once again thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

Good morning I am Andy Bennett, Chair of Felsted Parish Council Planning Committee.

We are objecting to this application.

Today you are invited to consider if there **have been any new material considerations or changes in circumstances.**

I propose that there most certainly have been and will cover 4 of the most important ones.

Firstly, under numbers of flights

The application stated that there would be no increase in flights, as allowed by the current planning approval for 274,000 flights a year.

Whilst technically true, it is morally corrupt.

Stansted airport itself projects that fewer than 227,000 flights would be needed for the current limit of 35million passengers and cargo.

If you approve this new single passenger and cargo total of 274,000 flights, you will release a true increase of **47,000** flights a year.

Correspondence suggests that even Cllr Alan Mills, the previous Chair of the Planning committee, who provided 2 of the votes to approve the original application, perhaps did not see that approval would lead to a real life increase in flights.

When combined with MAG trimming off a year from the forecast numbers to keep the application away from central government, this sleight of hand is a scandal and should cause you to consider it a material consideration.

Secondly, Under Aircraft noise

The application relied on a forecast reduction in noise contours and the promise of 50% quieter aircraft.

The Cole Jarman noise report first assumed 80% of planes would be new quieter aircraft, later they reduced this to 50% as a claimed typo.

With Boeing's order book suggesting a sub 30% level, even this 50% was clearly beyond possibility.

More importantly, they also assumed the use of quieter B737 MAX aircraft, the entire fleet of which is now grounded indefinitely.

Whilst the airport takes the only defensive position it can, claiming that this has all been scheduled into the noise forecasts, **their noise reduction forecasts are now implausible and a material change in circumstances.**

Thirdly, regarding environmental considerations

In August 2019 UDC declared a Climate and Ecological Emergency and committed to make the authority carbon neutral by 2030.

MAG's own figures project that, with this application, CO2 emissions (excluding road traffic impacts) would increase, from 1.56 million tonnes in the Base Year, by an additional million tonnes a year in 2028.

You cannot simply pick and choose which bits of carbon dioxide you are going to count. Buying a few electric vehicles for the Council, whilst approving the release of a million tonnes a year of Co2 into the air around Stansted, is missing the point entirely.

In making his casting vote to pass the original application, the Chair of Planning summed up that he was doing so in support of the next generation.

If the Extinction Rebellion movement and the one girl crusade which is Greta Thunberg, are telling us anything, it is that the youth of today don't want cheap flights to Spain, they want breathable air and a world with a future in which to raise **their** children.

In approving this application in the name of the youth of today, I have a feeling Greta Thunberg may well respond with 'how... dare... you...'

This must be considered a change in circumstances.

Fourthly, you want to build 3000 new houses as part of the WoB development. At the Inspector's review of UDC's Plan, Alistair Andrew, MAG's Head of Planning, in responding to a point I made regarding emerging Government guidance concerning planes not overflying densely populated areas at under 7000 feet, stated that he agreed the area designated for WoB was impacted by runway 04 flights and that in his opinion all houses should be marketed as being under a flightpath.

Adding in the new WHO guidance, calling for a dramatic reduction in acceptable noise levels for communities, and you can't have it both ways. Even if it survives the Local Plan process, you can't build houses in the WoB area, under the flightpath, and still approve this application, releasing 47,000 flights.

This emerging government and WHO guidance must be considered a new material consideration.

In summary

I have demonstrated that there are at least 4 new material considerations and changes in circumstances:

No-one denies that Stansted is an important local resource, but MAG needs to respect and to respond to the concerns from the communities their business impacts, and currently they do not.

Against falling passenger numbers, this application is being rushed through in advance of the introduction of new noise regulations which would govern it, just like the 2016 flightpath change, forced through 12 months before tighter regulations on changes to flightpaths were introduced.

This is wrong.

I urge you to do what the failed and rejected previous Conservative administration did not, listen to your community, do what is right, and reject this application.

Thank you

JANE GRAY

I used to live in a quiet landscape but now I am directly below the turning point of planes coming to land at the airport. They turn over my house on the outskirts of Ashdon day and night. This is disruptive to my life in the day but at night, I am woken continually and I feel it really affects my health and mental well-being, I have resorted to having a radio on all night so I have a level of constant noise ironically to drown out the noise of the planes. Noise in the peaceful countryside is so much more intrusive than in a town where the noise levels of traffic are part of the expected streetscape.

The Section 106 suggested would be totally ineffective in my house, many houses in Uttlesford are centuries old and sound-proofing was not a consideration for builders in those days, some of my walls are only a few inches thick. I use my chimneys for heating so mechanical ventilation is not an option. In any case, I don't think being encased in some sort of air conditioning unit is a good way to live. I used to enjoy the silence and the peace of the countryside, especially at night - the odd owl was a delight.

One of the consequences the expanding airport has had on Ashdon is the increased traffic. Airport employees are using the village as a rat-run to work and our protected lanes and narrow roads are suffering. The verges are becoming worn away and the traffic goes so fast that walking along the roads has become very dangerous.

I looked at the things that the proposed S106 would deliver for the community and would like to understand what a Local Bus Network Development Fund might mean. My village is rurally isolated with no bus or public transport after 3pm, so no way to return to the village after work and no opportunities to participate in evening events outside Ashdon. Is the Local Bus Network Development Fund going to supply money to supplement the local village bus service? If so, the Essex County Council Passenger Transport department have not been notified of this scheme. Or does it just mean that the buses and coaches serving the airport will be subsidised. I think this needs clarification.

To be honest there is no "sweetner" or "legal bung" that could adequately ameliorate the destruction of our quiet landscape. The motive behind expanding the passenger numbers is merely pandering to the commercial greed of Manchester Airport Group. The issues arising from the extreme climate conditions that we now find ourselves trying to address and reverse are of no consequence to them. To them

the bottom line is money. In my book people and the environment are more important.

In addition, since the Local Plan has recently been found un-sound and the Plan was closely bound up with employment figures at the airport and thus housing numbers, it might be prudent to ask for the whole Application to be decided nationally rather than locally or wait to hear the outcome of SSE's legal challenge that was heard in November of last year.

Chair of Broxton Parish Council _ UDC Councillor [R4U Takeley]

I've lived in Broxton for 26 years +
From before Ryanair existed and Stansted
started to find a use.
We know what it's like to live with the airport.

Additionally, the near constant fear of losing
our neighbourhood under airport expansion
plans, has been a terrible thing.

The now almost forgotten 4 runway proposal
was nightmare for us all.

It was claimed at the time that 4 runways were
essential

'No was not an option' they said.

Thanks largely to SSE, that blight on the area
has been seen off. I hope for ever.

Thank you SSE and others! Thank you.

Now here we are again facing more adverse
impacts from Stansted plans to expand.

More unrealistic promises.

More unrealistic projections.

The currently permitted maximum passenger
numbers are, thankfully, nowhere near being
met _ passenger numbers are falling.

So Why Are They Wanting More?

I think we've just had enough.

No more now thanks.

Stansted airport is a difficult neighbour.
We have to live with the side effects of their
business.

The noise.

The stink of aviation fuel.

Litter in our lanes and villages thrown by people
trying to dodge the excessive drop off charges

_ those high charges do not filter to us.

Fly parking due to high airport charges.

Heavy traffic unsuited to our rural lanes and
village streets.

The night flight disturbance particularly is
massive.

We're rural.

When there's no plane, it's almost silent.

The noise of planes shatters the natural quiet.

Of course, we notice them.

We are disturbed by them. Nightly.

A key part of this planning process hinges on
Material Alterations from Nov 2018 to now.

CONSIDERATIONS

SSE and others will describe in detail many
issues, but just think how the world has altered
since then.

Climate change simply did not feature so highly
then in the global conscience.

We should act on the views of around 97% of climate scientists: Climate Change is THE key issue of our time.

We should be working to secure the future for the next generations.
That's only right and fair.

I say, this whole Application does not stack up.

It states Ryanair will be using 737 Max planes during the time period covered in this Application.

That cannot happen as predicted due to the growing troubles with that aircraft.

With such a major and pivotal aspect of the figures used in the Application now being wrong, that has to be seen as a significant Material Alteration?

CONSIDERATIONS

The data should up-dated on the correct factual basis.

Ryanair is listed in the top 6 polluters in Europe. The other 5 are coal fired power stations. Expanding would be unsustainable.

Reducing flights should be our task.

I can't support expansion of Stansted.

It cannot be justified.

There are too many yet to be resolved issues to support Approval of this application.

Confirming approval would be ignoring local majority opinion and the available evidence and further damage the environment.

I beg the Planning Committee to REFUSE this application outright.
REFUSE.

Let's do this for our residents

Please get it right this time.

In anticipation _ Thank you.

My name is Patricia Barber. I am speaking as a member of Takeley Parish Council.

As a parish close to Stansted Airport – indeed part of it is in our parish – there are matters under consideration by the UDC Planning Committee regarding the 2018 Planning Application from Manchester Airport Group (MAG) which are of particular importance and relevance to this parish and about which there have been material changes in circumstances since the UDC meeting of November 2018. These are as follows:-

Noise

The World Health Organisation (WHO) Report 'Guidelines on Environmental Noise' which was published in October 2018 found that aircraft noise has an adverse impact at a much lower level than was previously thought. There is no evidence that the Officers took this into consideration – it is not mentioned in their report to the Planning Committee in November 2018. A paper published in the British Medical Journal in June 2019 by Professor Jangu Banatvala, Professor Thomas Muenzel and Martin Peachey 'The harms to health caused by aviation noise require urgent action' adds further weight to the evidence of the damaging effect aircraft noise has on health. Therefore any increase in capacity which increases the noise from Stansted Airport will adversely affect this village.

Air Quality

The air quality around the airport is obviously of great importance to Takeley. New research published in the British Medical Journal in November 2019 confirms that emissions of fine carbon particulates (PM2.5) have a more adverse effect on health than has previously been known. PM2.5 is produced from fuel combustion and transport sources particularly relating to airport operation. This is very worrying for Takeley as these particles will be carried on the prevailing wind the short distance between the airport and the village from taxiing aircraft and from aircraft landing or taking off. PM2.5 is known to effect respiratory and cardiovascular function and there is evidence now that it has other health impacts, for example on areas such as septicaemia and skin infections.

The Boeing 737 Max is currently grounded following the tragic loss of two of these planes. Production and deliveries have been halted to all customers and there is no sign that it will be operational again in the foreseeable future. This will affect both noise and air quality at Stansted Airport as it was projected in the statistics given

by MAG for the 2018 Planning Application that by 2028 the largest number of aircraft used Ryanair, by far the biggest operator at Stansted, would be the 737 Max. This aircraft is said to be much cleaner and quieter than the aircraft currently being used by Ryanair and was used by MAG when giving noise and pollution measurements for 2028. The figures given by MAG for noise and air quality will therefore need to be updated.

Climate Change

It has become very apparent in 2019 that Climate Change is probably the matter of most importance to the world. Data released by the United Nations on Wednesday of this week shows that the last decade was the hottest on record. The Committee on Climate Change said in September 2019 that aviation is likely to be the largest emitting sector by 2050 even with strong progress on technology and limiting demand. To try to meet its contribution to net zero by 2050 the level of operation should be no more than 25% above current levels, which for Stansted at 28 million passengers per annum (mppa) now would be 35 mppa. This happens to be its current cap. Therefore this should be the limit of Stansted Airport expansion.

Adequacy of the Section 106 Agreement

The Adequacy of the S106 Agreement document, paragraph 25, relating to transport measures says 'The applicant is also prepared to agree to a clarification that, where eligible for funding support, highway improvements within a five mile radius of the airport means within 5 miles of the boundary of the airport.' It is interesting to see in the minutes from the UDC Planning Workshop in October 2019 that MAG's initial assessment was that there would be no significant impact on the local road network. We beg to differ. Apart from the A120 and M11 the roads within a 5 mile radius of the airport are B roads or unclassified country lanes. As such we cannot see what is meant by improvements or how any improvements can be made to these roads which are often narrow and winding. Takeley already experiences large volumes of traffic at peak times - these roads and lanes are used to access the airport by workers and passengers. An increase in passengers will inevitably increase the traffic on these roads.

In view of the above Takeley Parish Council asks the Planning Committee not to give authorization to the Manchester Airport Group's planning application.

Patricia Barber 17.01.2020

**Uttlesford Planning Committee meeting 17 January 2020 regarding application
UTT/18/0460/FUL
Statement by Ken McDonald, 2 Greenfields, Stansted Mountfitchet, CM24 8AH.**

Good morning. My name is Ken McDonald.

For many years, I have been a member of Stop Stansted Expansion's executive committee and honorary secretary of The Hundred Parishes Society. I declare those roles merely to illustrate that I have a long-term and deep interest and love for this area. But I am speaking today in my personal capacity.

I believe Uttlesford District Council is out of its depth in seeking to process this planning application which undoubtedly affects matters of wider, indeed national and international significance.

Uttlesford is just one of some 300 district councils in England, and one of the smallest, with limited resources. Any attempt to properly consider such a significant planning application and to properly assess the adequacy of "mitigation" has to be viewed as challenging.

I know that many members of the Planning Committee are newly appointed, making them even less prepared for taking a decision of such consequence.

It takes courage to admit being out of one's depth. Uttlesford's administration and its officers have a track record of not admitting it. That is why we are all here today – the Council could have passed responsibility for this decision long ago to the national Government.

Key decisions are about to be taken at national level: in particular, a new Aviation Policy and judgement on Stop Stansted Expansion's legal application for the Government to take responsibility for determining this application. I can understand the airport's wish to get approval from a "soft touch" local authority, but why should you be rushed? There is no urgency. The current permission gives lots of headroom and passenger numbers are in decline.

I note that the airport has recently announced a tempting sweetener, but this is peanuts compared with the real cost to our quality of life through so many extra cars on our rural roads and so many extra passengers on our already overcrowded trains. Is our health, our way of life, even our soul, really up for sale?

Many of you were elected last year when the electorate dramatically demonstrated its dissatisfaction with the previous administration. The Conservatives were thrown out because they failed to listen to the community. Many voters wanted a less cosy relationship with the airport, and for a Council whose members did not simply toe a party line. I hope you will live up to our hope - for councillors with independent thought and for a Council that focuses on the needs and wishes of its residents. I sincerely hope none of you will stay silent through the debate and simply vote the way you have been told to.

Does this Committee really feel it is competent to take this decision and, in particular, to second-guess the High Court and the Government? If so, I hope you will conclude that too many material factors have arisen in the last year for you to overlook them. I hope you will conclude that the balance between need and harm no longer justifies approval.

If you feel you may be competent, but not yet, you do have an option to defer a decision until the High Court and Aviation Policy matters have been resolved.

And if you don't feel competent - if you do feel that Uttlesford is out of its depth . . .

Even now, at this late stage, you could voluntarily pass the baton to the Secretary of State. He has far greater resources at his disposal and will have to make the decision against the background of wider policy issues and competing demands from other airports.

District Councillors, I'm Ray Woodcock a resident of Stansted Mountfitchet, I'm involved in many local issues one being, I'm a co-opted member of SMPC Airport group, we oppose expansion.

Since August 2019 I've spoken to over 1500 people on their doorsteps about this expansion plan, by far the majority oppose expansion.

The local election of May 2019 resulted in many District Councillors losing their seats because they did not represent their constituents during the Nov. 2018 Planning Committee meeting. I sat close to one Planning Committee member during the application meetings. That Councillor voted to approve the application then turned to the adjacent colleague who also voted for it, then said to him, "Now my constituents are going to give me a very difficult time", they both lost their seats in the May election.

This planning application asks for an additional 8 million passengers a year to 43 million compared to the current planning limit of 35 million, it would also allow 47,000 more flights every year, **its clearly expansion.**

These additional flights together with more surface transport arriving and leaving the airport will increase air pollution in its vicinity and surrounding highways. There are many professional reports which confirm that people's health suffers from polluted air and showing that premature deaths are caused by it – especially PM2.5 ultra-fine carbon particles – which are very harmful to health **and there are no safe limits.** I'm sure others will tell us more.

You need to know how many air pollution monitoring sensors are positioned around the airport and the nearby highways, ask MAG. I see that no monitoring of air pollution is required by the proposed planning conditions and no monitoring of PM2.5 is even required in the proposed Section 106 Agreement. The only monitoring of air pollution required by the Section 106 is in Hatfield Forest and Eastend Wood – and PM2.5 is not included in that. **This is completely unacceptable. People must be protected as well as trees.**

UDC promotes Health & Wellbeing, is that compatible with the damage that air pollution does to our health? Approval of this application will also exacerbate the difficulties our already over stretched NHS has. This cannot be your intention but it will be the result if airport expansion is approved.

You should not feel that you are being pressurised to approve this planning application, **please do what the majority of your constituents ask and reject it. The mandate the electorate gave you is to oppose expansion.**

Ray Woodcock

On Friday 24th Jan. you could make history, do not approve this unnecessary expansion plan. This decision will prevent millions of tons of carbon being dumped into our atmosphere. Defy all who are encouraging you to approve this application, reject it, it will save lots in the future and show others to follow your lead.

STANSTED AIRPORT PLANNING APPLICATION

GREAT DUNMOW TOWN COUNCIL REPRESENTED BY CLLR TERRY MOORE – 17TH DECEMBER 2020

I am Terry Moore, representing Great Dunmow Town Council.

The Town Council strongly objects to the proposal and asks you to listen to your community.

This committee will view look at this application in the context of today's ever-growing concerns about the impacts on our environment. In the past, it could be said that we didn't know enough, or care enough about air pollution and climate change. The Town Council's opinion is that circumstances have changed and see great merit in the arguments presented, not least by that within SSE's vast library of thorough research. *today and next week.*

You have been asked to consider

- new material considerations and changes in circumstances since 14th November 2018 *and*
- the adequacy of the s106 to mitigate the harm to our community

so, My focus today is on *a closer analysis of* aircraft noise and traffic congestion: *From today's position.*

- The proposed new taxi-ways, etc will *enable this* bring new capacity *to the airport.*
- and f* From today's position, it is estimated that there will be noise from an extra 130 extra flights daily which must be evaluated in line with our knowledge that the promised Boeing 737 max planes cannot now be delivered in the timescales stated in ~~Stansted Airport's calculations.~~ *this application.*

- Again, from today's position, this ~~could~~ bring an extra 51,000 passengers per day. Half of these are expected to arrive by road. A very comprehensive s106 package would be needed to accommodate such growth.

In the knowledge that the district is relying on Great Dunmow to provide high levels of housing growth over the coming years, noise impacts will be an increasing consideration in future planning applications. ^{naturally enough}

By way of example:

- 1) A planning appeal judgement in June 2019 shows that it isn't always possible to build new housing close to an airport at current noise levels, let alone with this proposed expansion. I refer to an appeal dismissed for a housing development in Burton End. The Inspector concluded that **'the proposal would not provide acceptable living conditions for future occupants, with regard to noise and disturbance from aircraft...'**
- 2) Your own Environmental Health Officer's report dated 17th December 2019, for a small housing development at Dunmow Farm, The Broadway, Gt Dunmow, recommended that noise mitigation **conditions be imposed for the dominant noise source, from aircraft using Stansted Airport. It states that 'windows would need to be kept closed at night to protect from aircraft noise' and it suggests a mechanical ventilation system 'however we would not expect windows to be fixed shut in this situation'.**

Lastly, considering congestion, a
Cumulative local plan road congestion ~~is~~ ^{is} fundamental for s106 mitigation. An example of where this been overlooked is on the A120/B1256 Gt Dunmow exit. In November 2019, Highways England specified costly works to be carried out to enable a local plan allocation of 440 homes in Gt Dunmow.

The reason given was **'the agreed transport assessment shows A120/B1256 junction to be over capacity with the ^{proposed housing} development and there is a real danger that a queue could form back on to the main line of the A120.'**

To conclude, GDTC urges the planning committee to reject this application in line with these arguments.

Thank you,

A. Dodds

STANSTED PLANNING APPLICATION LITTLE EASTON PARISH COUNCIL REPRESENTATION

The May 2019 Local election results were a triumph for local democracy. Across the district, residents voted for a change in direction and local policy which swept aside the previous administration and gave the Residents for Uttlesford party the opportunity to deliver on their manifesto promises of truly representing residents.

This administration was elected largely on the key local issues of the Local Plan and Stansted Airport. Following the Planning Inspectors letter this week, we all now know where the Local Plan stands and we are now addressing the second key local issue on which this council was elected – Stansted Airport.

Your planning officers are recommending that permission be granted. This comes as no surprise given the track record of planning officers at UDC. This week's damning report from the planning inspectors on the ill-conceived and unsound local plan must make very uncomfortable reading for them.

In respect of the Stansted Airport application, Officers appear desperate to rush through approval before publication of the government aviation white paper setting out long term policy on carbon emissions, noise and health impacts. One has to ask the question as to why this is – Pushing forward a blinkered strategy at any cost didn't work for the local plan and it shouldn't work for this application.

I'm sure that officers have raised the spectre of future legal action from the airport should their request not be granted. This is at best scaremongering and at worst bullying. Fear of future legal action from the airport is not a reason for granting permission to an application which has such major negative impacts on the health and well-being of the local community.

It is worth reminding you that the officers work for you and effectively us – not the other way round. We elected you to represent us – We ask that you now do so.

At the EGM in June 2019 the council passed a resolution committing you to examining any new material considerations to which weight may now be given in striking the planning balance.

Many of you on this committee voted in favour of that resolution. Despite what your officers have said, there have been a number of new material considerations which have an impact on the planning balance and you will hear many of them today.

It really comes down to this:

- You know that the original decision was flawed and passed on party lines rather than what is in the best interests of the community – that's why you voted to pass the resolution to re-examine the proposal.

- You know that the health and environmental impacts of airport expansion will be damaging to the local community and that your prime objective should be to protect your community.
- You know that there will shortly be new government policy on aviation which is likely to further curb airport expansion.
- You know that there is widespread opposition to the proposals – It is one of the key reasons you were elected.
- You know that an increase in passenger numbers will result in an increase in flights – however the figures are massaged.
- We don't need to tell you the impact of airport expansion on carbon emissions – you know this.

You have declared a climate emergency within Uttlesford – We now expect you to back up these good words with actions. It would be a nonsense to declare a climate emergency and then sanction airport expansion which puts an additional million tonnes of CO₂ into the atmosphere by 2028.

The residents of Uttlesford have spoken loud and clear of their opposition to the airport proposals. We elected this administration because we were promised that things would be different – We now expect you to make good on that promise.

We now expect you to do what we elected you to do – To represent the views of the residents.

We expect you to refuse this planning application.

JB 1

Draft
may not all be
delivered in time

Stephen Bolter.

Gestingthorpe Resident, Parish Councillor, and Stansted Airport user once a year for a holiday return trip.

The P C instructed me to speak on behalf its behalf at its meeting last night (16 January). *Speaking on local matters*

Adverssi effect on the Climate and pollution taken as being covered elsewhere
Gestingthorpe is about 15 miles from the Stansted Runway, under the busiest flight path for arrivals.

In the 1980s Gestingthorpe was one of the most tranquil places in the Home Counties. It remained so until at, a stroke of a pen, aircraft routing was changed to make large number of aircraft follow a narrow path across the most populous part of the village. It still is tranquil in gaps in the queues of descending aircraft.

Most consideration of noise concentrats on the extreme take off noise in the area close to the airport, where noise sensitive people would not choose to live. Noise from landing aircraft is different in character and disturbing at greater distances from the airport. As in Gestingthorpe's case, a change of routing it can inflict it on people who chose to settle settled in a quiet area by a change of route.

Tranquillity and lack of background noise makes aircraft noise more disturbing, especially at night and early morning. People woken up in the early morning often fail to get back to sleep and become sleep deprived. The world health organisation considers 50 dBA dangerous to mental health. In 2006, 6000 people around the airport were exposed to over twice that sound level during a 16 hour per day. Expansion could make it more tha 10 000.

Now even lower

JB 2

Residents have suggested spreading the aircraft more evenly, but nothing has been done.

In recent years there have been heavier, noisier planes in the mix, including freighters and 4 engined planes with interference between engines producing a continuous thunderous rumble, which causes house floors and windows to vibrate. From Bulmer to Yeldham residents are woken up between 3am and 4 am by a particularly bad example.

Congestion at the Airport sometimes results in close stacking or sudden changes of route which require low altitude tight turns causing increased engine power and noise.

Noise is inevitable close to major airports, but Manchester Airports has failed to us the latest technology to adjust flight paths outside the close zone, to avoid unnecessary levels of disturbance, and minimise low level stacking. It has also failed insist that operations at night use low noise aircraft.

Increasing the number of passengers will increase the number of movements and the average weight of movements. This will result in more congestion, more stacking, more night flights and much more noise and disturbance,

Manchester Airport cannot claim need for additional Airport capacity. "London" airports already have the capacity for two return flights per year for the whole population of London and the Home Counties..

People are now more Climate Change aware, and are conscious that flying via a hub is more carbon intensive than flying direct. Stansted's airlines are desperately trying to fill aircraft by advertising cut price short breaks, at less than the price of a good restaurant meal in

9103

England, for those still unconcerned about the environment; - when what is needed is more flights abroad direct from regional airports,.

In summary.

There is no need for increased capacity in the London area.

If there is to be any explosion of aviation in the UK, it should be outside London and the greater south east of England

There is are already disturbing levels of sound and other pollution which Manchester Airport has not adequately addressed, and which would become worse with expansion.

Expansion would increase airport congestion, and overload local transport and other infrastructure

Unrestrained, Manchester Airports could make a fortune from Stansted at the expense of local people. It is able to devote huge resources to fighting a small district Council. This is matter of Regional and National importance, the decision on which should not be influenced by the financial exposure of Uttlesford District Council

Stephen J Bolton
17 Jun 2020



gordon robinson [REDACTED]

Planning committee

1 message

Butler, Janet <[REDACTED]>

17 January 2020 at 10:38

To: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

Janet Robinson – resident of High Easter. I am also a councillor for the parish of High Easter but today I am here in my own capacity and not as a representative of the counsel. I am strongly opposed the plan for the increased capacity at Stansted airport.

WHO guidelines are very specific in the recommended maximum levels of noise and emissions above which they state would have adverse affects on health, should the planned expansion gain approval the levels of noise and emissions suffered by local communities around Stansted Airport will greatly exceed the maximum recommended levels resulting in serious risks to the health and well being of those affected.

The planned increase in passenger numbers at Stansted airport would result in an additional 47000 flights.

The Boeing MAX aircraft was grounded in March 2019 following two fatal crashes, it has not returned to service and is unlikely to do so in the near future.

At the time of the grounding Boeing issued a statement saying that they had sufficient orders on their books to continue production until 2027. During the Dubai airshow in late 2019 Boeing received a number of new orders for the Boeing 737 MAX aircraft.

In the original planning application the Manchester airport group modelling of the noise and air quality impacts for the increased capacity assumed that Ryanair would replace a majority of their fleet with the MAX 8 aircraft which is significantly quieter and less pollutant than their current fleet of ageing aircraft.

To date Ryanair has not placed a single order for any new MAX 8 aircraft.

This month Boeing have had to stop production of the MAX aircraft, there is simply no space left to park any more new aircraft.

It is highly unlikely that Boeing will start production again for a number months after the Federal Air Worthiness authority approve the MAX aircraft for continued flight operations. This will further extend the time required to fulfil their current order book which at current estimations will not be achieved until at least 2029.

If Ryanair were to place an order to replace their current fleet of over 300 aircraft today it is unlikely that they would get delivery of the first MAX aircraft before 2030, ten years from now, so will continue their operations with noisy and heavily polluting aircraft for the next ten years.

The residents of the communities around Stansted are therefore condemned to suffering levels of noise and pollution at significantly higher than the maximum levels recommended by the World Health Organisation for at least the next ten years even at the current permitted 35 million passengers per annum. If the increase to 43 million passengers per annum is approved the adverse impact on local communities will increase significantly.

Handwritten scribbles or faint markings, possibly a signature or date, located in the upper right quadrant of the page.

David Russel Cohen

Members of the Planning Committee,

INVEST Essex would like to express its support for the application by London Stansted Airport to increase the planning cap.

As the publicly funded Inward Investment agency for the county of Essex, responsible for supporting the growth of the Essex economy through attraction of new businesses and business investment from elsewhere in the UK and overseas to the county, we support the application for the following four reasons:

Firstly , an opportunity for investment, expansion and continued growth

Since the acquisition of London Stansted Airport by Manchester Airports Group (MAG) in November 2013 , the new owners have increased annual passenger numbers from 17.7 million in that year to 28 million in 2018. The existing terminal has already been reconfigured internally to increase passenger throughput as well as to provide space allocated for lounges in order to attract full-service airlines. The airlines that have been introduced to London Stansted since April 2016 have accounted for 60% of passenger growth over the last two years and the airport estimates that since the purchase, 1,500 additional jobs have been created by employers at the airport.

The new management have worked hard to attract new airlines to London Stansted such as Jet2, SAS , Ural Air and British Airways, Air India and Emirates .Emirates added a second daily flight to Dubai less than a year after the first due to demand.

This offers significant connectivity for Essex with Africa, Asia, the Middle East or Australasia and can only enhance the county's offer to international investors.

A number of inward investors have located in the Stansted area predominantly to serve the European market. A much larger number of regional companies use the airport to attend European trade shows or for client visits. Stansted also sits centrally to the UK's Innovation Corridor , anchored at either end by London and Cambridge and providing connectivity for local knowledge-based companies in particular needing to travel to meet investors, customers or collaborators. A local

example is the internationally prestigious Chesterford Research Park , in which Uttlesford District Council's investment arm is a shareholder.

Secondly , an opportunity with Brexit.

The Government has indicated that after Brexit it wants the UK to remain in the European Common Aviation Area (an EU "open skies" agreement with some European non-member countries) or alternatively reach a separate "open skies" deal with the EU.

After Brexit , the UK will negotiate air routes (or "open skies" arrangements) bilaterally with third countries.

In our view, London Stansted needs to have the flexibility in capacity to respond quickly to capitalise on these new agreements for both passenger and cargo routes as the UK negotiates future agreements outside the EU.

Thirdly , an opportunity to provide capacity in the London area pending Heathrow's expansion.

Although Parliament voted in June 2018 to approve the Airports National Policy Statement which recommends the building of a third runway at London Heathrow , its owners BAA will still need to submit a planning application. ~~(expected during 2020),~~

Just before Christmas , Heathrow announced that , subject to planning permission ,they do not expect that the extra capacity will be available until 2028-29 at the earliest.

By increasing the planning cap, London Stansted has the opportunity **NOW** to attract additional airlines who are unable to access or expand at Heathrow. An example of this is Air India who launched a direct service to Amritsar from Stansted in October last year (there are no direct services there from Heathrow) and will be adding a service to Mumbai this February ~~(three airlines including Air India already serve Mumbai from Heathrow).~~

Finally , London Stansted Airport is an engine of growth within the Essex economy.

London Stansted Airport is the largest single-site employer in the whole of the East of England and generates approximately £1 billion annually to the UK's economy.

The airport takes its role as a good corporate citizen seriously and works hard to promote local supply chains and is working with others to increase the number of suppliers within a 50 mile radius from 44% to 50%. It organises an annual "Meet the Buyer" fair every November where buyers from the airport itself and its tenants encourage local suppliers to meet them personally and discuss their offerings.

Over 50% of passengers now use public transport (the highest of any UK airport) and the airport has supported initiatives to reduce the use of private cars.

Four million tourist visits to the UK from European residents are made annually via Stansted.

Stansted ranks second after London Heathrow in terms of the number of its passengers travelling on business.

A campus of Harlow College opened in September 2018 on land donated by the airport. Stansted Airport College is the only further education provision in Uttlesford District and the first FE college located at any UK airport , equipping students with the vocational skills required by airport employers.

Aside from existing accommodation at the airport itself which INVEST Essex promotes to its client base, further opportunities will occur at the proposed new Stansted Airport Business Park.

Taken together , this enhancement and the increase in the planning cap will provide a positive impact on the local economy.

We therefore urge you to approve the application

Presentation to Uttlesford District Council Planning Committee meeting 17 January 2020

My name is Sarah Cousins and I live in Brick End Broxted almost directly beneath the flight path. I oppose MAG's planning application and I am very disappointed with the officers' recommendation that the decision notice currently on hold should be approved.

It is now known that emissions of fine carbon particles from aircraft – known as PM_{2.5} – can have serious health impacts, harming myself and my family. I cannot believe that armed with this knowledge – and let's face it, it has recently been in every newspaper, on every news programme and all over social media – UDC officers would even contemplate recommending to the Planning Committee that the decision should be given the green light.

Knowing that this planning application would produce 13.6 tonnes of these particles a year – that's an extra 25% on top of today's levels – I can't understand how officers aren't instead recommending refusal of the planning application. These are MAG's own figures and whilst 13.6 tonnes may not sound a lot, these are tiny particles invisible to the naked eye. That means trillions of them – and they end up in our lungs. And this new evidence tells us that no levels are safe.

As I say, we live under the flight path less than two miles from the airport – and so we also suffer a lot of aircraft noise. There's currently about 500 flights a day, depending on the time of year. We know that would increase to about 600 flights a day even if this application was refused. But it would increase to about 750 flights a day if it was approved. It's all very well to promise people double glazing but you can't double glaze our garden and you can't live all summer indoors with the windows shut.

The new information from the World Health Organisation shows that noise levels damage human health at far lower levels than originally thought. Those of us who live locally are not in the least surprised by this new scientific information. I ask again, why, knowing this, are officers recommending that the airport be allowed to proceed with its scandalous plans?

Today I ask the members of the Planning Committee to please listen not only to your officers but also to your local community. So much has come to light since the previous Committee made its decision in 2018 so please also listen to those expert bodies such as the World Health Organisation and to those qualified people who have articles published in the British Medical Journal and consider the health of your local community and beyond.

Thank you for listening to me.

PRESENTATION TO PLANNING COMMITTEE: 17 JANUARY 2020

My name is Peter Sanders and I am the Chairman of SSE. I have lived in Uttlesford (Stansted Mountfitchet, Widdington, now Saffron Walden) since 1982.

SSE opposes the application and will make its main presentation on 24 January. This is my personal submission and my aim is to set out the context and to emphasise two of its most important aspects.

First, **climate change**. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimates that the way we are going now there will be a rise in world temperatures of 3-4⁰C. The results will be catastrophic. I need hardly spell them out, you are all familiar with them - melting ice floes and glaciers, rising sea levels, floods, raging fires, massive extinction of species, the destruction of tranquillity, threats to health, perhaps even a reversal of prevailing winds and currents. But, says the IPCC, this can be reduced to 1.5⁰C by 'rapid, far-reaching and unprecedented changes in all aspects of society'. Bold action from national and local governments and others is needed.

UDC has declared a climate emergency. It is committed to achieving net-zero carbon status by 2030. We welcome this. Before, in the 1990s, we had Local Agenda 21 (LA 21), later to be renamed as Sustainable Uttlesford - a partnership of the Council and the voluntary sector. I headed the voluntary sector and Roger Harborough the Council, and we worked together and with others to devise a programme of local action. Its rallying cry was 'Think global, act local'. Fine, as far as it went - though you wondered as you put vegetable waste on your compost heap and were deafened by a plane flying overhead. We need to act global as well.

That is why we welcome Uttlesford's declaration of a climate emergency. But words must be translated into action.

It might be said that at the age of 81 there is no need for me to worry. But I worry for my grandchildren, and even for my children. And I worry for our whole society. It is not exaggerating to say that the future of the human race is at risk. Uttlesford is right. This is a climate emergency, and I ask just one question: can you possibly say this is an emergency and at the same time approve an application that will give rise to a massive increase in carbon emissions?

Second, **creeping incrementalism**. Look at the history of all this - 1 mppa, 8, 15, 25, 35, now 43. And don't imagine this is the end of MAG's ambition. They are aiming, we know, at 50mppa, and if they are not stopped in their tracks they will no doubt argue for a second runway. A line must be drawn. We have been fighting this battle since the 1960s. First under the banner of NWEHPA (North West Essex and East Herts Preservation Association) and, since 2002, Stop Stansted Expansion. As Inspector Eyre said in 1984, the hard pressed people of this area deserve some finality.

Enough is enough, and I urge you to reject the application.

Peter Sanders

17 January 2020

Uttlesford District Council - 17 January 2020

Chris Hardy Speaking Notes

Introduction

Many thanks for the opportunity to talk to you all today. I am the Managing Director of National Express Coach, the UK's largest provider of scheduled express coach services and one of London Stansted's primary ground transport partners for over 10 years. We operate around 1,500 service journeys per day providing connections to and from hundreds of UK towns and cities and the airport. London Stansted is a key hub on our national network. We make up to 5500 passenger journeys to London from the airport each day.

National Express is fully supportive of London Stansted Airport's growth ambitions. London Stansted is an economic powerhouse, a critical export gateway and major source of employment for this area.

The continued growth and success of London Stansted is fundamentally important to National Express, but it also drives the growth and success of the wider region as well as meeting demand for air travel and global connectivity.

If international trade, investment, tourism and economic productivity are to grow in the UK we need to make full and efficient use of our airports. London Stansted Airport's growth is beneficial to businesses, consumers and residents within the East of England.

We have a bold vision for the Public Transport Interchange that provides state-of-the-art passenger facilities and supports future growth as the airport develops beyond 30 million passengers a year.

Our People

Across our operations at London Stansted we employ well over 300 front-line staff, including drivers, customer services, sales people, engineers, cleaners, builders, maintenance staff, controllers, managers and many more. A large majority of these are driving jobs. With our plans for growth including potential new routes and locations, we expect to see an uplift in employee numbers for both driving and customer service roles.

We offer real opportunities for local people to enter meaningful employment and we recognise the need to develop skilled and work-ready individuals to support our future recruitment needs and provide employment opportunities to local people. As part of our recruitment strategy, we hold recruitment days at the airport and participate in local job fairs.

We have partnerships with three local colleges, through which 23 work placements have been provided in the last year, and an agreement with the Stansted Academy to provide training and recruitment support with a focus on getting people back to work. All of this allows us to ensure we have a pipeline of talent to expand our operational team as the airport grows.

We provide numerous work experience placements and have provided subsequent employment for successful work experience students, as well as taking part in the airport's supported internships, which is fantastic in terms of developing and building the confidence of young people.

Community

We strongly encourage our employees to support their local community, through volunteering or fundraising for a charity. We have a local community ambassador to act as a catalyst for community engagement and support fundraising at each site. Our team at Stansted are raising money for Essex Air Ambulance Streets to Homes. Our staff can apply for a financial award from the National Express Foundation to bolster their charitable activity. So, in supporting the growth of London Stansted Airport, there is genuine benefit to the local community that reaches far beyond the airport itself.

The Environment

We recognise that a consideration around London Stansted's growth will be the effect on the local environment. Congestion and emissions will be some of the concerns expressed by local people in the surrounding area. London Stansted as I am sure most are aware has the highest proportion of public transport mode share of any major airport.

As highlighted in the airport's environmental statement within their application, coach services are a popular choice of travel to and from the airport. National Express 'A' services to London account for the greatest proportion of passenger trips by coach. We have a track record of increasing capacity to meet increased need and the coach station has been reconfigured in recent years to best handle peak demand.

Coach plays a key role in addressing the transport challenges associated with increased passenger growth at airports, including local congestion. Along with rail, we play a huge part in minimising the impact of traffic and emissions on the roads. Every one of our coaches takes up to a mile of traffic off the roads, and our state of the art vehicles are of the highest emission standard available. The National Express operation at London Stansted can underpin the airport's growth while minimising the local impact.

We believe it is to London Stansted's credit that it surrounds itself with high quality, dependable, responsible businesses like National Express that can help them enable sustainable growth.

To conclude, as a representative of National Express, and as a local resident myself, we fully support London Stansted Airport's ambitions to develop and grow responsibly and sustainably in a way that benefits the local community. Thank you very much.

From: **Mark Lucas** [REDACTED]
Subject: Stansted Airport Public Speaking Sessions
Date: 17 January 2020 at 00:49
To: stanstedairportplanningapplication@uttlesford.gov.uk



“Committee Members -

On behalf of the London- Stansted - Cambridge - Consortium (L.S.C.C. *for short*), I speak in support of the planning application by London Stansted Airport to increase its annual passenger cap.

This support is a majority view, based on consultation with the Board and assumes that the Airport is willing to meet the properly considered environmental and other relevant planning conditions applied by your council.

The Airport lies at the heart of the *UK's Innovation Corridor*, which links London and Cambridge and is home to over two million people and is the location of four million jobs.

The Consortium - (formed in 2013), brings together public and private organisations which have the shared aim of seeking economic growth, higher employment rates and providing places for people and business, whilst preserving the quality and character of the Corridor.

Uttlesford DC is a member of the LSCC, but has not sought to influence the contents of this submission

Stansted Airport and its owners the M.A.G. Group are key partners of the Consortium, because we have a common interest in the continued prosperity of North and East London and the Eastern Region as a whole.

The continued growth of the Airport and its improved connections to Europe and the rest of the World are critical to achieving the collective ambition of the LSCC - for the U.K's Innovation Corridor to become one of the top five Global knowledge regions by 2036.

Therefore, in the opinion of the Consortium, it is important that the airport has headroom to be able to grow its passenger **throughput beyond the current**

limit of 35 million passengers per annum, to best use of the single runway at 43 million p.p.a.

The LSCC urges the Airport to maintain, and ideally improve, the proportion of people accessing the airport using public transport - and to continue its support for investment in the **West Anglia Mainline, thereby increasing the proportion of people accessing the airport by rail.**

It is vital that the social and economic benefits associated with growth are balanced against any potential adverse environmental consequences. Of particular concern to local communities, of course; are issues relating to aircraft noise and air quality

impacts. The Consortium expects the District Council to examine the environmental impact assessment and ensure that any potential negative impact is properly mitigated.

The LSCC also looks to both parties to expedite discussions and negotiation of planning conditions and obligations, in a positive and constructive manner.

In this way, we can ensure that this vitally important economic asset can grow in an environmentally sustainable way to provide more jobs, better international connections and support economic growth in the region.

**Those conclude my remarks Chair.
Thank you all for listening."**

Mark A G Lucas

**For and behalf of The London-
Stansted-Cambridge-Consortium**

17th January 2020

Planning Application UTT/18/0406/FUL – Stansted Airport

Objection.

Thank you for allowing me to speak on behalf of Stebbing Parish Council.

I propose 4 reasons why you should refuse this application.

1. The confusion re the number of ait traffic movements.

The current number of flights relating to the 28million passengers in 2019 equated to 199,000 atms. At 35 million passengers this rises to 227,000 atms. This means we will still have an additional 28,000 more flights over Uttlesford even if you refuse this application. If you now approve the application to 43mppa the number of flights rises by another 47,000 flights over Uttlesford, and compared to today another 41,000 passengers a day using road transport to access and depart the airport. I know, because I was there, that the discussion in November regarding the implication of this was not fully understood by many, including the person who gave the casting vote to allow the application. This is a Material Consideration.

2. Health Impacts.

In October 2018 the World Health Organisation set much lower thresholds to avoid adverse health impacts of noise from aircraft. UDC officers initially wrote to MAG saying it must incorporate this evidence in its Environmental Impact Statement. To my knowledge this has not happened. Why not? The government is also dragging its feet in dealing with this crucial issue with the failure to publish the White Paper on aviation which was expected in October 2019. The WHO also published new findings re PM2.5 particles. Their research confirms the known associations between PM2.5 particles and respiratory and cardio-vascular diseases, Parkinson's Disease and Diabetes. PM2.5 particles can also cause skin problems, septicaemia and other infections. We feel that Uttlesford is playing a dangerous game with the health of its residents. The extra tonnes of PM2.5 from

75,000 flights will have severe health implications. This is a Material Consideration.

3. The Boeing 737 MAX Aircraft.

80% of all flights from Stansted are by Ryanair. When MAG submitted the current application, their modelling was predicated upon the use of the Boeing 737 Max, a quieter and 40% less polluting aircraft than its predecessor. This was assumed to be the case when the application was submitted. In the light of the grounding of the aircraft last year and the revelations in the press just last week, there must be a distinct possibility that this plane may never fly in its existing form. Confidence in safety is critical for aviation. For the 737 Max, this must be non-existent when even the people who built the plane say they wouldn't fly in it. This application was therefore granted on information that was inaccurate as noise levels and PM2.5 will both be excessively greater than both MAG and officers stated. This is a material consideration.

4. Climate Change

Air Travel is one of the greatest contributors to the acceleration of climate change. Either this Council is sincere in its published objectives to reduce carbon emissions or it is using fine words to appear to be doing what it thinks will make it sound good. WORDS ARE CHEAP; ACTIONS TAKE COURAGE. The desire of MAG to expand is unimportant compared with the climate catastrophe that we face. MAG does not need the additional expansion; it can already expand by 25% using its 35mppa granted permission. This is the limit that the Climate Change Commission recommends airports should be allowed to grow by.

For the sake of the health of Uttlesford and of that of the planet we urge you to refuse this application next Friday.

Aviation & Health

New Material Considerations

Professor Jangu Banatvala

Aviation & Health – New Material Considerations

- ❖ WHO Charter on Transport & Environmental Health (1999) requires the health of the community to be **put first** when considering transport projects
- ❖ UK is a signatory and the obligations apply to local government as well as central government
- ❖ UDC has an obligation to safeguard the health of the local community – so far as it is possible for UDC to do so

Aviation & Health – New Material Considerations

- ❖ The weight to be attached to the adverse health impacts of airport expansion are greater today than in November 2018
- ❖ New material health considerations in three main areas:
 1. Aircraft Noise
 2. Air Pollution - PM_{2.5}
 3. Climate Change

Aviation & Health – New Material Considerations

1. Aircraft Noise

- ❖ In October 2018, the WHO published new “Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European Region”.
- ❖ Evidence based recommendations – the most important of which is that the level of aircraft noise found to be harmful to human health is far lower than previously believed.
- ❖ The WHO has halved the decibel level of aircraft noise previously considered acceptable for the avoidance of adverse health impacts
- ❖ **Planning Committee did not have this information in November 2018**

Aviation & Health – New Material Considerations

2. Air Pollution – PM_{2.5}

- ❖ PM_{2.5} is fine/ultrafine particulate matter associated with emissions from transport and combustion sources.
- ❖ Ultrafines from aircraft take-off and landing can be detected up to 18 miles away (Heathrow & Seattle Study)
- ❖ Can't see them. They are roughly the size of influenza particles
- ❖ MAG says that Stansted Airport is currently responsible for annual emissions of 10.9 tons of PM_{2.5} – caused by airport-related road traffic as well as aircraft emissions
- ❖ This would increase by 25% if expansion approved, to 13.6 tons a year.

Aviation & Health – New Material Considerations

2. Air Pollution – PM_{2.5} (cont'd)

- ❖ New research published last year shows that there is no safe limit for PM_{2.5} even with levels of concentration below WHO air quality guideline limits
- ❖ We now know that PM_{2.5} is far more harmful than previously thought
- ❖ Inhaled and translocated to organs and tissues
- ❖ The new research confirms previously known associations between PM_{2.5} and respiratory and cardiovascular diseases and low birth weight
- ❖ Preliminary evidence linking PM_{2.5} to CNS diseases
- ❖ **Planning Committee did not have this information in November 2018**

Aviation & Health – New Material Considerations

3. Climate Change

- ❖ You don't need a Professor to tell you that in the past year, there has been growing evidence, and growing recognition, that we face a climate emergency
- ❖ Changing weather patterns will cause increased risk of disease including the transmission of newly emerging pathogen
- ❖ Increased temperatures will also facilitate the introduction and spread of vector borne infectious diseases in the UK, such as malaria and tick borne encephalitis
- ❖ Frequent heatwaves causing particular problems for the elderly and those with pre-existing conditions, e.g. cardiovascular and respiratory disease.
- ❖ Last summer's heatwave across Europe resulted in an estimated 70,000 deaths.
- ❖ **We are all far better informed now than in November 2018. We all know that we cannot continue with a “business as usual” approach to flying.**

Aviation & Health – New Material Considerations

Finally ...

- ❖ Individuals have a personal responsibility for their health
- ❖ We can do what we can for ourselves but have no control over external environmental impacts
- ❖ We therefore look to the local authority to safeguard the community they serve

~~S Hood~~ JA Devoti

Please may I use a few precious moments of my allocated time to congratulate this council for their election victory, I am sure everyone will agree that the Electorate must always be listened to.

Everyone knows that this application by Stansted Airport is premature because they still have not reached their present permitted capacity.

You have seen the governments own statements that the present capacity of the airport will not be reached until 2033.

We have all seen the dramatic change in awareness to global warming, from The Royal Family, film stars, pop groups, Top scientist and big Corporations, Sir David Attenborough has stated we must act now and stop the increase of pollution to our planet.

The general public are now recognising the grave concern for their carbon footprint that is contributing to climate change by the aviation industry.

These changes and shift in public opinion mean that this application to expand to 43 million passengers may never now be needed. This council can now justify its refusal of this application

Policy S 4 – Stansted Airport Boundary. This gives a de-facto monopoly on all car parking, the setting down of all vehicles including buses, taxi concessions, hotels, etc., and I believe that this monopoly is the driving force of this application as it can be seen that if you increase demand from the above you also increase the revenue from the airport operations!

If, and I mean if planning consent is to be given this monopoly will have to be reviewed.

This council has every right to review 106 agreements as great care must be taken into the cost of these huge developments

that the taxpayer will have to endure to provide the infrastructure for this application.

We all know that one of the failings of this country is providing the infrastructure years after we endure the problems and pain that we are creating today.

If the applicants are so sure of the need to expand Stansted Airport then they should be willing to provide all the necessary infrastructure before we suffer these intrusions into our daily lives.

I believe that Stansted Airport present proposed 106 agreement are grossly inadequate, in the scope of sound insulation, roads and rail which all must be revisited if this application is to be progressed, if at all!

I am sure everyone will agree that this council has to be bold, as nobody remembers the mediocre bland planning decisions.

But what is needed is the courage to say No! Tell the country No! Tell those people around the world who are suffering devastation from climate change that you have had the courage to say No!

No to more increasing pollution! No more damaging our environment! Even top scientist agree and are saying No! No saddling the taxpayer for the enjoyment and profits for rich Corporations!

I have held the office of Mayor, District and Town Councillor, and I know the workload that this Council and officers have to encounter with these huge applications.

In closing may I thank you on behalf of our community, but I implore you all to have the courage to say No!

2-3pm 17/1

SUPPORT OF STANSTED AIRPORT'S PLANNING APPLICATION – January 2020

I would like to offer you my own thoughts on the proposed expansion of London Stansted Airport. I grew up with my parents and brother in Bentfield Green, an area within Stansted village. I am now married with 2 sons and live on the ForestHall Park estate of Stansted so just across the motorway from the runway and the airport itself. Personally I think Stansted Mountfitchet is a lovely village to live in. It's growing rapidly as are many villages and towns in Uttlesford and the area. Not many places can boast a windmill, a replica motte and bailey castle with links to the Magna Carta as well as a thriving international airport!

At home we are rarely disturbed by aircraft noise and if we are it is usually by a helicopter flying over but that's about it.

I love to travel. Why wouldn't people want to see what's beyond their back garden?

My dad was heavily involved in travel for around 35 years or so. Up until his recent retirement he was a well-known figure at Stansted having played a big part in changes in the airport and has participated in many external committees. Having been lucky enough to fly overseas since the age of 6 months I am sure my love of travel and flying comes from him and the opportunities given to me.

If I'm not travelling with my family I do love to go away with a group of girlfriends. The destinations currently on offer from Stansted give a perfect chance to explore Europe without having to break the bank and, just as importantly, having to spend time travelling to airports further from home and fly from there.

In my view it is all about dreams. As a little girl myself I dreamt of being an air hostess – the image portrayed in the 1980's of the glamorous crew jetting off around the globe is one that continues to stick in my mind. Being at an airport has always given me a buzz – even now when travelling or even working.

I have two sons who have also caught the bug for travel. I'll always remember my youngest at about 2 years old (he's now 11) saying to me from his pushchair on his way to get his brother from school "I do that one day". When I asked him what he meant, he said "I fly aeroplanes and take people on holiday". That dream continues after a recent trip to the Aerozone where he was lucky enough to have a "behind the scenes" airside tour. He now wants to join the local, Stansted based, Air Cadets once old enough to do so. Who knows – perhaps he will start his dream job flying from Stansted in the future?

I started working at the airport back in 2014 after 20 years rushing about and commuting into London. It is so refreshing just being down the road from work. My current role at the Airport is as the Data Analyst within the Customer Relations team. Whilst some people obviously get in touch with an enquiry or a complaint, we do get those who take the time to send through their thanks or compliments. Refreshing in this often too negative world.

How can local people not think of the benefits of having a growing airport on their doorstep? East Anglia, Herts, Essex and the surrounding areas wouldn't, in my own opinion, be as thriving as they are without the opportunities and jobs that it provides. Surely the overall benefits of growth of the airport and the increase in small and large businesses around our area outweigh those issues greatly. Yes, there are many things that need to happen to make this become a reality but with the right backing and commitment I believe this can become reality.

It is certainly an exciting time for all and I do hope my own personal comments go a little way to help London Stansted Airport grow and move forward with the times.

Nicola Ward
20 Palmer Close, Stansted Mountfitchet, Essex, CM24 8FB
17 January 2020

Sam Johnson

UDC Planning Application.

Hi, my name is Sam. I'd like to talk to you about what Stansted Airport means to me and why I'm supporting the application for growth.

My love affair with the Airport started many years ago, one of my earliest memories is the weekly family outing. Every Sunday Dad used to take me, mum and my brother to watch the planes take off.

A man with a great work ethic, he worked at Inflight for 25 years, and now living in Little Hallingbury where he can still be found with his nose to the sky watching the Aircraft take off and land, explaining to my Nephews the differences between a 737 and 757 and that despite how they look in the sky, the tyres are actually bigger than the pair of them on each other's shoulders!

My parents divorced, but those visits as a family have always been one of my favourite memories. My Dad would talk about the Airport with such pride, 'It's such a great place to work Sam. Get in there girl, there's so many opportunities for the taking!'

Things got trickier when it was just the three of us. Mum sacrificed a lot to provide for us, and we became a handful.

I kept my head down and focused on my education, but my brother was not as fortunate. Never really one for studying he fell into the wrong crowd and left school at 16 with no qualifications. Quickly realising he had no options, he made the most difficult decision to join the Army, they promised a family that would further his education and whilst they did, and he has made some lifelong friends, he had to walk into a war zone to find his own opportunities because there was nothing here for him!!

I stayed on in education and started at University, my last year meant a year in Spain. Being unable to afford this I looked to the Airport. In 2005 I started as a Security Officer whilst I put a bit of money away to finish my studies, but as soon as I set foot in the Terminal, I found a family at Stansted. Not work colleagues but long-term friends. Needless to say, I never left!

The greatest thing about Stansted is the people! I can give you all the clichés, every day is different, the growth, the challenges etc... but it is absolutely the people that make it! Be that the people I have worked with, the people I have met or all those 'love actually moments'

I was lucky enough to have some great mentors, managers and friends that saw potential in me and pushed me to do more. They gave me the confidence to aim a bit higher and I've not only carved out a career at Stansted, but I have grown up there, truly shaping the woman I am today.

It's not the money that drives me, it's being able to provide for my family and give back to the community. I was so proud to be able to support my brother's wedding arrangements and secure my own home!

My greatest mentor at Stansted once said that nothing is as rewarding as watching someone you have helped succeed, and he was 100% right

I've been very lucky and been given so much support throughout my career by some great people and programmes.

15 years later a few more wrinkles, and a lot wiser, I've been fortunate enough to be able to offer the same opportunities to others. Internally and externally, supporting and coaching the future leaders of the Airport as well as take part in some amazing fundraising schemes.

Stansted has offered me stability, a career and friends. I honestly believe anyone would be successful given the support STN has offered. A whole new generation of successful men and

UDC Planning Application.

women will pass through our Airport and I am so looking forward to how we can shape the careers and lives of people in the area.

CDO3 ART.

Mike Taylor

Good Afternoon Madam chairman members of the planning committee and members of the public.

I should declare that I have an interest as a member of Stop Stansted expansion but I am primarily asking to speak as a district councillor for Thaxted and the Eastons but also as a GP who has worked in Uttlesford for 34 years, and looked after many patients during this time, some of whom I appreciate have employment at the Airport

I understand today that we are considering changes that have occurred since November 2018 which may affect the planning decisions made at that time, and the appropriateness of the section 106.

I only wish to consider factors which affect the health and wellbeing of our residents which may be adversely affected by an increased number of passengers using Stansted Airport.

As a practising doctor I am very used to using medical evidence to base decisions and I'm sure the committee will be very aware how important this is. As a relatively new counsellor I am interested in how such important evidence is used in decision-making outside the medical profession! I realise that some of the guidelines and papers that I will present, may have already been discussed, but I make no apology in so doing as I urge the committee to see the importance of the medical consequences of the proposed increase in activity at Stansted Airport.

I would first like to consider the impact of noise on our residents. Very important guidelines were issued by the world health authority in October 2018., in other words just before the decision which was made about airport

expansion to 43,000,000 passengers a year. This may therefore have been available to the committee at that time but like many pieces of information would not have filtered through to either the general public or medical profession, and certainly not into policy, (And I believe that this has not yet happened in this case into UK central government policy)

The guidelines looked at the impact on peoples health of both night flights and daytime flying and gathered evidence from worldwide studies which showed that there was an increase in ischaemic heart disease, Stroke, **HYPERTENSION** cognitive impairment and other medical conditions which was significantly powerful for the advice from the WHO that the noise levels for both daytime and night time flying should be significantly reduced. There does not appear to be data about the frequency of episodes of noise, one can only suppose that's the more episodes that there are, the more harm will be done.

Secondly I would like to review very recent data which has been gathered and published this year and in particular mention a study published in November 2019 and read by myself in the British medical journal, at that time. This is a powerful study which shows the medical affects of **short-term** high levels of particulates(in particular PM 2.5) and of nitrous oxide. The investigators looked at hospital admissions on days when high levels of these substances had been recorded (but these high levels were actually below the WHO air quality guidelines for the 24 hour average exposure to PM2.5) and they showed that there was a very wide increase in many conditions, unsurprisingly cardiovascular disease and respiratory disease but also conditions not previously studied such as Parkinson's disease diabetes and thromboembolism and particularly topically – sepsis, and many other conditions on days when high levels of pollutants had been recorded.

For these conditions, which have been rarely studied it was shown that for each 1 Microgram /cubic meter increase in short term PM 2.5s was associated with a staggering 2050 annual hospital admissions. For conditions with a known association, such as CVS stroke and respiratory disease the figure for increased annual hospital admissions was 3642 !

This is very interesting and important because most data which has previously been collected has looked at levels of pollutants over long periods of time (ie back ground levels) not peak concentrations.

Clearly this data and evidence is literally vital when considering the impact of an increased usage of Stansted Airport as it is impossible to see that an increased number of passengers will not generate more pollutants and also an increased need to service those passengers on the ground will also do likewise. We have proudly been told this morning that 50% of Stansted passengers use public transport. That suggests to me that half the increased number ie 4 million a year will use private transport, and I cannot see how that will not have a significant impact on local air quality.

There is also concern that peaks of pollutants namely particulates nox and volatile organic compounds may travel for considerable distances due to the weather condition known as inversion which caused the famous London smogs. We do not have data yet concerning these peak values around Stansted, but as we well know in medicine, lack of data does not mean that the condition does not exist

When Stansted airport was built it was in the countryside, now this is no longer the case and there are increasing

housing settlements within its proximity, and of course a garden community has been proposed within a few kilometres of it.

I can only mention the third factor, which I would wish to discuss and it is of course the elephant in the room, namely that of CO2 production and global warming. I have been told as a District councillor that the effect of the airport on global warming is beyond the scope of the councils involvement in planning, as we cannot mitigate against it. This seems to me to be quite shocking and is a clear reason why the proposed changes to the airport should be part of national policy and planning and not left to the poor district Council to try to cope with.

Thank you

Dr Margaret Beer – resident High Easter

*In the R4U Manifesto and Policies statement prior to the May 2019 election you state - “We believe it is possible to have a local government that is open, forward thinking and **works for residents.**”*

*You also state - “There are a lot of things to do and many **difficult decisions will need to be made, but we will always seek to put residents first.**”*

With respect to Stansted you state - “We commit to a fairer deal with Stansted Airport to balance employment with their responsibility to deal with dirty air, noise, road and rail congestion, and village fly-parking.’

Today you have heard many compelling reasons why you should not approve this planning application, at the very least unamended. You have been given reassurances that the threat of punitive consequences should you withhold or delay are groundless. The statutory procedure is for MAG to appeal to the Secretary of State. A worst case scenario is relatively small procedural costs. I am sure Uttlesford residents are more than prepared to run that risk.

The decimation of the Conservative Group last May was not a result of the electorate “fancying a change” but to have a council that represents their views.

The approval of the Stansted planning application flew in the face of compelling evidence not to, and bizarrely against the wishes of the vast majority of residents as represented by 47 town and parish councils, all councils that declared a view.

You were elected not to rubber stamp this erroneous decision but to rectify it particularly since the evidence against approval is even more compelling now than it was then.

You are making these decisions because of the promises you made to Uttlesford residents. If as individuals you were not prepared for the fight you should never have stood in the first place. What price democracy.

Following the approval in 2018 Cllr Lodge stated that the proposal is poor and does not serve the future of the district well and as a result our local environment, communities and transport will all be worse off. What has changed since then?

The Officers' recommendation is an uncritical rehash of the MAG planning statement with no attempt to challenge the many unsubstantiated and misleading claims. Why are the planners so wedded to passing this application? What was discussed at the 35 meetings they held with MAG? Have you asked? Can you shed some light?

~~MANA~~ NATS and Stansted have ridden roughshod over local residents for years implementing policies and plans that have adversely affected the health and wellbeing of real people with no attempt to mitigate the consequences of their actions. They have been nothing short of contemptuous refusing to MEANINGFULLY engage.

Stansted itself has put plans for the new arrivals terminal on hold. Reasons given are not only delays in the expansion approval but also economic and political uncertainty and fresh demands from airlines. This is not to mention the recent dip in passenger numbers. If Stansted can stop and pause in light of new developments surely UDC can do the same.

Uttlesford residents have put their trust in you - do not betray that trust.

PRESENTATION BY MICHAEL BELCHER
TO UDC PLANNING COMMITTEE RE UTT/18/0460/FUL
FRIDAY 17 JANUARY 2020

My name is Michael Belcher and I live in Burton End, Stansted just a field away from the airport.

This Committee has not been told the truth about Government policy or about the real purpose for the new taxiways and aircraft stands included in the planning application.

Members of the Committee should be aware that current policy absolutely does not provide any support whatsoever for building additional airfield infrastructure in order to increase capacity. The policy supports making best use of **existing runways** by lifting the constraints imposed through caps on numbers of flights and passengers. The officers' report does not make this crucial distinction clear, and instead they have imported their own ideas and interpretation of Government policy which is not the job of a local planning authority.

It cannot be true that the purpose of the new taxiways and aircraft stands is "to enable combined airfield operations of 274,000 aircraft movements" as stated. The reason this cannot be true is that the airport told the Public Inquiry in 2007 that no additional physical development was needed to handle 274,000 flights. These statements cannot both be true. It is unlikely that the airport lied at the Public Inquiry, therefore the only conclusion you can draw is that the airport is being economical with the truth in its current planning application. You should be asking questions about the real purpose of the new taxiways and aircraft stands, and when you get the answers please tell us the local residents.

It is also categorically not true as stated in the officers' report that the new taxiways and aircraft stands are already approved under existing permissions. You can check this for yourselves by comparing the airport layout plans in the 1998, 2001 and 2006 planning applications as I have done. Whilst comparing these plans and the related permissions you may be interested to discover that some key elements of airfield infrastructure have been built in the period

between 1999 and 2007 apparently without any detailed planning permission. Your planning officers are aware of this fact which was drawn to their attention last August. This is relevant in the context of the current application because access to the new Yankee aircraft stands applied for is from a section of Juliet taxiway for which no detailed planning permission has been identified.

I will conclude by simply urging members of the Committee to get at the truth by asking more questions about the proposals for new taxiways and aircraft stands, and when you get some answers please share them with us.

Thank you for the opportunity of speaking.

Stansted Airport Planning Meeting 17th Jan 2020

Edward Gildea – Green Party and St Mary's Church Eco team leader.

Yesterday David Attenborough warned that we can no longer delay taking urgent action to tackle global warming. 'The moment of crisis has come. We can no longer prevaricate.'

Governments have indeed been burying their heads in the sand, particularly those most wedded to conspicuous consumption and production of fossil fuels, and there is nothing more conspicuous than aviation.

So it's in that context that councilors must judge the new material considerations and assess the report of ~~their~~ Director of Public Services, Roger ~~Harborough~~.
you

He makes no reference to the climate catastrophe that we face. The Heads of Terms of the Section 106 Agreement make absolutely no reference to CO2 emissions, which put public health, our economy and all our futures at risk.
businesses

The Environmental Statement apparently 'demonstrated that there would be negligible impact from the proposals'. I guess Australia wasn't burning down, then, because surely you ~~couldn't~~ now brush aside the risks of continuing to pump increasing volumes of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere.
its economy in ruins
massive

By the way, ~~who actually funded the Environmental Statement?~~

That Statement also said that 'the sensitivity evidence does not suggest that there would be national consequences resulting from planning permission being issued.' No national consequences when Heathrow, Gatwick, Luton, City and even Southend airports are all madly rushing to increase their share of an aviation free-for-all?

I would like you to subject
I think the Environmental Statement (needs to be subjected) to rigorous analysis! *Following the funding and scrutinise the scientific research base.*

your officer's
of the framework
Mr Harborough's report says that the 'proposal is a sustainable form of development in line with National Planning Policy Framework 2019. But paragraph 8 clearly sets environmental objectives to 'minimise waste and pollution, mitigate climate change, and move to a low carbon economy.'

I fail to see how airport expansion is in line with that!

Airport expansion is clearly not in line with that.

He says that 'it is not open to a Local Authority to anticipate what national policy choices the government may or may not take.' But this council would be anticipating government policy whichever decision it made: anticipating a responsible policy if it refused the application or anticipating an irresponsible one if it allowed it.

The report says that you 'are not obliged' to embark on predictive judgments about the government's strategy of reaching net zero. But this means that you are perfectly free, and would be wise, to do so.

Besides which you would not be anticipating the government's Climate Change Committee recommendation that aviation emissions MUST be included in our strategy of reaching net zero by 2050. That is a very clear and material new consideration.

Our government is under massive pressure to set a good example by the time it hosts COP 26 in Glasgow in December, and it is surely inconceivable that they would not adopt their Climate Change committee recommendations.

There are many more material considerations to consider: the World Health Authority guidelines on noise and PM 2.5 particles; last year's IPCC report; the amendment to the Climate Change Act to reach net zero by 2050 and our own climate emergency resolution.

Meanwhile the Section 106 mitigations are laughable. Air quality is only to be measured in Hatfield Forest and Eastend wood, totally disregarding the effects on human health.

(There is no mention of how rail travel might make surface transport more sustainable, or how the car parks and proposed new coach and bus station might include electric vehicle charging points.)

Indeed the whole document has its head in the sand. (It is an ostrich.)

~~But~~ above all, within days the High Court will issue its judgment on the Stop Stansted Expansion case and the government will publish its Aviation White paper.

This council would look very foolish to grant permission now only to find that the law and history had headed in the opposite direction.

Thank you.

4 mins

*The jobs, economy & lifestyles
of the future will be green.
— There is no alternative
Start growing them now.*

Stansted Supporting Statement draft – Julien Sample

Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to speak in support for London Stansted airport's expansion plans. My name is Julien Sample and I am a member of the Executive team at Harlow College. Harlow College runs Stansted Airport College, which opened in September 2018, and the Stansted Airport Employment and Skills Academy.

Between the colleges and the Academy we work with over 7000 young people and adults a year, providing technical and academic education, apprenticeships and opportunities to progress into meaningful work or further study.

As the only Further Education organisation based in Uttlesford we can see the real benefit that the proposed increase in passenger numbers will have to securing career opportunities and prosperous futures for both young people and adults.

Essex County Council, the South East Local Enterprise Partnership and the UK Innovation Corridor all recognise the importance the airport plays to the local economy.

As such Harlow College formed a strategic partnership with the airport, working closely with them over the last six years in the planning, development and realisation of Stansted Airport College and supporting the Stansted Employment & Skills Academy. Throughout this period, we have seen first-hand how much the airport invests in local communities. The gift of land at the end of the runway to support the College development, provides our students with a clear line of sight to the workplace and as such they can see the breadth of opportunities provided for thousands of local people.

We are proud to work strategically with London Stansted Airport and firmly believe that through our unique partnership and the airport's generous support for Stansted Airport College, hundreds of young people and adults from across the district are now benefiting from the project. Much of the curriculum and associated future career pathways are in high value industries which are of strategic importance to both the UK and the Uttlesford economy, in disciplines such as Engineering and Aviation Operations.

Experience has also shown us that such strong and far reaching corporate social responsibility and support for education and training is not common amongst the business community. During my 17 year long career within the education sector, I have personally never seen a business that

is as proactive as London Stansted Airport in supporting people of all ages into education and employment.

We are equally grateful to Uttlesford District Council for the support it provided in making Stansted Airport College a reality and enabling young people **ACCESS TO** Uttlesford's first further education organisation. This public/private partnership is genuinely unique and making a difference to people's economic futures.

Through our community engagement regarding Stansted Airport College, we have noticed that much of the objection and hostility to the airport's growth plans, is not consistent or representative of the young people we engage with through both of our colleges. Many of these young people and their parents are positive, inquisitive and keen to learn more about the career prospects that a thriving and growing airport can offer.

Jessica from Saffron Walden an adult learner studying Performing Engineering Operations, says:

There are so many opportunities to progress with so many options to go down, supported by employers who inspire the next generation of aviation engineers. As a single mum, childcare is challenging, I live in Saffron Walden and my children go to school in Stansted, the college has offered me the chance to retrain in a field that I will be able to be employed in that is local, any further and my choice would have been different.

Adi from Great Dunmow studies Aviation Operations, he says

I wanted to come to the college to train for Cabin Crew. I love it here, the course really interests me, we spend time learning what could happen in and around the airport and how to deal with different problems. I am inspired daily. Stansted expansion will mean there will be more opportunities for local young people like me.

As you can see, our students genuinely want to live and work in this area. They can see that the careers available to them at Stansted Airport will allow them to access high value jobs and as such they can afford to remain living locally rather than moving out of the area.

We would therefore like to express our full support for Stansted Airport's plans and reinforce the positive impact this has on securing our student's futures.

Discall,

Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the committee, for allowing me to speak.

I will not delve into material changes, I will leave those to the experts.

I would however, like to speak on figures relevant to the s106 agreement.

Just to start off, on reviewing the update schedule January 2020. I see that contributions from the airport were requested/discussed for increase on five points, 4 of which were declined. The villages around the airport are suffering from the blight of 'Fly Parking'. There is a sum of £200,000 stated in the document, the only financial increase that I can see from the original s106. Where as I accept that the airport 'Monitor' fly parking, this is carried out by an automated system, which although taking details does not explain that the system is for statistics only and not an action line, the residents are therefore not impressed as no action is taken and feel let down and not willing to use the system again, considering it as a waste of time. I believe that the £200,000 is to be spread over a period of 10 years (I am happy to be corrected if I am wrong) but if I am right £20,000 pa will not go far thus costing UDC and the residents more money. This just so as MAG can increase their profits. I believe that the fly parking is being caused by the high cost of parking at the

airport, which is obviously to encourage people to arrive on public transport. Wrong, people may be arriving on public transport but they have left their vehicles in locations where it cost's them nothing and causes detriment to the character of Uttlesford and in most if not all cases inconvenience to the residents. In reverse of this MAG are reducing car park tariff's for people commuting from the airport station. Are they counting these vehicles in their figures when calculating their the emissions figures on vehicle movements arriving, around and exiting the airport? I would also like to now ask a question on the Sigs scheme which most or all of my Ward falls under, looking at the patterns supplied. I am happy to see Little Hallingbury has been included for it's Primary School, Healthcare Centre, St Giles Church and the Village Hall, with Great Hallingbury also having two buildings listed The school and church. There is no mention of the Village Hall which is practically on the flight path with the noise that I have experienced at Parish Council meetings being deafening at some moments.

With just those few points (there are many more, but as you are aware I have a limited speaking period), I would suggest that at the planning permission meeting on the 24th, should you be of a mind to approve, please defer this decision until the decision of SSE court proceedings have been annoced. However, should you be of a mind to refuse, please do.

Thank you all for listening to my comments.

ONE PERSON OVER 48 WEEKS (4 TIMES WEEKS) HOLIDAY
WILL MAKE UP TO 480 VEHICLE MOVEMENTS
HOW MANY PEOPLE DO THIS THROUGHOUT THE YEAR

CBI – Stansted speech of support (max 4 mins)

- Good afternoon. Thank you for inviting me to present today.
- My name is James Sloan and I am here on behalf of the Confederation of British Industry, representing businesses in the East of England region.
- The CBI speaks on behalf of 190,000 businesses of all sizes and sectors who together employ nearly 7 million people, about one third of private sector-employees.
- It is clear from our members in this region, and elsewhere, that the business community support the plans to allow increased passenger numbers for Stansted Airport.
- These plans are good for business in the region, and critical as Britain exits the European Union and looks globally for new trade opportunities.
- The airport is continuing to expand to destinations that will help support those opportunities, including Washington, Toronto, Dubai, and within the next few weeks, Mumbai too.
- The expansion plans will allow for this region to build upon its ties with the rest of the world and this in turn will enhance the attractiveness for businesses looking to invest in this part of the country.
- With the airport promising to invest £35 million over the coming years, these plans will only add to the attractiveness and encourage business investment in this region.
- Our members have welcomed the outreach opportunities that have arisen from initiatives led by the Airport, including the annual Meet the Buyers events, helping to generate £24 million for businesses in this area over the past nine years.
- In addition to this, the airport is a significant local employer offering a number of opportunities. With 12,000 people currently working at the airport, at present, the plans put forward would see the number of employment opportunities increase by another 5,000.
- The airport has a strong commitment to skilling up the workforce in this area, and it's welcomed that 5,000 school children take part in the Aerozone – encouraging young people to choose a career in the industry, alongside the work of Stansted Airport College with its partnership between industry and education.
- We are conscious of the environmental impact, but welcome the positive news that the Airport has had zero breaches in air quality.
- Alongside this a higher proportion of passengers arrive at the airport using public transport methods, compared to other airports.
- We make this representation today, on behalf of businesses in the East of England, and support the proposal to ensure this part of the country can continue to attract investment and talent to support to boost the economic opportunities for years to come.

The aviation industry is already taking steps to ensure the sector is net zero carbon by 2050 and a number of airlines are ~~today~~ developing alternative fuels & flying methods

Statement to Uttlesford Planning Committee re planning application UTT/18/0460/FUL by London Stansted Airport

My name is David Burch, I am Director of Policy for Essex Chambers of Commerce.

Essex Chambers are the leading business organisation in the county representing around a thousand businesses ranging from sole traders and small businesses through to national and multinational companies.

London Stansted are one of our major members and a Patron of the Chambers with whom we work on a regular basis. We also have other members who operate their businesses at the airport.

We spoke in favour of this application in November 2018 and nothing has happened since to change our mind. We remain fully supportive of this application as we believe that it will bring real benefits to the economy of not just Uttlesford but also Essex and the wider East of England and South East. The continued growth and success of London Stansted is important to the business of many of our members, not just in meeting demand for air travel and global connectivity but also as a major employer and export gateway.

The lifting of the passenger cap is all the more important given the aviation system in London and the South East is in need of additional runway capacity. If international trade, investment, tourism and economic productivity are to grow in the UK we need to make full and efficient use of our airports.

Stansted Airport's growth is beneficial to businesses and consumers within the East of England, providing a gateway to the world. This is especially important as the UK prepares to leave the EU and will be looking to develop new trade links around the world.

We have members in Essex Chambers of Commerce who currently have to travel to Heathrow or Gatwick to get flights to destinations outside Europe but with its' growing number of long haul links, and others planned for the future, Stansted is well placed to be a crucial part of making it easier for them to access overseas markets.

Although many people think of airports purely in terms of passengers air freight is equally important and plays a critical role in supporting the continued growth of the UK's world class industries. Ideally placed between London and Cambridge the airport is a major part of the UK's Innovation Corridor and will increasingly offer opportunities for businesses in the important scientific and creative sectors to access markets around the world.

The increasing range of 'just in time' express cargo services is appreciated by anyone ordering or sending a package via the internet, and airports like Stansted have a vital role to play in keeping trade and e-commerce moving.

The airport is already the largest single site employment base in the East of England with 12,000 people working there, half of whom live in Essex, and this application if approved would create 5,000 new on site jobs, double the airport's economic contribution to £2 billion a year and improve passenger choice and convenience.

The airport is also supporting the development of appropriate skills in young people through its' aviation college in partnership with Harlow College which demonstrates their commitment to supporting the local community and helping develop the jobs of the future.

It is crucial that London Stansted is allowed to continue to grow in a sustainable way in order to allow people, goods and services to enter and exit the country safely and efficiently.

I understand that the committee is again being recommend to approve this application by your planning officers. In their report they state that there are no material considerations that would justify a different decision to that of the Planning Committee in November 2018.

The Airport is prepared to invest £35 million over the next eight years for the benefit of local residents and businesses. We don't believe that this is something that should be lightly rejected given that Government funding will not automatically be there to deliver the measures proposed by the airport.

As we said in November 2018 we see no reason to reject this application and would urge you to accept your officer's recommendation and give approval to Stansted's application at your meeting on the 24th January.



Stansted Airport Planning Application

My name is Andrew Bramidge and I work for Harlow Council where I am the Head of Environment and Planning. From 2013 – 19, I have been the Council's Project Director for the Harlow Enterprise Zone. I am speaking here on behalf of the Board of the Enterprise Zone, which is a business led organisation, but also comprises a wide range of representatives from both the public and private sectors in the Harlow area. Its purpose is to promote and oversee the development of the Enterprise Zone as well as wider economic development activities in Harlow. The Board would wish to express its support for the planning application submitted by Stansted Airport to increase its cap on passenger numbers to 43 million per annum.

The Harlow Enterprise Zone comprises more than 70 acres of new development focussed on the Life Sciences, ICT and a range of other high technology activities across two main sites – Kao Park and the new Harlow Science Park. Kao Park is already home to some major multi-national businesses with Raytheon, Arrow Electronics and Pearson all based there. Together they are employing more than 1,100 people on the site, which has space for future expansion. Also, one of the largest data centre developments in the south east of England is now underway there with the first building completed in 2018 and another quarter of a million square feet of space to be built in the next few years following a major investment last year from Legal and General.

Construction work also started in 2018 on the first buildings at the Harlow Science Park with more work commencing next month. Over the next 5 – 10 years around 650,000 square feet of space will be developed, providing an additional 2,500 jobs across a 27 acre site. This is a critical part of Harlow's growth story which also sees Public Health England re-locating its Headquarters and National Science Hub facility to Harlow from 2022, building up to 3,000 jobs by 2024. All this is supported by the Harlow and Gilston Garden Town development, which is forecast to deliver an additional 16,000 homes by 2033 and more beyond the current Local Plan period.

The growth in employment opportunities at the airport will be important for the delivery of this growth of Harlow. Whilst the town is doing a significant amount, as evidenced above, to increase its employment provision, the broader range of jobs available at the airport will enable the wider delivery of growth plans.

We believe that the continued growth and success of Stansted Airport is important to support this economic and housing growth. The Board of the Enterprise Zone has resolved that it is supportive of the growth of the airport and sees it as an important piece of infrastructure that will support the economic growth of the area – in this regard we support the raising of the passenger cap.

The expansion of the airport will enable a wider range of carriers and more long haul flights, both of which are important to business growth in the region. The presence of a truly global airport, with significant capacity, will enable more international companies to locate in the region creating wealth and jobs. This potential is a significant factor in the marketing and promotion of the Harlow Science Park in particular. I have personally spoken to several companies interested in locating in this area who have said that their primary motivation in choosing our location is its proximity to Stansted Airport. The ability of the airport to offer greater capacity can only serve to increase this. The development of a Health and Life Sciences cluster just a few miles down the road at Harlow, spurred by the re-location of Public Health England, the development of a new hospital and the Enterprise Zone, provides a very significant opportunity that can be capitalised upon by Stansted Airport being used to its capability.

I have also spoken with an international consortium of investors who are interested in the long term potential of this region for infrastructure, housing and business investment. We firmly believe that the continued growth of the airport will be a very significant factor in our ability to attract more international businesses and investment to this region.

The wider London Stansted Cambridge Corridor, in which both Harlow and Stansted lie at the centre, is one of the fastest growing regions in the UK. It has higher productivity, population and employment growth than other parts of the country and in 2018 the Corridor's Growth Commission identified an ambition to become one of the top five global knowledge economy regions within the next 20 years. The continued growth of the airport into the long term will be an important factor in helping to realise this vision and the investment that will come with it. It is important that longer term certainty is created through this planning application which will in turn help us to attract the types of businesses to this region that will spur economic growth.

In conclusion, we fully support the planning application as a key enabler of long lasting economic growth in the region.

Andrew Bramidge
Project Director
Harlow Enterprise Zone

My name is David Aldridge. I have been an Uttlesford resident for 45 years.

In considering your decision, so crucial for us residents of Uttlesford, **please don't feel intimidated by the risk of MAG lodging an appeal or suing the council if you don't grant approval or don't decide next week.**

Section 68 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires this type of planning application to be determined within sixteen weeks. **However...**

MAG submitted this application on 22 February 2018. The statutory sixteen weeks **expired 17 months ago**, on 14 June 2018, **since when** MAG has been **entitled to appeal** to the Secretary of State, for non-determination. Ask yourselves: **why** has MAG **not** done so already? **What** is the **real risk** of MAG doing so **now**, if you don't determine it next week?

I understand that SSE has been arguing for 2½ years that this application should be determined by the Secretary of State, as a matter of national interest. It seems **MAG would actually be doing SSE a favour by lodging an appeal** on the grounds of non-determination within the prescribed time limits.

Such an appeal would **not** (as has been suggested) lead to UDC (or members) being sued. The Secretary of State would simply set up a Public Inquiry, chaired by a Planning Inspector, to examine the application, hear evidence, and recommend one way or the other.

It would be **exactly the same** process as if UDC refused planning permission and MAG appealed. **This is what happened in 2006**, following UDC's refusal of the **last** major Stansted Airport planning application, when BAA wanted the planning cap raised to 35mppa.

BAA appealed against UDC's refusal in November '06. The Secretary of State set up a Public Inquiry, which ran from May to October '07. The Inspector produced his report in January '08 and the Secretary of State finally granted permission in October '08.

Even that wasn't the end. SSE brought judicial review proceedings in the High Court and then took the case to the Appeal Court, who finally ruled on 18 June **2009** - more than **2½ years** after BAA had lodged its appeal.

So, if MAG wants to go down the same route and appeal to the Secretary of State, MAG will need to be **extremely patient** - it's a **very long route** and the **outcome is unpredictable**.

There is a **myth** that MAG could **sue UDC for millions** if there is **further delay** in the decision or approval is refused. The **reality?** There is **no basis whatsoever in law** for MAG to sue UDC (or members). **You are all doing your job.** The procedure would be as I've just described - the public inquiry.

In the 2006 BAA case, planning permission was eventually granted by the Secretary of State and **costs were awarded against UDC.** And **what was the amount of money that UDC had to pay BAA in costs?** We know the answer. **It's on the SSE website and it's a response provided by Uttlesford planning officers to a Freedom of Information request.** The **total paid to BAA by UDC** to settle the costs award was **£100,000** of which £11,000 was recovered from Herts County Council.

So the **net amount was just £89,000** - not "millions". That is the **factual position**, so can we **put an end to all the scaremongering?** Please refuse, but **don't be afraid to delay your decision if you need more evidence that the environmental impacts are unacceptable.**

District Councillors, I'm Ray Woodcock a resident of Stansted Mountfitchet, I'm involved in many local issues one being, I'm a co-opted member of SMPC Airport group, we oppose expansion.

Since August 2019 I've spoken to over 1500 people on their doorsteps about this expansion plan, by far the majority oppose expansion.

The local election of May 2019 resulted in many District Councillors losing their seats because they did not represent their constituents during the Nov. 2018 Planning Committee meeting. I sat close to one Planning Committee member during the application meetings. That Councillor voted to approve the application then turned to the adjacent colleague who also voted for it, then said to him, "Now my constituents are going to give me a very difficult time", they both lost their seats in the May election.

This planning application asks for an additional 8 million passengers a year to 43 million compared to the current planning limit of 35 million, it would also allow 47,000 more flights every year, **its clearly expansion.**

These additional flights together with more surface transport arriving and leaving the airport will increase air pollution in its vicinity and surrounding highways. There are many professional reports which confirm that people's health suffers from polluted air and showing that premature deaths are caused by it – especially PM2.5 ultra-fine carbon particles – which are very harmful to health **and there are no safe limits.** I'm sure others will tell us more.

You need to know how many air pollution monitoring sensors are positioned around the airport and the nearby highways, ask MAG. I see that no monitoring of air pollution is required by the proposed planning conditions and no monitoring of PM2.5 is even required in the proposed Section 106 Agreement. The only monitoring of air pollution required by the Section 106 is in Hatfield Forest and Eastend Wood – and PM2.5 is not included in that. **This is completely unacceptable. People must be protected as well as trees.**

UDC promotes Health & Wellbeing, is that compatible with the damage that air pollution does to our health? Approval of this application will also exacerbate the difficulties our already over stretched NHS has. This cannot be your intention but it will be the result if airport expansion is approved.

You should not feel that you are being pressurised to approve this planning application, **please do what the majority of your constituents ask and reject it. The mandate the electorate gave you is to oppose expansion.**

Ray Woodcock

On Friday 24th Jan. you could make history, do not approve this unnecessary expansion plan. This decision will prevent millions of tons of carbon being dumped into our atmosphere. Defy all who are encouraging you to approve this application, reject it, it will save lots in the future and show others to follow your lead.

Monika Simonalyte .

dear

dear

Good morning everyone,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to you today. I'm Monika Simonalyte and I've been working at Stansted Airport for ^{three} years since I graduated from Loughborough University with a degree in Air Transport management. I've been interested in aviation from a young age, my father having been the Senior Manager of an Air Traffic Control Tower.

Do I support the Stansted Airport Planning application? Absolutely I do, and I'd like to explain why as it is something, I am very passionate about.

Stansted Airport Ltd, which is part of Manchester Airports Group, gave me the chance for my career to 'take-off'. Back in 2015, after a rigorous and highly competitive application process, I secured a place at Stansted as an Airport Management Graduate. In total, there were 6 of us accepted that year, and in total ^{who came} coming from all over the country, after graduating from reputable universities to apply their knowledge and skills by working at Stansted Airport. The variety of graduate schemes is wide, all of them covering main areas of airport business including airside operations, engineering, terminal operations, customer experience and business change. Myself and fellow graduates are now in managerial positions, having their own teams and influencing the airport's future strategy, making the graduate scheme a success story.

Such job opportunities are there because of the airport's immense growth, creating a demand for us young professionals. It's great to be part of Stansted's exciting contribution towards stronger connectivity for global Britain and I am proud to be a valued member of the team delivering this by seeking to make the best use of Stansted's capacity in a responsible and sustainable manner which will benefit the communities and regions it serves.

What is also great that we are encouraged to offer our skills on a voluntary basis which not only helps to strengthen ties with the area where I live and work but has also been linked to improved employee wellbeing and engagement.

Whether it's talking to Stansted College students about the airport's digital and future innovations or showcase career opportunities at the onsite Aerozone facility or doing a 50km walk with my fellow colleagues to support and raise money for a children's cancer charity- there are a lot of opportunities at Stansted, to work together for a better future.

help based of it

By 2015, we were 43 people, well ok low word

you will see

B. 3 to page

The approval of the planning application and the subsequent development that will follow will lead to more job opportunities for young people to come and join us at Stansted Airport. Attracting future employees that have an abundance of energy and ideas and a strong eagerness and determination to learn and succeed will be a significant advantage for the airport and the approval of the planning application will unlock that potential.

Last year at a careers fair at Loughborough University I witnessed first-hand just how much interest there is in Stansted's growth. One of the main questions coming from final year students who are already looking for jobs next year was about Stansted's Transformation Project and opportunities to be involved.

To sum up, I am proud to be working at Stansted Airport and starting my career here as a Graduate, hence I strongly support the planning application to be approved. It will help to ensure the continuation of Graduate schemes which attract young talent and help to prepare the future leaders for the industry to see.

As Henry Ford once said - "Coming together is a beginning, staying together is progress, and working together is success."

Thank you

N Banks.

AFTERNOON

Good morning, thank you for allowing me to speak to you all today. My name is Neil Banks,

It's been my privilege to work at Stansted Airport for the last 30 years. When asked the question why do I support the growth of Stansted I look back and remember the journey I have been on during my time at Stansted. Having worked for BAA, Ferrovial and now MAG I have seen lots of changes and as ownership has changed over the years as have the airlines and the passengers.

During my 30 years I have been able to introduce schemes that support people returning to work, apprenticeship schemes, welcomed Graduates on placements and career development programs that give people the opportunities to grow individually into the leaders of tomorrow.

SINCE

NOV 12 4 11 PM '12
W/E

SINCE 11/12

The introduction of the Dementia friendly community project that to date has seen over 800 people trained to be Dementia friends.

Even my own children have found their feet at Stansted. My eldest son has worked at Stansted for nearly 10 years and my youngest son now started at the amazing Airport College last year and hopes to join the airport Fire service when he leaves.

The sense of family and the spirit of the people is what makes Stansted a very special place in my heart.

More importantly I have been able to give back to the local communities through 6 years of mentoring at both Forest Hall in Stansted and Stewards academy in Harlow helping students that were struggling to deal with school find ways to succeed.

Supporting the vital work carried out by one of the local foodbanks that we support in Harlow, with weekly delivers of items surrendered by passengers, that would previously have gone to landfill that instead will go to feed the local community. Helping host Christmas dinner parties with the Rainbow charity at Harlow Rugby club. Gardening at Bridge End Gardens in Great Easton. I'm just one of the gang of volunteers representing Stansted across a vast number of local projects giving back to the communities that surround the airport.

ARMY

#50 PINK
NO B/E
CARBON
NUTRIL

I'd like to tell you of a young Autistic boy called Scott how's mum wrote to our CEO to say that he has never been on holiday as the airport is to be frightening for him. After chatting to his mum I arranged a visit for the whole family - Scott, mum, dad, and his sister - to come to the airport one Saturday to try to get over his fears. After 3 hours of talking and walking and looking at what happens at the airport the family not only went on their first holiday abroad by air but Scott also started to pick up at school and grow in confidence as a young person. I still get letters from Scott telling me how he is getting on at school.

That's why for me Stansted is more than a job it's a family and like all families it needs to grow to be able to give more back to the country, the community and the people that make Stansted airport great.

Neil

Michael Young.

UDC Planning Committee 17 January 2020

When the original planning application was discussed in November 2018 one councillor stated that he would be voting for approval on economic grounds. In particular he referred to the need for jobs for young people stating, and I quote, "that we have an obligation to the next generation".

After the meeting I asked him if he was worried about climate change. He said he wasn't as he would be dead before that was a problem.

Leaving aside the hopeless contradiction in those statements I accept the importance of the economy, but we need to remember that the economy is a wholly owned subsidiary of its parent, the environment.

If we destroy the environment we won't need to worry about the economy.

Local government has a well-deserved and commendable reputation for devising and following rules and procedures. But it is not renowned for recognising its limitations and for seeing the bigger picture.

I would argue that the council has an overriding obligation to look at the bigger picture. This application would result in a significant increase in flights, a fact not appreciated by some members of the previous planning committee. In turn that would result in airport CO2 emissions reaching 2.5 million tonnes per annum, an increase of 60% over base year levels.

Although not always apparent from the officers' report there have been some very important developments over the last 14 months.

In June last year the government amended the Climate Change Act to require greenhouse gas emissions to be reduced by 100% rather than 80% in 2050.

In September the Committee on Climate Change recommended that the growth in UK aviation should be limited to "at most, 25% above current levels". That would, of course, not allow Stansted to expand beyond the current limit of 35 million passengers.

MAG projects that if the application is approved then its CO2 emissions will reach 2.5 million tonnes per annum; that's an increase of almost 1 million tonnes over current levels.

Should that be a reason for refusal?

Well the Airports National Policy Statement states that an increase in carbon emissions alone is not a reason for refusal, unless that increase would have a

material impact on the ability of the government to meet its carbon reduction targets.

At present government forecasts indicate that it will not meet its aviation target for 2050. When you are already over the limit then there is absolutely no scope for further increases.

And what has only recently been revealed is that the government is assuming that emissions at Stansted will only reach 1.6 million tonnes in 2050. That's the figure it needs to come anywhere near meeting its climate reduction targets. But that is way below the airport's proposals to increase emissions to 2.5 million tonnes.

This differential of over 50% must be a material consideration.

The proposed increase in traffic would severely impact on the government's ability to meet its reduction targets. It is therefore a valid reason for refusal.

We do need to consider future generations. This application is unsustainable. I have heard various definitions of sustainability but the one I prefer is simple and straightforward – don't cheat on our children.

Michael Young

Aldridges Farm

Wimbish

Presentation to UDC Planning Committee, 17th January 2020.

Re:- Planning Application UTT/18/0460/FUL

My name is Irene Jones. I live in Broxton and have been in residence there for 42 years.

Today, you will hear many well researched and sincere presentations from other members of the public.

But I want to go straight to the point.

Australia is burning. Sea levels are rising. I recommend you search for 'Thwaites Glacier' on the internet. The imminent collapse of this glacier in Antarctica will cause a rapid, and catastrophic increase in sea level rise. Closer to home, our health is at risk.

This is all due to toxic emissions caused by everyday activities. We can work towards reversing these emissions. It will be difficult. Where possible we can use public transport, or choose less polluting personal vehicles. We can buy locally produced food, or grow our own, rather than having it shipped from across the world.

I have flown three times in my life, the last journey was over thirty years ago. I was quite shocked when I recently found out that it is not uncommon for people to fly multiple times in a year.

As the aviation industry is one of the worse polluters, why is Stansted Airport asking for more flights? It has permission to take its passenger throughput to 35 mppa. But the poison is up there now. OK, we'll plant trees, lots of trees. But it will take at least 30 years, maybe 40 or 50 years for those trees to begin to absorb the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. And no one talks about the trees that are dying from toxic emissions from aircraft. In my village, there are trees that have died, are dying, which are under the flightpath. *4) live under the flightpath*

P.T.O.

So, Councillors, as Stansted has not withdrawn this application, as I requested at an earlier hearing, I am asking you to reject the application. I have not exceeded my time, but the earth is running out of time.

P.S. I chose to add the following:-
Councillors, since I wrote this piece at the
beginning of this week, we have seen further
horrendous evidence of the fires in Australia;
we have been told of unsustainable temperatures
in our oceans and yesterday, Sir David
Attenborough stated "we have reached crisis
point, and we must act to reduce carbon
emissions. We must act now."

With respect, councillors, it will be utterly
irresponsible to grant this planning
application.

Alex Smith

Good afternoon, my name is Alex Smith and I am speaking today in support of Stansted's application. I have lived in Saffron Walden for nearly 5 years and worked at Stansted since June 2018.

When my husband and I first looked at moving to the area the fact that Stansted was close by was definitely a tick in the 'pro' column. I had fond memories of Stansted from when my now husband surprised me with a trip to Rome for my 21st birthday. I was excited by the prospect of having so many new destinations on my doorstep and Stansted has certainly allowed me to explore- Mexico for my honeymoon, Dublin to visit my granddad's hometown as he turned 80 and revisiting Corfu, where my husband and I went on our first holiday together. I personally have always had a good experience when travelling through Stansted with polite staff and only ever minor waits and am rather put out travelling all the way to Heathrow or Gatwick if Stansted is not available.

I was so excited to see a role for me at Stansted when I was looking for a career change. As a school librarian with an English degree it was a bit unexpected but once I saw the post I knew Stansted was somewhere I would really enjoy working! Luckily for me, I was appointed and since day one I have been proven right. The airport is a fantastic place to work and I can honestly say that I have never worked somewhere so interesting and with so many different opportunities made available for all staff. I struggle to think of a time when I have heard anyone at the airport say that they do not really enjoy their job.

I'm lucky in my role as I work as part of Stansted's ~~Corporate Social Responsibility~~ ^{Community} team. I see first-hand how thoughts of the local community are a golden thread running through any decisions made, and we have a long-term CSR strategy to ensure we are supporting our local communities in a myriad of ways.

My role at the airport is to run the Aerozone which is Stansted's on-site education centre, not to be confused with Stansted Airport College. The Aerozone has been running for over 4 years and hosts school visits for learners aged 4-18+ allowing students to learn more about the airport and the aviation industry. Since opening, we have had more than 16,000 students visit the Aerozone and it has been free of charge for every single school visit. The Aerozone is an incredibly popular resource for schools, currently with only limited dates available for the next 4 months.

Each visit to the Aerozone is supported by colleagues from around the airport who volunteer to give up their tea breaks, their lunchtimes or even their days off to speak to the students about what they do, answer questions and provide career inspiration. Without the Aerozone, nearly 17,000 students may not have been able to speak to pilots, police officers, cabin crew, rangers, air traffic controllers, fire fighters, security officers and more, and those students may not have the same career aspirations that they do now. The adults remark at the quality of the visit (on several occasions I've been told it has been their best school trip ever) and they are astounded that it is a free facility, with many saying they would have gladly paid for such an impressive visit. But, the Aerozone is not about making money, it is a manifestation of Stansted's commitment to using our resources to enhance the educational and longer-term career opportunities for local young people.

The airport truly is committed to making sure that the future generations know there are opportunities available for them locally. Granting the planning application would provide us with even more scope to improve the Aerozone facilities and expand the opportunities we can provide.

Joanne Witteridge

Good Afternoon,

- As a resident of Cambridgeshire and an employee of Stansted Airport I felt strongly that I need to express my support for the Planning Application.
- All my family live in the Uttlesford district and I lived in Bishops Stortford for approximately 18 year, before moving to live in Cambridgeshire on the outskirts of Cambridge not far from Linton Zoo and in that time I have had many lodgers including Cambridge University Student who have stayed with myself and family.
- Students as we all know usually tend to live on a tight budget, and with their love for travel, Stansted opened the opportunity to travel to many of the place that the airport fly's to. With Ryanair and Easyjet flights offered at a low budget price it was extremely inviting and offered them many opportunities. I have enjoyed many evenings in the kitchen chatting over a cup of tea or glass of wine listening to their many adventures from Ibiza to Krakow to Rome etc.
- The train or bus service directly into the airport from Cambridge made it even more accessible. May I stress however that although I have mentioned the students my family and friends of all ages, travel regularly in and out of the airport and we are all extremely excited that a growing Stansted will give us the opportunity to explore more destinations from our local airport, with long haul having being added to that equation which is a wonderful sight.
- I have owned property abroad and Stansted and it airlines has given me and friends and family the opportunity to visit regularly or as often as finances allowed, which with the budget airlines was a lot more than first thought.

- The 2nd point I should like to make having worked at the airport for 6 years in many different roles. The opportunities that the airport can offer to all generations regarding employment is second to none within the employment spectrum.
- The airport bug as we call it in my family seems to get passed down through family generations, One of my 3-year-old Grandsons first words was Jet 2, he loves watching the aircraft and the thought that maybe one day he will work within the aviation industry is a satisfying thought. We can't wait for him to experience the adventures that the aérozone community has offered to so many children from local and surrounding schools since it opened. I have had several members of my family work at the airport over the years and all speak highly of the opportunities, training and prospects that are on offer.
- I can remember in my early 20's visiting enterprise house for a job fair and knew then that sometime in my life I would work at the airport. It may have been many jobs and 2 children later that I joined the airport, but I can honestly say that I have left the best until last.
- I feel so proud to be a part of London Stansted Airport community and look forward for the next chapter to unfold.

Uttlesford District Council Planning Committee concerning the current Stansted Airport Planning Application (17th January 2020) 17th January 2020

I am Robert Beer representing EARAG the Easters and Rodings Action Group .

As you are now probably reeling from the original and now additional reams of poorly written evidence from both MAG and Officers I implore you to apply a simple Reality Test as framed around MAGs original claim.

Do you honestly believe the MAG claim that Stansted can expand from its 28m passengers of today to 43m passengers with no significant material adverse environmental impact occurring

.... seriously do you?

in opposiing expansion to 35m passengers the then head of udc planning Roger Harborough wrote

Stansted will continue to make an important contribution within the limits of the existing permission. There is no evidence that development will have significant economic benefits either locally or nationally which need override the recognised dis-benefits.'

What has changed for the same UDC officers to now take the opposite view and continue to endorse 43m. passengers.

We will never know as there are no available minutes of the 35 meetings that took place between UDC officers and MAG

So for expansion to 43m passengers

- Have we reached anywhere near the 35mpp current permissions ... no
- are there any time critical issues involved, no the application is wholly premature
- have issues relating to noise, air pollution, health, congestion improved .. no they are all appreciably worse
- Have climate change concerns improved. NO they worsen by the week
- Have health concerns on noise and emissions changed favourably....No WHO guidelines say not & have been ignored

- Are we clear what the increased number of flights will be...No confusion reigns

also

- New Findings on Health Impacts of Particulate Matter have come to light
- Issues with the Boeing 737 Max remain seriously unresolved
- Plans for Expansion at Other Airports will dramatically affect Stansted demand

Do not be intimidated by Officers threats of of what MAG will do next.
MAG **might** appeal with little consequence to this Council

You can legitimately in weighing the balance of issues review and re-open the previous decision by the previous Council

You have a number options

- Reject this Planning Application outright once and for all - there will be no dire consequences
- Defer a decision until the High Court rules on the SSE challenge
- Call for more evidence on key issues on areas of legitimate challenge
- If you feel you've not had time or understood the complexity of this case that's ok; many haven't including the last Planning Committee...so be honest ... put your hands up and pass a motion to send this Application to the Secretary of State for decision on grounds of not having the relevant experience.

It is what the pre-election Committee Chairman should have done. Don't follow his example...you will not be forgiven as he and his party were not.

Thank you

(481

J Fox – Statement 17 January 2020

Mr Chairman and planning committee members,

When I spoke at the EGM in June last year in response to STAL's less than satisfactory Section 106 offer, I concluded my contribution by expressing the hope that we would see the start of a new relationship between UDC and the community.

I deliberately didn't address the environmental imperative that, for the purposes of this public hearing can no longer conveniently be set aside and ignored.

The unanswered question remains as to whether there has been a material change of circumstances since the conditional approval of the application in November 2018; issues that may have tipped the balance of favour against this controversial application?

The answer hiding in plain sight is surely yes. From the government downward, it is now universally accepted that we are living in a climate emergency.

Climate Change Committee ('CCC'): The CCC published a landmark report on 2 May 2019 recommending that the UK should amend its legislation to commit to net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. This will require a major review of current Government policy on aviation carbon emissions and a coordinated approach to manage these nationally rather than allowing decisions about airport expansion to be taken by local planning authorities.

Notwithstanding these developments, MAG projects Stansted Airport carbon emissions of 2.50MtCO₂ in 2028 compared to the Department for Transport's (DfT) assumption of 1.37MtCO₂ for the same year. Thus, if the application is approved, Stansted Airport carbon emissions in 2028 would be 82% higher than assumed by the DfT.

The 43mppa planning application Environmental Statement volume 4.2 page 27 states that "the development case is unlikely to materially impact the UK's ability to meet its 2050 national aviation target of 37.5MtCO₂; ; an extraordinary statement; especially in the light that CCC has already stated that another runway at Heathrow would breach this threshold by 15%!

It is therefore hard, if not impossible to see how the environmental impact of the application can be reconciled with the CCC's May 2019 report and UDC's commitment to become carbon neutral by 2030!

Stansted's proposals would only increase aviation's carbon footprint further still and would do nothing to square the circle between aviation expansion and its increasing impact on the environment.

At the beginning of June 28th special meeting, I recall the chairman making a direct statement to the members of the planning committee about all actions having consequences whatever the outcome of future deliberations.

Stansted airport, like the wider aviation industry clearly thinks it can operate in a parallel universe where it isn't accountable for its actions and the subsequent environmental consequences that follow.

I urge you to do the right thing: make a statement in which the well being of the residents in Uttlesford and the protection of the environment is given priority over the commercial interests of Stansted airport!

We are told that humanity has only ten years to make a difference. You can make one straight away!

Reject this application!

**STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATION BY CLLR ALAN DEAN, STANSTED NORTH
ON JANUARY 17TH 2020 ON BEHALF OF CONSTITUENTS REGARDING
PLANNING APPLICATION UTT/18/0460/FUL: AIRFIELD WORKS TO ENABLE 274,000
AIRCRAFT MOVEMENTS AND A PASSENGER THROUGHPUT OF 43,000,000
ANNUALLY.**

(NOTE: Shaded words not spoken owing to time constraint.)

Madam Chairman, Committee Members

My name is Alan Dean. I have been a Member of UDC for Stansted since the days of 8 million passengers per annum.

I have long believed that this Council should establish a mature relationship with Stansted Airport; one of equal partnership with the largest employment site in this region. It is popularly recognised that the airport provides services that are appreciated by a great many people.

Firstly, I feel obliged to say that the way in which Uttlesford District Council's Planning Committee conducts and accounts for itself in public is crucial.

The former committee's meeting 14 months ago on this same application was a disgrace; it was conducted in a way that left the public believing that the decision to approve was rigged. A majority of the committee sat in silence or near silence throughout the meeting; they failed totally to justify their vote for approval.

I raised a question about existing airport infrastructure that allegedly had not been given planning permission. I was promised by the then chairman that the issue would be addressed later in the meeting; that answers would be given. No answers were ever given. The matter was ignored. The chairman seemed so eager to get home by teatime that he forced through a vote prematurely, leaving challenges and questions unanswered. The committee left all members of the public aghast.

In my 32 years as a Member of this Council, I had never knowingly witnessed a worse charade of undemocratic unaccountability on such an important issue. The applicant deserved better. The public deserved better.

And now, 14 months later, we are here again; with a new committee, hopefully in better shape.

I wish to implore the Committee and its supporting Officers to conduct this continuing important business rigorously, transparently and in a professional way.

I do not wish to see the climate change and other issues in the officers' report taken as read and not debated. I will be angry if matters raised by consultees are ignored. All questions and challenges really must be addressed in a respectful and thorough manner.

I would like to be assured that someone on the top table is logging issues that are raised today and in correspondence to ensure that they are well and truly explained and addressed. The public must be able to see that democracy is being done; that there is some clear rationale for why decisions are reached, whatever those decisions may be.

Do not be ruled by the clock. I have referred to the way the November '18 committee seemed to be rushing to catch a plane, or at best, to avoid dinner being burned.

My second point is that this Council also has a responsibility to have regard for the negative impact that aviation has on the lives of people, on biodiversity, not only in close proximity to the airport, but on a global scale.

It matters not whether aviation emissions are produced in the vicinity of Stansted, England; close to Dubai International Airport, or at all points between the two. All carbon emissions contribute to escalating climate change.

I recently went with my wife to Amsterdam – by train; by direct Eurostar. We enjoyed a night-time canal boat trip to see their winter festival of light. What struck me most were several illuminated displays depicting roadworks signs and motor vehicles half submerged in the canal. There was a glowing model of city centre tower blocks partially submerged in the canal's cold waters. The message – THIS COULD HAPPEN IF WE FAIL TO ACT.

In this country we appear to have a government that, this very week, is bailing out a failing airline with subsidies and with tax breaks from the very tax that is meant to help restrain the public's demand for aviation, and to encourage us to use the train more and the plane less.

I sympathise with the planning committee's dilemma. Your officers are telling you that you can pay no regard to aviation's carbon emissions that are helping to destroy the planet, its human life, its wildlife, its plant-life.

Why are your advisors telling you this? Because central government at Westminster is supposed to have all the answers to sort out all the necessary carbon-reduction objectives.

Yet this week, Her Majesty's Government is doing precisely the opposite.

This Council has voted twice to take action and to promote action by others to address the Climate Emergency. So, the Planning Committee finds itself in the jaws of a moral and practical dilemma. It is up against insincere and apparently hypocritical central government that both dithers and then acts in the opposite direction from what is needed.

Only two days ago, our health minister, Matt Hancock, declared “Nope” when asked whether people should fly less to help save the planet. He said greener planes will solve the problem. He said no one should make sacrifices, but should carry on doing what they want to do. Mr Hancock said electric planes are the solution. When pressed, he hadn’t a clue when, if ever, large electric planes would become reality. I shudder to think whether there will be any space for passengers when adequately-sized batteries have been accommodated on board for a trip from Stansted to Dubai.

Will Uttlesford District Council also take the line that it is always someone else’s responsibility to save the planet and mankind from self-inflicted destruction? I hope that officers, but especially committee members, will next week discuss this matter thoroughly in public, so to satisfy local people that they are doing the right thing for the climate emergency. Please ensure, Madam Chairman, that your committee’s conclusions stand up to scrutiny.

Do not be ruled by the clock or calendar.

If business cannot be completed on January 24th, the meeting should be adjourned whilst challenges are investigated; whilst professional advice is obtained; until committee members are satisfied that they are armed with the evidence that allows them to be able to say “we did our best and we justified our decisions”.

In concluding, madam chairman, please let me say that I have been in correspondence with officers since the day before Christmas Eve on various detailed matters of procedure and policy. I have not yet received satisfactory written responses. I will pull these and other matters together into a document that I will publish and send to the committee and its officers before January 24th. I have spoken to some of them at today’s meeting.

Thank you for listening to me today.

Alan Dean

Stansted, 17th January 2020

Speaking at the Uttlesford Offices on the 17th January 2020 :-

Good afternoon, and thank you Chair:-

CLLR Chris Webb From Hatfield Broad Oak Parish, Greenhill and Bush End Ward.
I have lived there 44years.

More passengers, 35mppa up to 43mppa, 22.8% increase, which means more vehicles, much of which get to and from the Airport via the B183 which passes through our Hamlets and Villages, not withstanding Takeley, the Canfields, Hatfield Heath, Sheering on to Harlow and the M11.

The B183 is a Secondary Distributor which carries a higher volume of traffic than would be expected in a rural village. A 12hour survey by Essex Highways at Takeley Four Ashes Traffic lights in June 2017 recorded 6,171 vehicles using the B183South, nearly 10% of them in the LGV2-HGV2 categories. The vast majority of these must pass through Hatfield Broad Oak.

These numbers confirm that the large amount of vehicular traffic through Hatfield Broad Oak is over capacity for the medieval street pattern of the village.

This volume of traffic through the village on roads narrowed by pavement and street parking is rapidly becoming intolerable and at school times there can be gridlock, resulting in diesel fumes and short tempers. Walking or cycling along the B183 in the village at peak hours is not a pleasant experience.

Bush End Lane is a protected lane but residents have experienced increases in the amount of vehicles using the Bush End Lane and other small lanes in this area and in Great Canfield to avoid the traffic lights at the Takeley B1256/B183 junction.

Building works will mean more HGV's, can these be encouraged to use the Motorway?

The 106 monies should help, upgrading infrastructure / roads etc, and encouraging the traffic to use motorways will help our Village and Hamlets.

So, more passengers , more traffic, more noise more pollution, and what of the carbon footprint, and carbon neutral by 2050.

Please let's protect our Villages and environment.
Thanks for listening to me.