

Cabinet	<b>CAB/031/06</b>
Date: 19 <sup>th</sup> September 2006	

**STANSTED AIRPORT GENERATION 1 PLANNING APPLICATION.  
(EXPANSION BEYOND 25 MILLION PASSENGERS PER ANNUM)  
RESPONSE TO UTTLESFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL CONSULTATION ON  
BAA PROPOSAL**

Joint Report By : Cabinet Member for Planning, Environment and Culture  
Cabinet Member for Highways and Transportation

Enquiries to: David Dash, Major Development Projects Manager. Telephone  
01245 437509

**Purpose of Report:**

To consider the joint recommendation of the Cabinet Members for Planning, Environment and Culture and Highways and Transportation on an ECC response to the BAA Planning Application under consideration by Uttlesford District Council.

(An earlier draft of this report was considered by the Planning, Environment and Commerce PDG on 7 September 2006. The Highways and Transport PDG will consider a report focussed on transport issues on 21 September 2006.

**Recommendation**

That ECC responds to Uttlesford District Council on the BAA G1 Application as follows

1. That the Planning Application as deposited by BAA is unacceptable. However, whilst the County Council reiterates its overwhelming opposition to a second runway, it will accept increased use on the existing runway but only subject to stringent conditions and additional environmental mitigation and the provision of the necessary infrastructure improvements.
2. The grant of any planning permission that the Local Planning Authority should be minded to grant to this planning application should be deferred until they are satisfied that all of the outstanding planning obligations and

conditions that are still required in respect of the current permission have been fulfilled.

3. The conditions/obligations identified in Appendix 1 are regarded as being essential in securing the environmental mitigation and necessary infrastructure improvements identified in recommendation 1 above.

## **1 Introduction and Background**

1.1 This report sets out the Essex County Council position on the planning application submitted to Uttlesford District Council by BAA in April 2006, and known as 'Stansted Generation 1. A response is required by Uttlesford before the end of September.

1.2 In 2003 Stansted Airport Limited (STAL) was granted planning permission for development comprising:

“ Extension to the passenger terminal; provision of additional aircraft stands and taxiways, aircraft maintenance facilities, offices, cargo handling facilities, aviation fuel storage, passenger and staff car parking and other operational and industrial support accommodation; alteration to airport roads, terminal forecourt and the Stansted rail, coach and bus stations; together with associated landscape and infrastructure.” (The 2003 planning permission)

1.3 This permission was granted subject to a number of conditions. In particular, Uttlesford District Council (UDC) imposed conditions on passenger throughput and air transport movements (ATMs) in the following terms:

- “The passenger throughput at Stansted Airport shall not exceed 25 million passengers in any twelve calendar month period (Condition ‘MPPA1’)
- “....there shall be at Stansted Airport a limit on the number of occasions on which aircraft may take off or land at Stansted Airport of 241,000 ATMs during any period of one year of which no more than 22,500 shall be CATMs” (Condition ‘ATM 1’)

1.4 The proposed development is, that which was granted planning permission in 2003, subject to the same conditions, save in respect of MPPA 1 and ATM 1. BAA seeks to remove existing condition MPPA 1 (to have no passenger throughput limit) and increases the ATM limit of condition ATM 1 from 241,000 ATMs to 264,000 ATMs. BAA envisages increases in the amount of runway capacity available up to 35mppa, with the average daytime declared capacity growing towards 48 movements

per hour. The proposed ATM limit is a 9% increase on that permitted whilst 35 million passengers per annum is a 40% increase on the 25mppa permitted. Throughput in the 12 months to June 2006 was 23 mppa.

- 1.5 No additional facilities (terminals etc.) are planned on site as sufficient are already permitted and no new mitigation above that already in place is proposed within the current application.
- 1.6 Essex County Council policy opposes the development of a second runway at Stansted Airport and will only accept increased use of the existing runway subject to environmental mitigation and necessary infrastructure improvements. This policy position was adopted in response to the Government's consultations on future aviation capacity and the subsequent White Paper published in December 2003. The Government's position as contained in the 2003 White Paper 'The future of Air Transport' is to support fuller use of existing capacity in the London area and to support a second runway at Stansted.
- 1.7 Since the planning application was submitted BAA have been taken over by Ferrovial, a Spanish company. The takeover has had no effect on the current application. It has however delayed further consultation on the proposed second runway. However, the new owners have reiterated their commitment to implementing Government policy and state that it is their intention to submit the second runway application in late 2007.
- 1.8 The proposed developments have been considered jointly by officers of the 4 local authorities most affected, Essex, Uttlesford, Hertfordshire and East Herts. Uttlesford is the determining authority with the other authorities being consultees only.
- 1.9 A report on the Planning Application known as Generation 1 was considered by the Planning Environment and Commerce Policy Development Group and will be considered by the Highways and Transport PDG on the 21<sup>st</sup> September. The view of the PEC PDG has been incorporated into this report and any additional issues raised at the H&T PDG will be dealt with via lead member approval. This response has to be available to Uttlesford DC prior to the end of September when it is understood that that Council will consider the application.

## **2 Issues and Stansted G1 Application**

- 2.1 The growth of Stansted utilising capacity on the existing runway raises a wide range of issues but those most affecting Essex are aircraft noise and surface access together with employment and the economy. Climate change is the biggest global issue but its impact is essentially driven by

national and international policy concerns not those emanating from the current application. Uttlesford District Council will also have to consider and balance more local concerns.

### **3 Air Traffic Forecasts**

3.1 Consultants SH&E working for the four Local Authorities (Essex CC, Hertfordshire CC, Uttlesford and East Hertfordshire District Councils) have examined the BAA Air Traffic Forecasts. SH&E comment that the patterns during the day for the 2004 and the 2014 (25 mppa) scenario show similarities with a series of peaks and troughs. They comment that the 2014 (35 mppa) scenario shows a very steady and high level of utilisation during the day from the hour beginning 0500 GMT through to the hour beginning 2100. This is a pattern of runway utilisation very similar to that recorded at both Gatwick and Heathrow. Given that the volume of passenger traffic at Stansted of 35 mppa in 2014 is very similar to the 32 mppa currently being handled at Gatwick the pattern for Stansted looks to be reasonable, according to SH & E.

3.2 SH & E view is that the overall pattern of aircraft movements suggested by BAA's figures is reasonable and should be robust enough to allow consideration of surface access requirements in terms of flows on the local network. However, they have not reviewed the surface access data for passengers or staff.

Whilst SH&E conclude that the potential for actual traffic to exceed forecasts significantly in the future is limited they do identify a plausible scenario where this could happen (higher long haul traffic at Stansted with no mixed mode operation at Heathrow) There is some uncertainty about the voracity of the BAA forecasts. In essence the potential deleterious consequences of uncertainty surrounding potential higher forecasts, in the proposition being put forward by BAA is that these would be borne by additional adverse environmental conditions. The prudent way of dealing with this issue is to limit passenger growth to 35mppa at Stansted rather than an unconstrained passenger throughput.

### **4 Passenger Forecasts**

4.1 The current planning application is to allow growth on the existing runway beyond the presently permitted passenger limit of 25 mppa. BAA has compared the permitted position of 25 mppa at 2014 with that forecast of 35 mppa for the same year.

4.2 BAA forecast Stansted to continue to grow as an airport catering mainly for low cost European airlines. They suggest there will be some long haul services carrying some 10% of passengers, but the majority will be on short haul low cost services.

- 4.3 BAA's forecast for 2014, a date when they envisaged the second runway would have opened, is 35 million passengers. A greater number of passengers per plane, either because load factors for the low cost airline increase or because of more long haul services with bigger aircraft, would increase throughput. BAA assumes an upper figure of 40 mppa.
- 4.4 Increasing throughput from 25 mppa to 35 mppa is forecast to result in an extra 6.7 million terminating passengers. The other 3.3 million will transfer between aircraft at the airport and so not add to pressure on surface access infrastructure.
- 4.5 The local authorities' consultants (SH&E) consider 35 mppa to be a reasonable forecast while the low cost airlines themselves publicly doubt whether 35 mppa will be achieved by 2014. They fear rising airport charges (particularly those intended to pay for a second runway) will discourage airlines from starting new services which are the main elements of the growth.
- 4.6 SH&E also consider the forecast increase in transfer traffic to 17% assumed by BAA does not appear to be unreasonable particularly as the range of destinations served by Stansted including long haul destinations is expected to increase.
- 4.7 It is clear however that whatever the rate of growth by 2014 and beyond a throughput on one runway in excess of 35 mppa is possible particularly if the second runway does not go ahead as planned by BAA. These uncertainties regarding passenger numbers and mitigation can be avoided if passenger throughput is limited by condition. This should be an essential proviso if any permission were to be granted.
- 4.8 A condition limiting throughput in any 12 month period to 35 million passengers is strongly recommended. This is the level assessed in detail in the Environmental Statement and is considered to be a likely outcome by 2014. This will need to be augmented with further limitations to avoid overloading transport infrastructure at peak periods.

## **5 Noise and Air Quality**

### **Air Noise**

- 5.1 Measurement of aircraft noise is a complex area, with numerous different technical means of measurement, none of which entirely encapsulate individual experiences of noise and levels of annoyance. The 57 dB LAeq contour adopted by the Government as its noise benchmark represents an averaging of noise levels and does not take into account variations such

as those arising from differential flight path use, individual perceptions, and/or particular maximum levels. Nor does it deal with the issue that greater numbers of flights could cause annoyance by their frequency, even if their noise levels are reduced. BAA accordingly has not felt it needs to take the widest possible view of who might be affected by air noise in order to meet Government standards and has resisted any suggestions by the local authorities that it should follow best practice in noise measurement and mitigation rather than abiding by the minimum levels required.

- 5.2 BAA has not applied for any variation to noise conditions to accommodate extra flights. In addition to the above general considerations, this reflects the fact that condition AN1 attached to the 2003 25 mppa permission provides a very generous cap of 43.6km<sup>2</sup> on the area of the 57 dB LAeq noise contour. Earlier forecasts for the noise contour were based on an assumption of much noisier airplanes. The 25 mppa application assessment forecast a contour of 42.9km<sup>2</sup>. This compares with current projected contours of 33.9km<sup>2</sup> for the 35 mppa case, 29.7km<sup>2</sup> for the 2004 baseline and 27.5km<sup>2</sup> for the 25 mppa case. The earlier forecasts for 25 mppa thus forecast a much wider noise impact for Stansted than the 35 mppa case, despite the latter case involving 31,500 more ATMs and 10 mppa more passengers. It is worth noting that the later forecasts indicate that if airport growth was capped at 25 mppa, noise levels around Stansted in 2010 would be forecasted to actually reduce from current levels, with the contour area smaller by 2.2km<sup>2</sup>.
- 5.3 In addition to assumptions about airplane technology there are a number of other operational considerations that will affect future noise levels. BAA carried out sensitivity tests on the following areas to see if changing assumptions resulted in any significant variations in forecast results:
- Greater percentage of wider bodied large aircraft
  - Different modal splits
  - Redistribution of departure traffic on the Noise Preferential Routes
  - Potential introduction of precision area navigation (P-RNAV)
- 5.4 The fleet mix test showed that contour areas increased on average by 13% and the population with the 57 dB LAeq increased from 3,550 to 4,330 compared to the 35 mppa case. The other sensitivity tests showed only minor variations. The noticeable variations produced by the fleet mix test highlight the potential ramifications of Stansted increasing its share of the long haul market, with consequent increases in numbers of large aircraft used for longer flights.

## Night noise

- 5.5 Noise at Stansted during the period 11:30 – 6:00 is subject to Government restrictions currently effective to 2012 which limit flights according to a quota system as well as restricting overall movements. The Civil Aviation Bill currently before Parliament proposes that beyond 2012 the overall movement restriction at night be dropped. However this aspect of the Bill was defeated in the Lords and a commitment has been secured that the overall movement restrictions at night will be maintained. The quota is, however, generous and actual current use falls below the maximums allowed. In Winter 2005/06, for example, 76.4% of the quota was used and 65.3% of the movement level was used. There is accordingly scope for significant increases in night flight activity before maximum levels are reached. The late evening and early morning 'shoulder' periods could be affected if the night restriction period was to be extended to 8 hours in future, which may occur as a result of a standardised European noise measure – Lden, which averages noise impact over 24 hours and gives greater weight to evening and night noise disturbance.

## Ground noise

- 5.6 The Environmental Statement found that ground noise (including airplane activity on the ground as well as airport-generated traffic and activity) would cause 'moderate adverse impacts' at Tye Green, Gaunts End and Molehill Green at certain times. This impact would be spread over an extensive period, given the significant amounts of traffic generated by late evening arrivals and early morning departures.

## Cumulative Impacts

- 5.7 BAA looked at air and ground noise in isolation and did not consider any cumulative impacts, either when ground and air noise impacts are combined, or when baseline conditions are taken into account and not just the increment between 25 and 35 mppa. While the limited scope of the current planning application to vary the ATM condition may suggest a narrow view is adequate, this approach is not supported by EIA Regulations, which require an assessment of cumulative effects.

## Mitigation

- 5.8 BAA has not proposed any additional air noise mitigation measures for households. BAA already provides noise insulation for households within the > 66 dBA contour and since no additional households are forecast to be affected, it takes the view that it is under no statutory responsibility to provide more generous compensation. The Airports White Paper, however, provides that to address the impacts of future airport growth,

acoustic insulation to any residential property should extend through to the 63 dBA level. Furthermore, analysis of the ES information provided does not make it clear if there are any differences between households currently covered by noise insulation schemes and those projected to be within relevant contours.

- 5.9 The Schools Service has considered the potential implications of aircraft noise on schools in the area. The DfES, in its Building Bulletin 93 (Acoustic Design of Schools) recommends maximum ambient noise levels, both within schools and in playgrounds and playing fields. For classrooms, the upper limit for the indoor ambient noise level is 35dB LAeq and for unoccupied playgrounds 55dB LAeq with at least one area suitable for outdoor teaching activities where noise levels should not exceed 50dB LAeq. Non-compliance with the DfES standards could potentially lead to the disruption of lessons and steps should therefore be taken, wherever practical, to ensure compliance.

Recent noise level monitoring at schools in the vicinity of Stansted Airport, carried out on behalf of Essex County Council, indicate that the DfES recommendations are being exceeded at a number of schools by the current air traffic generated by the airport.

- 5.10 Bearing in mind the issues raised, there is general concern regarding the noise level contours used by BAA, notably the 63dB LAeq, which appears to trigger compensation payments, which is considered to be significantly too high. Even the DfT figure of 57dB LAeq, considered as 'the onset of significant community annoyance' allows noise levels in excess of those recommended for schools. Whilst this mismatch in central government recommendations between DfT and Dfes is far from helpful, as the authority responsible for education in Essex it is considered that the recommendations produced by the DfES should be followed as they are the most relevant to the school estate. We would expect that BAA Stansted, as a responsible provider of services to the public would share this view.

- 5.11 In order to move towards implementing DfES standards it is proposed that the following conditions should be attached to any approval:

1) That BAA Stansted undertake regular noise surveys at school sites in the vicinity of the Stansted Airport on a timetable agreed with the County Council and the schools.

2) That if non-compliance with Dfes document BB93 is shown to be due to aircraft noise, then BAA Stansted will fund any necessary remedial measures to improve noise insulation at the relevant schools.

## Air quality

- 5.12 Air pollution does not have the same high profile or impact at Stansted because of its predominantly rural location as it does at Heathrow. The evidence presented in the ES indicated that air quality is predicted to be similar in the 35 mppa case to the 25 mppa case, although concentrations of the pollutants analysed (NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, particulate matter, benzene and 1,3 butadiene) are marginally higher in the 35mppa case, as would be expected from an increase in ATMs and associated road traffic. There is some concern that the evidence presented does not conclusively establish the extent to which air pollution problems might arise from the addition of air pollution levels on top of existing baseline, cumulative effects of combining new pollution from different sources, or projected growth from other sources (ie Growth Area status). There is some concern that the current monitoring of air quality is inadequate to establish baseline levels and that BAA should commit to improved monitoring and more up-to-date models. The National Trust has particular concerns that air pollution from Stansted and the road network is having a significant effect on the ecosystem of Hatfield Forest. The ES found that EU targets for vegetation protection and ecosystems protection were not exceeded within Hatfield Forest or Eastend Wood, more comprehensive air quality monitoring funded by BAA in the Stansted area is an appropriate way forward.

## **6 Surface Access Transport Issues**

### **General Issues/Funding Contributions**

- 6.1 A number of key transport issues are still subject to ongoing investigations and discussion between BAA, the Highways Agency (HA), the rail sector and the local Highway Authorities Essex and Hertfordshire County Councils (ECC and HCC). The following paragraphs within this section provide a summary of the current position.
- 6.2 ECC will seek to minimise the impact of the airport expansion on the travel needs of Essex workers, residents and businesses. In order to achieve this ECC needs to ensure that the airport can be accessed efficiently by all modes of transport and that the environmental impact of surface access to the airport is reduced by continued growth of the public transport (PT) mode share.
- 6.3 The impact of the current 25 mppa permission on local surface access provision is offset by a package of planning conditions and planning obligations. A number of these obligations have not been implemented by BAA due to changes in circumstance that have occurred since the 25 mppa permission was granted back in 2003. The Generation 1 expansion

proposals provide an imperative to review the previous planning permission and confirm the conditions and obligations that BAA are still required to fulfil. The application to vary the current permission also provides the opportunity to replace conditions relating to surface access that are no longer considered appropriate and to strengthen others. The grant of any planning permission that the Local Planning Authority should be minded to grant to this planning application should be deferred until they are satisfied that all of the outstanding planning obligations and conditions that are still required in respect of the current permission have been fulfilled.

- 6.4 The current permission provided funds for local highway improvements (£2M), funds for improving the airport's bus and coach services (£1M) and the imposition of a levy on airport parking that currently provides around £600,000 per annum for improving access to the airport by non-car modes. ECC recommends that the current system is strengthened and rationalised by introducing the collection of a much more realistic charge related to the number of passengers above a baseline of 20mppa. Trips to the airport made by passenger transport, walking and cycling will be encouraged by targeting the collection of this charge at a unitary rate (except HGV's on all airport related trips made by road vehicles of all descriptions. HGV's will attract a charge of 5 times the rate imposed on other vehicles. ECC have recently bid for Transport Innovation Fund (TIF) funding to explore this approach in more detail in cooperation with BAA. If this system were to be introduced at, for example, an equivalent of £1 for every passenger in excess of 20 mppa, an annual income of £15M would be provided towards improving the local highway network and promoting passenger transport access to the airport once throughput has reached 35 mppa. At current levels of use this might be achieved by a charge of £1 per car (or other vehicles) and £5 per HGV.
- 6.5 It is recommended that the requirement for introducing vehicular transport charges is incorporated by way of a s106 Agreement between BAA and ECC.
- 6.6 It is envisaged that a Local Transport Board would be established to manage expenditure of the transport fund outlined in paragraph 6.4 above. Membership of the Board would include Essex County Council, Hertfordshire County Council, BAA, the Highways Agency and DfT Rail.

#### Forecasting Uncertainty

- 6.7 Experience gained from earlier expansions of the airport indicates that there is a great deal of uncertainty surrounding BAA's forecasts. BAA's forecasts for the nature and composition of flights serving the expanded airport and the origins and destinations of future passengers are to a large

degree based upon the opinion of their forecasting experts. Section 3 of this report indicates that SH&E, the expert air transport consultants engaged by ECC, have reported that BAA's air traffic and passenger forecasts appear to provide a reasonable base for examining impact on surface access to the airport. It must be remembered however, that predicting the impact of the airport on surface access will be influenced by many factors and that the surface access strategy for the airport will need to be sufficiently flexible to cater for a range of possible outcomes.

- 6.8 Passenger growth observed at Stansted has consistently outstripped all of the forecasts made in recent years made by BAA. A high level of uncertainty surrounds the level of housing and employment growth that will eventually result from the East of England Plan. Further uncertainty is linked to the potential level of passengers that will transfer flights within the confines of the airport, the geographic distribution of passengers and employees within the UK, future aircraft load levels and the timing of trips. Minor changes to these factors could combine to significantly alter the impact of the airport expansion on surface access provision.
- 6.9 The limited capacity of the single runway is a key factor affecting BAA's forecasts. BAA have argued that the runway is already fully utilised within the airport's morning and evening peaks and that the majority of the additional traffic required for growth to 35 mppa will be achieved by smoothing demand across the day. The TA predicts that this will result in only limited peak hour impact on surface access provision but the peak conditions will extend across a peak period of two or three hours. It is possible that small variations to the assumptions supporting BAA's forecasts could increase the demand to travel within future peak hours or peak periods. The imposition of a cap on movements using the runway in the morning and evening peak periods would help allay concern about the underestimation of the impact of the airport on surface access transport peak hour congestion.
- 6.10 In order to cater for the possibility that the impact of the airport expansion will vary from the forecasts presented in the Planning Applications TA it is important that the future impact of the airport is carefully monitored. Future growth of the airport should be conditioned to ensure that its impact on surface access provision can be managed. Limiting passenger throughput to 35mppa by condition would mean that transport access uncertainty is managed. This may need to be augmented with further limitations to avoid overloading of local transport provision at peak times.

## Impact on the Trunk Road Network

- 6.11 The M11 and the A120 (T) provide the principal highway access to the airport. Both of these roads are managed by the Highways Agency. BAA's TA argues that the impact of the airport expansion on future capacity issues on the local trunk road network is not significant when compared against background growth. The TA identified a number of areas where the local trunk road system is forecast to be subject to flows over the road capacity in 2014 and 2023 with the airport operating at 35 mppa. BAA made no commitment towards addressing these problems in the TA.
- 6.12 BAA have only recently changed their position on providing improvements to the trunk road network and limited time is available for the HA (Highways Agency) and ECC to consider the improvements that BAA are now investigating. Suffice it to say they are inadequate.
- 6.13 Current Government policy on the impact of development on trunk roads requires the applicant to demonstrate that the trunk road can accommodate the total traffic forecast at the "first point of contact" fifteen years after beneficial use of the development. Applicants are also required to provide improvements downstream of the developments first point of contact with the trunk road network to maintain the level of service provided to existing users ("Nil detriment"). The Highways Agency has insisted that BAA conform to the Government's policy and provide the required trunk road improvements.
- 6.14 BAA has now agreed to comply with the HA's requirement and have developed and offered to provide the following schemes:
- "First Point of Contact" Schemes: Kerb and lining works to provide extra capacity at the A120(T)Bassingbourne Roundabout, the A120(T) Priors Wood Roundabout and at the A120(T) east facing slips near to the mid-stay car parks.
- "Nil detriment" Scheme: Kerb, white lining and signal operation works at M11 J8 to prevent blocking of the junction.
- An initial technical note from BAA has been received by the HA but at the time of writing has not been seen by ECC.
- 6.15 The HA / BAA have yet to reach agreement on how to address the A120(T) weaving capacity between the Bassingbourne and Priors Wood roundabouts and ECC will demand that this issue is satisfactorily resolved. The TA suggests that the expansion to 35 mppa takes forecasts flows above the design capacity of the three lanes currently provided. BAA are now re-visiting their forecasts to try to demonstrate that the closure of the

- link to local roads at the Coopers End roundabout, that has an extant planning permission, will reduce weaving to a level below the design capacity.
- 6.16 In practical terms it is difficult to envisage how the capacity of the short A120 (T) weaving section between the Bassingbourne and Priory Wood roundabouts can be readily improved by widening. The most obvious and practical solution, which would also improve conditions at the M11 junction 8, would be to provide north facing slips onto the M11 to remove weaving airport traffic from the A120 (T) link. Given the uncertainty regarding BAA's forecasts it would not be prudent for the HA to underestimate the potential for future weaving capacity problems on the A120(T) at this stage. ECC will press the HA to secure a robust solution to this potential problem by securing the provision of north facing M11 slips to remove airport traffic from the A120(T) and the M11 junction 8.
- 6.17 ECC are concerned at the recent announcement that the free running left slip between the M11 southbound off-slip and the A120(T), which was to have been provided as a planning obligation for the current 25 mppa permission, has been downgraded. It is understood that the HA have agreed to this scheme being downgraded as the free running lane cannot now be constructed to current design standards. The scheme will now consist of minor flaring to provide two left turn lanes for the A120(T) on the M11 southbound off slip's stop line at the M11 junction 8 signals. ECC consider this to be unsatisfactory and that a direct slip must be provided. The free running lane would have meant that A120(T) traffic from the M11 north would not have passed through the M11 junction 8 signals. The removal of traffic from the M11 junction 8 signals would have provided more signal time and improved conditions for the remaining traffic. The downgrading of this scheme heightens the case for BAA and the HA to improve the capacity and rationalise the layout of the M11 junction 8 to accommodate the flows forecast for the airport expansion.
- 6.18 ECC remain highly concerned by the decision, made by the DfT in late 2005, to defer the widening of the M11 between junctions 8 and 9. ECC has no confidence in the DfT/HA's assessment of the transportation needs of this area and will need to be satisfied that this scheme will be reinstated into the Government's road programme for early construction. The HA have been asked to investigate the possible provision of climbing lanes as an interim solution. In light of the uncertainties associated with the expansion of the airport it is recommended that the HA carefully monitor traffic conditions on the dual two lane carriageway section of the motorway north of Stansted to insure that improvements are introduced in good time.

#### Rail Access

- 6.19 A number of rail related planning obligations attached to the current planning permission have yet to be provided. The main reason for this is that the anticipated need to lengthen the existing 8 car Stansted Express (STEX) trains to 12 car trains has not arisen due to timetable changes introduced by the train operator "One" in December 2005. These changes, which doubled the frequency of peak period STEX to 4 trains per hour, were achieved by providing additional peak period paths that were previously used by commuter trains. The loss of commuter services was partially offset by making STEX trains stop at Harlow, Bishop's Stortford and Stansted Mountfitchet. As a result of these changes STEX now has to serve both airport passengers and local commuters. The increased STEX frequency has obviated the need to extend the trains to 12 cars and to provide provision for 12 car trains at the Stansted Mountfitchet and airport stations.
- 6.20 Major changes have occurred to the regulation of the rail industry since the 25 mppa planning application was considered. The functions of the Strategic Rail Authority (SRA), which played an active role in the consideration of the 25 mppa application, have now passed to DfT Rail and Network Rail. It is understood that Network Rail will comment on the physical impact of the Generation 1 planning application on the West Anglia Rail infrastructure. Network Rail have the responsibility to ensure that any increase in service required for expansion of the airport can physically be accommodated on the line and at its stations. DfT Rail is responsible for the Government's rail policy and for managing the train operators' franchises. DfT Rail are therefore responsible for altering the rail operator's franchise to provide any increase in the level of service required to support expansion of the airport.
- 6.21 The Generation 1 TA indicates that there will be a need to extend the 8 car STEX (Stansted Express) trains as the airport throughput approaches 35 mppa. BAA has not made any commitment to providing the extended trains and the TA suggests that the additional capacity will be provided by the rail industry.
- 6.22 ECC accepts that additional STEX capacity will be required at some point in the future. The additional capacity will need to be provided before overcrowding on STEX trains impacts on Essex commuters and further reduces the attractiveness of the service to airport passengers. The first stage in this process is for DfT Rail and Network Rail to confirm that the West Anglia Line and the stations served by STEX, particularly Liverpool Street, can accommodate the extended trains.
- 6.23 Network Rail have indicated that the possibility of running 12 car trains to Stansted was explored as part of the current 25 mppa permission and they do not foresee any in-principal problems. Network Rail does not plan

to carry out any detailed assessments until West Anglia Route Utilisation Study is complete at the end of 2007.

- 6.24 Steer Davies Gleave (ECC's consultants on rail issues) have advised ECC that whilst 12 car STEX operation is likely to prove feasible there would be major costs involved including additional platform equipment and costs incurred in storing and moving the additional rolling stock to form and break 12 car trains. Power supply limitations along the West Anglia Line and the potential need to increase the level of staff to operate the 12 car trains also need to be addressed. The rail industry will need to confirm that these improvements are deliverable and identify the parties who will be responsible for funding them.
- 6.25 BAA'S TA acknowledges that the Air Transport White Paper indicates that it is the responsibility of the airport operator to bring forward and secure funding for the transport provision required to support airport expansion. On this basis it would be reasonable to require BAA to ensure that 12 car STEX trains are provided when needed rather than leaving this important decision to the rail industry. In order to address the concerns outlined above ECC would expect BAA to enter into a formal agreement with DfT Rail, Network Rail and the train operating company to monitor the future use of STEX and insure that the extended STEX trains are provided before overcrowding occurs.

#### Impact on the Local Road Network

- 6.26 The TA indicates that the application will have little effect on the local roads surrounding the airport that are managed by ECC. ECC refute this absolutely and assert that these local roads could prove to be attractive routes for passengers diverting around incidents on the trunk road network. BAA already has planning permission to restrict access to the Cooper's End roundabout from the local roads that lead to villages to the north and to Takeley. The residential development on the Rochford nurseries site to the south of Stansted Mountfitchet will divert Forest Hall Road away from the Secondary School but will not close the route to airport traffic heading for the local roads to the south and west of the airport. ECC will require BAA to monitor the use of the local road network to examine the impact of diversion caused by problems on the trunk road network. Where necessary traffic management measures should be introduced to deter (or possibly encourage) use of local roads by airport traffic.

#### Bus and Coach Access

- 6.27 The TA assesses the impact of a number of new bus and coach services to accommodate the additional demand that will arise from the expansion

to 35 mppa. ECC would wish to see the recent successes in expanding the coverage and frequency of the airport's bus and coach services continue. If the provision of new services is left to the market it is likely that attention will focus additional provision along proven routes at the expense of developing new services along routes that have yet to be established.

- 6.28 ECC believes that it is essential that BAA's obligations for bus and coach provision that are attached to the 25 mppa permission are continued with any permission granted for 35 mppa. This would initially include continuation of the use of the parking levies to promote increases in PT mode share to the airport and provision of additional funds to help establish new airport bus and coach services. This system could subsequently be replaced by a transport charge linked to the increasing passenger numbers as outlined in section 6.4 of this report.

#### Mode Share

- 6.29 The Government's Air Transport White Paper indicates that the Government expects airport operators to demonstrate how they will increase the proportion of passengers travelling to /from the airport by public transport when they submit proposals for new capacity. The proposed 40% increase in throughput to 35 mppa from the current 25 mppa permission provides a major opportunity for BAA to improve upon the airport's current passenger PT mode share target.
- 6.30 In recent years BAA have been particularly successful in increasing the use of bus and coach travel to the airport. BAA's success in this area should be recognised along with the fact that they have already achieved the longer term passenger PT mode share target of 40% that was attached to the current permission. In terms of the PT mode share for passengers achieved at European airports Stansted now ranks third equal with Munich behind Amsterdam Schipol (42%) and Zurich (59%). This does not mean that BAA should be allowed to relax their grip on this issue. Continued effort will be required to maintain and grow the passenger PT mode share and to make further improvements to the PT mode share of airport staff.
- 6.31 BAA's TA indicates that the continuation of their current transport policies could result in a small decrease in passenger PT mode share to 39.9% when the airport reaches 35 mppa in 2014. The TA also identifies a limited range of potential operational interventions that could enhance this figure to 43.2%. The interventions that produce the "enhanced" case consist of a number of additional bus and coach services that could be suitable for funding from the local transport fund outlined in sections 6.4/6.5 of this report. The TA considers but does not recommend the adoption of a

number of other measures such as increased parking charges, forecourt charges and remote park and ride sites. It would appear that there may be scope for future joint working with BAA to explore the potential for remote park and ride operations at Harlow and Braintree.

- 6.32 ECC's recent bid for TIF funding seeks funding for the investigation of the possible future introduction of road user charging in the vicinity of the airport. ECC will wish to investigate this issue in cooperation with BAA in the hope that further significant increases in PT mode share will result. Sections 6.4/6.5 of this report provides further information on this proposal which would eventually replace the current system that obliges BAA to operate the airport parking levy and provide funds for bus/coach development.
- 6.33 ECC would also expect any permission for 35 mppa to secure continued improvement in the PT mode share of the airport's employees and further reductions in the share of single occupancy employee cars.

#### Parking

- 6.34 The TA reports that the forecast 35 mppa passenger parking requirement of 38,800 is below the level of 42,700 that were permitted for the 25 mppa permission. ECC believe that in order to focus BAA's efforts in maintaining and improving the future passenger PT mode share the 35 mppa permission should amend the level of parking to reflect the reduced requirement that is now forecast. However as this already has planning permission it is unlikely that BAA would agree to this without compensation.
- 6.35 The proposal to relocate a significant proportion of employee parking to Coopers End and then to Northside and provide shuttle bus services to the employment areas would appear to be sensible. The TA also suggests that there will be a progressive need to increase the number of car share bays in car parks directly controlled by Stansted Airport Ltd (STAL) and those leased by STAL to other businesses. The TA does not clearly identify if or how many additional employee parking spaces will be required in the future. If permission for further spaces is required it should only be given on condition that the measures outlines above are secured.

## **7 Employment and Economic Impact**

- 7.1 Government considers airports and air services to be essential for the economy especially the high tech companies such as pharmaceuticals which are so important to the East Region. Stansted is now the third largest airport in the UK for both passengers and freight and clearly plays

- an important role in aviation but the nature of its services, that of low cost flights to the UK and Europe, essentially means that its economic impact is less than a similar sized airport not based on low cost carriers.
- 7.2 Of the 18.3 million terminating (non transfer) passengers in 2004 3.4 million (19%) were business passengers. For the 25 mppa case in 2014 5.2 million (23% of terminating passengers) are forecast to be travelling on business, the lack of airport capacity squeezing out leisure passengers. However, with the added capacity in the 35 mppa case business travellers would only rise to 5.5 million (19%) with foreign business travellers actually falling by 130,000.
  - 7.3 For the East Region business travel, UK and foreign, will increase, from 1.9 million to 2.2 million (25 – 35 mppa cases) but will still fall as a proportion of the region's total air passengers. The development to 35 mppa would therefore be largely serving leisure passengers (94% of the additional terminating passengers) with the majority being UK in origin.
  - 7.4 The development of Stansted would in BAA's view add to the airport infrastructure within the London area airports system adding to the 'locational competitiveness' of both the East of England and London. In addition any increase in services across Europe is of benefit to local and, it is claimed, London firms doing business on the continent. The destinations of these new services however may not offer the potential of the existing centres served.
  - 7.5 BAA also claim the growth of nearly 2 million foreign leisure passengers (5.2 million to 7.1 million 25-35 mppa, 1 million extra visitors) as an economic benefit. Their assessment is that some of these visitors would not come to the UK if Stansted was limited to 25 mppa. The downside is that growth to 35 mppa enables an additional 4.4 million UK leisure passengers (2.2 million visitors) to fly out of the country spending far more than the visiting foreign passengers.
  - 7.6 In addition to the wider economic impacts, the airport also has more obvious employment impacts. The employment study area comprises all local authority districts which account for 1% of Stansted employees. Using this definition, the study area comprises all local authority districts of Uttlesford, East Hertfordshire, Braintree, Harlow, Chelmsford, Epping Forest, Colchester, St Edmundsbury, South Cambridgeshire and Cambridge. In 2003, some 79% of Stansted employees lived in these districts with Uttlesford, East Hertfordshire and Braintree accounting for 59% of total employment.
  - 7.7 Stansted related employment comprises four categories of employment. Direct on-airport employment comprises employees of businesses whose

- activity is directly and solely related to Stansted, whose jobs are based within the Airport boundary. Total direct on airport employment at Stansted was some 10,600 jobs in 2003, by 2005 this had increased to 11,600. Direct off-airport jobs is limited and in 2003 was estimated at 300 mainly hotel related jobs.
- 7.8 Indirect employment comprises employment in firms supplying goods and services to the businesses at the airport, in 2003 this was estimated to be 1300 jobs. Finally induced employment is defined as employment supported by the expenditure of those employees in the above categories. The employment multiplier yields an estimate for this category of 2,900 in 2003.
- 7.9 In 2003 the total Stansted related employment was 14,800. Forecasts for 2014 for the 35mppa are 23,200 jobs some 8,400 above the 2003 year base.
- 7.10 Employment numbers are considerably less than was originally envisaged in the estimates presented to the Airport Inquiries of 1981-1983, which forecast that Stansted's total airport related employment at 15mppa would be about 28,700. It is clear therefore that the direct economic impact of the airport has been less than originally envisaged. Nevertheless the employment increase is important in a sub region that relies predominantly on out commuting.
- 7.11 The actual wider economic impact of the airport is not easy to measure, however business organisations consider the existence of a major international airport in the region as being of benefit.
- 7.12 The scale of growth proposed up to 35mppa is not considered to require additional housing and employment land allocations beyond that already identified in the Regional Strategy.

## **8 Waste**

- 8.1 The expansion of Stansted Airport will have an impact on the generation of waste albeit limited in overall quantity, some 10,400 tonnes forecast with 35mppa. BAA has a long term target of 80% of airport waste to be recycled/composted by 2020 with an interim target of 40% in 2010.
- 8.2 In 2004/5 Stansted achieved 22% recycled/composted. The County Council expects that these targets are included as planning obligations/agreements in any planning approval, including financial penalties if these targets are not met.

## **9 Climate Change**

- 9.1 One issue of increasing importance globally and which needs to be considered as part of any airport development is climate change. Emissions from aircraft, carbon dioxide, vapour trails and nitrogen oxides, are the fastest growing contributor to climate change which itself is seen as the greatest environmental threat to the planet.
- 9.2 BAA is of the view that as a global issue it has to be addressed at a global or at least national/European Union level. The EU's intention is to introduce an emissions trading scheme for EU aviation which would include most of Stansted's traffic. This has the support of the UK government, BAA and BA though not of the low cost carriers using Stansted.
- 9.3 Whatever the ultimate success of such a scheme the contribution the additional operations at Stansted, if permitted, will make to global climate change will be small. The proposed increase in air traffic movements is just 23,000 atms (from 241,000 atms permitted) and it might be argued some would migrate to other airports if Stansted were not expanded.
- 9.4 Essex County Council and its residents are rightly concerned over the impact of climate change. However it is considered that it is not a justifiable reason for refusal, partly because of the government's policy stance in the Air Transport White Paper and partly because of the limited level of growth being proposed at Stansted. Development should only be permitted however, if it is limited to the levels forecast in terms of both aircraft movements and total passengers.
- 9.5 Emissions and climate change are issues where this authority may wish to seek to put pressure on government to clarify its intentions as to how UK aviation is to develop without compromising the essential policy aim to reduce the growth of climate change emissions. This can be done separately to this application.

## **10 Relevance to Corporate Objectives and other Strategic Plans**

- 10.1 The Essex Corporate Plan 2006-2009 includes the following corporate objectives:
- Minimising Essex's ecological footprint
  - Protecting our environment

- Improving the quality of life of Essex residents and communities
- Tackling traffic congestion
- Encouraging the use of passenger transport
- Making Essex more attractive to do business

10.2 The existing scale of Stansted Airport impacts on all these corporate objectives. Managing the impact of change is a key element of the Essex response to the proposal.

## **11 Finance and Resource Implications**

11.1 There will be some direct resource implications if this proposal goes to Public Inquiry in pursuing the objectives identified in this report. In the longer term, if successful, additional resources through conditions and obligations could be directed to providing transport infrastructure in the Stansted Area and in providing mitigation at schools.

## **12 Area of County Affected**

12.1 Stansted Airport is of national significance and hence its impact is County-wide. The most significant part of the County affected is the Districts of Uttlesford, Braintree, Harlow and Epping Forest

## 13 Conclusions

- 13.1 The proposed expansion of Stansted for the full use of the existing runway is in line with existing government policy but will cause increased disturbance for residents over a wide area. However this does not mean that the local impacts cannot be managed by the imposition of measures to mitigate the environmental impact. The application as deposited by BAA with no passenger throughput limit and no additional mitigation measures is unacceptable. Local people are understandably concerned and must be assured that if any permission is granted it is subject to stringent conditions to ensure forecast impacts are not exceeded.
- 13.2 Noise is likely to be the greatest concern but the increase as measured by the government's favoured method, the 57Leq contour, is not great and the forecast area encompassed is less than previously permitted. The increase in aircraft movements although relatively limited in extent above that already permitted is forecast to occur particularly in some of the more contentious early morning and late evening periods. This will cause increased local disturbance. It will also be important to manage the noise impact on noise sensitive activities and the issue of the impact on schools needs to be mitigated.
- 13.3 It will be important to scrutinise potential changes in airspace operations proposed to occur in 2009 to accommodate overall growth of traffic in the London area and this may provide a solution to the lack of Continuous Descent Approaches from the south-west and pressure should be maintained on BAA and the National Air Traffic Service (NATS) to resolve the issue. Requiring change in the organisation and operation of airspace cannot however be a condition to any permission.
- 13.4 Any permission that is granted must be subject to stringent conditions and limits to control noise nuisance. Uttlesford DC should be informed that these should include a limit on total throughput (no more than 35 mppa) and limits on day and night contour areas. It should also include monitoring and additional noise insulation requirements for schools.
- 13.5 The provision of adequate surface access infrastructure is another essential element of any potential permission. Permission should only be granted if BAA is committed to make the necessary financial contributions to the required network enhancements.
- 13.6 The impact of the airport expansion on the local transport networks should be offset through the introduction of charges linked to increases in passenger throughput. This charge will be targeted at airport related trips. ECC's recent TIF bid proposes to explore the development of this system in cooperation with BAA. It is intended that the annual transport charge

- would replace the current system where funding is provided by the airport parking levy and other financial contributions provided by BAA. A Local Transport Board would be established to manage spend of the annual transport charge.
- 13.7 Limiting passenger throughput to 35 mppa would manage longer term uncertainty. This may need to be augmented by further limitations to prevent overloading of local transport provision at peak times.
  - 13.8 The HA should be pressed to secure robust solutions to the capacity problems forecast on the A120 (T) and at the M11 junction 8. Given the uncertainty regarding BAA's forecasts it would not be prudent for the HA to underestimate the potential for future weaving capacity problems on the A120 (T) at this stage. ECC believe that the provision of north facing slips onto the M11 and rationalisation of the layout of the M11 junction 8 will provide the most practical solution for this issue.
  - 13.9 The TA forecasts that peak period overcrowding on the current 8 car STEX trains will worsen by 2014 if the airport is allowed to expand to 35 mppa. BAA suggest that the need to provide 12 car STEX trans will be met by the rail industry whereas the Air Transport White Paper requires the airport operator to bring forward and secure funding for the transport provision required to support airport expansion. ECC recommends that the impact of the airport expansion on the rail system is regularly monitored to ensure that 12 car STEX trains are provided before overcrowding becomes a problem. Uttlesford should require BAA to enter into a legal agreement with Network Rail for the provision of the rail infrastructure required to accommodate 12 car trains. BAA must also enter into an agreement with DfT Rail and the train operator, within 6 months of any consent, to ensure provision and operation of the 12 car STEX trains before overcrowding occurs.
  - 13.10 ECC will wish to draw on the £2.0 M fund provided under the terms of the 25 mppa permission to address any issues that may arise on the local highway network. In the longer term this fund should be superseded by the annual transport charge system that will be investigated via the TIF process and established by way of a S106 Agreement.
  - 13.11 Global issues such as emissions and climate change while of great importance are not considered to be a justification for an objection to the application.
  - 13.12 If the application is refused or not determined by Uttlesford District Council a Public Inquiry is the likely outcome. The decision is then in the hands of the Inspector and ultimately the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. In any event the Local Authority would have to put

forward conditions that should be applied if permission were to be granted. It is difficult to be precise on the issue at the present time but such an Inquiry is likely to involve significant costs both in monetary terms and staff resources. The Inspector, if recommending to the Secretary of State to grant permission, may not choose to put forward conditions as tough as those preferred by the local authorities.

- 13.13 This report identifies the strategic issues concerning the expansion of Stansted Airport utilising capacity on the existing runway. From an Essex County Council perspective it is recommended that a response be made to Uttlesford DC setting out the planning conditions and financial requirements (Section 106 agreements) outlined in this report and summarised in Appendix 1 which this authority would wish to see imposed on any permission granted. From a technical perspective it is considered that the implications of expansion to 35mppa (not an unrestrained expansion) can be mitigated and managed by conditions and obligations. The County Council should however make it clear that any views expressed on the present application do not affect its continued total opposition to a new runway.

## Appendix 1: Proposed Conditions and Planning Obligations

Proposed Conditions, together with Section 106 Obligations, to control and manage and, as far as possible, mitigate the impact of growth of the airport, and should include the following high level controls relating to:

- a) An absolute limit on annual passenger throughput of 35 million passengers together with limits on aircraft movements. A cap on movements using the single runway in the morning and evening peak periods would reduce the potential for unexpected levels of peak demand having an adverse impact on the surface access transport network.
- b) noise contour controls for both day and night; That BAA Stansted undertake regular noise surveys at school sites in the vicinity of the Stansted Airport on a timetable agreed with the County Council and the schools. That if non-compliance with DfES document BB93 is shown to be due to aircraft noise, then BAA Stansted will fund any necessary remedial measures to improve noise insulation at the relevant schools
- c) surface access improvements to both road and rail infrastructure, including improvements to the A120(T), M11 Junction 8 and airport access roads; provision of 12 car trains; other appropriate Essex and Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan schemes;
- d) BAA must enter a formal agreement with DfT Rail, Network Rail and the train operating company to monitor the use of STEX and ensure that the extended STEX trains and necessary supporting infrastructure is provided before overcrowding occurs.
- e) Further and on-going financial contributions towards transport provision initially including continuation of the use of parking levies to promote increases in PT mode share including the establishment of new airport bus and coach services. The current funding system for addressing the transport impact of the airport is to be replaced by a system of road user transport charges linked to increases in airport throughput. Joint working between ECC and BAA through the TIF process will be used to investigate and develop the new transport charging system. This fund is to be collected from airport related vehicular trips and managed through a Local Transport Board to address transport impacts arising from the airport expansion.(S106 Obligation)

- f) Adopt a minimum target of 40% PT mode share for passengers
- g) making the airport as sustainable an operation as possible (subject to periodic reviews and further improvements in accordance with evolving policy and best practice), in respect of such issues as waste, energy and water saving; renewable energy production and use of low emission fuels on the airport site;
- h) a further financial contribution to be agreed to the Stansted Area Housing Partnership Fund.
- i) continued contributions to skills education in areas where airport recruitment is concentrated.

More detailed essentially local impacts are for the Local Planning Authority, Uttlesford District Council to identify and impose conditions to manage.