



## Public Document Pack

# Uttlesford District Council

Chief Executive: Peter Holt

## Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

**Date:** Thursday, 27th April, 2023

**Time:** 10.30 am

**Venue:** Committee Room - Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden,  
Essex CB11 4ER

**Chairman:** Councillor M Foley

**Members:** Councillors M Caton, A Dean, J Evans (Vice-Chair), P Fairhurst,  
V Isham, G LeCount, M Lemon, S Luck, N Reeve and M Sutton

## **AGENDA**

**1 Apologies for Absence and Declarations of Interest**

To receive any apologies for absence and declarations of interest.

**2 Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

3 - 8

To consider the minutes of the previous meeting.

**3 Response to Government's Night-Time Noise Abatement Objectives for the Designated Airports from October 2025**

9 - 15

To consider a response to Government's Night-Time Noise Abatement Objectives for the Designated Airports from October 2025.

**For information about this meeting please contact Democratic Services**

Telephone: 01799 510410, 510369, 510460 or 510548

Email: [Committee@uttlesford.gov.uk](mailto: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](mailto:uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk)

Website: [www.uttlesford.gov.uk](http://www.uttlesford.gov.uk)

# Agenda Item 2

**STANSTED AIRPORT ADVISORY PANEL held at COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, LONDON ROAD, SAFFRON WALDEN, CB11 4ER, on FRIDAY, 24 FEBRUARY 2023 at 2.00 pm**

Present: Councillor M Foley (Chair)  
Councillors M Caton, J Evans, G LeCount, M Lemon, N Reeve and M Sutton

Officers in attendance: D Hermitage (Director of Planning) and C Shanley-Grozavu (Democratic Services Officer)

Also

Present: M Peachey, Councillor L Pepper and T Wilson

## 1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Luck and Dean.

The Chair introduced Mr Martin Peachey and Mr Tom Wilson, both specialists within the field of aviation, who were in attendance as guests to advise the Panel.

Further introductions were given by all.

## 2 **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as a correct record.

The Chair gave an update on engagement with the airport since the last meeting. He explained that due to the ongoing legal dispute at the time with the Manchester Airport Group (MAG), he had been advised against scheduling a meeting of the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel (STAAP) in 2022. Furthermore, there had been limited communication between MAG officers and UDC members. As MAG had been unable to attend this meeting, he was keen for another meeting to be arranged before the pre-election period with the airport in attendance.

Councillor Evans, Portfolio Holder for Planning, Stansted Airport, Infrastructure Strategy and the Local Plan, provided a brief summary on the recent meeting of the Stansted Airport Consultative Committee (STACC); including his request for MAG to share their Sustainable Development Plan (SDP) which was in the process of being redrafted and would set out the strategic context for the long-term growth and development of the airport.

In response to questions, Councillor Evans clarified that public transport usage was not included in this strategy. At the end of 2022, Stansted Airport had reported that 47% of airport users travelled to and from the site on public transport, which was lower than the pre-pandemic level of 52%.

### 3 **APPOINTMENT OF A VICE-CHAIR**

Councillor Le Count proposed that Councillor Evans be nominated as the Vice-Chair of the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel.

This was unanimously agreed.

### 4 **CAA CONSULTATION ON AIRSPACE CHANGES**

The Director of Planning provided a verbal report on the Civil Aviation Authority's (CAA) current consultation on the Revised Airspace Change Process Guidance, also known as CAP 1616. He said that there had been various rounds of consultations, including with local communities, and he requested that if members had any further comments, then they should contact him. Overall, there were no substantive changes to the stages and steps within the airspace change process requirements, but the proposals brought more flexibility. He highlighted various proposals including amending the requirements around Temporary Airspace Changes or Airspace Trials, as well as the requirement for mandatory current-day scenarios at the early stages of consultation but raised slight concern around the suggestion to transfer responsibility from the CAA to the proposer when publishing consultation responses.

The Panel discussed the impact which the revised CAP1616 could have both on the airport and the district, and the following was noted:

- Prior to the introduction of the CAP 1616 Airspace Change process, the CAA used the CAP 725 process. The transition to the new process included more stages which while it slowed down the process, ensured that it was done more thoroughly, and a fair outcome was achieved for all interested parties. Previous Post Implementation Reviews (PIRs) carried out under CAP725 concentrated on operational objectives, and not environmental results.
- CAP 1616 affects arrival and departure routes; while, Stansted Airport has not changed their departure routes since 1989, the volume of traffic on the two Clacton departure routes was increased in February 2016 with the removal of the Dover departure routes. This had resulted in the intensity of traffic doubling above some residents' properties which are under the Clacton routes.
- The Airspace Modernisation Strategy (AMS) programme currently underway was designed to improve efficiency for the airlines as well as minimising adverse noise impacts for local residents. It could provide greater capacity for the airport as well as the possibility of switching between alternative routes would provide noise respite for residents.
- The next phase of the AMS programme was Stage 3 where Stansted Airport would publish its proposed new routes with options for public consultation. This was anticipated later this year following Stage 2, the establishment of design principles, for which the Council was represented by Councillor Evans in the airport's Stakeholders

Engagement Group during the latter half of 2021. There has subsequently been a delay while vertical climb profiles for departures were being finalised. This would allow additional time for the Council to prepare their response.

- Departures must follow fixed Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) which are 3km wide corridors from take-off to 4,000ft.
- There were no fixed routes for arriving aircraft but rather a wide swathe of flight paths where aircraft have to arrive at an intercept point at 2,000ft for final approach to the runway. This was roughly above Thaxted (for the south westerly runway) and High Wych (for the north easterly runway). Typically arriving aircraft are less noisier than departing aircraft.
- The Government's policy is that as technological advantages become available they should be shared between the aviation industry and local residents affected by flight paths. For example, BAA have previously made reassurances that technology was being developed so that an aircraft's navigation would adjust to go over less populated areas, particularly on incoming flights.
- Modern aircraft have a better climb performance which has an instant effect for housing in close proximity to an airport. Current take-offs were at a 4% gradient, whereas now many can depart at between 6 – 8%. Despite the steeper climb, generally the same amount of thrust is used.
- There are two types of take-off procedure for noise abatement (NADP1 and NADP2) and Stansted Airport uses NADP2, which effectively reduces the noise levels closer to the airport (about 5 to 13 miles) by moving it further out.
- Contributions are made by the airport to a Community Fund when an aircraft infringes flight rules. It was clarified that, for departures this is a corridor 3km wide and the airport has a track keeping performance accuracy rate of above 99%.

Members asked that a brief response to the consultation to be submitted to the CAA.

The Director of Planning highlighted the Sound Insulation Grant scheme; the airport's enhanced sound insulation grant scheme which provided funding to help deal with excessive aircraft noise. Further information could be found on a dedicated webpage on the UDC website.

In addition, members requested officers look at noise mitigation on heritage buildings to ensure that relevant guidance was available for those who wished to apply appropriate mitigation measures to listed buildings.

5

## **AIRPORT PARKING DISCUSSION AND UPDATE**

Councillor Caton, member for Stansted South and Birchanger, provided the Panel with a summary of the issues of airport fly parking in and around Stansted Mountfitchet. He explained that the Parish Council had worked with the airport to install "No Airport Parking" signage on the Mountfitchet Green and Foresthall

Park estates in the south of the village, following concerns around airport users parking in the area to avoid paying carpark fees. However, whilst the signage had been beneficial, it has moved the fly parking into the north of the village and the airport had since said that they had exhausted funds to extend the initiative further. The problem was echoed in other areas, such as Takeley and Bishops Stortford.

Councillor Sutton highlighted airport parking issues in Takeley, particularly the impact that they had on the safety of the roads. Issues included residents renting out their drives then parking their own cars on the road, vehicles using the area as a pick-up point to avoid airport fees and several airport transfer and parking businesses operating out of Takeley.

The Panel discussed the following solutions as possible ways to resolve the parking issues:

#### Enforcement through the North Essex Parking Partnership

This approach would see restrictions being imposed and enforced by the North Essex Parking Partnership. It was highlighted that operations of the Parking Partnership had resolved the issue of fly parking in Hatfield Heath.

Members raised concerns that some residents may not be able to afford the resident permits which cost £70 for the first car and £105 for a second car. In addition, it would require agreement from 75% of each road impacted by a proposed scheme.

#### Working with Stansted Airport and MAG

Members discussed requesting MAG to enforce a similar model to their parking operations in Wythenshawe, near Manchester Airport. This would require them to fund the parking permits for residents in nearby areas and offset their costs with the income from penalties issued the enforcement of the permit scheme.

Members suggested additional action from MAG including providing further funding for more signage, reducing the pricing of their car park, setting up off-site car parking provisions, and permitting private companies to provide additional parking facilities elsewhere.

#### Policies within the Emerging Local Plan

Members requested that officers and the Local Plan Leadership Group work to include policies around airport parking in the Local Plan.

#### No Action

Members raised concerns that members of the public were committing criminal damage when it has been left to residents to deal with.

The Director of Planning agreed to conduct further research into the schemes implemented by MAG in the areas which surrounded Manchester Airport.

*Councillor LeCount left the meeting at 15:50*

## NIGHT FLIGHTS DISCUSSION AND UPDATE

The Chair gave a verbal update on the government's recent consultation on night flights restrictions at the designated airports (Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted), as well as national policy beyond 2025. The DfT is currently reviewing the results of this consultation and is expected to publish a decision later this year together with its proposals, for public consultation, for the next night flights regime which starts in October 2025. In the meantime, the government has rolled over the 2017-2022 regime which imposed a limit on the number of movements and the total number of noise Quota Count (QC) points allowed. Together this limits the number of aircraft able to take-off and land during the night and puts a cap on the total amount of noise QC points allowed. The QC system is effectively a proxy for the amount of noise each aircraft emits, so the QC limit is the total amount of noise allowed.

He highlighted several schemes implemented to reduce or limit night flights including a voluntary local agreement with Heathrow, a ban on night flights as part of a condition of Planning permission in Frankfurt and a limit on night-time airport slots at Brussels Airport by the Belgium government. In addition, he outlined the Australian noise metric system which is an additional tool to measure noise impacts known as 'Number Above' contours. This metric combined information on every aircraft noise level above 60, 65 and 70dB with the number of aircraft movements and was now adopted in the UK and elsewhere as a supplementary noise indicator.

Should the Panel work toward a night flight ban, then he asked to use the WHO definition of an 8-hour night, rather than the DfT definition of 23:30 – 06:00.

Members discussed the possibility of seeking a reduction of night flights and the following was noted.

- There needed to be further consideration into the increase of freight movements to and from the airport and the impact that this would have on noise generated at night.
- Most night flights operating out and in of Stansted Airport were long-haul cargo flights and it was inevitable that if the airport chose to prohibit this, then the night traffic would be pushed to another part of the country, at night, as operators had to rework their schedule. However, there were reports that it was not economically advantageous to fly freight at night.
- Due to the rural nature of the surrounding area, there was greater sensitivity to noise generated from Stansted Airport, compared to other airports located in built-up areas.
- As different aircraft generated different levels of noise, Stansted Airport could choose to be selective with who they accept at night in order to mitigate noise.
- There were several factors which influenced the pricing and timing of flights, including the peak flying times, demand for a flight and the length of a rotation. Stansted Airport could seek to reorganise their pricing structure and remove cheaper flight slots at night in order to reduce the number of commercial night flights.

- Members discussed the impact which budget airlines had on the noise generated from the airport. Ryanair operated using predominately 737-8 and 737-9 aircraft which were less noisy and were usually on time, but their profit relied heavily on volume with high load factors and new routes. This business model worked well from Stansted Airport as the location better suited cheaper, short-haul flights.
- A total ban on night flights would disrupt the priority mail services which operated out of the airport; however, this could be negotiated by accommodating additional flights in the shoulder periods.

Members acknowledged the economic influence in which Stansted Airport had within the district and were keen to encourage working between the two organisations as this would be beneficial for all. The Chair requested officers looked to schedule another meeting of STAAP, before the pre-election period, and for the relevant officers at MAG to attend in order to begin to discuss the prospect of a voluntary agreement of noise reduction at night, whilst working towards a night flight ban.

The Chair thanked Mr Peachey and Mr Wilson for their contribution to the discussions.

*Meeting ended at 16:38*



**Committee:** Stansted Airport Advisory Panel

**Date:** 27 April 2023

**Title:** Response to Government's Night-time noise abatement objectives for the designated airports from October 2025

**Report Author:** Dean Hermitage – Director of Planning

---

## Summary

1. The government is seeking views on night-time noise abatement objectives at the designated airports, which include Stansted, beyond October 2025. The consultation is for a period of 6 weeks, ending 9 May 2023.
2. Due to the timing of the consultation a special meeting of the Stansted Airport Advisory Panel (STAAP) has been called to formulate a response to the consultation.
3. Following the meeting, officers will seek an executive decision by the leader to adopt and submit STAAP's comments to government on behalf of the council.

## Financial Implications

4. None.

## Background Papers

5. Open consultation - [Night-time noise abatement objectives for the designated airports from October 2025 - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/night-time-noise-abatement-objectives-for-the-designated-airports-from-october-2025)

## Impact

6. As per table:

Communication/Consultation	n/a
Community Safety	n/a
Equalities	n/a
Health and Safety	n/a
Human Rights/Legal Implications	n/a
Sustainability	n/a

Ward-specific impacts	n/a
Workforce/Workplace	n/a

## Situation

7. The Secretary of State, as “competent authority” for the noise designated airports (Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted) is required to define a noise abatement objective for airports where a noise problem has been identified.
8. Owing to increasing evidence nationally with regards to the relationship between aviation night noise and impacts on health and sleep disturbance the government is seeking views and evidence on what night-time noise abatement objectives should be.
9. The current applicable night noise objective for Stansted for the period 2022-2025 is:

*“Limit or reduce the number of people significantly affected by aircraft noise at night, including through encouraging the use of quieter aircraft, while maintaining the existing benefits of night flights”.*
10. The purpose of a noise abatement objective is to act as the enabling statement that provides the focus for any necessary noise measures.
11. For 2025 onwards the government is proposing:

*"Whilst supporting sustainable growth and recognising the importance to the UK of maintaining freight connectivity, to limit and where possible reduce, the adverse effects of aviation noise at night on health and quality of life".*
12. **The committee may wish to consider whether or not it agrees with this statement.** In the event it does not, it should consider suggesting an alternative.
13. The wording of the government’s proposed night-time noise abatement objective reflects a movement away from an objective focusing on the number of people affected by noise, to a greater focus on the adverse effects on health and quality of life.
14. Although numbers of people affected could obviously remain an indicator used to measure success against the objective, government has asked for views on what other metrics could be used to measure success against the objective. **The committee may wish to consider suggesting further metrics.**

15. Officers will provide further advice in relation to these two questions at the meeting.

### Risk Analysis

16. None identified.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
1	1	1	1

1 = Little or no risk or impact

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

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

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

## Night-time noise abatement objectives for designated airports

The government sets night-time operating restrictions at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted airports. These airports are designated for the purposes of noise regulation under the Civil Aviation Act 1982. We last consulted on these controls in December 2020. The decision, published in July 2021, rolled-over the existing restrictions for a period of three years, putting in place the current regime covering the period from October 2022 to October 2025.

Consultation on the next night flight regime can be expected to launch in late 2023. Ahead of that consultation, we are now seeking views and evidence on what night-time noise abatement objectives should be for the designated airports for that next night flight regime. We are also seeking views on how the proposed night-time noise abatement objective should be assessed to ensure it is successful.

The purpose of a noise abatement objective is to act as the enabling statement that provides the focus for any necessary noise measures. The intention of the government is to have a night-time noise abatement objective which is aligned with our national aviation noise policy statement, and which includes measurable and achievable outcomes against which progress can be assessed, and which can achieve a balance between the needs of different stakeholder groups.

For the purpose of the regime to commence in October 2025, we now seek views on using the following night-time noise abatement objective:

"Whilst supporting sustainable growth and recognising the importance to the UK of maintaining freight connectivity, to limit and where possible reduce, the adverse effects of aviation noise at night on health and quality of life".

This night-time noise abatement objective would apply to all three of the designated airports (Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted) and would apply to the night period (11pm to 7am).

**Select the airport for which you wish to provide your views (you may select more than one option).**

- Heathrow (Complete section 'Heathrow')
- Gatwick (Complete section 'Gatwick')
- X Stansted (Complete section 'Stansted')

### Stansted

For the purpose of the regime to commence in October 2025, we now seek views on using the following night-time noise abatement objective:

"Whilst supporting sustainable growth and recognising the importance to the UK of maintaining freight connectivity, to limit and where possible reduce, the adverse effects of aviation noise at night on health and quality of life".

**19. To what extent do you agree, or disagree, with our night-time noise abatement objective for Stansted airport?**

- Strongly agree (Skip questions 21, 22 and 23)
- Agree (Skip questions 21, 22 and 23)
- Neither agree nor disagree
- X Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know (Go to question 24)

## Stansted - night-time noise abatement objective

20. Provide a reasoning for your answer.

UDC is aware that the night-time noise abatement objective is a high-level statement and that a more detailed consultation on the night flight regime is to follow later this year.

UDC is concerned with the specific inclusion of the term “freight connectivity” within the proposed statement and the introduction of the term “and where possible”. This suggests greater dispensation will be given to freight activities and a watering down of the existing objective which states “limit or reduce the number of people affected”. The term ‘where possible’ is undefined and weakens, already inadequate night time protections for residents.

It is UDC corporate policy to seek a reduction in night flight activity and therefore noise impacts on residents in connection with Stansted Airport and it is not considered the proposed night-time noise abatement objective assists in achieving this. It appears to do quite the opposite.

## Stansted - night-time noise abatement objective

21. Would alternative wording be preferable for the night-time noise abatement objective?

- X Yes
- No (Go to question 24)
- Don't know (Go to question 24)

## Stansted - night-time noise abatement objective

22. Provide a reasoning for your answer.

UDC does not consider further support need be given to night-time freight at Stansted Airport, nor should the strength of noise night controls, and therefore protections to

residents be weakened purely to support economic growth. An evidence-led and balanced approach, considering economic needs set against negative impacts on sleep and health must be taken.

**23. Provide alternative wording on a night-time noise abatement objective.**

*“Whilst being mindful of the need to support economic growth, to limit and reduce the number of people significantly affected by aircraft noise at night, including through encouraging the use of quieter aircraft, and acknowledging that many historic buildings cannot easily be retro-fitted to mitigate against aircraft noise.”*

## **Stansted - assessing the night-time noise abatement objective**

In recognition that each of the designated airports and its environs has different characteristics, consideration was given to setting different night-time noise abatement objectives for each designated airport. However, on balance, we believe that the core noise abatement aim remains the same at each airport.

The different characteristics of each airport and its environs could be addressed by the use of different metrics to measure achievement against the objective, rather than within the objective itself.

The wording of the night-time noise abatement objective reflects our movement away from an objective focusing on the number of people affected by noise, to a greater focus on the adverse effects on health and quality of life.

Although number of people could obviously remain an indicator used to measure success against the objective, we are keen to hear views and evidence on what metrics could be used to measure success against the objective.

**24. How should the proposed night-time noise abatement objective for Stansted airport be assessed to ensure it is successful?**

The current night-time noise abatement objective is measured by the number of people affected by aircraft noise. This remains a key metric. In the case of Stansted, which is situated in a district home to the second largest concentration of listed, historic buildings in England, this metric should be more nuanced. It should take into account residential buildings for which it is difficult, by way of their built fabric and the inability to well-insulate them against noise, that are located within affected areas.

## Final comments

### 25. Any other comments?

UDC looks forward to providing further comment during the consultation on the night flight regime later this year and is happy to provide further clarification or evidence in terms of the points raised above.