

**Transcript of Special Meeting of UDC Planning Committee to consider Stansted Airport Planning Application UTT/18/0460/FUL on 14 November 2018.**

**Member Attendance Details**

Councillor Robert Chambers – Conservative  
Councillor Paul Fairhurst – Residents for Uttlesford  
Councillor Richard Freeman – Residents for Uttlesford  
Councillor Anthony Gerard – Residents for Uttlesford  
Councillor Eric Hicks – Conservative  
Councillor Mark Lemon – Conservative (formerly Independent)  
Councillor Janice Loughlin – Liberal Democrat (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Alan Mills – Conservative (Chairman)  
Councillor Howard Ryles – Conservative  
Councillor Lesley Wells – Conservative

**Officers**

Mr Roger Harborough – Director of Public Services, UDC  
Mr Nigel Brown – Development Manager, UDC  
Mr Gordon Glenday – Assistant Director Planning, UDC  
Ms Karen Denmark – Development Management Team Leader, UDC  
Mr Jeremy Pine – Planning Policy and Development Control Liaison Officer, UDC  
Mr Marcus Watts – Environmental Health Manager, UDC  
Mrs Elizabeth Smith – Litigation and Planning Solicitor, UDC  
Ben Ferguson – Democratic Services Officer, UDC

**Others**

Mr David Sprunt – Essex Highways  
Ms Katherine Wilkinson – Essex Highways  
Ms Mary Young – Essex Highways  
Mr Peter Henson – Bickersdike Allen Partners ('BAP') (Noise)  
Mr Nigel Mann – WYG (Air Quality)

---

**Note:** The meeting started at 10am with a brief introduction followed by an opening statement by the Development Management Team Leader, followed by a series of short representations from UDC councillors not on the Planning Committee, Parish Councils, members of the public and the CEO of STAL, which completed the morning's proceedings at 12.30pm. The afternoon session began at 1.15pm and this was the actual deliberation meeting. This transcript covers the opening statement by the Development Management Team Leader and all of the afternoon session.

---

**10.00 am** – Start

Chairman's introduction, including brief statements by Nigel Brown and Elizabeth Smith. [Not transcribed]

**10.06 am**

**Presentation by Karen Denmark, Case Officer**

Thank you very much, Chairman. As has already been said, this has been a collaborative approach. I've had a team that I've been working with, and this is some of the team. So I'd like to introduce you to Peter Henson, who deal with noise issues, Nigel Mann, air quality, Mary Young, David Sprunt and Katherine Wilkinson, who have been dealing with the highways issues, Gordon Glenday, who most of you know, and Marcus Watts, our Environmental Health Officer, Jeremy Pine, who is policy.... yes, and has had a wealth of experience in dealing with the Stansted Airport planning applications, having dealt with them previously, and Roger Harborough, who is the Director.

This application, as you are all aware, relates to Stansted Airport, and the application has been accompanied by an environmental statement that has been independently reviewed and found to be satisfactory. As has already been said, officers have worked in conjunction with a team of people, including officers from Essex County Council, Hertfordshire County Council, East Herts District Council, Place Services, Network Rail, Highways England, Natural England and other officers within the Council. Further expertise has also been provided by Jacobs and Aecom to Essex Highways and Highways England respectively. In addition, we have been advised by WYG on air quality issues, Bickerdike Allen Partners LLP on noise, who specialise in aircraft noise.

So the planning application relates to an uplift in passenger numbers from the currently consented 35 million passengers per annum to 43 million. This is proposed to be within the current consented number of air transport movements of 247,000 [sic]. These are currently conditioned to be no more than 243,500 passenger movements, 20,500 cargo movements and 10,000 general aviation movements. The proposals seek to limit cargo movements to a lower cap of 16,000 and passenger and other movements, including general aviation, to 258,000 per annum. The application also relates to the construction of some physical infrastructure, so we have a rapid access taxiway, which is here, a rapid exit taxiway, six additional stands, known as Yankee stands here, and three additional Echo stands. This gives you some better indication of the access taxiway and the exit taxiway, the six stands and the three additional stands.

The application is assessed on the basis of predicted airport growth, seeing the current cap of 35 million being reached by 2022, and continued growth to 43 million passengers per annum by 2028. It must be remembered that the growth to 35 million is consented, and this growth can and will happen regardless of the outcome of this application.

The application sets out the baseline of the current situation environmentally as at 2016, the year where data sets are available for all topics. The impacts of growth are considered against the baseline and compared between the predicted impacts at 35 million passengers per annum. The issues are as set out in the Officers' Report, and no significant adverse impacts have been identified, subject to mitigation measures being secured by conditions or Section 106. Highway impacts are required to be mitigated in respect of junction 8 of the M11. The mitigation scheme has been prepared, and found to be acceptable. This involved the widening of the carriageway on key approach and exit arms, and a series of amendments to lane allocations, and the proposed signalisation of Priory Wood roundabout. You can't see it very well, but this is the scheme. I've broken it down into smaller sections. We've got the reassignment of the hard shoulder; we've got an on demand signalisation from exit from the depot; we've got the carriageway to be widened at the exit to the motorway services; designation marking lines to be amended and re-designation of lines, areas within the roundabout, and reassignment over here where you ...and the carriageway to be widened ... as you're going round the roundabout. Then some additional changes here on the northbound off-slip. I'm rushing over this. There will be a more in-depth presentation about this later on. The Priory Wood roundabout, it's proposed to do some traffic lights on that particular slip off the roundabout. This is sometimes referred to as the interim plus scheme, so if you hear that term during the day this is the scheme that we are referring to. The interim scheme is the scheme that Essex County Council have got funding for and hope to get under way. But, like I said, that will be discussed in more detail later on.

Because this scheme needs to mitigate impacts arising from the growth from 35 million to 43 million, this may be some time in the future, so Highways England have actually requested that at 35 million the scheme be reviewed to see whether it is still the most appropriate scheme. Because it could be that whilst we are agreeing this today, some time down the line this may not be the most appropriate scheme and could actually end up causing harm. So they want it to be reviewed, and Highways England are also hoping to get some funding for strategic improvements to the M11. If that is the case, if they have managed to secure funding for a major scheme, then the costs of this scheme will be a financial contribution towards the larger scheme. So either way there will be a mitigation scheme, either it will be a physical mitigation scheme on the ground, or it will be an equivalent financial contribution towards a larger scheme.

In terms of other highways mitigation, we've got levies that will be collected and the sums will go towards sustainable transport measures. There is a transport levy that is currently collected, which is 25p per car parking transaction, and £10 per annum for staff car parking. Kiss and Fly is currently not subject to the levy, because that wasn't in place at the time the previous unilateral undertaking was drawn up. The current levy currently raises around £550,000 per annum, and this predicted to grow to around £1.6 million per annum. Part of that growth would come as a result of an additional 10p per transaction being applied to the Kiss and Fly transactions. So this levy would be used for improvements to public transport, road schemes, cycling and walking schemes under the umbrella of the Transport Forum and its working groups. It can also include upgrading buses, installation of vehicle electric charging points, including rapid charging points for taxis, and in addition there will be a ring fenced sum of £1 million for improvements to bus and coach networks – that is in addition to the levy money – and there will be a ring fenced sum of £800,000 for highway improvements within five miles of the airport for Essex roads.

Moving on to noise: noise mitigation is considered to be one of the most contentious issues, and the airport currently runs a sound insulation grant scheme. They are proposing to revise this and have a new scheme. This will now have three tiers of funding. Those properties within the red area will be entitled to £10,000 for noise insulation works, including double glazing. The properties in the yellow areas will be entitled up to £8,000 and the properties in the green area up to £5,000. Previously, the applications for grants needed to be match funded. Now the scheme will pay 100% up to these caps. The noise contour is currently conditioned to be no more than 33.9 square kilometres. The airport currently operates well with-inside that limit, and the noise contour will increase from where it currently is whilst the airport expands up to 35 million passengers per annum, but it's not expected to breach the 33.9 square kilometres that it currently covers. When the throughput reaches 35 million per annum, or 31st December 2024, the application will be required to submit a strategy to set out the measures required to reduce the area of the noise contour by the end of 2028 to an area of 28.7 square kilometres, and this area may not be breached thereafter. This proposed reduction in the noise contour is based on the assessment as set out in the environmental statement. This is underpinned by the assumptions in relation to aircraft fleet mix, which take into account replacement of existing aircraft types by newer variants, including the aircraft anticipated to operate emerging long-haul routes.

A community trust fund is also being prepared, community and wellbeing - sorry - community and health trust fund, which will have £150,000 per annum, and this is for communities which are impacted by noise and disturbance, which could impact on health and wellbeing. This would cover the parishes within a 10 mile radius of the centre point of the runway, and includes areas on East Hertfordshire, Harlow, Chelmsford and Epping Forest. The trust would be open for applications for projects aimed at protecting or enhancing the social, economic, health and environmental wellbeing of the community. Parish Councils have previously been prevented from applying for grants under the old trust fund, and that restriction is now lifted in the new proposals.

A few housekeeping bits: there's a revised... following negotiations with East Herts District Council, who felt that issues hadn't been addressed satisfactorily – we've had various meetings with them – and we've now reached an agreement. It was more about tweaking some words in the Section 106 requirements. So

in the supplementary list of representations in front of members there is a revised schedule for the transport section. We have had confirmation now, a letter from them, that they've now lifted their objection. You should have a copy of that in front of you. We've had two more representations, plus a letter from a Parish Council. They don't raise any new issues; it's all things that have been covered in the reports. Members have had a series of briefing notes from SSE, and the applicant has done a response document which was sent out late yesterday. You also have a copy of that in front of you. I'm not going to comment on the particular issues that have been raised in those documents.

Subject to the mitigation packages and the conditions set out in the report, the application is therefore recommended for refusal - sorry approval.

[Laughter]

**10.21 am**

Public speaking session – including members of Council, not on Planning Committee, Parish Councils, members of the general public and the Chief Executive of Stansted Airport Ltd. **[Not transcribed]**

**12.30 pm**

**Adjournment**

**1.15 pm - Start of afternoon session**

Chairman: Thank you very much Ladies and Gentlemen. Sorry we're a little bit late reconvening. The form for this afternoon: I've got four or five major headings which I'm going to try and guide people through. Basically, it's now an open discussion with the members. I would remind everybody exactly what we've got in front of us. An application for a RET and a RAT, return access, return exit, nine aircraft stands and the uplift of the passengers from 35 to 43 million. I'm going to start with environmental aspects, and I'm going to ask - I think - David - or is it Katherine? - who's doing it? you're doing it? - David - to take us through in a bit more detail the transport consequences. David, if that can include the scheme - you know - that's on the cards now, the interim plus and the interim extra plus in those sorts of sequences, and then pick up the other bits and pieces. OK?

Speaker? - Just as a matter of protocol, I've just been asked, I presume what we're going to do is you gentlemen and ladies are going to make a presentation. Should it be necessary, then the members can ask questions. I'm going to try and take it on a subject by subject basis then it allows you to actually directly quiz the experts that are there with any questions you've got. But it's just for you members now. Yes, Councillor Fairhurst.

Councillor Fairhurst: Yes, Mr Chairman, and thereafter there will be an opportunity where we can discuss ourselves and have a debate ourselves.

Chairman: Yes, I'm just trying to get some form to it so that we know where we are "ish". Mr Sprunt.

David Sprunt: There's two schemes that I'm going to go through. The first one is the scheme which Essex County Council has put forward to deal with the existing problems and to deal with the Local Plan growth that's been proposed, not just in the Uttlesford area but also within East Herts as well, and it also deals with the growth of the airport up to 35 million, so that what's this junction is modelled on with the work that we're due to start actually next financial year, sort of late spring early summertime, there will be work starting on site. You will notice there has already been some site clearance, those of you who travel that way, work to get some trees down and that sort of thing, so work has started already on some of the work. I will try and take you through the scheme as much as I can. I do realise that on the board it may be

a little bit small for everybody. So you should have some plans distributed in front of you which might make it a little bit clearer but I'll try and take you through it on here as well.

The scheme essentially is in three parts: there is the southbound slip off the motorway over here, the northbound slip here, and the A120 west over the other side. So I'll take it section by section. This section here we're looking at widening the exit to five lanes, there would be some new gantry signs to make sure people get in the right lane. Currently it's a bit difficult to know which lane to go in, so we're trying to sort that out at the same time by putting in some additional signing as well to make that a lot easier. On this side here we're looking at widening the slip for an extra lane and having a dedicated lane specifically for the purposes of the motorway service area. So taking that traffic out and then giving two full lanes to the A120 traffic going to the west and there's still a lane for circulating traffic going towards Takeley and anybody who's missed the junction towards the A120 eastbound as well. The biggest piece of the work is to the west as you can see. That includes adding a third lane to both of the approaches to junction 8 as far as the junction down towards Bishop's Stortford. For those who don't know, this the motorway service area here, so it will provide a lot more capacity for traffic coming off the motorway which currently backs up from that junction, and also makes it quicker for traffic to get on to the junction and away. So that will have quite a big impact in terms of keeping traffic moving on and off the junction. Down here we have some widening works down towards Bishop's Stortford and the replacement of the existing roundabout, which is here, with a set of traffic lights. It's the best solution in terms of controlling the movement. The roundabout tends to prioritise the A120 significantly, which is where the most traffic is, but that said it needs to be shared round a bit more equitably and this allows you to do that within certain parameters which the signals themselves, being intelligent signals these days, can monitor and move the timings around. So that will be quite a significant improvement there and obviously just some widening on this approach here for traffic to merge and move out into the lanes on the approaches. Just down here, members of this committee will probably be aware that there's an approval for a rear access to the motorway service area, and that is included in our scheme so that will tie in very nicely. They are expecting to start that in spring of this year, so there will be work starting on that as well. We haven't had that confirmed yet but that is their aspirational date anyway to get that moving, and that will ease this egress from here for those who know how difficult it can be at times to get out of the service area.

So that's the interim scheme. That will take us up to 2033 with conditions no worse than they are at the moment, so it will give capacity throughout the Local Plan period basically, and deal with the growth in Bishop's Stortford and the growth in Uttlesford, and Stansted up to 35 million.

This is the interim scheme proposed by MAG. It's a little bit difficult to see on this, but once again you have drawings in your pack. They are proposing to extend one of the lanes here as well to give a bit more capacity for the left hand lane so for additional traffic coming from Cambridge direction turning left along towards the A120. There are some lane reassignments as you come around this section here, because the current lane assignments aren't necessarily that logical. I know they've only just been repainted by Highways England, but there is some disagreement about what should actually be allocated to which lane, and by changing those around you can actually increase the capacity by making better use of the lanes you've got. They are looking as well to do a small widening just here, which is just before the slip which goes southbound towards London. At the moment you probably realise there are two lanes right at the beginning and it quickly widens out to three, but it's to give three lanes all the way through. So once again you can get better alignment and capacity, certainly from the A120 west here going across the bridge.

Other improvements include some widening on this side of the service area to provide an additional lane around here, and again some reassignment of the lane designations as well. Effectively you will have three lanes going down the slip road here, once again to clear that, because those of you who use junction 8 will know that this regularly queues back and blocks this junction here. So by doing that you increase the flow into and down the slip road, and as part of that we've had to widen the slip road to obviously three lanes making use of the existing hard shoulder there to accommodate that.

The last little bit is they've asked now to signal the exit from the Highways England depot which is just located in here. So that's really it in a nutshell. It's not a massive change to this scheme we're proposing

but it does deal with the additional traffic from that 35 to 43 million. That's all I want to say on those. I think I've probably talked you through those anyway.

This is the only other bit of their proposals – and the screen again is probably not the best place to look at this. This is the Priory Wood junction. As you come from junction 8 down here, there have been problems here in terms of collisions happening with people coming down here at speed and shooting straight out here. So this is trying to mitigate against that, because the more traffic doing it the likelihood is that there's more potential there is for increases in collisions there, so it's just effectively a minor signalling scheme to try and deal with that. So that's all the highways improvements that are proposed. I'm happy to take some questions now.

Councillor Freeman: Thank you. Two questions: How long - by which I mean how many years or decades will this work take? Because whenever you drive around the motorway network in Britain the only thing you can be sure of is that they'll let you down, so a 4 hour journey might take 6 hours. That's the only rule you can apply. So how long? Over what sort of duration will this be spun out? How much? How much is it going to cost?

David Sprunt: The scheme is going to cost £10 million and it's funded from various sources. Essex put in some money to develop it. Money from the South East LEP, money from Cambridgeshire and Peterborough LEP. There is some money from MAG as well. So there's money from a combination of sources to fund that 10 million improvement. In terms of timescale, as I say, it's due to start late spring/summer next year. We haven't got a contractor on board as yet, so we haven't got a firm programme, but our intention was that it wouldn't all be done in one hit. Whilst it would be let as one contract, we would do one slip road, then next slip road, then the bigger bit to the west. So we're looking at a contract period, I would suggest, somewhere around about 18 months to get that all complete.

Councillor Freeman: Just if I may, Chairman, does that mean that MAG would be making no contributions to this? It seems to be fully funded already from elsewhere.

David Sprunt: Well, the interim scheme, they've already used some of the funding that was allocated within the existing permission to go towards this. There were some other schemes, some of which haven't come to fruition, some which weren't considered as important, or weren't required anymore because it's obviously difficult when you set these up a long, long time ago to know exactly what's going to happen in the future, so we've managed to move some money around with their agreement and the agreement of the various parties, be that Hertfordshire and ourselves, to fund the improvement here and bring those monies together.

Councillor Fairhurst: Thank you, Mr Chairman. It looks very impressive. I know nothing about the dark arts of highway management, but it seems to me that the big issue here is the difference between the interim scheme and the interim plus scheme, and I'm assuming that your response to Councillor Freeman is the £10 million is for the interim plus scheme.

David Sprunt: No that's just for the interim scheme.

Councillor Fairhurst: Not the plus scheme. So could I ask what extra is it going to cost is for the plus scheme?

David Sprunt: I haven't got a figure for the plus scheme, because obviously that's something ... we would generally ask for a lot of these schemes to be delivered by the third party, so on that basis they deliver them at whatever cost that is, be that £10 million, £5 million, whatever the price is at the time.

Katherine Wilkinson: I just say that, in terms of that scheme, we would want that scheme to be delivered on the ground by 39 million passengers per annum, so that would be delivered with no cost to anyone else apart from the airport. There is coming, we all know there is major infrastructure needed later down

the line, and so Highways England are seeking funding, and it's in their RIS2 scheme. If it comes to the point where the RIS2 scheme is looking very close and on the cards, then it wouldn't be worth putting this scheme in, and that scheme would be costed at the time rather than now, and that funding would be put in to fund that. So whichever way the funding will go one way or the other, and the most appropriate way, which, although we're talking about it now, is Highways England's call.

Councillor Fairhurst: Thank you. The word you used is it's a 'small' addition. It's not a huge addition between interim and interim plus, and to the layman my only question is if it's such a small scheme why wouldn't it make the whole thing to increase our capacity by 20% and thereby reduce our congestion from the very beginning?

Sprunt: It all ultimately comes down to timing. We've got a delivery programme for the scheme that we've got. The funding stream for that finishes in 2020, so we have to have the scheme on the ground and delivered by 2020. Obviously, the MAG improvement is only one that would be subject to agreement here, so once again we've just can't keep waiting and waiting and waiting, and there would obviously be probably another two year wait by the time you got that design incorporated and agreed and everything else. So it was better felt to get the works done now and out the way.

Councillor Loughlin: Thank you. I think it may have been answered. I was going to say I know some of the money is coming from the old permission, but is some of this dependent on the decision today for the scheme? If it is refused will that money still be forthcoming?

David Sprunt: That money has already been secured.

**1.30pm**

Chairman: OK. Anybody else on transport issues? We can't let him off that lightly.

Councillor Gerard: I just want to clarify: are we going to be discussing the Jacobs report in detail? Are we going to have an option to do that, or is this the opportunity? Now? OK. Thank you, Mr Chairman. First of all, I just want to make the point that this is a very complicated application and an awful lot of documentation that we have had to study. I have done that, and I have questions on the Jacobs report that need to be clarified, because based upon those clarifications or not, it knocks on to other things that have an impact for me on further issues. So, I don't know who's going to answer the question, but my first question is specific in the report that I've read – and I've read the Officers' Report on the Jacobs report. There seems to be an issue on sensitivity and the assumptions of a sensitivity analysis. In the report Jacobs has put in a 10% uplift, and I'd just like clarity because there have been allegations from different parties that it should be, or it shouldn't be, and I don't know what the truth is. I'm here to find out what the true evidence. So can someone clarify why there is a 10% blanket uplift?

Katherine Wilkinson: I'll go through that. I think in terms of where we are with the Jacobs report, I've said how we got to this stage. The application came in with using the growth without any Local Plan growth. And that is because of the position of the Local Plan which has been agreed. That's not my area. So it had that growth in it. Myself and Highways England were concerned that we wanted to see what it would look like with that Local Plan growth, so not the existing one but the one that has not yet been approved. Therefore we said we would do some sensitivity tests because we had the model that Jacobs hold to do David's scheme and that included all the East Herts growth and the UDC proposed growth in it. So we said we would do that as a sensitivity test. That's what this modelling is, as opposed to the modelling in the transport assessment, which has TEMpro growth in it. So that in itself was undertaken, and it was also taken up to 2033 rather than 2028, which is the date that the 43 million is met. So that is more years' growth on top of that to allow for the Local Plan. We also wanted to see what would happen if there was a sensitivity in terms of - there's a number of assumptions that this report is based on in terms of modal share and distribution, so that's why we asked for this 10% to be put on. The reason it was 10%, not 12%

or 8% was really because we looked up what the variables were, and it did seem that this was a justifiable number. Hand on heart, I can't say that we went "that would be 2%, that would be 15%, that will be der, der, der", but it was knowing we were adding this extra growth, which didn't need to be added, knowing that we were adding the years that we didn't need to be adding, and this extra bit, then it made sense to us that it would show what would happen at that point.

Councillor Gerard: On that point, in terms of your distribution sensitivity test that you just mentioned, from what I have read off the report and in the Jacobs report, it seems that that test has been based upon the applicant's transport assessment. Is that correct?

Katherine Wilkinson: Yes.

Councillor Gerard: It hasn't been based on an independent transport assessment? It's been based on the applicant's transport assessment?

Katherine Wilkinson: The 10% test?

Councillor Gerard: Yes, the distribution sensitivity test.

Katherine Wilkinson: So, the 10% test was where ... you know a little bit more about that, because you asked for it.

Chairman: Can we just ensure that everybody uses the microphones. I know it's awkward putting them on and off, but some people at the back can't hear.

Mary Young: The sensitivity test modelling used the Essex Highways VISSIM micro simulation model, so it was able to incorporate all the connecting junctions as opposed to looking at all the junctions separately. The model itself, the inputs for that model came from our wider strategic VISSIM model, so that took account of background traffic, and the background traffic included the Local Plan growth to 2033 for all the adjacent districts. So our test in terms of background traffic included all the Local Plan growth. On top of that we then used the applicant's traffic figures for the airport itself. So the modelling included background growth and the applicant's airport traffic, and it was the airport traffic that was then grossed for the 10% sensitivity test and then also the distribution was amended on their own traffic.

Councillor Gerard: Mr Chairman, I do apologise, but I do need to probe a bit more on this, because it is, for me, quite an important issue. And the devil, I think, is in the detail. Could I ask, also in the report there are also issues to do with other assumptions regarding how much more traffic was going northbound or southbound, and in the report there are certain percentages applied. The report assumes there is 5% more traffic from the A120 west, 2% less from the M11 north, and 3% less from the M11 south. I just need clarity as to why those percentages have been used. Thank you.

Mary Young: That was based on looking at first principles and local district populations, and I did a professional judgement as to where the traffic in relation to population centres and which part of the network they would use, and it was a slight variation on the applicant's distribution. So we used that as a sensitivity to see, if there were changes, particularly towards the west, the south or north, what impact that would be on the junction. So that was manually assigning employee trips and then passenger trips, and then combining the two and coming up with the variation which resulted in the sensitivity test.

Councillor Gerard: There is a section in the report about the average queues made in 2033 based on the 43 million passenger per annum and it compares it to the 35 current planning permission, million passengers per annum, which is included in this junction 8 work, and it goes into detail about am and pm peaks, and in that 5% and 10% uplift you were talking about. So can you clarify again please? My understanding is that it shows, with a 10% uplift the am peak - the traffic queue is 362 metres, which is an



additional 4%. The pm peak is a 461 metre queue, which is a 25% increase. That is applying the 10% uplift. When you only use the 5% uplift the numbers obviously change. The am peak is a 380 metre queue or 10% increase, and the pm peak is 40 41 metres 20% increase. If those numbers are indeed correct, it certainly implies to me that those are quite considerable increases in queue lengths.

David Sprunt: A lot of that is down to how sensitive the junction is and where the traffic is actually coming from. Because you can imagine, if you're taking traffic from....I can try and give you an example, say from the M11 north going towards the A120 east that actually only traverses a very small part of the junction, whereas if you reallocate it to the west obviously it then traverses several arms of the junction. So the effects can be quite significant on the junction, so it's very, very sensitive as to where the traffic is actually coming, so for the purposes of doing the sensitivity test, because we know that how far you go round a junction like that makes a very big difference to the impact that you have on it.

Councillor Gerard: Sorry, does it include any analysis of any potential increase in traffic from the extra homes that we have planned between now and 2033.

Katherine Wilkinson: Yes. So the whole sensitivity test is based on having all those extra homes in, in East Herts and Uttlesford. What we have to remember is that without the 10% on but with all the extra homes, that the interim plus scheme, with the airport growth to 43, shows that it mitigates that scheme completely, so you actually have more capacity than without the airport and without the scheme. And that's the bit that we have to focus on, although the sensitivity tests they show us what we knew already, that we need this large RIS scheme from Government and that needs to come forward and that helps us to put pressure and HE put pressure and Jacobs concluded that the scheme mitigates the airport growth and brings it back down to, without the extra 8 million on top of the 35 million, and also HE and AECOM have looked at it and drawn the same conclusions, which is why HE, after looking at this and weighing everything out, and doing the DMRB checks on the scheme and having the safety audit on the scheme, which is why the thing that puzzled David, I think, about the lights coming out, that's gone in there now, because of HE. So although we are talking about it now, it's HE's scheme, and they are clear and we are clear that in terms of this development from 35 to 43, this scheme does consume its own smoke, if you like.

Councillor Gerard: Mr Chairman, that's all I have for now. Things may crop up that mean I may have to ask some more questions later.

Chairman: Everybody's here for the day, OK?

Councillor Fairhurst: Mr Chairman, I promised I wouldn't give you a hard time, so I'll keep it brief, but I have a problem because as I understand it.... This looks very impressive by the way. I know nothing, as I say, about roads, but this is impressive because a lot of work has gone into it. I'm assuming many years of effort and research, and that's good because it means our traffic will improve. My concern – and I'm saying this as an amateur, but we've got to make a decision here today – is that if we have discovered this already, and it has taken into account, as we've been told, the Local Plan, which hasn't been approved – in fact we've been told it only had minimal weighting – then it's really ambitious. If we then set the sensitivity test, then you've got me worried, because for me in sensitivity testing it's a very fine tuned thing. It's scientific. Now I've got a science (inaudible) in me so I don't know anything about this, but you mix 1% here and 1% there and you can change the whole creature, and we're dealing with queues and we're dealing with cars, congestion and traffic. So when I hear that it's a best guessed professional assessment tied with an applicant's process, tied with, we can assume, certain costs for the Local Plan, which hasn't been adopted yet, I'm no longer comfortable with this beautiful scheme, if you don't mind.

Katherine Wilkinson: So the reason we call it a sensitivity test is because the applicant has put in their testing of the junction, not using the Local Plan growth, using forecast growth, TEMPro growth, taking it to 2028, and then they did an extra one again just using that growth, not Local Plan growth but the forecast

growth to 2033. That also showed that this scheme consumes the extra traffic from the development. So what we are really saying is that we maybe stress tested it would be a better thing to say, because what we've done is added the extra stuff in there to see whether it would still work. And it works up to a point, it work with the extra stuff and then you add extra 10% on and it doesn't work so well. So that's what I mean. So I understand what you're saying about being concerned, but what we've got is what they have to do with the development, and then we've checked it and it still works with what they don't have to cover for this development.

David Sprunt: And when we're doing major road schemes this is standard practice. We have to try and predict where we're going to be in the future, so we have to make a best educated guess (inaudible) I was just trying to say it's standard practice with major road schemes when you're doing to them to try and assess what's going to happen in the future and yes, the Local Plan isn't approved yet, but we are where we are in terms of the funding stream so we have to make the best judgement that we can in order to take those schemes through, so we assume they're going ahead. We're probably going to assume it's not going to be any worse than what's included in the Local Plan so are actually designing probably at the moment the worst case scenario for 2033, so I think it's a fairly robust scheme I would suggest.

Councillor Lemon: This might not be the time to raise this, but I'm concerned about junction 7A. I don't know whether you've looked at junction 7A in conjunction with the increased traffic to the airport, particularly on the villages south of the airport, and I'm talking about the B1383 and the A1060. I attended the consultations on junction 7A and we were informed, or I was informed, that they did not think that there would be any increase of traffic on those roads due to junction 7. Now the villages there are a rat run to the airport. We do have people coming that way and it's increasing. The motorway people said "very little increase in traffic". There was then a scheme to put traffic calming measures at the junction of the B1383 and A1060, because we thought fine, you know, that's what we need. But the County Council Highways people turned it down because they said there's going to be a huge increase in traffic on those roads. Now, you know, who is right? Because I feel that people will come off at junction 7A and will come through those south villages to get to the airport. Now have we looked at that effect in our environmental survey?

David Sprunt: As part of the junction 7A work we did do some very extensive modelling, and actually the impact on those villages was actually positive in terms of traffic, because at the moment, exactly as you say, people try and get in to the back end of Harlow, or likewise come back in the opposite direction. But because you have effectively the free flowing movements southbound at junction 8 in both directions, the impact of having junction 7A means you can get into that northern part of Harlow much easier than you can at present, because you have to go all the way down to 7 and come back on yourselves, so it did actually show a redistribution of traffic from those back roads keeping on to the main road network, the A120, M11 and junction 7A, so it was a positive story there and I suspect there may be an opportunity, once that junction is in and traffic has settled down, maybe to revisit that junction. I don't know.

Councillor Lemon: There is just a query. I agreed when I went to the consultation that it would be positive, particularly for Hatfield Heath and Hatfield Broad Oak. But why I was shocked was when Highways and the County Council said "you're going to get a lot more traffic through". We can't have anything to slow the traffic down or slow the flow down. So who's right? Was the first consultation right or is this other one right saying we can't do anything to stop the traffic or slow the traffic down because you're going to get a huge increase in traffic.

Katherine Wilkinson: Yes. We will take that and just confirm that, because we are all under the impression that the traffic will get better due to 7a on the local roads. What I do want to say though, in terms of the local roads, that there is a fund being put aside, £800,000 for local roads, and also to accompany that – because partly what you've just said in a way demonstrates it – is that we're looking from 35 to 43 million and we want to make sure that we do the right thing for the local road network, so there is a monitoring

scheme that will be approved by Essex County Council being put forward by the airport to monitor the local roads in the area, and also the network that belongs to the airport. So that monitoring will be in place for the lifetime of the growth of the airport and beyond, and that then, the funded money, will be able to be spent on anything that is needed. And that pot of money was put together by looking at what could be needed that we think now, but when it gets to 35 and that kicks in, we will be able to use it effectively.

Councillor Lemon: Just a quick one to come back on that is, I hope you will look at Hatfield Heath. We have a traffic build up from quarter to eight to half past nine, and in the evenings from 4:30 to 6:30/quarter to seven. And it's all associated, a lot of that will be associated with airport people going there and coming back to work.

Councillor Fairhurst: So really what you're saying is: We don't know; we're going to do our best. We really don't know. Because we're doing 26 million at the moment per head. We hear the congestion is still high. We try to aim in agreeing this wonderful programme to get to 35 million, and we say to ourselves: let's extrapolate from where we are. We build this in to 2025, and that will get us to 2028 but if we get to 43 then we'll try something else. Now are we going to keep on forecasting this – I'm not going to say ignorance because clearly it's professional and very impressive – but we don't know. It's a gamble, isn't it? And we gamble on congestion. I do use this road quite a lot because I love driving, and it's never free. Today. And that's at 26 million. So we're in the dark from 26 to 35, and based on that assumption, we're going to build from 35 to 43. It's not scientific, but it's professional.

Katherine Wilkinson: Are you talking about..... You talked about junction 8? The whole forecast. Well, the forecast is based on the way we forecast traffic and the way we forecast for every scheme, and it's the best way that we've got of doing it. It's a way that's used in planning developments all the time, so we're always making decisions based on those forecasts. What we can do is try to mitigate what we think is going to happen. We think for this we've got a flexible plan in place that means that we're not saying we are going to..... Well, we are saying we are going to do that, but Highways England will be there when it comes to that point, making sure it's exactly the right thing, so we're using the tools we've got and we're trying to do it in the best way we can.

Chairman: OK. Anybody else with anything specifically on transport? I'm aware that we're sort of not picking up perhaps some of the other (?) and fly parking and bits, but we are going to come back to that later.

Councillor Gerard: Are we going to come back to that later, or I can ask the questions now.

Chairman: I think let's take them now while we're in this general subject heading. So anything linked to transport, parking, let's take it now.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you Chairman. So going to the transport assessment issued on parking..... If we could come back actually in terms of your other assumptions. In terms of the kiss and fly, there's an assumption that the kiss and fly will be reduced, in the report, by 30%. Can I just clarify that is correct?

Katherine Wilkinson: No, no. That's fine. So currently we're at the point where kiss and fly is 20% and there are targets within the Section 106, or that will be within Section 106, to take that, to maintain that at 20% and then reduce it by the time we get to 43 million passengers per annum to 12%. We we're at 20% in 2016.

[Inaudible – Nigel Brown speaking to Chairman]

Chairman: I think, for the point of clarity, we're at 22% kiss and fly at the moment. I think the target is to reach 20% by 39 million and for 12% by 43 million. That's what I think is in the report, Katherine.

Katherine Wilkinson: Right, OK. And I've also got here that 31%...they were at 31% at 2014, so they've reduced from 31% and then it's down to ... 22% now, then 20% at .....39 million and then 12% at 43 million.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you very much for clarifying that. Can I just ask, in terms of some other considerations in the report, the way I read it I didn't see any consideration for the peak traffic times, Friday afternoons and summer peak times. Could you clarify whether those peak issues of traffic were included in the report? I couldn't see them, and I wondered why.

Chairman: Specifically relating to what?

Councillor Gerard: Related to whether they're included.... Whether Friday afternoon peak rush hour and summertime bank holidays, when everyone is going on holiday, and there's queues along the M25 and the M11 etc. Are they included? I couldn't see them.

Katherine Wilkinson: No. They're not included. It's an average traffic in October, which is still within the higher level of traffic through the year. But we have not done..... It's not standard practice to take the worst case scenario. In fact, we avoid times like Christmas when there's high traffic. Also the peak for the airport might not necessarily be the peak for the traffic on the network in that, for example, we wouldn't accept traffic surveys generally done in the summertime because there's generally less traffic. We avoid school holidays. So there are certain months of the year and times when, they're called neutral months, and they are ...the DfT tell us what they are ... and that's what we use if we're looking at general traffic flows on applications.

Councillor Freeman: You've said "transport". I mean transport isn't just junction 8 and cars. It's railways. Are we dealing with that now, or does that come later?

Chairman: You can go where you like.

Councillor Freeman: One of the things that deeply concerns me about this application is the impact on the rail system, because railways are very difficult to expand. Roads are hard, but railways I think are very much harder. And the line from Cambridge to Bishop's Stortford round to London is very heavily used already. There are estimates of up to about a billion pounds, I think, to actually increase its capacity. I used to think with railways it was just a question of stuffing a few more trains on, but obviously there's limitations in terms of signalling, lengths of platforms, how many carriages you can use, and the mitigations appear to be using trains which are more like cattle trucks. In other words they are trains you don't really sit down on. You don't expect to sit down because they don't have many seats. You stand on them all the way. So people from Bishop's Stortford or the airport could stand all the way to London Liverpool Street because that's the sort of carriage that you've got. They do use these, Chairman, on things like the Docklands Light Railway, which have a few seats but they're designed not really to sit down on. It works quite well. Of course you don't go very far on the thing, you know. You get out. It's got frequent stops. But I don't see that that's an adequate mitigation for this. And the other point is that the airport will poach capacity from the Bishop's Stortford to Cambridge line. In other words, Bishop's Stortford to Cambridge will turn into a branch line with the odd train now and again. They won't have the full capacity for the commuter traffic. Already the commuter traffic has serious problems. It wouldn't be such a problem if it were not for the fact that we planned to build North Uttlesford Garden Community, or whatever we call it now. That is 4,000 houses at a place which I agree is good because it's got a railway station, called Great Chesterford, you know. Great. Actually it would seem that that's going to be turned into a branch line by these proposals, and that's not acceptable. The capacity just wouldn't be able... would have less trains probably than it does now. It's not a question of scheduling. It's a question of capacity, getting them from Bishop's Stortford down into London. So what are the solutions there? The

figure is about a billion pounds at the moment, and that's not money that's going to come from the airport, I'm sure.

Katherine Wilkinson: Are you able to take this, Jeremy, in terms of...

Chairman: I think Jeremy is better placed perhaps. It's not yours, Katherine.

## 2.00pm

Jeremy Pine: Yes, thank you, Chairman. I think the thing to bear in mind is that there is a new franchise on the line, operated by Greater Anglia, and they're committed to new rolling stock throughout their network, and that will include longer trains on the Stansted to Liverpool Street route. Currently there are, as you know, four Stansted Express trains an hour, running both ways, and also there will be a train running from Norwich through to Cambridge and Stansted when the new trains are introduced, and then there's the existing cross country train running from Birmingham to Stansted Airport. This planning application doesn't include any increase in the frequency of trains on the Stansted Airport route. It just includes increasing the length of the trains when the new franchise is in operation, and that, according to Network Rail, who have looked at the confidential loading data, is sufficient to cater for airport related demand. So I don't think it's right to say that the Bishop's Stortford line will be pinched or tethered, because that would also be benefitting from new trains as part of the new rail franchise.

Councillor Freeman: If I may, Chairman, just challenge that. The point is that this proposal seems to be to turn Stansted Airport into something quite similar to Gatwick Airport. Gatwick Airport has a very decent railway – I've used it a lot – on a proper railway line. The station is actually embedded in the airport's excellent system, and London Gatwick runs 194 trains a day, that is 11 trains per hour, and at the moment the Stansted to Liverpool Street runs 76 trains a day, which is only 40% of the usage to get trains from Gatwick to London. So, if we're going to turn Stansted Airport into a Gatwick airport and we're going to use public transport a lot – all of which are very laudable – then we need an awful lot more trains. Just longer trains on won't do it. Of course you're limited by platform length. We had that when Whittlesford Parkway was extended. You couldn't put longer trains on there until they put a longer platform on it. The maximum length of trains is 12 carriages and the higher capacity is achieved, as I say, by taking seats out and making people stand. On this sort of route, taking seats out and making people stand and charging them probably £5,000 a year for the privilege for a season ticket, simply persuades them to get in the car or to car share (which is a good thing), but it's not making full use of public transport. I just don't see the model stack up on this. I'm not sure that they've been properly investigated, Chairman.

Chairman: I sort of see where you're going with it, but it's not for this application to fund the two line system coming to a four line system. I wish it was within our gift and that MAG held their hand up and said "we'll do it". You know, we're talking about an enormous investment that will have to come forward. But I think partly it will have to come forward as a result of the expansion, whether is Cambridge or Stansted, and everything else that's happening. It's Harlow North and, if you like, if that's going to come. And all of those will eventually contribute to infrastructure. I'd love to say that we've got all of it in place at the start, but maybe we won't have. I take your point completely. I'm aware that the train company has looked at lengthening from eight to 12 carriages and they've looked at that and said that that will meet the demand at present.

Councillor Fairhurst: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think you're right. I think our job is not to require Stansted Airport to rebuild the tracks or to rebuild the roads in fact. But we are here to determine sustainability, and my own experience – as you know, I was very fortunate to be at Stansted Airport on my own yesterday – and I had to get back from Stansted Airport by train. I had the tremendous honour-----

Chairman: I think we ought to explain to everybody that you weren't allowed to do the site visit because (talking together).

Councillor Fairhurst: I left on the train, which was full at the airport at around half past two, I guess. It was full and I got to Audley End promptly. But that's to 26 million passengers per year. We're not talking 43 million. We're not talking 35 million. At 26 million that train was full. So if we add another four coaches and increase capacity by 50% now the train is more than full. Now is taken up four coaches and we haven't got to 40%. We're here to discuss the sustainability of 43 million a year. I'm trying to say... It's anecdotal. I'm not good at models or science. I got to see what I see. Yesterday wasn't a fancy day, it wasn't a high day, it wasn't Friday afternoon, but it worked for me.

Councillor Lemon: Thank you. Just a point from myself. We're talking about number of passengers per year. Should I look at the figure that MAG give me for when we reach 35 million passengers a year or should I take notice of the Department of Trade's figure. Which one are we working on?

Chairman: Are you asking me? OK.

Councillor Lemon: We can't work on both figures, can we? I've either got to think that that is the figure I'm working on, or it isn't. So I would like to know, should I work on MAG figures or the Department of Trade.

Chairman: You've heard two versions of this. You've heard the version that was presented this morning and the version that was presented by SSE in all fairness, and you've also heard the interpretation by Ken O'Toole basically saying, well this is where we were, this is where we are now and if you do a pro rata of that it doesn't take much to actually work out, perhaps, where it's likely to be. That doesn't mean that it didn't dip before, 10 years ago when it just went completely the other way, and obviously that's a risk that MAG will take if they make this investment if they're given this permission. But I can't help you with a specific because, like a lot of these things, it has to be a best projection of what we know based on what information is in front of us today. I'll let you draw your own conclusions of which figure you think is nearer. Let's use that word. OK?

Councillor Gerard: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Just ... Councillor, I absolutely agree with you, and there are so many things here that rely upon us having to consider whether or not this application has the potential to turn Stansted Airport potentially into something the size of Gatwick. We are being asked to debate this and make considerations based upon conflicting information. I think there's a whole topic here on this in itself, which, of course, I think we need to clarify, because we're being told conflicting information. On the one hand the applicant is arguing – and it is their right to argue, as the applicant – that that is not true, and on the other hand we have information we have been given that makes reference to various Department for Transport forecasts. I appreciate that forecasts are forecasts, but there are elements of evidence there that I feel we need to consider and clarify. So I think this is an important point. It is very hard for us to go forward until we've clarified this point. Are we going to be looking at a Gatwick type airport or aren't we? Once we get past this I think we can move on, but I think this is a critical issue.

Karen Denmark: OK this. Can I go back on that? Right. With regard to forecasts, the DfT forecast predicted that MAG would be operating at 4 million passengers lower than they actually were. So the DfT forecasts are not in line with reality, so - you know - you can give that what weight you wish to in your determination of this application. But the fact that the DfT forecasts are under-predicting the passenger throughput at Stansted in comparison with reality sort of does give some credence to the fact that perhaps MAG do know what they're talking about. The forecasts, they say they're there as guidance but local factors, local airports, they have better knowledge of what they're doing. The DfT forecasts are just a broad brush approach. But we are determining an application to increase passenger numbers by 8 million passengers per annum. We're not talking about this airport becoming a second Gatwick. It is an increase of 8 million passengers per annum.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you very much. I must actually question that statement if I may, because fundamental policy, and policy that's quoted by the applicant, refers to 'Beyond the Horizons', June, 2018 the issue of best use. And it's a crucial, crucial bit of policy that the applicant is relying upon, and if we don't get past this issue of what is best use, and how we define best use, then actually I find it very hard to move forward. So if I may, just on this point, we were distributed yesterday I think it was – again, I need clarity on this because I need to weigh up information I've got from all different parties here – we were distributed with a briefing note by SSE called 'Making Best Use of Existing Runways'. In there, if you go to page 2 of that document, there's a paragraph called 'Comparison with Gatwick', and I'll read it because it's actually quite important what it says. It says: "Relating to SSE's current Judicial Review application the Government Legal Department" – this is the Government Legal Department – "under disclosure obligations provided SSE with DfT information comparing the capacity of Stansted with the proposed new infrastructure to the capacity of Gatwick. The following is an extract from the Department for Transport ministerial briefing note." And this is from the Government legal department. 'Whilst we have not been able to independently validate the increase in maximum runway capacity to 55 hourly movements, the figure is consistent with comparable pieces of infrastructure such as Gatwick Airport runway, and therefore we have a reasonable degree of confidence in it.'" Now I read that as.... You know I raise my eyebrows because I read that as quite an important piece of evidence that we've just discovered, so I need someone please to help me understand who to believe.

Chairman: Anthony, can I have a copy of that please? We've got that already? (Inaudible) Elizabeth is going to read some extracts, I think, from the same policy.

Elizabeth Smith: Paragraph 1.4 of Chapter 1 of Beyond the Horizon states as follows, and I quote: "On the 24th October 2017 the Department for Transport released its latest aviation forecasts. These are the first DfT forecasts since 2013. The updated forecasts reflect the accelerating growth experienced in recent years and the demand was 9% higher in London in 2016 than the Airports Commission forecast. This has put pressure on existing infrastructure despite significant financial investment by airports over the past decade and highlights that the Government has a clear issue to address." Now in this document there are references to the earlier 2013 framework document.... Sorry, my apologies. They refer to a further document, and I quote from this document: UK Aviation Forecasts produced by the Department for Transport, paragraph 1.3 of Chapter 1, and this states, again I quote: "The purpose of these forecasts is primarily in informing the longer term strategic policy rather than in providing detailed forecasts at each individual airport in the short term. The uncertainty reflected by future demand growth scenarios at the national level is compounded at the level of the individual airport. At the airport level the Department's forecasts may also differ from local airport forecasts. The latter may be produced for different purposes and may be informed by specific commercial and local information, and such information is particularly relevant in the short term." Furthermore the Government document then goes on to say at paragraph 1.4: "The forecast should not be considered a cap on the development of individual airports. In some circumstances more recent airport specific data and forecasts might be used in conjunction with additional relevant information to inform local planning decisions." I hope that will assist you in your deliberations.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I apologise – and Mrs Smith, thank you very much for that – but it doesn't really help me at all, because the question I'm trying to ask is: can I rely upon a statement from something that has been given to me that says that the Government Legal Department – and this is somebody who we ultimately report to; this is the Government – which basically says that they have a degree of confidence in the fact that Stansted Airport is comparable to Gatwick potentially. Now we need to understand this. Because all the assumptions are being made upon the issue of – and this is a planning issue of best use, and the issue of best use is a crucial thing for me in my deliberations. I need to understand this issue of .... the background to this in terms of the original proposal by MAG two years ago showed a higher number, there's been printed information distributed and given out by SSE and in their presentation last week had a clip from a note from officers in their discussion where it says, you know, below 10 million because otherwise it would be a nationally significant project. There are lots of

things here that make me ask the question, because it's significant – and the word significant I use it properly – to my deliberations weighing up the pros and the cons. I need to know this. Does Stansted Airport have the capacity to grow to the figures, as forecast by DfT, to a point where as Gatwick, by 2023 52 million, and by 2033 at 57 million. So what I'm asking is that MAG are saying that at 35 million is going to be full in five years. That's what they are telling me. They're saying: By 2033 we're full. That's five years' time. It sounds a long way away, but it's five years' time.

Chairman: What they're saying is that they will have reached the limit of their permission.

Councillor Gerard: That's what they're telling me.

Chairman: Yes.

Councillor Gerard: I log that. The DfT document then says that 35 million will be full in 15 years in 2033. And another document from DfT tells me that in 25 years it will be full with Heathrow Terminal runway 3. Now I don't know which to believe and we, as a committee, need to get to the bottom of this otherwise we're going to struggle.

Chairman: OK. Elizabeth, do you want to respond? But I'll sum this up afterwards.

Elizabeth Smith: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The thing is, Councillor Gerard, that the two sets of figures are produced for two different purposes, and therefore they do not conflict. Right now the arrivals hall at Stansted is, as I understand it, too small to take the throughput ultimately they're talking about. There is already, I believe, planning permission in place for a new terminal arrivals building that is not yet built out. Basically the figures are provided for different purposes, and anything that is provided by the Government legal service is going to be extremely case specific and provided or compiled for the purposes of one case. It is not general information upon which anyone else can rely. It's case specific.

Councillor Gerard: Mrs Smith, thank you very much for that, but can you understand how it casts doubt in my mind about what figures to believe? I am still struggling.

Chairman: I'll try and sum up where I think we are with this. If we look at the numbers as they were in 2014 when MAG took over and we look at the number we've got now, and we simply divide by years and we project whatever, then it would seem fairly logical that we are going to hit that 35 million within four to five years. Would you agree? If it is pro rata'd on a line. That seems like common sense to me. So I agree we can all bandy figures around and where we're going on targets, and I take Elizabeth's point that sometimes they are used for different reasons, but if we have to apply our common sense because none of us are experts, so based on that we've got a trajectory through to 35 and we've got an application in front of us to move that 35 to 43. I completely take your point. Comparison to Gatwick, well, it's about numbers so we will be at 35, can we handle 43? By the time we're at 43 Gatwick might be at 61, which is the application they've recently made, as you know, for using the reserve runway. So all of these feasts are moving, and if one thing we have learned in planning recently – because a lot of us are new to this – is that the goalposts keep moving a little bit, and therefore it's really difficult to pin things like this down. So coming back to your first point, which was best use, how do you clarify that? I completely get it. And you read from Beyond the Horizon, which is a document you yourself quoted: "Therefore the Government is supportive of airports beyond Heathrow making best use of their existing runways". That was their statement, and that's what we've got to determine, if they are doing that. I'm trying to sum it up to move us to a point where you feel a little bit happier.

Councillor Fairhurst: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I think there is a difference here and I think that the legal officer in fact hit the nail on the head and we need to explain that. There are two forecasted figures here. One is based on a national view. When you're DfT you look at Stansted and you look at Gatwick and you look at Heathrow, and you look at the different traffics around London, and you apportion traffic based on



a trend. When you're Stansted you say: Look, I've got an opportunity here. I've got Ryanair; I've got brilliant business processes and I can really estimate the progress, so in theory, if we say 'Yes', we at Stansted have the fastest growth, we were told, in England on airports, then the national forecast of DfT becomes less significant than the local forecast who is doing a different thing in terms of business. So there are two different figures here. But I'd like to come back to what I initially said. These are forecasts. They are best guesses. They are attempts to define. You said it's common sense what's done in the last five years is done in the next five years. No, no. That isn't common sense. It's common sense for today. That's 20:20 vision. In the next five years things could change. I'm told there's a Brexit issue going on, which might affect things. There is an Aviation Strategy. There is the whole issue of air pollution that may change things. So we really don't know. It's difficult to forecast these things. The problem is we're sitting here now not discussing forecasts. We're actually discussing real things. People use forecast magic to interpret something to come to a concrete result. I don't blame Councillor colleagues feeling awkward about this because you're not specialists at this issue, but when we walk out today we have to have a definitive which will make a difference to those forecasts when they become reality. So they're forecasts. They're not real. It's like the roads.

Councillor Lemon: If the Department of Transport's figures might not be aligned with reality I would like to get our MP to question the Department of Trade and get them to give us more reliable figures that are in line with reality so that we have... hopefully they may be the same as MAG's, and if they are fine. But are they going to be the same as MAG's? At the moment we're just relying on MAG's figures, and I don't think that's good enough for me to really come to a decision. Perhaps our MP could help us get more reliable figures for us.

Nigel Brown: Can I just clarify? Just to bring this back into you know.... This is not an application for an unrestricted best use at Stansted Airport. It's an application to increase the numbers beyond the consented amount from 35 million to 43 million. I know that doesn't sound like a pretty major thing that I've just said, but I'm trying to bring it back to the debate that we're talking about. Secondly, what Councillor Fairhurst said is quite right. The Government will have a look and try to make the best forecast across the whole of the airport network. Also, the date of that particular document was 2014, if I've picked that up correctly. The best people to know about the forecast from their own airport are the airports, and the DfT have actually conceded that in their documents. So we do have to accept the forecast going forward. What you've just said about Brexit and uncertainties is a fact that we have to talk about forecasting going forward. A lot of the mitigation has got flexibilities based upon figures. We're now talking about actual, you know, actual passenger numbers we're talking about as being figures, or dates as a backstop. We're not relying upon dates, simply to add those flexibilities. Things like 'get to this level' and 'if the situation is like this you will do this', 'if it's not like this you will do this', but you will do this anyway. And that's written through all the litigation processes, because unfortunately we are talking..... We're not talking five years ahead. We're talking 10/15/20 however many ahead, and unfortunately that's the way we need to work and to the forecasts. And, however uncomfortable that is, it's the nature of forecasting and checking those issues. And that's on everything, in terms of traffic, in terms of airport numbers, all those types of things. It's just an element of trust moving forward, based upon forecasts.

Councillor Freeman: Very briefly, Chairman, thank you. You said earlier that when it comes to infrastructure we're not going to expect the airport to pay for a new railway line into London, and I get that. But may I refer you to the letter to Councillor Lodge from the Rt.Hon. Chris Grayling, the Secretary of State for Transport dated 7th August this year. In the third paragraph it says: "I can confirm that current Government policy in relation to airport planning applications is that the developer should pay the cost of upgrading or enhancing road, rail or other transport networks or services where there is a need to cope with additional passengers travelling to or from expanded or growing airports, and this would apply in the case of Stansted's planning application." It's there in black and white from the Secretary of State, sir, so when it comes to payment... At the moment Stansted Airport, MAG, has got away with nothing in the

sense I'm told that the upgrading of junction 8 is already paid for. Or at least not the junction 8 plus, but the junction 8 is paid for already out of existing funds. That's wonderful.

Chairman: OK. Shall we add the last line of the statement? "Governments would only contribute to surface access costs where they were not needed purely for airport expansion and they benefitted non-airport users." In other words, what it's saying is that contributions proportionate with the expected. They're not going to fund everything, but obviously there's other costs and other users for these infrastructure projects.

Councillor Freeman: So how much then is going to be paid to upgrade the rail network in relation to the extra amount of money?

Karen Denmark: Network Rail has confirmed that there is sufficient capacity within the franchise improvements and the existing network, and therefore no other mitigation is required. Network Rail has given us that response.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you very much. There is one more question on rail while we're on the subject. If I can bring it down to the issue of capacity, which we've just talked about. It just triggered something that I made a note of earlier. Passenger standing capacity. Again, in the Jacobs report I think it was, it assumes that capacity will be 65% higher than seating capacity. Standing capacity will be 65% higher than seating capacity. And that's in the report; that's an assumption in the report. I'm told by, I think, SSE that that is contrary to Government policy. DfT PiXC guidance. Now apologies: guidance. I don't know when guidance becomes policy, but there is a guidance note on what is correct standing. Now, regardless of policy, 65% more people standing on a train than sitting on a train today I find it quite painful to think about, having stood on a train many times, but I can't even think about how it's going to be next year or the year after that. I'm all about evidence. Apologies, but I'm a chartered surveyor and I deal with evidence like the whole table here. I need clarity on this. Is the assumption contrary to DfT PiXC guidance please?

Chairman: Mr Brown?

Brown: Well no. That's probably better from further along the table. But what I wanted to point out was that, in terms of the evidence, Councillor Gerard, your independent advisors are in front of you, not behind you. There's quite a lot of stuff being fed to you by .... well, being fed both by MAG and from SSE. Your independent advisors are in front of you. You're looking at advice that has been given to you by SSE with some sort of tinge. And I'm not criticising them – that's what they would do. But that's evidence in context as opposed to pure evidence.

2.30pm

Councillor Gerard: That's why I'm here, and that's why I'm asking these questions, because that's my job.

Chairman: I absolutely agree. Mr Pine, Jeremy, could you clarify exactly where we are with train capacity: standing/sitting.

Jeremy Pine: All I can really do is tell you what Network Rail have told us. They've reviewed the transport assessments as part of the planning application. They asked a number of questions about the transport assessments, and this was directly to Greater Anglia. These questions were related to the impact of increased passenger numbers of crowding of services in the peak hours leaving London, the impact of a higher mode share of 35%, and how this growth would impact on Tottenham Hale station. As a result of these queries the airport and their consultants undertook further assessments and provided the technical notes to Network Rail, and there was also some confidential loading information provided to Network Rail by Greater Anglia that we and the consultants at Essex did not see. All I can say is Network Rail is satisfied

with these findings and accepts the consultants' conclusion that higher capacity rolling stock on the London services can accommodate passenger growth from the airport in the timetable assessed, so in the timescale assessed. They don't object to the planning application but note that increased rail passengers resulting from increased air passengers would mean that longer term rail capacity schemes on the West Anglia mainline are likely to be needed sooner. The point is that's a longer term. They don't object to this planning application.

Councillor Gerard: Is there anyone here who wrote the Jacobs report that I can ask this question to? Because I'm still struggling. I'm sorry.

Chairman: Concerning rail, I don't think there is. Katherine?

Katherine Wilkinson: Jacobs didn't write the report on rail. They wrote the report on the M11 junction.

Councillor Gerard: So could I ask: who wrote the report on rail with the assumption of 65% higher? I just want to clarify if it is what it is.

Chairman: Where are you reading it from exactly?

[Inaudible]

Councillor Gerard: Apologies. I have read that there is an assumption about standing capacity, and I just want clarity on this, because it seems that, if that assumption has been made, I think it's outrageous, and I just want clarity on that please.

Chairman: What I think I'm going to do is I think I'm going to park that one.

Elizabeth Smith: We believe that this information was in the environmental statement, but in order to progress matters perhaps it would be easiest to ask the applicant's agent to confirm?

Chairman: Is the applicant's agent able to confirm if that's in their environmental statement?

Applicant: The transport assessment for the rail covered a whole host of data, standing and seating capacity, and it calculated that capacity based on what is confidential data supplied to us and all applicants were requested by the train companies. It's confidential because it's commercially sensitive, and that is revealed to Network Rail in the assessment in full, and yes, there is an assessment of all capacity in the carriages of the 12 car carriages were put in that assessment going forward to 2028 as well.

Chairman: I do not believe that properly answers your question. What Councillor Gerard is saying is: Was there an assumption, if you like, that 65%.... So if there's 165 people on the train 65 of them are standing. If I'm reading this correctly.

(Inaudible)

Councillor Gerard: My question is: the environmental report, in terms of rail travel, makes an assumption that capacity would be 65% higher. I'm talking about passenger standing capacity would be 65% higher than seating capacity. Is that correct or not correct? (Inaudible) And apparently that is contrary to DfT guidance PiXC guidance. So I need clarity on that.

Chairman: I appreciate you weren't prepped with the question, but do you know the answer?

Applicant: It's quite a detailed question. If you could give me a bit of time.....

Chairman: Yes, I think I will give you a bit of time and we'll come back to it, if that's all right with you, Anthony. Only because it's reasonably complex and I'd like a fairly specific answer, if that's OK. Thank you very much.

Karen Denmark: Excuse me, Chairman, could I just ask ... I mean there is no reference to that in my report, so I'm not quite sure where you got it from, but the table on page 37, the bottom table, you've got line loading, total capacity including standing, so not just standing, the total capacity including standing you've got 62% in there. That's the nearest I can find to any reference to 65% in my report, so I'm not quite sure what you've seen or where you've got it from but that's the nearest I could possibly find.

Councillor Gerard: Well, maybe I will also look for my reference.

Chairman: They're going to take it away, and we'll see where we go from there. Any other questions on transport, where we go forward? I'm going to move it on, and I'm going to come back to that point. OK? If we've got nothing else necessary relating to surface access transport then I'd like to move on to noise as such. ... OK. Questions relating to noise.

Councillor Gerard: Are we getting a presentation on noise first, or....

Chairman: We weren't necessarily going to do a presentation. I would think it would be a reiteration perhaps of what you heard this morning. So I think we'll just take it as questions and as it comes, if that's OK. Councillor Ryles to start followed by Councillor Gerard.

Councillor Ryles: Thank you, Chairman. I've got an interesting question, hopefully. I would like to know if the noise levels and also the air quality is deteriorating or the noise levels have got higher between 2006 permission (the appeal was upheld in 2008) and in proportion to the amount of air passenger transport movements. So, for example, if in 2006 – these are very rough figures – there was 100,000 traffic movements and in 2016/17 there was 150,000, that's an increase of 50%. Now, can anybody tell me if the noise levels have gone up by the same proportion in that period, and likewise air quality has deteriorated or got worse by that proportion? The reason why I ask that is because there's an awful lot of detail in here, and I'd like to be able to understand and project basically for myself – because we have got some numbers now – what it's going to be like in 2028.

Chairman: OK. Well, it's two separate questions to a certain extent. So if I give it to Peter Henson for the noise....

Peter Henson: I have to say I haven't seen - I haven't got to hand - with me now figures for 2006. What I did hear in a presentation this morning, however – and anyone can correct me if I've heard this wrong – but my understanding is that the contour area - the 57dB contour area in 2007 exceeded what it is in the baseline and indeed now in 2017. So it was broadly, I believe.... as I say I only heard this fact this morning, so anybody knows different please feel free to correct me but it's suggested it was exceeded.... In other words, what this development ... proposal is asking for ultimately is a contour limit to conditions that will.... As you know, permission at the moment of 33.9km square contour, condition will constrain it to 28.7 in 2028. And I think I heard a fact this morning that it was exceeded in 2007 - this 28.7 was exceeded in 2007 - or thereabouts, so the noise levels were higher but have got lower because of the modernisation that occurred over time. So, as I say, I couldn't give you chapter and verse about the past because I haven't got it in front of me, but certainly going forward the airport currently has permission to produce noise up to a contour of 33.9, the 57dB contour, and the baseline is 24. In 2017 was 26.1, and so it's going to rise up to something like 32 over the next few years because of the lack of modernisation, but as the modernisation occurs, as I say, that will lower down. So, in other words, with this development the overall noise effects will be no worse than what the airport is allowed to produce now. Indeed, the general finding of the environmental statement is that the changes in noise are very, very low. This would be no more than 1dB between the 'do nothing' and the development case.

Councillor Ryles: So you're saying that even though there are going to be more air traffic movements, more passengers, bigger planes, carrying more passengers, the noise levels over this period you believe, the projections say, will actually reduce because of that contouring. Is that right?

Peter Henson: They'll reduce in terms of a contouring area, they will reduce over and above what was permitted in the 25 plus application. So they will reduce compared to what the airport is permitted to ultimately create now, so to speak. If you compare it on a year by year case of what in the environmental statement is called 'do minimum' against the development case, then it's going to vary every time. In 2023/24 they're broadly the same because there's been no modernisation, numbers are similar, then, as the numbers increase, then the effect of the noise of the greater number of aircraft movements is, to some extent, offset by the modernisation but there will be obviously .... if you've got more aircraft movements you will get a very slight increase in noise level, but the increase, as I say, is of a very low magnitude.

Councillor Ryles: OK. But as I understand it... What can the airport do to persuade the users of the airport and these carriers to go for modernised aircraft to reduce the noise? Is there some influence they can have, or is it going to be in the hands of technology and the business flow of those particular carriers?

Peter Henson: It's a good question. It's a question I do try and put myself when I'm on these projects to airports and airlines. I think essentially the airports do apply pressure as best they can to the airlines to modernise their fleet. A given airport has a limited power to do that, of course, because, if you take an airline like Ryanair, it's got fleets that operate all round the world, certainly round Europe, and one airport it is difficult for them to apply particular pressure. Sometimes one could, for example, as an airport operator, say well, we will charge you a lower landing fee in the event that you use a quieter aircraft. And that would be a structure that an airport operates. So, for example, if they change their 737 800 to a 737 max, and it's probably 3 or 4dB quieter on departure or 5dB quieter on departure, it might mean that the airline will only get charged £X instead of 3x£X. That's an incentive by the airport to the airline. I know in practice some airports have difficulty applying that because of the contracts they have in place already with airlines, but that's the sort of thing that an airport can apply.

Councillor Ryles: Do you know if those measures have been put in as a mitigation, because I've had a look through and I couldn't see any suggestion by MAG that they would charge less for quieter planes. Or am I being silly here? Or naïve.

Peter Henson: No. I think in terms of what airports.... Airports tend to try to introduce incentive schemes. I mean even the night quota count to some extent is an incentive scheme to operate quieter aircraft. So airports do this, generally the best they can, with penalty violations, etc. So Stansted do have penalty violations for aircraft, if they're too noisy they get penalised. So in terms of fleet modernisation, I think in general terms, for the Ryanair fleet, for example, that's going to happen irrespective of what Stansted do per se. I think the important thing is that modernisation will bring about noise benefits, and it's who benefits from those noise benefits, and it's Government policy that the benefits that arise as a result of fleet modernisation should be shared between the airline industry and the local community which may be affected by noise. I think, when you look at this particular application, that's precisely what's happening in this particular case. Because in the first place we have Government policy saying we should make best use of existing runways, which we've been discussing, which MAG are, they're seeking to do. They're seeking to do that by increasing movements from the 35 to 43. That, when you look at the contour areas, are essentially going to shrink over what they're permitted now, which is 33.9, it's going to shrink down over time to 28.7. Now in 2028 you can look at the 'do nothing' case, or the 'do minimum' case, you can look at the development case, and you will see a slight increase in noise. So for the community you can say: Well, actually things are going to get a little bit worse for us. Maybe marginal, maybe 1dB. We may not notice it; we may notice it. We'll see more planes and some might notice it, but that is a worsening for you. There's no doubt about that. But had the modernisation not occurred you would have been

experiencing more noise than that. So the airline industry are saying: Well, please can we benefit a little bit from this. And that's really what, in my mind, this application is doing. It's very much following what Government policy actually is.

Councillor Ryles: Thank you. And the-----

Chairman: I'll come back on the air quality. I'm going to split this into two. I'm just going to get Mr Brown to explain what policies there are, then I'll come back to the councillors that have put their hands up.

Nigel Brown: I'm happy to be elbowed from the right on this one, but I think in terms of picking up Councillor Ryles' comment in terms of how we're making this happen, I think the bit ... the two bits ... you should be looking at is page 45 in the report and also suggested condition 7, which is actually showing a level of noise that is clearly showing an improvement from.... you know, I don't confess to know what kilometres squared mean, but in terms of figures only that the smaller the number the quieter it is, is what we're aiming for. Condition 7 actually puts in a time span in terms of where we actually needed to be, with a snapshot in time at 35 million, which is the consented amount all by 21st December. That's what I was saying earlier about we're still forecasting forward, but you've got to have dates and you've got to have numbers as well, and that's a commitment to actually show by that date it has to be at a certain level, and if it's not they're in breach of the conditions and they can't operate, so no business is going to continue knowing that they're going to hit a wall at some particular point. That also gives a snapshot of time whereby they need to start programming, how they're going to reduce it to even lower by the time they get to the 43. And that's shown in Condition 7, and Condition 7 has very, very clear teeth to prevent them from continuing with a guidance in terms of how it should go. And that actually shows it on page 45 in terms of going from the baseline to the 'do minimum' development case, and then all the way through. So that's where the control would be, and the incentives to actually make sure they make that is quieter aircraft and people managing stock going forward. So those are the ways forward in terms of doing it, but the teeth is (?) Condition 7 in terms of the mitigation to make that happen.

Councillor Wells: Yes. Back on the noise, I understand that noise is quite subjective. Some people are more affected by it; some places are more affected by it. I'd like to better understand the contours that are on the map for noise, because I live in a village, as do a lot of the residents, just on the edge of that and we're told that we're not affected. Yet I can sit in my garden in the summer, as can they, and flights go over every 80 seconds. So I'd like to understand how they are mapped out, and also understand whether they are static, whether they're going to change. If we are ... well, we are increasing flights, although we're not increasing flights on this permission, but flights will increase obviously, and bigger aircraft. So are those swathes going to alter?

Peter Henson: Yes, noise contours. I think in the environmental statement there are different types of noise contours, but I presume you're probably talking about what are listed as LEQ contours, are they? Because that's the standard index, if you like, used and recommended by the Government for rating community effects. I think the first thing to say about the contours on the map, in the environmental statement there are labels for observed adverse effects. There's one called a LOAEL, which is lowest observed adverse effect, and there is a SOAEL, which is a significant observed adverse effect. Now the contours that you're talking about – I'll come back to how they're created shortly – but the lowest one that's shown on your maps is 51dB LEQ 16 hour for the daytime. I guess what you're saying is you live in a village just outside that particular contour and the environmental statement talks about lowest observed adverse effects occur at this contour line and they get worse as you go in towards the airport. But there's also a further index, which is also described in the environmental statement which is called no observed adverse effects, and that's not defined as a level as such, but it's lower than 51, and it's recognised that whereas 51dB – and this is now sort of Government guidance, certainly following the air space change consultation, 51dB is considered the lowest level at which there is an observed adverse effect. What you're saying is: Well actually I'm observing the planes and they affect me in an adverse way and I live outside this 51dB contour. Everybody accepts that people have different sensitivities, and there are going

to be some people who are outside that contour, but there is some further boundary which isn't shown as a contour, but there's a boundary called the no observed adverse effect. So that's the point which, as I say, is not really defined, partly because it's quite hard to define because people have different sensitivities, whereas no-one would be adversely affected by aircraft noise. But the environmental statement ... the purpose of the environmental statement is to determine adverse effects and significant adverse effects, particularly significant adverse effects, because that's what determines whether the application is acceptable or not. So, that doesn't mean that people, like yourself, who are on the boundary of these adverse effects should be ignored, and indeed, the Government advice is that from the lowest adverse effect up to the significant observed, people aren't necessarily significantly adversely affected, but they are affected, and there should be mitigation applied to assist people who are in that boundary. So from your perspective, I can understand what you're saying. You're really saying: Well, actually I'm .... OK, I'm not as bad as some dwellings that are very close to the airport, but I hear the planes, they affect me, they affect me adversely, and therefore how am I going to be helped? Well, I think, in your case, the airport are seeking to refine their operational procedures in order to minimise the effects of aircraft noise as they fly out from Stansted. By that I mean looking at flight tracks, seeing where people live. Can they move the flight track slightly? That type of analysis up to 4,000 feet is generally the airport's responsibility, and beyond that, and certainly beyond 7,000 feet, it becomes the Civil Aviation Authority's responsibility. But closer to the airport it is the airport's responsibility to look to see whether or not certain operational procedures can be applied to help reduce noise effects on people like yourself. As far as the contour is concerned, and how it's calculated, it's fairly complex, but the thing I will say, it's a function of the number of aircraft and also how noisy each aircraft is. So it takes account of how many flights operate in a typical summer day and looking at the mix of aircraft, how noisy each particular aircraft type is. So all that is taken into account in calculating an average noise exposure level, it's called, which is then plotted on a map and the contour is put on the map like a ground level, if you like, but it's actually a noise level on the ground. Then you draw a contour along joining up all the 51 values to get your 51dB contour, which is pretty close to where you actually live.

### **3.00pm**

Councillor Wells: If I could also just ask then, how larger aircraft would affect that? I would point out that I'm not talking about myself specifically. I'm talking about the villages that I represent. I mean, where previously they were within the contour, but now, for some reason, they're not. It's changed very slightly because of the different routes that are taken, but that said, the planes still come right overhead. So how will larger aircraft.... Because presumably they will be bigger and noisier, even with better engines

Peter Henson: I can understand that fear, but I think the environmental statement makes it very clear that the noisiness of the aircraft is not actually going to increase. Because the aircraft types operating are going to continue to operate, but, as an average sort of decrease because of the modernisation of the fleet, so the bigger aircraft that you're talking about will still fly over but it won't be any noisier than the ones that fly over now. You're going to get more aircraft, but the average noisiness of the aircraft is actually going to be a little bit less, if that makes sense.

Chairman: Does that answer the question, Lesley, ish?

Councillor Fairhurst: I'll be brief, Mr Chairman. I'm now completely at a loss because science has proved all our observations wrong. Big aeroplanes are going to be cheaper, going to be lighter, going to be faster and they're going to be less noisy. I'm afraid I don't buy this. I'd love to, but I can't. They're bigger engines. I fly a lot in these creatures; they power up when they take off.... They are marvellous machines, but they are bigger engines, carrying more weight. I'm not a scientist, as I say. I'm going to ask Richard, because he's going to solve it for me, but that's asking too much. And with all due respect, I mean I understand averages.... So if I've got 55 aeroplanes flying with gaps of half a second between each and I average them out, it's not 51 for one. It's a whole lot more divided by the absence of one in the middle.

So the chaps living under the path are being hammered regularly, more frequently and, know what, it's less noise. Now you've got me.

[Applause]

Chairman: Ladies and gentlemen, really. I'm trying to get through this, OK? I understand your position, but if you could be as quick and succinct as possible, Peter.

Peter Henson: Yes. The noisiness of an aircraft... The noise contours and whether something is getting noisier per se is a function of the noisiness of the aircraft and the number of aircraft movements. So what I was saying is the average noisiness of the aircraft, going forward, will reduce because of modernisation. That's why. So the average noisiness of the aircraft fleet that are flying.... The big aircraft will remain as noisy as they are today, because they will be the same aircraft, but you will get a lot of additional aircraft coming in that are quieter but there will be more of them.

[Inaudible]

Peter Henson: No, sorry. Yes, the overall noise will get slightly higher - 1dB. The overall noise exposure will increase, I accept that, but the question was about the noisiness of the individual aircraft. Individual aircraft will not get noisier. Just to take your point, I think you were making the point they are big aircraft, big engines. I accept that, but you're the same age as me. Do you remember the small aircraft with small engines that used to take off from the Queens building? Boeing 727s. And you hear them crackle and take off and significantly much louder than the aircraft today.

Councillor Fairhurst: Let's not kid ourselves. There is more noise. Let's not talk about LEQ, contours and all the wonderful science. There is more noise. More aeroplanes means more noise. We've got to try and avoid the science. It's confusing people.

Chairman: Mr Brown. Just briefly.

Nigel Brown: This isn't science at all. I think that 3.3 of the Officers' Report clearly states what the proposal is. The application does not – that's English; that's not science; that's 'not' – propose to increase the number of aircraft movements from 274,000. So there will not be an increase of flights. So the words 'more of this' and 'more of this' is not the case. It's more passengers, not more flights, and that cap will still be there. I think Karen will clarify.

Karen Denmark: The airport already has planning permission for 274,000 flights per annum, so this application is seeking to increase the number of passengers within that flight cap. So, yes, there will be more flights, but it will be within an existing cap that they already have planning permission for.

Councillor Fairhurst: Thank you Karen, that was very well put. There will be more flights, and there will be more noise. The issue I'm trying to get to is this---

Karen Denmark: But the noise contour will reduce.

Councillor Fairhurst: Yes, I'm not going to be leaving that. But the issue is this though. We have in this room today some kind of reverence for what happened in 2006 and 2008. We are using this as a benchmark and saying they got permissions for that and we're going to get less than that. I'd like to just leave.... I can't wait for a cup of tea. But here's the problem and, Mr Chairman, I mean sincerely: we are living in a better world. We're living in a world where the House of Commons is driven to reduce our levels of noise, who, we are told by one of our speakers – and this is part of our evidence – that noise is a plague of the future. We're told - and I spoke to my daughter, who is a professor of neuroscience – there is a real correlation between noise – not 51 decibels or LEQ's – that noise makes a real difference to



cognitive development of young children. I don't care about lowest assessed or more significant assessed issues. They haven't been assessed. They are being assessed in Munich. So let's stop kidding each other and face the facts and make a decision based on the facts. Thank you.

Karen Denmark: Sorry. Can I just come back on that? They have consent for 35 million passengers per annum, and they have consent for 274,000 flights, so the growth up to 35 million passengers per annum will actually see the noise contours grow. That is consented, and we can do nothing about that. What we have to consider in the determination of this planning application is what happens between 35 million and 43 million, and that shows that the noise contours will reduce. So, yes, there will be impacts up to 35 million. Unfortunately, that's already got planning permission and we can do..... We are not considering that element of growth today. We are considering the growth from 35 million to 43 million, and that shows when the noise contour would then reduce.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I've almost forgotten what I was going to ask, but I'm reminded now, Karen. Thank you very much for clarifying that. Summing up.... I've got a few points here. I'll try and keep them brief, but to try and help us all here. There is the issue of modernisation, and there's the issue of the noise contours, and the short version is modern planes would reduce our contours because they are more efficient, blah, blah, blah. So can I just then clarify a few things. The reason why the contours show because there are assumptions made in the reports. MAG has made an assumption that 57% of the aircraft will be new aircraft, what they call Max/neos aircraft by 2028. So that's kind of a fundamental assumption, and that assumption I don't think has been scrutinised. It's been taken as fact. 57% of aircraft will be Max/neos. At the same time, we know that Ryanair is the main airline at Stansted Airport. We know as a matter of fact, and I did check it... because last night at 11 o'clock we had another letter come in from the applicant trying to explain things, and I tried to get my head around it again, so I checked. Ryanair accounts for 82% of Stansted Airport passengers. That's fact. Ryanair accounts for 78% of all Stansted Airport aircraft movements. Fact. So we have 78% of the planes in the sky are Ryanair planes. Can we all agree on that? Now, because I'm so anal, I checked the Ryanair order book to find out what planes they use. And they're all using all these Boeing planes. The Boeing planes have different ages. Now the fact is that the order book, in terms of.... The order book doesn't show 57% would be Max neos; it actually shows something else. Because of their order book, when you analyse it, and I did, the order actually shows that only 30-35% will be Max neos. So something is not quite right. MAG is saying 57% by 2028 will be these new aircraft. Ryanair are saying 130-35 have been ordered, and those won't come in until that date. So I'm trying to understand that discrepancy. Bear with me, because I've got a bit of logic here. Apparently these new aircraft are quieter, and apparently they are 40-50% quieter, so it does explain your issue with new planes. They are quieter, but we are now on an assumption.... In the report the assumption is that there will be 57% of these quieter aircraft, but actually Ryanair (the main plane in the sky) are saying that's not true. When you analyse.... When you look at the order book and you look at the age of the planes and when they're ordering the planes, and you start to analyse the average of the planes, because this is all about that assumption. The assumption is the golden thread of all assumptions here. It's this issue of modern planes, quieter, tick: don't worry about noise. Analyse the Ryanair fleet and there are 459 planes as of 31st October, Ryanair planes. Various ages, ranging from brand spanking new, still with the stickers on, up to 16 years old, of which there are only three. Now there's an average age of planes in this range, and to do the numbers you add up the planes, 459, you add up all the different ages and how many are there, and there's an average age of, 2947 divided by 459, average age of 6.42 average age. You look at that and look at the order book and look at when they have to order these planes, assuming that they don't order new planes to replace planes they have just bought – no-one does that – even if you replace a plane that has still got five years left, there's no way that they can get the planes in time. So I want to ask the question: Am I right or am I wrong? Has the assumption been made, with proper scrutiny, that 57% of these new aircraft will be available? The homework I did at midnight – and I had better things to do, but I did it – tells me that there is a problem here.

Peter Henson: OK. It's a very good point. It has been raised, I know, by SSE in their recent briefing note. It's a question I first asked MAG when I first came on board about the extent of modernisation they were

assuming in their ES and they explained to me that that information had been provided to them by their forecasting engineers, ICF and that by 2028 they are estimating about 50% modernisation of the narrow bodied jets and 24... a bit less than 20%. You're quite right. There's information out there that describes now Ryanair are going to modernise their fleet going forward and what they've ordered at the moment, and what they've got further to order, and people can look it up..... It's on the Boeing website actually. It suggests that – I mean I can read it out to you here if you like – in very broad terms it says they've got a fleet of 400 Boeing 737 aircraft with orders for 115 new Boeing 737's and 110 of the 737 max's, which are the modern ones, but with options for 100 more. And that the fleet will grow to about 585 by 2024. Now when you look at those figures that suggests – and it's difficult to say exactly how they'll do it – but it suggests it could have a modernisation fleet of about 30-odd% by 2024. The ES assumes less than 20%. As far as 2028 is concerned and the 50%, that is a figure that has been advised by these aviation forecasters. I'm not a specialist in it, but what I can tell you, based on my knowledge of other airports that are going through a similar procedure now, looking at forecasting ahead to this sort of years, it is a standard assumption that about 50% modernisation by 2028. So all I can tell you is, as an independent consultant, that makes sense and is what other airports are doing, and seems to be in line with the Ryanair fleet modernisation programme.

Chairman: I'm just going to interject a little bit, inasmuch as I suppose, if you get a permission today, then all of a sudden you've got an order book and you order some planes. Therefore that might be the logic of where it goes or where it ends up. I'm just presupposing that that's probably what happens. If you've got a limited capacity then you don't go there. So, you know, I think that's where it is. Councillor Freeman. And then I'm going to take a short break.

Councillor Freeman: I think a short break sounds an excellent idea, Mr Chairman. I'll try and be as brief as possible. It seems a scenario similar to boiling the frog. What we're saying is we're going to boil the frog but we're going to use slightly cooler water, so that's OK. It will be fine; the frog won't notice it. What I do know, Chairman, is that aircraft are intrinsically noisy, and I once organised a lecture for one of the Cambridge societies of which I'm a member, called The Silent Aircraft Initiative. The Silent Aircraft Initiative is paid for by Rolls Royce Air Engines and takes place in the engineering department of the University of Cambridge and elsewhere. The simple message is that the current design of aircraft cannot be made silent. If you want a quiet aircraft – and you can make them quiet – it has to be something entirely different: a thing called a flying wing. They look very strange, and nobody would want to fly in them. So there is a really touching belief in technology. We'll put a new engine in and it will be better. It will use less fuel, and there's this assumption that eventually you get to a point where you use almost no fuel, but a heavier air machine always uses fuel just to stay in the air. It's the basic physics of it. So don't be blinded by the fact that there's another piece of machinery coming down the line. It will be quieter, it will be more efficient, but it's asymptotic. It's approaching a point where there's no very great improvements with the current design of aircraft. That I think we have to realise. When it comes to aircraft noise, they will always be noisy and the fact is Boeing produce this particular type of aircraft at the rate of 1½ a month it would seem. Is it 1½ a month or 1½ a week? Help me Anthony. What's the production rate of these aircraft Anthony? [Councillor Gerard: 1½ per week] ... and they're increasing is to 2 per week in the foreseeable future, which actually isn't very many, considering that they're going all over the world. So the rate at which they can be replaced I think is optimistic in these estimates. And the other thing is that MAG don't actually own any aircraft. They don't do aircraft. Actually what they do is airports, and actually they're more of a business partner now, an airport that happens to be a business partner; it's got a retail park in it and a runway, and all the controls to make it an airport. So if, for example, Ryanair decide to move its operation somewhere else, and take its latest aircraft with it, it would still continue to be an airport but you wouldn't have necessarily any influence at all over the sort of aircraft flying in and out of there. So the predictions, I think, are... it's not to say that they're optimistic necessarily, but they're hard to make, because they're commercial predictions made on what is a very variable playing field, I think.

Councillor Lemon: Thank you, Chair. The larger and quieter aircraft are going to be good for us all. There is no question about that. I think that the case has been made. But how do we make sure that the operators of the present aircraft will go out and purchase quieter planes as soon as possible? Or will they make their planes last right to the end of their life? Or will MAG give incentives to make it worthwhile for operators to purchase these planes, larger and quieter planes, almost as soon as possible so that it helps everybody? Or will MAG be able, or will the operator of airports, be able to say to the people like Ryanair: If you don't go for these quieter planes then we will stop your noisier ones flying?

Karen Denmark: That's part of what the conditions are about. Whilst we can't do anything regarding up to 35 million, because that's already consented around noise contour 33.9 square kilometres, but that's why Condition 7, which sets out both a time frame and a passenger number target .. erm trigger, that's based on the applicant's assumptions that they are going to have these quieter aircraft. And based on those assumptions, that they're going to have the quieter aircraft, they have said that their noise contour will reduce, so we're saying: OK, you've said that, we're going to tie you to it. And so we have said, based on your projections as set out in your ES you will meet that commitment that you're making, as set out in your ES. If the quieter aircraft don't come in they can't have the growth because they can only fly the aircraft which meet the noise contour as it's set. So if Ryanair say: Sorry, we've only got our noisy aircraft. We're not going to have quieter aircraft, then the airport operator essentially, in very simplistic terms, has the right to say: Sorry, Mr O'Leary. Take your aircraft somewhere else, because you can't fly here. Or go and get a quieter aircraft. So, that's how the condition, in simplistic terms, that's how the condition ties in.

Councillor Lemon: I agree with that. I'm glad you've said that. So the airport operator will be able to say to the aircraft operators: You can't fly that aircraft because you haven't met our assumptions. The other thing I would say is I wish we all could stop using the word 'assumptions', because I don't really know what it means.

Chairman: Right. Hang on. I'm going to do Councillor Gerard and then Councillor Loughlin, and then we'll have a break.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you Chairman. Councillor Lemon, I hear what you say. The reason I use the word assumptions is because they're repeated a thousand times in the documents. We are being asked to make a decision today based upon assumptions, and I can't use any other word because that is the word that has been used. So that's the word that we have to use and I'm struggling with this because Miss Denmark is basically trying to tell us that, you know, you make a decision, the condition is not fulfilled, and therefore the airline is going to get a slap on the wrist by MAG, but we will already have made the decision, so it's after the event.

Chairman: I'm going to ask Mr Brown to clarify exactly how that slap on the wrist can operate.

Nigel Brown: Slap on the wrist is that you cannot operate at that level. You can't implement the permission. It's literally... and we put some checks into place. No airline, taking current simplicity scenario there, Ryanair are not going to say: Oh, carry on and do your worst. They will have to think about this, because Stansted is not alone in operating on that basis. Stansted wouldn't go: Oh let's just hope that Ryanair buy all the right planes by the time we get there. They are going to be thinking ahead. But if they don't, if we're over-estimating what they're doing, then at the end of the day they can't have this permission. That is what that condition is doing. The condition is getting to the point where once you get to the 35 million, which they've already got consent for, they can't go beyond that because that is what these noise contours do. That is not assuming anything. That's.... well, it is assuming something. It's taking an assumption, which is that there's going to be reduced noise contours in that particular position, and that's where it's going to be once they get to 35 million. If we're wrong then they can't go beyond that anyway. We're assuming that very strict reduction in noise contours at that particular point. And both the airlines and the airport know it. So that's not an assumption; that putting a control, and it's not a slap on the wrist. It is: You cannot implement this increase in numbers. That's what that says.

Councillor Gerard: With respect – it’s a terrible thing to say, but with respect, who will enforce the conditions? I’m a UDC councillor and, you know, conditions of all types, on any planning permission have to be enforced. Now we have trouble enforcing builders sweeping the streets after the truck leaves. On the Newport Road. With respect, I’d like to know how that will be enforced. Because it seems a pretty big condition to enforce.

Chairman: Fair question.

Nigel Brown: Well, I’m not going to go on mopping the roads, because that is not a planning issue anyway. This is dealing with a proper issue, a proper breach of planning control, and the issue is they are in breach of that planning control. If necessary we can have injunctions attached to that to prevent them from carrying on doing that. And it’s as simple as that. Stop! That is what it is.

Councillor Lemon: Chairman, just one very quick one. I think we all ought to realise that the purchase of these new class of planes which we all want rely entirely on the aircraft operators having the money to buy them.

Councillor Loughlin: I want to be in on that conversation when MAG says to Michael O’Leary: Look here, Michael, you can’t fly your planes. Let me know when you’re doing that, please. I definitely want to be there. Going back to enforcement: money talks. Ryanair is a very successful operator, and the biggest operator that Stansted Airport uses. I cannot believe, and I may be cynical, that somebody is going to come along and actually say: You can’t do this anymore because you haven’t fulfilled this. I’m sorry. I don’t believe that for one moment.

Chairman: Ladies and gentlemen, we’re going to take a five minute break, so everyone back here at 25 to. Just five minutes. (Adjourned for a short time)

**3.25pm**

**Break**

**3.40pm**

Chairman: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. Sorry, that was a bit longer than we planned, but I think everybody needed it. I’m going to pick up two points. I’m just going to go back on Councillor Gerard’s point on the train standing, and ask if Alistair [Alistair Andrew, (MAG)] has got the information there. If you’d like to pick up on that point, and then I’m going to come back on another point as well just before we start.

Alistair Andrew: Chair, as I understand it, unless the Councillor can point exactly to where the 65% reference is.... I don’t know whether he can – I really just want to refer back to the (Inaudible) Oh, you have. Right.

Councillor Gerard: Chairman, I did find this. It was in the presentation that was given to us last week by SSE. It was in their presentation, and its entitled ‘Impacts on Rail Services – further justification for refusal’. So I want clarity. That’s the page I’m referring to, and it says: “Passenger standing capacity on trains has been wrongly calculated, giving assumed capacity 65% higher than seating capacity. This assumption is contrary to DfT PIXC guidance C.11, wholly unrealistic and may well be physically incapable of being achieved.” And the reference it gives is: PIXC passengers in excess of capacity, the standard DfT measurement for train overcrowding.

Chairman: Right, OK. Does that help you? No. You’re not prepared for that comment really, are you?

Alistair Andrew: I'm careful and conscious, Chair, not to introduce new material to you at this point, which I don't think is the purpose of today. What I would say is that the line loadings are clearly set out in the Officers' Report based on how we have calculated them, which Network Rail's advice and guidance and with data supplied from the train operating companies. The test that the Councillor just mentioned there is guidance for a wholly different purpose. If we were asked to have carried out that assessment by Network Rail, or by Anglia, or indeed any of the parties responsible for the rail network, it would have been carried out. We've carried out the guidance as advised, and that's the Officers' Report. And the loadings, as identified there, show that there is spare capacity on the network with 12 car trains, as your officers have already pointed out.

Chairman: Thank you for that.

Councillor Gerard: If I may, Mr Chairman, just to clarify on a point of reference. I did try to find the answer from MAG's information. I want to make it very clear that I'm not relying upon SSE's information, clearly only as a counterbalance. In fact, I did make reference to a letter that they circulated on 9th November in which they actually made a reference to rail, and I was hoping that they would clarify the matter for me. When I look at it again, I think on the question of that they simply said Network Rail have no objections. I just want to make a point. I am trying to work with the MAG information.

Chairman: I appreciate that, Councillor Gerard. OK. I'm going to come to Mr Brown now, because we left the last session..... No, I'll come back to you in a second, Councillor Fairhurst. Mr Brown, we were discussing how to perhaps have a little bit more teeth to the holding feet to the fire on aircraft movements. Perhaps you could come up with a proposal.

Nigel Brown: One suggestion, which I've bounced off MAG but we haven't gone into detail yet. As part of the mitigation, Condition 7 is a clear one, and does do what I said it was going to do. I think the response in Councillor Gerard's comments was: What enforcement action would be taken, and would we have the stomach for it, etc, etc, and all that stuff. What you could do – and it's not practice to duplicate planning conditions in Section 106's just to add weight to them – but what you could do is expand that Condition 7 in Section 106 as part of the mitigation, as an undertaking for which, if this was approved MAG would be a signatory to the 106, with also stress tests with it. So there's an undertaking by MAG to do that, as well as some other checks and balances within that to make sure that they are on lines. We're not just sitting there waiting for them to get to that particular situation to make sure. And that could cover things like routings and stuff like that as well, so therefore there can be community stuff. So it could add a little bit more to it to actually achieve that, rather than just hoping and praying that we are going to get to the situation at 35 and suddenly the noise contours have shrunk and/or they're beginning to shrink then off we go. We have confidence that Condition 7 won't be breached in terms of what we've got going forward, but I think an undertaking within Section 106 with necessary stress levels, with necessary other actions, such as routings and stuff like that, would give it a lot more teeth. And because MAG would be a signatory to the 106, and to that undertaking, they've agreed to do it. So all of a sudden, if you're in breach of the 106 is an absolutely clear injunction, with penalties as well. I think that will give.... It should give members a little bit more comfort than what you would have if you just had the condition.

Councillor Fairhurst: Yes, Mr Chairman. You know we're not going to let it go. We asked a question of standing room only. Now it matters. It matters because it is in the evidence. If we had access to it, so did they. We got evidence last night, and we read it and went through it, because that's our job here. And the same applies to the applicant. If we have a situation which is a questionable one about 65% higher standing capacity, it matters because you have longer carriage trains. If it's in contravention of some policy it's a big issue, and it's not good enough saying we haven't read our homework.

Chairman: OK. Point noted.

Councillor Freeman: Yes, thank you. In support of that apparently – and I can't give you the original here – Network Rail's response explicitly states: "Increased rail passengers resulting from increased air passengers would mean that longer term rail capacity schemes on the West Anglia mainline are likely to be needed sooner", which is fine, but there are no such schemes at the moment for short term or medium term or long term improvements. There are no schemes for improvement apparently.

Chairman: I'll bring you back to my earlier statement. It would be lovely if we could solve all the infrastructure problems that we've got with this one application, but we have to consider this in balance as to what it's going to cost us as such.

Councillor Fairhurst: Sorry, I really didn't mean this to go on, but this is an issue. Sustainability means it works, and every time we get to a point that worries, we say we can't discuss it any more. We cannot agree to a system here today that hasn't been gone through thoroughly. It was stated in the press and all over the place that we were not up to the task, and I disagree. We are up to the task, as long as we make sure we answer all the questions and solve all the problems. This is a big problem; it's not a minor problem. It's substantial to the issue of whether it's sustainable or not. So I'm not letting it go.

Chairman: Well, we have a contradiction, haven't we? We have a contradiction where SSE have made one statement and MAG have based theirs... No, they've made a statement as such, so whether that can be verified, or how we progress that, it would have to be done. MAG have based their assumptions on what they were asked to do to actually as a requirement for the application as such. And they've had a statement from Network Rail. I'd love to be able to say: Look, we're going to four track the line in five years' time or something, and I absolutely understand that is probably what it is going to need, but we're not today going to be able to resolve that issue. I understand what you're saying, but we're not trying to gloss over the fact.

Councillor Fairhurst: I don't believe that at all. It's not our job. It's a job for the officers to clarify the process, and there seems to be a lack of evidence here for us. We're trying to make a decision, and we're relying on very hard working people trying to tussle with all the issues, and MAG's got a view. This is a view which is in the evidence, and we can't find a solution to the problem. It's not your problem, it's not my problem. It's a problem the officers have to solve.

Roger Harborough: Mr Chairman, if you look at para. 9.142 of the Officers' Report that sets out the definitive position in terms of the scale of this particular issue. Hourly data presented to Network Rail, which Jeremy Pine referred to, not included in the application due to sensitivity of the data, show that demand may exceed seating availability on four Stansted Express services heading northbound during the pm peak should airport passenger rail mode share rise to 35% by 2028 with the growth of the airport to 43 million passengers per annum. Whilst this would impact on seating availability there would be sufficient standing capacity to accommodate the passenger numbers. So that is the assessment of the impact of going to 43mppa. On four services leaving Liverpool Street in the pm peak there may not be sufficient seats for everybody to sit down. Now Network Rail have taken the view that that degree of impact is acceptable in the context of the proposals.

Councillor Fairhurst: My cases rests, M'Lud. We were told it isn't sufficient. We were told it breaks policy rules, and we all know that vulnerable or elderly people standing on rails for more than 20 minutes is a risk, it's a hazard, and it's simply wrong.

Roger Harborough: Chairman, Network Rail are aware of the PIXC guidelines and have taken those into account, no doubt, in responding to the planning application.

Chairman: OK. Moving on. We've sort of dealt with noise assessment. I'd like to talk about air quality now. So I'm sure some of you have some questions. I am going to try and move things on as much as possible.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you, Chairman. Again, I think that there is a follow on from noise, as quite a nice link, which obviously connects the issue of the new fleet assumptions. We went through that issue of the new fleet assumptions, those lovely quieter, wonderful planes, which apparently are better for our environment. I just want to point out that the issue of air quality is based upon the assumptions also on new fleet. There is a connection there. Now I want to just move on to the issue of emissions, which is obviously a big issue, and it is a health issue, it is an environmental issue. The modelling that's quoted in the report, it apparently considers modelling up to 1,500 feet, and it's been brought to my attention, and I've looked for information to clarify in the MAG EIA reports and all the other reports, that there is a recommendation by the ICAO that it should be at 3,000 feet – double the height. Now I just want clarity, please, from somebody as to if that is correct and why the modelling only considers 1,500 feet.

Nigel Mann: So we were made aware of this yesterday, and we've had a look at this. Basically, the difference in the height is fairly arbitrary because, as you look at the emissions going for a higher amount, the higher level, then you're actually looking at a wider set of emissions as well, because as you go higher you're also going out further. So we've had a look and the effect would be negligible in terms of the actual... where you draw that line. So there's not a significant difference between looking at the different methodology.

Councillor Gerard: Sorry, Mr Chairman. I'm not sure how you come to that conclusion, because my simple question is: If the ICAO recommends 3,000 feet, why aren't we using 3,000 feet?

Nigel Mann: We've looked at the assessment that's been done. We were looking at it in the context of local pollutant levels, not... We must really be very careful here, because we're looking at the effect on local levels of nitrogen dioxide, not airborne levels of nitrogen dioxide. But we are looking at carbon dioxide in a global sense. So when we looked at the effects of the aircraft emissions on local levels, which is very, very, very minimal, this level that you pick is nothing. It's 0.000 effect, because the effect on local air quality – so we're talking about nitrogen dioxide – is very, very low as the planes have gone. So actually, like I say, you can take a level and you're actually balancing two different things: your height as well as area.

Councillor Freeman: Thank you. We have a panel of independent experts here, who presumably are being paid (I hope they are - paid by somebody anyway), but they don't seem to be providing very much in the way of answers. When I served on independent panels and I was asked a question I gave an answer as good as I could give. So I'm a bit disappointed at the moment. I'm disappointed with that one, because that says: Look, there may be a world standard here, or best practice standard, but if it's not convenient we're not going to use it. We use another one. That's not an answer. I'm sorry. It really isn't. If there's a world standard, or a best practice standard, or an industry standard, that's the standard you use. Now the whole of this application is full of cherry picking of the right standards to fit the argument. It's a question of: This is the answer we want, let's choose the standards that give it. And the noise profile levels are very much the subject of that. How long you measure them for, or whether you average them, or whether you take a peak. It's a very complicated matter, Chairman, and that is the basis upon which... I've been a scientist all my life. I wouldn't want to get my brain round this lot, because it would take years to do it properly. It really would. It's a very, very technical subject, so we're very dependent on the quality of our advice, obviously, and that is the merit of the Secretary of State dealing with this, because presumably they have access to the best advice. I would hope so, you know. But we're just a department, we're 10 councillors and a collection of officers, who are very competent and very hard working – there's no question about that – but this is a very highly technical area, and that's one of them. Now the point I wanted to ask is not about that. As I say, I'm disappointed in that answer, and if you hire experts you expect them to give answers, not to actually just give more confusion to the subject. That's just my personal opinion based on serving in this sort of business for the last 30 years. The air quality management area. If I turn to page 99 of the Officers' Report, paragraph 10.30. Start with air quality. We've got the infamous Hockerill junction, which is not in Uttlesford, fortunately, but it's very close to the

airport. In Saffron Walden, my own town where I'm an elected member, there is the only actual.... I think it's the only air quality management area in Uttlesford, and further on down this page 99, paragraph 10.33, starts with mitigation measures says, about two thirds of the way down that paragraph: "The continuation of air quality measures will be secured by way of a Section 106 legal obligation". Well, I'd like to know what Section 106 legal obligation there is to improve the air quality. Of course, it's a very hard thing to do. We've got an air quality management area in Saffron Walden, the junction of Thaxted Road and Radwinter Road. It's an air quality management area; it's designated as such, and actually nobody has done anything about making it better. Of course, in order to make it better you either have to say to the cars and the traffic: You're not going that way; we'll find another road for you, and Mr Sprunt and us have wrestled with this for years, we really have, and Mr Sprunt is quite close to trying to persuade us to adopt another one of his schemes, which actually is just outside this office here, which involves lots of one-way streets and things.... But hey, you know, the message is it's very hard to deal with. I don't see how Section 106 agreements can possibly solve this matter. It's imaginary. Say: Oh, it's going to be a Section 106 agreement. That's one of these non answers. Because you can't fix it with.... Well, if you can, please explain to me how. I've wrestled with this for years in my own town, without success.

**4.00pm**

Elizabeth Smith: Thank you, Mr Chairman. The wording of the report does not say that a Section 106 agreement could make the quality of the air better. It says "The continuation of air quality measures would be secured by way of Section 106 legal obligation. We will continue to do the best we can." That is not the same thing as saying: We will make it better. We will implement measures that we hope, in the basis of the knowledge at the present moment, will improve the situation. A Section 106 cannot cure; it can only put in place measures that may, on the basis of knowledge available at the time, help.

Councillor Freeman: In that case, Chairman, if I may just come back on that, that's an unfortunate use of English, because what it says is: Actually, we're not going to fix it but we're going to look at it; we're going to watch it. The same argument, Chairman, is applied to Hatfield Forest, which is an extremely sensitive to nitrogen dioxides. We say what we'll do is we'll monitor them. It's fine; we're just monitoring. It will be OK. That is not an answer. If you can't fix it, mitigation is what is required when it comes to sustainability. The balance of this is that unquestionable economic advantage, unquestionable employment advantage to Stansted Airport expanding and profiting. I'm very much in favour of that. Full employment very important; high technology very important; close to Cambridge, as one of the speakers this morning pointed out, it's the nearest airport to Cambridge. Much better than driving round the M25. All this is absolutely true, but if you cannot mitigate to an adequate extent then you cannot go ahead. And that's it. We've just established all we're going to do is to measure, and that's the end of it. That's not good enough, Chairman.

Karen Denmark: Right. With regard to the Section 106 around the air quality and AQMA, so the measures in there are the sustainable transport levy, where funds are raised from the parking transactions at the airport, and that goes into the funds, which are overseen by the transport forum and its associated working group. That can include funding for schemes such as offsite charging points, introduction of providing funding for electric buses, and things like that. So things that can reduce carbon emissions within the air quality area - NOx emissions sorry. With regards to Hatfield Forest, it's not just a case of 'we'll monitor it'. The requirement in the Section 106 is to continue monitoring, as requested by Natural England, and if impacts are identified, an appropriate mitigation scheme must be drawn up, approved by Natural England, and implemented. So it goes further than that.

Councillor Freeman: I'd like to know what that scheme is, Chairman, because I don't believe it's technically possible.

Karen Denmark: But we don't know yet, because the monitoring is happening. It's only just.... MAG has had nearly a year-long battle to get the monitoring equipment actually installed in Hatfield Forest from



Natural England because they got the planning permission for it, had to get consent from Natural England to actually install it in there, and it took nearly a year to actually come back and say Yes, it's fine, despite the fact that we were granted planning permission. So once the equipment is in there the monitoring can carry on. That had to be.... That was part of the 25 to 35 mppa mitigation, was that they had to install the monitoring equipment. So we're taking that one step further now and said: Right. OK. You get the equipment installed, we will monitor it, you know, it will be monitored over that 10 year period for the previous consent. If harm is identified over that period, then you will have to look at a mitigation scheme and implement it when you get to 35.

Councillor Fairhurst: Sorry. Will we switch off the aeroplanes? I will just differ slightly from my scientist next to me. I think the chaps in front of us are doing a really hard job; really they are. We're all in new territory here and you try the best you can. But we've got to be vigilant about it. It's an important decision to make. I want to read two things which matter to me – I hope they matter to other people as well – from a Prime Minister herself on the 25-year environment plan. It says: "Our natural environment is our most precious inheritance", and the thoughts of the Secretary of State, in terms of the clean air strategy, says: "Air pollution is the top environmental risk to human health in the UK, and the fourth grade of risk to public health after cancer, heart disease and obesity." So this is not a minor detail; it's a very big detail. Now I love being told we're going to monitor things. We should have been monitoring for the last 20 years. Don't start monitoring because someone is going to pass an application. But whether we monitor or not, if we don't have something in place that says: This is what we're going to do if things start to fail, then we lose forests, we destroy air. We make a decision today which isn't a maybe or conditional, it's a Go ahead; buy your planes, fly your planes; have a wonderful time, and if it all goes wrong in 10 years' time we'll think of something. That's not going to work for me. Thank you.

Nigel Mann: If I can just help on this matter... So the... it relates to biodiversity, because obviously nitro-dioxide will effectively make the forest imbalanced, you know, which then means that species will be less attractable or ability to flourish. There are management measures. We're talking about actually chopping down bits of the vegetation to allow, to bring in that biodiversity, so there are a set of management measures, and that's different for every single different woodland or grassland. Grassland you chop the grass back and then the plants that don't want too much grass, and the animals will get in. So each different biodiversity there is a management measure, and that's what Natural England would be looking to adjust it to maintain the biodiversity.

Councillor Fairhurst: Thank you, Mr Chairman. That's exactly what I'm looking for. Now can you please put on a piece of paper so you've got something to make a plan against? Because that's what we need...that's the information we need. We can't make decisions in the air, chaps, best endeavours we'll do our very best. That's the information... for example, Hatfield Forest is a big issue for us, because there's another one apparently as well, that are all dying. And if we do have a plan that says: If this happens we do that, as Nigel Mann says, we must be a little bit more comfortable with the decision.

Councillor Gerard: Mr Chairman, thank you very much. I assume the same goes for Elsenham Forest too.

Nigel Mann: Yes, exactly. I mean Natural England will have a slightly different plan for it, but there will be a management measure that they would be seeking to implement.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you. Can I move on now to the issue of cumulative road impact, and to do with air quality. What I want clarity on is have we adequately assessed the cumulative impact of the proposal combined with the additional 15,000 houses?

Nigel Mann: Yes, I believe that it has on the basis of the discussions we've had this morning from transport, because effectively, when the transport model is approved those are the numbers that go into the air quality modelling. So if the transport people are basically happy with the numbers representing

the cumulative assessment, so in the same way that it heard about the process this morning, that goes for air quality because that is exactly the same numbers that are used.

Councillor Gerard: If I may carry on. Can I move on to the broader issue of carbon emissions and climate change? Again this was something that I read in the environmental statement. I've done research, and briefing notes were sent to us by SSE as well. Again, I need some clarity so we can know what the effect is. First of all, we're here, we're Uttlesford District Council, we're the District Council trying to make a decision here, but there are bigger impacts on us that do affect our decisions. I don't believe we're supposed to ignore them. I appreciate we can't fix them, but they do have a bearing, so bear with me if you can. So, the big one. The Climate Change Act. My understanding – and again, Mrs Smith, please tell me if I'm wrong – but the UK has a statutory duty on the Act and that duty is to reduce emissions by 80% by 2050. I understand that all sectors of the UK economy have to contribute to that task, including the aviation sector. Now it seems that the aviation sector bit of that, which is why we're here, is the numbers – and I need clarity – are to keep the CO2 levels below 37.5 million tonnes by 2050. So that's the target. The way I read it, the Department for Transport, when it talks about this issue, makes a planning assumption. Again, I'll need some clarity on the definition of what planning assumption means for us. But the planning assumption for Stansted Airport is that the carbon dioxide is that that target should be 1.37 million tonnes by 2028, which rises to 1.64 million tonnes in 2050. Now that is a planning assumption for Stansted by the Department for Transport, as I read it. MAG, in the documents that we've read and in their submission, they're projecting CO2 of 2.5 million tonnes by 2028, that's compared to the 1.37 that it's supposed to be. So their own projections for CO2 are 1.3 million tonnes more than the Department for Transport guidelines. So what I'm asking is that it seems logical that, if their own projections are 80% more than the Department for Transport guidelines, there is something wrong. Why haven't we scrutinised that? Why hasn't it been brought up in big flashing lights? And so, what I'm trying to say is that if you look at..... And that's just to 2028. If you look at the cumulative impact, which is our statutory duty to 2050, the cumulative impact is nearly 29 million tonnes. The question I want to ask, please, is: Is this a material consideration for us to consider, and if it's not, why not?

Nigel Mann: I do believe it is a material consideration. We've checked through the numbers, but the numbers are as predicted. However, it is also, like you say, a global and a national situation that is the same with obviously many developments. That's not trying to excuse it, but yes, I do believe it is a material consideration.

Roger Harborough: Yes, I agree it is a material consideration, but members need to have regard to Beyond the Horizon, which is the Government's policy framework on these matters, which makes it very clear that the Government believes that best use of runway capacity can be permitted locally without attaching any weight to carbon emissions. And that's because the Government believes that, at a national level, the cumulative impacts of those best use proposals, in combination with the third runway at Heathrow, are compatible with its obligations in respect of the Climate Change Act. So it's a matter of Government policy that you do not attach any weight to it in taking a decision on this particular planning application.

Councillor Gerard: Mr Chairman, we're being told not to give any weight to climate change, basically. What I'm trying to say is, on the one hand we're being asked to make a decision locally, and we're told by the NPPF that we must consider all environmental impacts, we must consider national policy – which I assume includes international statutory duties – and now we're being told not to give weight to an international statutory duty. I can't.... I'm not going to go any further without clarity.

Roger Harborough: I'm not saying that. I'm saying that the Government is satisfied that it can meet its international and national commitments in respect of carbon emissions without planning authorities, when they're determining proposals for best use, to attach any weight to the carbon emissions associated with those best use proposals.

Councillor Gerard: So we come back to best use. I mean what you're saying is actually it comes back to the point that was skipped through a little bit earlier on, which is the issue of best use, which is, therefore, at the crux of this whole thing then.

Roger Harborough: No. It isn't, because Government's policy is expressed in general terms. It doesn't talk specifically about additional capacity at Stansted Airport. It talks about best use of airports in the UK, other than London Heathrow. We don't have before us today an application for best use for Stansted Airport. We have an application, as Mr Brown has said, we have an application to permit an increase in the passenger numbers without any increase in air transport movements.

Councillor Gerard: Sorry, Mr Chairman, Mr Harborough has just said we don't have an application for best use, in which case it is contravening Beyond the Horizons, which says that it will look at applications for best use. We don't have best use, therefore I'm confused. Please clarify.

Roger Harborough: The application is consistent with Government policy about proposals to make best use of existing runway capacity. It doesn't say you have to apply for best use of the runway.

Councillor Gerard: May I quote from what we are told... considerable weight is to be afforded to this document, Beyond the Horizons, which, by the way, we're waiting a Green Paper update any day, like next week, and then the White Paper comes out in the new year.... But we're here today, so let's look at this Beyond the Horizons, which is, by the officers' own report, policy. This is policy. We have to work to policy. And it says, and I go to paragraph 1.5. The heading of this section is Making Best Use of Existing Runways. It says, and I'll read it in full so I'm not accused of leaving things out: "The aviation strategy call for evidence set out the Government agrees with the Airport Commission's recommendation and was minded to be supportive of all airports who wish to make best use of their existing runways, including those in the south east, subject to environmental issues being addressed." And then it says the position is different for Heathrow. Therefore, if they're supporting best use, and this document is entitled, and it's the front cover, Making Best Use of Existing Runways, I'm confused. On the one hand we're being told: Follow this as policy, give it substantial weight, making best use, Beyond the Horizons. On the other hand, we're being told this application is not best use. I'm confused.

Chairman: I understand why you're confused. I'm going to ask ... I think ... I'm going to think about how I'm saying this. (Inaudible) I completely understand where you're coming from, OK. In some iterations of what we're doing we've used the best case or best use of the airport as a criteria for reasons why we should be doing things. And in this instance we've got the Government saying that it isn't necessarily relevant to the application of this particular element, if you like. I've got it, or I did have it. What we've got before us again – I'm going to bring it back to what we've got before us – we've got that 274,000 cap, which isn't going to change. We've got the RATS and the RETS, and we've got the parking bays as such. Does the RET and RAT actually make best use of the airport? It certainly improves it, which is something that has developed from where the RETs and RATs were approved before. Does the parking improve the use of the airport? Yes, it does. It's making better use. I'll use the word 'better' use. (Inaudible)

Councillor Gerard: Apologies, but the policy is not 'better use'-----

Chairman: I know what it says in the document. I'm saying the application before you is making better use than what it had before, which is what I said. (Inaudible) I can't square this circle, inasmuch as it's a statement that is in a document as such. So I'm going to move on if we haven't got a clarification of this. (Inaudible) Then give us a specific question, and we'll take a specific answer. (Inaudible)

Councillor Gerard: If I may. I do think we need to come back to that issue. It's kind of a crucial issue. If, in the meantime, someone could be looking into this, perhaps legal. But on this issue of air quality – it's a big issue. We have a duty of care to look after people's wellbeing, health, environmental health – I'm on the committee of environmental health, it's important to me and other members of the committee. The

NPPF, our national bible, as it were, planning bible, is very clear on this in terms of sustainability. NPPF, paragraph 8, I think it is, which deals with environmental objectives and climate change. So paragraph 8c, very clear, environmental objective, “to contribute to protecting, enhancing our natural built and historic environment and minimising waste and pollution and mitigating and adopting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy”. Now this obviously has just come out. This is the new one I’m quoting from, not the old one which was slightly different. This one actually reinforces climate change. So that’s kind of important, I think. That’s called the environmental objective – one of the things that we have to consider. Quite a big one. Paragraph 148 of the NPPF, which is entitled: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change. The word climate change is used again. And it says basically: “To support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate and to contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and support renewable and low carbon energy associated with infrastructure”. And finally, of course, there’s paragraph 150: Planning for Climate Change, which says: “New development should be planned” – two things – “to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change and to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions.” So I do think we have some very serious issues here. Not being able to answer the question that I raised as to why it is that the MAG projections are 82% above, in terms of how many million tonnes they are more than DfT guidelines, and contravenes international/UK obligations.

Chairman: Right. Let’s take that as a specific question.

Roger Harborough: In relation to the NPPF guidance on responding to climate change challenges, the NPPF sets out quite clearly the areas in which it expects the planning system to intervene. So that’s around the energy efficiency of buildings, it’s around minimising the need to travel, so you don’t get so many carbon emissions from transport movements. What it doesn’t include, quite specifically, because you’re more up to date Government policy on aviation development says so, it doesn’t include seeking to minimise the emissions from aircraft when they’re moving around the airport or in flight.

#### **4.30pm**

Councillor Gerard: So in the Officers' Report, in the conclusion, in paragraph 10.40 of the Officers' Report – and I’ll just get to it if you bear with me a second – 10.40, the conclusion basically says: “It is considered unlikely to materially impact the UK’s ability to meet its 2050 national aviation target.” I’d like to know who considered that, and I think that that consideration – “unlikely to materially impact” – bearing in mind we’ve been told that its a material consideration - the Climate Change Act, I believe that is contrary to the NPPF. So that’s a conclusion that I don’t understand.

Chairman: I do take your point.

Karen Denmark: All the Government guidelines, the airport aviation policy framework and the other documents say that carbon emissions from aviation will be dealt with at a Government level. So that is why we are looking.... Essentially that chapter is looking at the emissions and in that context. Just looking through those documents....

Councillor Gerard: I feel I’m being put in a bit of a corner here, and I’m not sure how to get out of this corner, because I feel like we’re in a corner here, and I’m struggling to go forwards without....

Chairman: Let’s see if we can throw some clarity on it. Councillor Fairhurst in the meanwhile. I’ll come back to you.

Councillor Fairhurst: Thank you, Mr Chairman. It’s been a long day and we’ve discussed a lot of things. A lot of science, I’m told, and a lot of assumptions, a lot of detail, and you’ve learned all about amazing things about RETs and RATs and LEQs. Very impressive stuff. I do think you’ve got to start calling common sense now – it’s getting late. Policy is important; that’s our job. But I want to put it in real words. I want

to use words instead of abbreviations and letters. I want to talk about real things. We're actually not scientists or specialists, and we're trying to do a proper job here. We take it quite seriously. As you can see, we read a lot. I use two words, English words that I love, and they're very important here. The first word is congestion, from the Latin. Congestion: from 'con' (together) and 'gethera' (to heap up, to load up). Together. To heap together, to congest. The other word is Refuge. 'refugit' 'fugerere'. To flee back. They're two important words we're going to talk about here, because congestion talks about a lot of things. We all know what congestion means: we talk about congested traffic, congested lungs when you've got a lung disease or you've got asthma, congested air, noise congestion – too much noise in a place. And that's what this is all about. It's congestion of noise and air and cars and planes. We've got to come to a point here. You see congestion is a strange thing. I lived in Hong Kong for a year and a half, and Councillor Gerard also did for a while, and Hong Kong defines congestion. You have to fly into the centre of a town, between skyscrapers, and they loved it, because that wasn't congested for them. In an area space four times the size of Uttlesford there are 5 ½ million people, and that wasn't congested for them. They were doing business, and it worked for them. Great business. Business can work in congestion. It's fine. Far more congested than London was. London is congested. They even have a tariff. You pay money to go into London because they decided: You know what? Enough is enough. We're going to draw a red line. When you drive in you're going to pay money, because it's congested – of course comparing London to Hong Kong is like comparing, well, Uttlesford to London. It's different. It's a different set of circumstances. We talk about Uttlesford because, you know what, we've decided we're going to handle this at a local level, not a national level. That's why we have DfT figures as opposed to our local figures. We've already agreed on that. You've got to say to yourself: Do we have red lines for Uttlesford. Do we have red lines for congestion, or do we have to say: Stop! It's enough. Because that's what we're talking about here. Now it would be hypocritical for me to say I don't like the airport, because I rather do. I like aeroplanes, I like cars, I like music. I like aeroplanes. When I was five – I'm going back a bit - at five my dad took me to the airport and I watched these marvellous aeroplanes. And I'm talking about when there were Viscounts, and I even saw a Constellation once. These were real aeroplanes. And you watched them flying over, sort of hanging in the air. The most amazing thing for a boy. It was brilliant. I've never flown a Constellation. So who am I to talk about airports? You've got nice new aeroplanes, which are apparently cheaper to fly too. It's about congestion. You're not flying to Lap Kok airport now in Lantau. They moved that outside the red line in Hong Kong as well. But I also love music. I love noise. When I was five – and I'm doing a lot when I'm five – I went to a symphony concert, and I sat right in front so I could hear all the bells. (???) the bell that goes. Well, 1812 Overture, there's a cannon that goes, and the louder the better. Deafening. Forget about decibels. That was brilliant. Then I go home. I go home to quiet as my refuge. I flee back to my refuge. People go to London today. I have friends who live in London, believe it or not, on purpose, and they say London isn't what it used to be. Ain't what it used to be. It's congested. It's different. And they're lucky because they can flee back to a refuge in the country. And an airport in the country, they're going to flee back to Uttlesford to the green. And you can keep on fleeing back because it's fun. The problem is, sometimes sound isn't a good thing. It's not about 51 decibels. I'm terribly sorry: I'm not a scientist. It's about the appropriate noise for the space. When you're walking a young baby of six months old who's coughing at 11 o'clock at night, and an aeroplane or even a dog barks, that's too much noise. When you're standing watching a Viscount land you never get too much noise. It's all relative, and we're discussing the relative here. And I've got a problem with this place to be honest. We've been discussing... it's about the degree. How much noise? How much congestion? How much traffic? How many cars? How many planes? I discovered a concept called 'stacking'. I understand this is all evidence. One of our speakers told about the fact they live in Felsted, I think. They talk about aeroplanes stacking. And stacking means pollution. Believe it or not, pollution is congestion. We're killing the planet with congestion. And we may be, in this committee, the last bastion to put that red line in Uttlesford, to hold on to it. And if we don't, where's our refuge then – the Hebrides? Where do we keep moving? At what point do we say: 'Enough'? I'm told, and I've sensed it already, that 2006 was a different year. We didn't really care then. We've woken up, I hope, and it's slightly different now. So yes, as a commissioner we tax, we stack, and I'd be the last person to change. We permitted 35 million people to fly into this refuge, and, of course, to fly out to Ibiza. Are we going to carry on, just keep on winching it up, because business is business, and that's great for everybody? It's

great in Hong Kong; it's great in London. And we all benefit from that, no doubt we do, but unfortunately here around this table we're only batting for Uttlesford. That's in the red book; I had it checked today. We're only batting for the residents and the environment of Uttlesford. We can't talk about Bishop's Stortford, as bad as it may be, because, you know what, it's not relevant. We're here to bat for our people. I'm sorry. I know you don't want me to jump the gun, but I'm proposing that we reject it out of hand. It's the red line. It's been crossed. There's not enough science, and I'm going to be against it. Thank you. (Applause)

Chairman: Ladies and gentlemen, please, really. As we discussed before, I'll park that, because I want to finish the debate. OK? But I'll take it when it comes. Councillor Gerard, did you want to speak?

Councillor Gerard: I was going to second the motion, but I'll wait.

Chairman: Yes, if you can, please. I want to move on and finish the other issues that we've got here. Does anybody else have anything to say specifically related to climate?

Roger Harborough: So, looking in detail at what Beyond the Horizon, the future of UK aviation, as recent Government policy statement says: "The implications of the UK carbon commitments. As explained in the aviation strategy Next Steps document, we have made significant steps in developing international measures for addressing aviation carbon dioxide emissions. As part of that approach the Government has looked at a carbon cap scenario. This was developed to explore the case for expansion, even in a future where aviation emissions were limited to the Committee on Climate Changes planning assumptions of 37.5 million tonnes of CO2 in 2050. Under the DfT carbon cap scenario the cap is met using a combination of carbon pricing and specific measures. In a central demand case we determined that the most appropriate specific measures to use, based on the cost effectiveness and practicality of implementation were more efficient aircraft ground movements using single engine taxiing and higher uptake of renewable fuels." This is a key point. More efficient ground movement policy involves Government action to incentivise the use of single engine taxiing at UK airports. It's assumed the policy would lead to a 95% take up rate by 2030, and beyond, and it's estimated this measure would reduce fuel consumption by around 1% per flight on average. And then it goes on to talk about the renewable fuels policy that again involves Government regulations. So the point that has been made is that the Government has accepted, in relation to emissions from aircraft, that it needs to take the initiative to ensure that the carbon cap scenario could be met. It's not looking to councils in determining planning applications to contribute to that objective. Thank you.

Councillor Fairhurst: I hate reading in public. Beyond the Horizons, page whatever it may be: "Role of local planning. Most of the concerns raised can be addressed through our existing policies", and so on, and so on. Then the sentence is – and it's quite important – "For the majority of environmental concerns the Government expects these to be taken into account as part of existing local planning application processes." That is a policy. "It is right that decisions on elements that impact local individual, such as noise and air quality, should be considered through the appropriate planning processes." I'm sorry. That's my job.

Roger Harborough: So I see nothing inconsistent with that (talking together) the committee about the Government's role in capping carbon emissions.

Councillor Gerard: Just a couple of points. Just following on from that, and it really leads on to the issue of public health, which is kind of a big one I think. There's one question I have to ask of the officers. I read that, in terms of a quality of life assessment – and I'll let everyone get to the relevant section – my understanding is there isn't one. I also read in the detailed submissions that were made by UDC, replies by MAG, and I've read UDC specifically asked MAG to supply us with a quality of life assessment. Now I don't see one. So first of all, if I've missed it in the 12,000 pages, forgive me. Please let me know where it is. And if I haven't missed it, please can you tell me – because I don't actually think it's possible for me to

weigh up – and I’m not sure if any of us can – weigh up the harms and the benefits without that quote. Because it is about quality of life. We’re being asked to balance economics with health and social and environmental issues. So that would have been a really useful assessment to have in front of me, and I don’t see it. I’d love to see it, please.

Roger Harborough: The Council didn’t ask for a quality of life assessment. The reason for that is that the mechanism for assessing the effects of a proposal of this nature is the environmental statement. So that is a comprehensive assessment and it brings together all those strands.

Karen Denmark: Sorry, I’m getting accusations from SSE that we did ask for this document. I would like them to give me the page and the place where we asked for that assessment.

Chairman: OK. Let’s not -----

Councillor Gerard: I found it. You had a spreadsheet where you on the left, MAG on the right, and SSE underneath in yellow I think it was. And I think it was quite early on in the spreadsheet, page 10 or something, there is a direct question on the UDC site that went: Please can you supply us with a quality of life assessment. And MAG goes to say: We don’t need to do this because der, der, der, and nothing further came from that. So I’d just like to know why not. Now I have it in my bag out there – I can go and get it if you give me a minute, but hopefully you have that information to hand.

Chairman: Just bear with me a second. We’ll try and find the relevant piece of paper. To a certain extent Mr Harborough has answered the point by saying that normally an application of this would be satisfied with an environmental statement as opposed to a quality of life assessment. I see sort of where you’re going. It’s whether it would have helped you in making this decision.

Councillor Gerard: Thank you. I need ammunition to make a decision, and I find that I’m running out of ammunition at the moment.

Chairman: Yes, I think ammunition is the wrong word, but that’s neither here nor there. I’m just going to take five minutes, I’m going to pause for five minutes because legal want to catch up with what’s going on over there, and we’ll try and find exactly where we are. (Inaudible) Yes, if you’re very quick, with the microphone.

Councillor Lemon: Thank you. I’m here because I want to help the community. That’s why I became a councillor. And whatever has been said today – and it’s been a long day for us all – I’m beginning to feel that.... And I know that pollution, noise and emissions are going to increase. As far as I am concerned, that’s what the main thing is about: the quality of life. I just don’t see how anything can be better than that. We’ve got to think of quality of life, and at the moment I am edging towards voting against. I’m sorry.....

Chairman: Take five minutes everybody, please, and it really only will be five minutes.

(Adjourned for a short time)

**5.08pm**

Chairman: Right, ladies and gentlemen, continuing. I’ll try and make this the last session, definitely, without another break. I’m going to go to Mrs Denmark to clarify where we were and then I’m going to take Councillor Loughlin.

Karen Denmark: Right. I was just trying to get to another document, but I haven’t actually got a chance to do it. So, quality of life, we didn’t ask for a quality of life assessment. It gets mentioned briefly in the

scoping, and the gen 1 inspector actually felt that all the other environmental assessments carried out in the environmental statement actually cover all the aspects of quality of life adequately without the need for a separate quality of life assessment. The only document that's an official submission from the applicant is this one. There is no reference to a request for a quality of life assessment, so I've got no idea where that accusation has come from that we have asked for one but one has not been provided. (Inaudible)

Councillor Loughlin: Well I've torn this up three times and started again. I just want to say that I've listened... I've read thousands of pages of documents, the environmental study and transport study and everything, and I have listened to everybody who has spoken today on both sides about the figures. But I'm not concentrating on that because people that are cleverer than me have talked about them today, and that is fine. And the picture – I don't know if it's clearer, but we now know where we stand on that. So I'm not going to bother with that bit. And I've written it down because I'm not quick to think off the hoof. But I've said about the figures. I mean I have many reasons to be pleased to have an airport so close. And I and my family, like many others and some here, use it for holidays or business, and as I'm married to an Irishman we use it to visit family and they use it to visit us. Long gone are the days when a trip to Galway took a whole day. A drive to Holyhead with three squabbling young boys and a grumpy husband. A ferry crossing and a long drive from the east of Ireland to the west. Now it takes an hour or two. We had reason to be particularly grateful to have an airport and a low cost airline close to us when a few years ago our eldest son died unexpectedly, and family were able to be here the same day or the next at a time when we needed them most. And I'm very grateful for that. But I'm not here today to judge the application on how I feel about the airport. I have to make a balanced and unbiased decision on planning policy as defined in the Uttlesford Local Plan. For the purpose of this application I will use the existing 2005 local plan. Although it's hoped that the planning inspectorate will find the emerging local plan sound, it cannot be taken for granted - a lesson learned from the last Local Plan. First of all, I'd like to mention the Localism Act. We don't hear much about it now, but it made a great deal of difference to local authorities. It devolved decisions previously made by Government to local authorities. One of the paragraphs in the Act relating to planning states – and I am a planner, so I will be concentrating on that – and I quote: “There are some significant flaws in the planning system. Planning did not give members of the public enough influence over decisions that make a big difference to their lives. Too often power was exercised by people who were not directly affected by the decisions they were taking. This meant, understandably, that people often resented what they saw as decisions and plans foisted upon them. This is still true. Many Parish Councils and local residents are quite rightly concerned about the impact of this application, and I share some of their concerns. It's been mentioned this application is premature, and although the NPPF states that prematurity is not a reason to refuse, it is relevant. MAG's own calculations state that the present 35 million permission will not be reached until 2023, which differs from the Department for Transport's prediction. Paragraph 8.2.2 of the DfT 2017 document regarding air quality states: “Emissions of air pollutants are created by aircraft, airport operations and surface access, and these all have an impact on air quality. At the local level poor air quality has an adverse effect on health, quality of life and the functioning of the ecosystems. The emissions and concentrations of air pollutants are also of concern nationally”. And it goes on to say at paragraph 8.2.3: “The aviation forecasts are an import to the estimation of air quality impacts. Higher passenger growth results in a greater number of ATM's, higher fuel consumption and greater resulting emissions of air pollutants from aircraft, airports and surface access sources.” Although this application doesn't seek to increase the ATM's, even with mitigation measures the surface access sources are likely to remain high, or may become worse. It would be wishful thinking to assume that all passengers or the workforce, many of whom come from outside the district, will use public transport or that all private cars, taxis, etc, would have conveniently placed electric recharging sources. Even assuming that people will want or choose to drive these vehicles, it will take some time to bring these changes about. Also, cars are expensive items, and not everyone has, or will have, the money for a futuristic vehicle. There may come a time when all vehicles will be pollution free, but I suggest this won't be in the near future. Certainly not by 2023, or even 2034. The Officers' Report tells us that Elsenham Woods is already subject to nitrogen deposition that significantly exceeds the critical load for its triple SI woodland habitat. Although Stansted Airport has been advised to undertake



any necessary measures to reduce oxides of nitrogen outputs and nitrogen depositions and the aims of targets of an airport sustainable development may be laudable, the damage has already been done and is likely to increase.

Monitoring is not a mitigation measure. It just tells a story. Given that Stansted Airport owns Elsenham Woods, and I believe have a statutory duty to take care of it, judging by the amount of damage to the woods it seems they haven't done a very good job so far. No mention has been made of the wildlife that depends on this and other woodlands for their survival. Extra access traffic generated by another 8 million passengers per annum, particularly on the M11 and A120, as well as local roads, will undoubtedly be affected by emissions from cars, buses and various other vehicles making their way to and from the airport. Given that the Department for Transport are aware of - and concerned about - the effects of poor air quality on health and wellbeing, the application is contrary to policy ENV13 – Exposure to poor air quality. It reads: "Development that would involve users being exposed to on an extended long term basis to poor air quality outdoors near ground level will not be permitted." A zone 100 metres on either side of the central reservation of the M11 and a zone 35 metres either side of the centre of the A120 have been identified as particular areas to which this policy applies.

And I come on to noise. UDC's Environment and Health Department states: "The environmental study details some improvements to aircraft that are gradually coming on line. Subjectively, these aircraft are likely – and I take that word "likely" – "to be quieter on departure, but this is not necessarily the case on arrivals." The dictionary definition of 'subjectively' is "existing in the mind; not objective; based on personal feeling". Aircraft noise, either in future or now, is not subjective. It is real to those affected by noise. Unless a guarantee that aircraft will be replaced in the life of this proposed application – which is unlikely – it remains an assumption. The Government's publication, Beyond the Horizon, which relates to making best use of existing runways, paragraph 7.30, Reducing Noise, states that "While there are benefits to living near airports" – and I think I've mentioned some that I use myself – "to employment and convenient access to an international gateway, aviation noise can have negative impacts on the quality of life of those living near airports and under flight paths in terms of noise annoyance, sleep disturbance and health issues. It is recognised that opposition to airport expansion and air space changes is driven primarily by local concerns about noise, and that continuing growth in air traffic will make this more challenging." It goes on to say that new generation aircraft have a smaller footprint on take-off and landing than the aircraft they are replacing. Although this is good news it does not say how far in the future some of these replacements are likely to take place.

As with air quality, surface access traffic noise will be generated by an increase in passenger numbers along the M11 and the A120, which has a large amount of residential dwellings along its length. It will particularly affect those who live close to the airport, and, as with air quality problems, the noise generated by the amount of extra traffic will have a detrimental effect on local villages and towns who are on the route to the airport. For all these reasons the application is contrary to policy ENV11: "Noise generation development will not be permitted if it would be liable to affect adversely the reasonable occupation of existing or proposed noise sensitive development nearby, unless the need for the development outweighs the degree of noise generated. It has not been proved to me at this time that there is such a need.

The NPPF states in paragraph 80A: "mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development and avoid giving rise to significant adverse effects/impacts on health and quality of life". Again, at this time I don't believe this application's mitigation measures have been reduced to a minimum. The health and wellbeing of residents of this district and beyond must be paramount, and I don't feel that the applicant has done enough, or will in the near future be able to do enough to protect those whose lives will be blighted by this application in terms of noise, air quality and environmental issues.

For many years – and it has been mentioned today – I have been complaining that it is grossly unfair that only applicants have a right of appeal if an application is approved. The only avenue is the Ombudsman or the prohibitively expensive judicial review. It is therefore important that what we made today, and beyond, is what we feel is the right decision. And for all the reasons that I've mentioned and the policies that I've mentioned I will be voting against this application.

Chairman: OK. Does anybody else wish to speak before I try a sum up, and then I'm going to take the motion that I've had before me?

Councillor Freeman: Very briefly, I fully concur with Councillor Loughlin, the vice-chair. She and I were actually the only two people on this committee who heard the last airport application in 2006 as members of the Development Control Committee then. I have to say it was a much easier decision. This is a hard one, but I think that Councillor Loughlin has hit all the nails on the head bar none.

Councillor Chambers: Mr Chairman, I've been a lifelong resident, and hopefully still will be, of this area. Something that I feel passionately about. I think we all have a very difficult decision today. I think we've all realised that, and the information we've got, as you've heard, thousands of pages, is extremely difficult to take in. Because the more you read the more tired your mind gets and then tends to get a little bit fuzzy. We are here today to make a decision on the future, the medium term future, of Stansted Airport. We have to look at real planning reasons. We're not here, not being disrespectful to everybody sitting here, most of whom are against the expansion of the airport. We're here to look at it on purely planning reasons. Now we've been told that we should not succumb to business, and I agree with that altogether. We have to look at local people. But one thing which has really struck me, listening to 12 hours of people speaking for or against, is that we have an obligation to the next generation. Not just us. We've had – a lot of us, not all of us – a lot of us have had most of our lives. We have to think about the next generation. Now I have been listening very carefully to what people have to say, and I know most of those people who were for the airport have some association with it, maybe have a business connection with it, or maybe work at the airport. But what has struck me is – one of the things very important – what that young lady said this morning from the academy. I talk to a lot of people – young people as well, surprising as that may be – and all the young people I talk to say that the airport is something which is a good idea. Now if you live under the flight path, or you're close to where the aircraft take off and land, I can fully understand why you don't like it. But you've actually heard today, with the airport, that they have permission for 274,000 ATMs, of which they haven't used anywhere near what they can use, so therefore the number of flights will be limited to that 274,000. And presumably, if and when it gets to that, there would have to be another application to raise it. Am I right? [Karen Denmark - Yes you are right] Now for all these reasons I feel very, very strongly about we have no reason to say from 35 to 43 is premature. Anybody sitting in this room tonight, if they've had anything to do with the business – and I mean big business – you have to plan for the future. You cannot be like politicians – and we're all the same. We only work to a four-yearly thing, because each four years somebody puts a cross on a piece of paper. I'm not thinking about that now. I'm thinking about the future generations of Uttlesford. I'm thinking about where they're going to get their work from, where they're going to get their connections from, where they're going to live, and the airport has something to do with all those things. So for that reason I urge you to go along with what the officers are saying and approve the application. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Chairman: OK. Anybody else at this stage? No? OK. I've got a motion in front of me for a refusal, and I have a seconder for that motion as such. So we're going to take a vote .... (Inaudible)

Nigel Brown: Could I just do my usual boring stuff? This is when it gets back to..... We do need a reason, and what I would suggest.... I think what would unite this whole room here today is, this is a significant decision by members, and what I would suggest is if members have a refusal reason, and it is agreed, that the matter - we check the robustness of that refusal reason and bring it back to a future committee – not next week, I would suggest – but take it back to a future committee for members to ratify it. You need to be advised on the strength of the refusal before you actually formally refuse it. But I'm happy to take – if members are mindful to refuse it – to take it away as a resolution.

Councillor Fairhurst: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I take very seriously what Councillor Chambers said about the youth and about the future. As you know, I'm the chap who brought in the Youth Council. They do matter. They are the future, and we have to consider the jobs they have. It's really important. We are very fortunate at the moment that we don't have unemployment in this area, but that's not permanent

and I have been involved in very big business for a long time, so I know how it works. I know about futures as well. But it's exactly that point that tips me over the edge, because, to be quite honest, it's the future of our children, and the future of our planet, and the future of Uttlesford that we are discussing today. We won't be here, sitting at this table, in 15-20 years' time when the impact of the air quality and the noise and the other harms that occur here will affect us. And the damage we do to Elsenham Wood and the other areas will really be well along the line. And they'll turn back to us and they will say: Thanks Dad, because you've broken it. Now I'm speaking specifically – because I think we're on the same wavelength here. Yes, we have to consider, we have to weigh up the deal as far as business is concerned. We have to weigh up a real future. Things are going to change. I'm hoping, I really am hoping, as Councillor Loughlin said, we will have electric aeroplanes, we'll have carbon free transport. I really think it's not impossible if we put our minds to it. But until that time, what is absolutely certain about this process is you are heading headlong into damage. No-one can question that. We have to be hopeful; we have to be optimistic, but as things stand now, based on this application, that's the certainty. So because of that youth.... I also support them. We have three options here. We can say, we have to say, we can approve - nothing wrong with approving - we do that a couple of times, defer, prematurity, we don't have enough information about it, says the Chairman. There's a lot missing. A lot of it can be filled in and give us a better chance, a better handle on where we're going. Any problem with this? What I do for a living we talk about 'billable hours'. The amount it costs, each one of you guys. I'm just going to thank Katherine and Mary and Peter. You sat here and took it all from us. They spent hours on this stuff. I'm going to thank SSE, because they've done hours, they've spent a lot of billable hours themselves. They've helped us make some semblance of this process. I'm quite chuffed that we had today, because today we didn't sound completely amateurish, I hope you agree with that. We did a decent job of it. It now comes to the bottom line. When you come to the wire, there's no flinching now, you don't take the easy way out now. We say hold our own. Let's look at the three, objectively and frankly. First: Are we absolutely sure, beyond a reasonable doubt, are we absolutely sure that saying Yes to this process is what our children will thank us for? Because you are Mr Health & Safety in this Council. So you know what I'm talking about. Are you absolutely sure, when you put your pen to paper, that what we're doing is right? Because if you're not absolutely sure you've got two other options: defer or refuse. And I must tell you, when I went through this documentation – you can see I'm surrounded by what I would call a numerate individual and a scientist – but I went through this process, and crikey, I'm out of my depth. I'm good with paper. Reading through 5,000 pages is what we do for a living. I was out of my depth. Baffled with noise, LEQs and things. I had to establish what an ATM was – I thought it was a bank. I worked at it. We apply our minds. I think, I hope, all of us put our effort in, and we try hard, and it's conspicuous that all of us made an effort. At the end of the day, where we are today, I don't think anyone here, I truly don't think anyone here – including you, Mr Chairman – can put your hand on your heart and say: I know what I'm doing. You don't. You know maybe 80%. You may feel a preponderance, but you do not know. And that leaves you with defer or reject. Because if you say Yes, beyond a reasonable doubt, you walk into this with confidence and say 'Go for it! Build your airport'. ... And to be honest, I agree with you. I love our little airport in the country. I use it more than you do. I pop over to Germany every now and again and I think it's brilliant. I think it's brilliant. I'm not sure how it will look when it's at 35 million a year, but we are not asking about that, we are asking where it goes from here. I'm asking you, I'm appealing to you, think about it because I know who you are. Think about it. If you're absolutely sure, you sit there with hand on heart, and I'm going to ask for recorded votes so I know who you are, then vote for it. If you're not absolutely sure, then go for a deferral. I know you would like a deferral, because I know you can unravel.... I'm certain everything is solvable in life. As far as I'm concerned, it's billable hours. It's the cost of all these fine people, and all of us, and all of those people, and you, to come here over and over again and read all the documents. I think it was someone we respect here who said it's been nine months. I think people can be made in nine months. How much longer do you need? I had enough time to cover it all. As you can see, my learned friend here had time to do it twice over. So I appeal to you to think about this. It is a big decision. We've done the homework. We feel it. And of course you're fine. We've got Nigel. We'll be fine. He's helped us a lot. No, we do respect you. But the point is this: how to thank you, Karen, because it's a hard job, and I've told you that already. We've done the work, now step up and do the right thing. Thank you.

Chairman: Councillor Loughlin, very briefly, and then..... (Inaudible)

Councillor Loughlin: You mean I have to be as brief as that? He's doing Hamlet next week, aren't you? I just want to ask about the policies, because I'm very firm in the policies that I want to use, which are: our local plan policies ENV11 and ENV13. We're told that this is going to go away. I will not waiver from those policies. You're talking about going away and coming back to the committee at a future time. Why did we need to do that? Can you not say now what policies we should use? I actually believe (talking together) I believe the ones that I've used are the ones that are relevant to this. If you tell me different, why can't we.... Why do we have to come back?

Nigel Brown: It's not just....you've suggested ENV11 and ENV13, which are actually the two policies from picking up the debate which picks up over noise and air quality. I would move back from GEN1 and GEN7. Those policies are picking up those. I do advise you that the evidence that we've got, and what we felt justified us recommending the approval, you feel that you not, but it's not just the policy; it's the wording of the policy. We're putting 'ands' and 'buts', it could be 'you haven't got enough evidence to demonstrate that it doesn't do this'. So it's literally the wording of the condition, rather than just throwing policies at it. And that's what I would suggest it is. As an adviser, I do have to advise you that that is the best way forward for the council to try to put forward as robust case as we can put forward. That's all I can say.

Chairman: OK. Councillor Gerard, I'm trying to wrap this up.

**5.30pm**

Councillor Gerard: I know you are, but I do feel that, after all the debate and after all the questions, I do need to speak on this matter. We haven't mentioned the elephant in the room of policy, which is emerging local plan. I'll come to that in a moment. But there are many grounds to reject this application. On balance I believe it's the correct decision to reject on balance. We have a duty, actually a duty of care, to make the right decision. I agree with my colleagues here, I agree with many people around the table, I love the airport, I use the airport. I use many airports, and I think it's one of the things. I also have been involved in big business, and I was involved in the Hong Kong airport in the 1990's; I was advising the provisional airport authority. I understand about airports. I understand the economic benefits that come from airports and big business. The fact is, though, that we are responsible and we have to look after the interests of our community, our wider community at large, which here happens to be Uttlesford. If we were the business development committee of South East England we would be thinking about things differently, and the economic benefits would be broader, and we could consider them. But the economic benefits to Uttlesford that I can.... I've asked for numbers, I've asked for the actual numbers for the economic benefit, which is one third of our consideration, I don't believe that those economic benefits, as prescribed in our bible, the NPPF, as prescribed in paragraph 8, I don't believe that those outweigh the two other thirds, which are the social issues – and we have many people who are here who are social, and we've had 47 Parish Councils representing their social community.... 47 Parish Councils have said this is wrong, and I believe that we have to consider that. Not one has said: You know what, on balance, actually it's going to give us more jobs, it's going to be good for us, we're going to be better, and we say 'Yes'. Not one has said that, and I have to consider that. The future is wonderful, I agree. You have to look at the future. I have a 16-year old daughter. She's a councillor on the youth committee, and she's flying to Germany to visit friends and go places using Stansted Airport. Wonderful. But that's not the issue. I wish Stansted Airport (inaudible) and I think it's wonderful that Harlow is doing so well and supports it, and East Herts and so on support it, but we're Uttlesford. It's been given to us; it's been put on our table, and if the decision wasn't put on our table someone else would make the decision based upon what is important to them. But we're here, the book says that we're responsible to our electorate and the wider community of the district. So it's not just our wards, our voters, but it's all 80,000 residents of Uttlesford.

So, cut to the chase. We cannot approve this because, on balance, the harms, social and environmental, in my opinion, outweigh the economic benefits for Uttlesford, and therefore the following policies apply. I agree, Councillor Loughlin. In terms of air quality, I agree. ENV13 applies. I agree ENV11 applies on noise. I would argue that SP11 is a material consideration which we could consider the weighting of, but I just make a point to consider it, please. I think that we have an issue on ...we have the NPPF which clearly, paragraph 8 and 148 and 150 on carbon emissions. On air quality I would agree that we have 175(b). On road traffic I think GEN1 is possibly a bit borderline. I think it's worth considering but perhaps that's ...maybe... I'm not sure, although I do believe that SP11 kicks in on that. On the rail traffic I think NPPF 104(e) and NPPF 109. On public health I think there is a very strong case for GEN2 and also NPPF paragraph 91, 204 and 205. And then the final issue, I agree with Councillor Loughlin, the Localism Act is something to consider too. So I will conclude there, and I'm happy to second the motion to reject this application.

Chairman: Thank you. Mr Brown, I just know, wants to clarify one thing, then I'm going to ask Councillor Loughlin-----

Nigel Brown: Can I just... Although we can't sit in our Uttlesford bubble here. I know you're here to represent Uttlesford, but the benefits need to go beyond Uttlesford and just like you're considering the impacts beyond Uttlesford. So it's not just.... Because we're talking about an airport, the impacts go beyond Uttlesford, and the benefits go beyond Uttlesford, so I just need to clarify that. I just also need to clarify in terms of.... There's also the proposal from Councillor Fairhurst is that to (?) to refuse applications on the basis of ENV11, ENV13, and for the formal refusal reasons to be considered and to come back to you for further consideration.

Chairman: You're happy with that = OK Councillor Loughlin.

Councillor Loughlin: Thank you. Well, I've already mentioned the NPPF paragraph 80A, which I think is relevant, and I think Karen agrees with that, but I do not and won't agree to SP11. I was here when the last public enquiry happened for the Local Plan, and the Inspector left before we even got to the end, and we found it unsound. It can't be material, because at the moment we don't know what the inspectorate will do, and we're quoting policies that are hearsay. People want it to go through, but that doesn't necessarily mean it will, and I don't think it's strong enough to quote that.

Nigel Brown: This does get to the boring bit, in fact. Just to pick up Councillor Loughlin. She's spot on, apart from the fact it is material, but with very little weight in terms of the Local Plan, because of the status that it's got to. It still is material.

Chairman: We know where we are. Councillor Fairhurst's application.

Councillor Fairhurst: I'm just trying to defend what Nigel Brown said. SP11 at the moment, in the ELP, doesn't carry full weight. Is it possible in a condition like this to say SP11, subject to it being approved. Because you're talking about the same window, aren't we?

Chairman: No, you can't.

Councillor Fairhurst: Can't we? (Talking together)

Nigel Brown: As today, on 14th November we are considering application on application. You are right. If we have a public enquiry following a refusal that's set up in the summer, we could be in a different place, but that's where we are, so we have to consider it as a snapshot today.

Chairman: OK. Well, we know where we are. I haven't said much today.... (Inaudible) Mr Ryles.

Councillor Ryles: Thank you, Chairman. Before you move towards the vote, I've been sitting here, my mind is going round and round, because I do appreciate all the concerns about the environmental side of things and noise. We have to think about the wider things as far as the economy is concerned, and the good that it will bring, and jobs for the future, etc. When I start to think about what our experts have said about improvements in planes I start to think, Well, when they brought out early trains, probably some time ago, they said if you went over a few miles an hour you were going to suffocate. And likewise, you know, when.... Some people might remember, but there were cars with some people waving flags in front to make sure people didn't get knocked over. So whilst I appreciate.... and also, just one more thing. I am directly affected, because I live in High Easter, and I get the planes coming over from 6.15 every 15 minutes. But I think we have to look wider than what our own needs are in this area. I know my Parish Council, Takeley, are going to be very upset with me, but I do think we have to think wider, and I do think that, you know... I'm a great believer in technology, and it will solve itself in the future. I think there is some demand within business that they have to make their planes more efficient. The whole society is moving towards a greener environment, you know. We're all trying to do things greener and quieter and having a bit more consideration for our common land. So I think those sorts of things will happen in the future. Whether they will happen in time for 2023 I don't know, but I don't think that it's helpful really to put in a barrier here now on this planning application, because if Stansted Airport wanted to have more planes flying they've already got the permissions back from 2008. So let's be sensible about this. Let's look for the future. As Robert, as Councillor Chambers says, let's think about the future, the economic growth for our people, for our youngsters. And one thing, which I know sounds a bit trite, but I think in Star Trek that somebody said the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few. And I think we should consider that. Try not to be too local. We are local. We have to decide on this, but let's have a look at the bigger picture. That's all I've got to say.

Chairman: Anybody else? No? OK. I didn't prepare a speech for this. I'm just going to wing this from what's been said today. I did receive an email late last night, about one o'clock in the morning, asking me to be courageous in whatever decision I choose to make, and basically implying that I would be a coward if I made a decision in favour of this application. I know all of us have received a certain amount of bombardment of emails and there's been a certain amount of information which may be questionable, but may be correct, and has therefore been tested today, and that's been one of the issues inasmuch as we haven't been able perhaps to get to the bottom of some things. And I think that's put enough, shall we say, doubts in people's minds as to exactly where we are. So I'm going to try and simplify it for me. I take the points about the railways, but this application can't be expected to resolve every single infrastructure problem that we have in this country. What we have to judge is whether the mitigation that is being proposed is sufficient to cover the application that's in front of us. And that's a judgement call for all of us, you know. Are they giving enough back for what we're going to do? Is the application premature? I take your point. I mean, Paul, I'm sure with your business, you know, if it's expanding then you're going to employ more solicitors. You basically plan in front. I don't think with the existing trajectory that Stansted is going through actually applying for this application now is premature at all. I think, if anything, you know, they've got to get their work cut out because, depending on what happens today... If it goes to appeal it's going to take 18 months to get to a decision, or wherever it goes. So prematurity. I noticed from our site visit the other day, they haven't as yet built satellite 4, that I think was part of the 2008 permission, and they certainly haven't built some of the stands that were also part of that 2008 application. So what's happened is the demand, basically, has driven what they've done. And the same thing would happen here. If the demand fell off then they're not going to do certain things, and basically we're all quieter and everything for it.

I think we've got to look again, a bit like Councillor Ryles perhaps the broader picture. This country voted on 23 June 2016 to leave the EU. For me it made a decision to stand on its own two feet. It made a decision that we are capable of standing on our own two feet, and I think, with that, we have to be able to support that decision, which means investing in the future, investing in our young people. I'm, like Councillor Ryles, going to look at this bigger, if you like. I know the impact on Uttlesford. I understand that, but I think we've also got a duty to everything else going forward, and that's how I'm coming at it.

So, having said enough, I'm going to go to the vote for a rejection, as Councillor Fairhurst proposed, and seconded by Councillor Gerard. All those in favour of a rejection please show, and you want the named vote. Yes, but we put all the hands up together and we'll record the vote then. OK? So all those in favour of a rejection, please show. Five. How did I know? OK. All those against that rejection, please show. Five. In that case I have a casting vote, and I'm going to vote against the rejection. So we go back to the substantive, and the substantive is for an approval. (Inaudible) Or....

Councillor Fairhurst: I'm going to propose we defer. (Inaudible)

Chairman: We do need a reason. Can we have a reason so we know why we defer?

Councillor Fairhurst: We're not ready. We have an aviation strategy coming in a month's time, which would help us a lot. We have Brexit coming in about three months' time, which will change things. We need to know where we are. I think a deferral would allow us to fill in some of the holes. It would definitely make... We discussed here, and the Chairman agreed there were holes to be filled, so I think it's what we need to do. I strongly propose the deferment.

Councillor Gerard: I second the deferment proposal.

Chairman: I have a proposal for a deferral now, and I have a seconder for a referral. OK? The reasons for that being the reasons you've just proposed. We'll go to the vote on that issue. All those in favour of a deferral, please show. Three. OK. All those against the deferral, please show. Five. Abstentions? One. OK. So that item is rejected. I now go back to the substantive, which is a recommendation for approval. Does that find a proposer?

Councillor Ryles: I propose approval.

Chairman: OK, I have a proposer. Does that find a seconder?

Councillor Hicks: Seconded, Chairman.

Chairman: OK. I have a proposer and a seconder for an acceptance. All those in favour of this application being approved, please show now. Five. I have five in favour. All of those against, please show. Five. For the reasons I outlined this item is approved. Thank you very much.

Nigel Brown: Just to clarify to everyone. The resolution today is to approve but the Secretary of State has requested that we do not issue a decision to approve until they have made a judgment on the matter.

**Ends 5.47pm**